



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

# S. 4(1) of Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 2016

## Inspector's Report ABP-307100-20

---

### Strategic Housing Development

467 homes, a shop, a gym, a café and  
a creche

### Location

Maynooth Road, Crodaun, Celbridge,  
Co. Kildare

### Planning Authority

Kildare County Council

### Applicant

Crodaun Development Company Ltd.

### Prescribed Bodies

Irish Water  
National Transport Authority  
Transport Infrastructure Ireland  
Inland Fisheries Ireland

### Observers

See Appendix

**Date of Site Inspection**

18<sup>th</sup> August 2020

**Inspector**

Stephen J. O'Sullivan

## Contents

1.0 Introduction .....	4
2.0 Site Location and Description .....	4
3.0 Proposed Strategic Housing Development .....	5
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Section 5 Pre Application Consultation .....	6
6.0 Relevant Planning Policy .....	9
7.0 Third Party Submissions .....	19
8.0 Planning Authority Submission .....	26
9.0 Prescribed Bodies.....	32
10.0 Screening for Appropriate Assessment.....	34
11.0 Environmental Impact Assessment .....	35
12.0 Assessment of other issues .....	46
13.0 Material Contravention .....	61
14.0 Chief Executive’s Recommendation.....	62
15.0 Recommendation .....	64
16.0 Reasons and Considerations .....	64
17.0 Conditions .....	68
Appendix – List of persons who made submissions .....	77

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1. This is an assessment of a proposed strategic housing development submitted to the Board under section 4(1) of the Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 2016.

## 2.0 Site Location and Description

- 2.1. The site is on the northern side of the town of Celbridge, Co. Kildare. That town had a population of 20,288 at the 2016 census. The site has a stated area of 12.68ha. It consists of 3 fields under pasture bounded by hedgerows. Its closest point is c1.7km from the centre of the town on Main Street. The site is on the eastern side of the Maynooth Road which is the regional route R405. The site has c650m of frontage onto that that road, which is subject to a 50kph speed limit and has a footpath on each side with a painted line to mark off a cycle track. A bus stop stands on the road along the southern part of the site's frontage. The northern part of the site adjoins a roundabout at the junction of that road and the R449 which leads to junction No. 6 on the M4 motorway c1km to the north-east.
- 2.2. The site is relatively flat. Kilwogan Stream runs along its southern boundary with trees and hedges along both sides. Kilwogan Lane is on the other side of stream with suburban housing one and two storeys high to the south of that lane at estates known as Castle Village and Thornhill Court. The land on the other side of the Maynooth Road opposite the southern part of the site is occupied by single storey suburban housing in an estate known as Crodaun Forest Park. This housing does not have frontage onto the Maynooth Road. The land across the Maynooth Road opposite the northern part of the site is undeveloped. The southern part of the eastern site boundary adjoins other fields. The northern part of the eastern site boundary adjoins the curtilage of a secondary school. Another post primary school lies on the other side of the Maynooth Road to the north of the site beside a commercial development with mainly two storey functional structures that accommodate offices, childcare facilities, some bulky retail uses and a petrol station.

### 3.0 Proposed Strategic Housing Development

3.1. The proposed development would provide 467 homes, a shop, café, a gym and a creche. The proposed housing mix would be as follows-

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5 bed	Total
Houses			87	92	20	199
Apartments	18	210	40			268
Total	18	210	127	92	20	467

The gross floor area of the residential development would be 53,123m<sup>2</sup>. The floor area of the other uses would be 1,338m<sup>2</sup> including 766m<sup>2</sup> for the creche, 330m<sup>2</sup> for the gym, 119m<sup>2</sup> for the shop and 123m<sup>2</sup> for the café.

3.2. The proposed development would provide a public open space of 2ha at the northern end of the site. Four apartment blocks would be laid out along the eastern edge of the site facing the Maynooth Road. They would be 5 or 6 storeys high. They would contain 216 of the proposed apartments. The non-residential parts of the development would be on the ground floor of the southernmost block. The rest of the scheme would provide 3 and 2 storey buildings comprised of the 199 proposed houses and another 52 apartments.

