

Case	27.PC0202	
Reference/		
Description	Arklow Sewerage Scheme Wastewater County Wicklow.	r Treatment Plant at Ferrybank, Arklow,
Case Type:	Pre-app consultation	
Meeting:	6 th	
Date:	28 th September, 2017	11.10 a.m.
Location:	Board's offices	
Chairperson:	Anne Marie O'Connor	

Attendees:
Representing An Bord Pleanála
Anne Marie O'Connor – Assistant Director of Planning
Mairead Kenny – Senior Planning Inspector
David Curran – Senior Executive Officer
Kieran Somers – Executive Officer
Representing Prospective Applicant
John Joyce, Irish Water, Project Manager
Olwyn James, Irish Water, Spatial Planning Specialist
Kevin Scanlon, Wicklow County Council, Local Authority Project Manager
Clodagh O'Donovan, Arup, Consultant EIAR Lead
Eamonn Sweetman, ByrneLooby, Consultant Project Manager
Neil Reid, Arup, Consultant Assistant Project Manager
Colm Moore, Clancy Moore, Project Architect



The meeting commenced at 11.10 a.m.

The Board referred to the previous meeting held on the 9th November, 2016 and asked if the prospective applicant had any comments to make on the record of this. The prospective applicant replied that it had no comments to make.

Prospective Applicant's Presentation:

The prospective applicant recapped on the scope and extent of the proposed development and noted for the record that two additional elements have been added to the project since the time of the last pre-application consultation meeting; these are the integration/interface with the Arklow Flood Relief Scheme proposed for the South Quay and the proposed upgrade of the rock armour revetment adjacent to the site. With respect to the proposed flood relief scheme, the prospective applicant said that meetings have been held with representatives from Wicklow County Council and the Office of Public Works. It added that a memorandum of understanding between it and Wicklow County Council is being prepared. The proposed flood relief scheme includes elements such as flood defence walls, river widening, surface water drainage and public realm improvements. The prospective applicant said that any SID application made to the Board with regard to the instant development would be cognisant of the local authority application which would be also made to the Board pursuant to either section 175 or section 226 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. Worse case scenarios for phasing and construction sequencing will be outlined with regard to this.

With respect to the proposed upgrade of existing rock armour revetment, the prospective applicant said that analysis and data indicates that this will not offer sufficient protection for the proposed buildings on the site in extreme weather conditions. It is proposed that the new replacement revetment will be approximately two metres higher that the existing one and will extend for approximately 500 metres adjacent to the subject site. The prospective applicant remarked that the provision of a walkway along the revetment had been considered, but has now been omitted from the scheme owing to health and safety issues which might arise in relation to wave heights and overtopping. The Board's representatives asked the prospective applicant to elaborate on this further and the prospective applicant did so by saying that it had weighed up the financial viability of providing an amenity which, ultimately, might not comply with health and safety standards. It said that robust consultations with Wicklow County Council had taken place on this and stressed that this decision would not impede any future development of a similar structure or an amenity space.



With regards to health and safety, the prospective applicant clarified to the Board that it was having regard to best practice guidance as set out in the 'European Overtopping Manual on wave overtopping of sea defences and related structures' (EurOtop), in its decision to no longer pursue the walkway.

With respect to the development plan and policy context, the prospective applicant noted Objective W16 of the recently adopted Wicklow County Development Plan which provides that the local authority 'will work alongside and facilitate Irish Water's Water Services Investment Programme.' The prospective applicant also noted that WwTP are currently 'open for consideration' in the WZ Waterfront zoning of the Draft Arklow and Environs Local Area Plan but that the LAP has yet to be adopted and that these provisions remained subject to possible amendments. The prospective applicant said its understanding was that the local area plan will be formally adopted in November 2017.