3.3. The proposed development would provide two new junctions onto the Maynooth Road providing access to an internal street network with an orthogonal layout. There would be a linear open space running from the proposed park along one of the north-south streets for most of the length of the site. There would be landscaped strips along the southern and western boundaries of the scheme, and a smaller space forming a square amid housing.

3.4. 709 car parking spaces are proposed. Each of the houses would be provided with 2 carparking spaces on or near their curtilage. The apartments would be provided with 1 parking space each, 154 of which would be at basement level under the apartment blocks. 10 spaces would be provided for the commercial uses. There would be another 33 visitor spaces at various locations on the streets around the proposed development. 574 bike parking spaces would be provided in the basement below

the apartment blocks, with another 23 spaces at surface level beside the commercial premises.

#### **4.0 Planning History**

- 4.1. There is no relevant planning history pertaining the site. There is an application for permission currently before the board under ABP-306504-20 for a strategic housing development of 372 homes on the other side of the Maynooth Road opposite the northern part of the site of this application.

#### **5.0 Section 5 Pre Application Consultation**

- 5.1. A pre-application consultation in relation to a proposed development of 382 dwellings on the site took place on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2018. However the documentation submitted with the current application refers to another pre-application consultation with the applicants and the planning authority took place at the offices of An Bord Pleanála on the 29<sup>th</sup> May 2019 in respect of a proposed development of 495 dwellings on the site. The main topics raised for discussion at the tripartite meeting were as follows:

1. Development strategy for the site to include layout, density, unit mix and typology, elevational treatment, connectivity, Part V proposals, open space provision, childcare facility
2. Infrastructural constraints- foul and surface water drainage; flood risk
3. Transport and parking
4. Any other matters

Copies of the record of the meeting and the inspector's report are on this file.

- 5.2. The board issued an opinion on which stated that the submitted documents required further consideration and amendment to constitute a reasonable basis for an application for strategic housing development in respect of the following issues -

1. Design, Layout and Unit Mix

Further consideration/justification of the documents as they relate to the layout of the proposed development particularly in relation to the 12 criteria set out in the Urban Design Manual which accompanies the above mentioned Guidelines and the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets. The matters of arrangement and hierarchy of streets; the creation of a defined urban edge along the Maynooth Road; connectivity with adjoining lands; provision of quality, usable open space and the creation of character areas within a high quality scheme should be given further consideration. This further consideration should be undertaken in an holistic manner, examining the entirety of the development site and should examine areas of the site where increased height and density may be appropriate, for example along the Maynooth Road, overlooking the areas of open space and along the southern site boundary. In addition, further consideration/justification of the documents as they relate to the proposed housing mix, having regard to the proportion of three bed and larger units within the overall proposed scheme. The further consideration of these issues may require an amendment to the documents and/or design proposals submitted

## 2. Elevational Treatment/Finishes

Further consideration and/or justification of the documents as they relate to the elevational treatment/expression and finishes of the proposed development, having regard to the context of the site within an established suburban area and the desire to ensure that the proposed development makes a positive contribution to the character of the area over the long term. An architectural report and urban design statement should be submitted with the application. In addition, a report that specifically addresses the materials and finishes of the proposed structures including specific detailing of finishes, openings, the treatment of balconies, railings, landscaped areas and boundary treatments, having regard to the long term management and maintenance of the proposed development should be submitted. Furthermore, particular regard should also be had to proposals for the treatment of the interface between the proposed buildings and public realm/areas of communal open space. The further consideration of these

issues may require an amendment to the documents and/or design proposals submitted at application stage

### 3. Infrastructural Constraints

Further consideration/clarification of the documents as they relate to wastewater infrastructure constraints in the network serving the proposed development in particular as it relates to the Lower Liffey Drainage Area Plan. The documentation at application stage should clearly indicate the nature of the constraints, the proposals to address the constraints and the timelines involved in addressing these constraints relative to the construction and completion of the proposed development. (The prospective applicant may wish to satisfy themselves that an application is not premature having regard to the information sought above).

### 4. Surface Water Management and Flood Risk Assessment

Further consideration of the documents as they relate to surface water management for the site. This further consideration should have regard to the requirements of the Drainage Division as indicated in their report dated 10th May, 2019 and contained in Appendix B of the Planning Authority's Opinion. Any surface water management proposals should be considered in tandem with a Flood Risk Assessment specifically relating to appropriate flood risk assessment that demonstrates the development proposed will not increase flood risk elsewhere and, if practicable, will reduce overall flood risk. A Flood Risk Assessment should be prepared in accordance with 'The Planning System and Flood Risk Management' (including the associated 'Technical Appendices'). Further consideration of these issues may require an amendment to the documents and/or design proposals submitted.

### 5.3. The opinion also stated that the following specific information should be submitted with any application for permission –

1. A detailed landscaping plan for the site which clearly sets out proposals for hard and soft landscaping including street furniture and play areas where proposed, and which includes detailed proposals for the area of zoned public open space, included within the red line boundary.



2. A detailed phasing plan for the proposed development
3. Ecological Surveys
4. Waste management details
5. A site layout plan indicating what areas, if any, are to be taken in charge by the planning authority. Streets should be shown up to the boundary to facilitate future access
6. Details of re-routing or undergrounding of any overhead power lines
7. A report identifying demand for school places likely to be generated by the proposal and the capacity of existing schools in the vicinity to cater for such demand.
8. A schedule of floor areas for all proposed units

#### 5.4. Applicant's Statement

- 5.4.1. In relation to item 1, the statement states that the submitted design statement addresses compliance with the 12 criteria including those relating to the hierarchy and alignment of streets, the provision of an urban edge along the Maynooth Road, connectivity with adjoining lands, the quality of the open space and the proposed character areas, and the passive supervision of the public realm. An engineer's report refers to DMURS. The proportion of one- and two-bedroom units has been increased. In relation to item 2, a report is submitted that addresses finishes and materials and the details of landscaping have been addressed by landscape architects. In relation to items 3 and 4, an engineer's report addresses infrastructural constraints while a flood risk assessment has been prepared after consultation with the council. The specific information requested by the board has been submitted in relation to landscaping, phasing, ecology, waste management, taking in charge, relocation of power lines, a schools report and a schedule of floor areas.

### 6.0 Relevant Planning Policy

#### 6.1. National Policy

- 6.1.1. The government published the **National Planning Framework 2040** in February 2018. Objective 1b is to plan for an additional 490,000 to 540,000 people in the Eastern and Midland Region. 3c is to deliver at least 30% of new houses in settlements, other than the cities, within their existing footprints. Objective 11 is to

favour development that can encourage more people to live or work in existing settlements. Objective 13 is that, in urban areas, planning and related standards including height and car parking will be based on performance criteria that seek to achieve well-designed high quality outcomes in order to achieve targeted growth. Objective 27 is to prioritise walking and cycling accessibility to existing and proposed development. Objective 35 is to increase residential density in settlements.