In relation to the preparation of the EIAR which will accompany the formal planning application, the prospective applicant said that an informal scoping process is being undertaken and that the scoping report is being finalised. It is intended that the scoping report will be issued to stakeholders for comment at the same time as non-statutory consultations are commenced. The prospective applicant advised generally that liaisons are on-going with representatives from Wicklow County Council and the Office of Public Works. Marine site investigations are currently in progress and the land-based site investigations are complete for the sewer elements. With regard to the Wallboard Site, the prospective applicant noted that site access for additional investigations is challenging from a health and safety perspective. The Board's representatives reminded the applicant that the need to address the issue of potential ground contamination of the site in any application had been raised by the Board in its earlier Direction.

With regard to consultations, the prospective applicant said that two open day consultation events have been scheduled for October 2017. A four-week period of non-statutory consultations is scheduled to commence shortly and this will extend until the middle of November 2017.

Responding to the Board's query on the matter, the prospective applicant said that the community needs analysis has been undertaken. With regard to the proposed Arklow Flood Relief Scheme, the prospective applicant said its understanding is this will be submitted to the Board sometime in Quarter 2 of 2018. Noting this, the representatives of the Board said that they might seek a meeting with the Office of Public Works.



The prospective applicant then gave a presentation on the proposed architectural design and form of the proposed buildings on the subject site. The prospective applicant noted that the site, as it currently exists, is largely defined by its maritime and industrial character. The prospective applicant said that it has consulted with the local authority with regard to the scale and appearance of the proposed development and advised that the local authority is in favour of a stacked approach for the wastewater treatment plant so as to release the remainder of the site for a landscaped amenity area. The prospective applicant then outlined the options it had considered with regard to materials to be employed. A series of images have been prepared for the non-statutory consultation which will commence shortly. With regard to the proposed design and form, the prospective applicant said that this has been presented to the local authority and it is happy with the scale and massing; however, the prospective applicant noted that the local authority is noncommittal with regard to the preferred design finishes (louvred fibre cement board clad to a concrete frame structure) and that this leaves it in something of a quandary. The prospective applicant said its preference would be to work up as much of the design as possible rather than have this conditioned if a grant of permission were given; it commented that such a scenario might cause a delay in construction and also lead to extra costings.

The Board's representatives noted the concerns of the prospective applicant in this regard, but said that they could not give any guarantee with regard to any planning decision made by the Board. It was also pointed out to the prospective applicant that the Board can only advise on matters relating to proper planning and sustainable development or the environment which may have a bearing on the Board's decision in respect of a future application, but cannot speculate on what decision the Board might take on such a matter. The Board's representatives did express some reservations regarding the massing of the proposed main building, its visual impact in a local context and its possible dominance in the skyline. Noting this, the prospective applicant said it would take these comments on board and reappraise its design approach. The prospective applicant also noted that the forthcoming public consultations might be of assistance in terms of feedback on this aspect.

The Board's representatives indicated that they might seek a further meeting with Wicklow County Council as part of this pre-application consultation case.



Responding to the Board's query on the matter, the prospective applicant said that a flood risk assessment has been conducted for the site and that it has established the site does not flood. With respect to the proposed replacement revetment works, the prospective applicant reiterated that these are to protect the site and to prevent wave overtopping. These works do not form part of the proposed Arklow Flood Relief Scheme it emphasised.

The Board enquired as to whether there has been any more development with regard to phasing. The prospective applicant said that the current intention is to provide 24,000 PE capacity; if this were to be upgraded to 36,000 PE capacity, this will only entail internal works.

The prospective applicant also undertook to revert to the Board in relation to its preparation of the compulsory purchase order application which will be lodged at the same time as the formal planning application.

The prospective applicant said that its current intention is to lodge the formal planning application circa Quarter 1 of 2018.

Conclusion:

It was agreed that a further meeting in this pre-application consultation process will take place prior to the prospective applicant requesting closure. The prospective applicant will request this meeting and indicated that it was likely to do so following the conclusion of the non-statutory consultation time period.

The meeting concluded at 12.40 p.n	n.
	_
Anne Marie O'Connor	
Assistant Director of Planning	