- 6.1.2. The **Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas** were issued by the minister under section 28 in May 2009. Section 1.9 recites general principles of sustainable development and residential design, including the need to prioritise walking, cycling and public transport over the use of cars, and to provide residents with quality of life in terms of amenity, safety and convenience. Section 5.11 states that densities for housing development on outer suburban greenfield sites between 35 and 50 dph will be encouraged, and those below 30dph will be discouraged. A design manual accompanies the guidelines which lays out 12 principles for urban residential design relating to context, connections, inclusivity, variety, efficacy, distinctiveness, layout, public realm, adaptability, privacy and amenity, parking and detailed design.
- 6.1.3. The **Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments** were issued in March 2018. Section 2.4 states that peripheral urban locations are generally suitable for development at densities of less than 45 dph that includes a minority of apartments. It contains several specific requirements with which compliance is mandatory. SPPR 1 says that up to 50% of apartments in a proposal can be studio or one-bedroom units with no minimum requirement for a proportion of three-bedroom units. SPPR 3 specified that the minimum floor area for one-bedroom apartments is 45m<sup>2</sup>, for two-bedroom apartments it is 73m<sup>2</sup> and for three-bedrooms it is 90m<sup>2</sup>. Most of proposed apartments in schemes of more than 10 must exceed the minimum by at least 10%. SPPR 4 required that there shall generally be a minimum of 50% dual aspect apartments in schemes on suburban sites. Requirements for individual rooms, private amenity and communal space are set out in the appendix to the plan. Section 4.21 states that parking on intermediate urban sites served by public transport or close to town centres must consider a reduced parking standard. Section 4.22

states that a benchmark for less accessible locations would be one space per apartment with a visitor space for every 3 to 4 apartments.

- 6.1.4. The minister issued **Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Urban Development and Building Heights** in December 2018. Section 3.6 states that development in suburban locations should include an effective mix of 2, 3 and 4 storey development, and that 4 storey or higher buildings can be accommodated along wider streets and parkland. SPPR 3 allows approval of buildings that are higher than the provisions of development and local area plans where an applicant has set how the development would comply with the criteria at section 3.2 of the guidelines and with wider strategic and national policy parameters. The development management criteria at section 3.2 are stated at the scale of the town referring to public transport links, architecturally sensitive areas and a positive contribution to place making; at the scale of the street referring to the response to the natural and built environment and a positive contribution to the neighbourhood and streetscape while not being monolithic, enhancing the context for public spaces and thoroughfares, and making a positive contribution to legibility of the urban area and the mix of housing; and at the scale of the site/building with particular reference to daylight. SPPR 4 is that planning authority must secure a mix of building heights and types and the minimum densities required under the 2009 guidelines in the future development of greenfield and edge of city sites, as well as a greater mix of building types and heights.
- 6.1.5. The minister and the minister for transport issued the **Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS)** in 2013. Section 1.2 sets out a policy that street layouts should be interconnected to encourage walking and cycling and offer easy access to public transport. Section 3.2 identifies types of street. Arterial streets are major routes, link streets provide links to arterial streets or between neighbourhoods, while local streets provide access within communities. Section 3.3.2 recommends that block sizes in new areas should not be excessively large, with dimensions of 60-80m being optimal and 100m reasonable in suburban areas. However maximum block dimensions should not exceed 120m. Section 4.4.1 states that the standard lane width on link and arterial streets should be 3.25m, while carriageway width on local streets should be 5-5.5m or 4.8m where a shared surface is proposed.
- 6.1.6. The minister issued **Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Childcare Facilities** in June 2001. Section 3.3.1 of the guidelines recommends that new housing areas

be provided with childcare facilities at a standard of one facility with 20 spaces for every 75 homes.

## 6.2. Regional Policy

- 6.2.1. The Eastern and Midland Regional Assembly - Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy 2019-2031 (RSES) provides a development framework for the region through the provision of a Spatial Strategy, Economic Strategy, Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan (MASP), Investment Framework and Climate Action Strategy. Celbridge is located within the Metropolitan Area. The RSES has established a settlement hierarchy for the region. It does not specify in which category Celbridge would lie, but it would fit the description of a self-sustaining town. Table 4.3 states that the policy for such towns should seek consolidation and investment in employment, services and transport.

## 6.3. Local Policy

- 6.3.1. The **Kildare County Development Plan 2017-2023** applies. The settlement strategy in section 3 identifies Celbridge as a moderate sustainable growth town (the 3<sup>rd</sup> highest category of settlement) in Dublin's metropolitan area and allocates it a target housing figure of 3,250 new dwellings in the plan period to 2023.
- 6.3.2. The planning authority varied the development plan on 9<sup>th</sup> June 2020 after the current application was lodged. The stated purpose of the variation was to align the county's core settlement strategy with higher level guidance under the NPF and RSES. Under the variation Celbridge is identified as a self-sustaining town, the 3<sup>rd</sup> category of settlement, and it is allocated a target housing figure of 603 new dwellings in the period of 2020-2023. It envisages that 1,406 new dwellings would be in line with projections under the NPF in the period ending in 2026. Section 2.11.4 of the varied plan states that self sustaining towns required contained growth focusing of services, infrastructure and employment to balance housing delivery. Policy SS4 of the varied plan states that the zoning of lands will be reviewed where there is an oversupply of land for housing. The variation to the development plan has been challenged in the High Court which has made various interim orders as to whether, how and where the varied provisions of the development plan should be applied. For clarity the assessment of the proposed development and the recommended decision set out below are based on the original provisions of the

development plan prior to the variation. However the orders of the High Court relating to the variation could be changed in short order and the varied provisions were cited in submissions on the application. Therefore, for completeness, advice is also given below as to the how the varied provisions of the development plan would apply to the current application.

- 6.3.3. Section 4 of the development plan refers to housing. Table 4.2 indicates that residential development on greenfield sites should be at densities of 30-50dph. Section 15 of the plan refers to urban design. Section 15.5.2 says that development on greenfield sites should be at a lower intensity providing a transition to the open countryside. Table 15.1 states that apartments will not normally be permitted on greenfield edge developments. Section 17 provides development management standards. Section 17.4.6 states that apartment schemes shall only be considered in appropriate locations at a suitable scale and extent. Table 17.9 sets out car parking standards. Section 17.7.6 states that these are maximum standards, apart from those in the residential category.
- 6.3.4. The **Celbridge Local Area Plan 2017 to 2023** applies. Most of the site is zoned under objective C for new residential use. The northern part of the site is zoned under objective F for open space and amenity. There is an objective to provide a pedestrian and cycle route along the southern edge of the site. The LAP maps the parts of the town within flood risk zones. The proposed housing is not within such a zone. The site does not include any of the areas or features which are designated by the plan to protect natural or cultural heritage. Section 4.4 of the plan states that it is proposed to prepare a Transport Management Plan (including Public Transport Accessibility Strategy) to support the sustainable growth and development of Celbridge. The proposed Transport Management Plan will include recommendations for the phasing of development on the basis of the timely delivery of strategic infrastructure. Section 6.3.2 of the LAP states that a childcare provision of 20 spaces per 150 homes is appropriate in new housing developments. Objective MTO1.8 states the new housing should provide permeability to adjoining development or greenfield sites with development potential.
- 6.3.5. The site is part of a Key Development Area (KDA) No. 4 designated by the plan at Crodaun. KDA 4 covers c20ha and includes the site and the land across the Maynooth Road which is the site of SHD application 306504. Table 4.1 of the plan

estimates that the KDA has capacity for 600 new homes. A design concept with a suggested layout for development in the area is provided which show a new 4-arm junction on the Maynooth Road that would provide access to the development lands on either side, as well as a new road running south-west from the roundabout at the north of the site. The concept shows a rectangular layout of blocks on the current site with a central area of open space and a linear space along the southern boundary of the site. It shows 2 pedestrian and cycle routes through the site running north/south, the eastern one of which would include a link over Kilwogan Stream to Kilwogan Lane. Section 12.2.4 of the Lap says that development on this KDA should reflect the established pattern of development in the area with a mix of housing types ranging from 2 to 3 storeys at a density in the order of 25 dph. Existing landscape features such a tree lines should be integrated into open spaces. The opens space network should incorporate pedestrian and cycle routes.

#### **6.4. Statement of Consistency**

- 6.4.1. An EIAR is not mandatory because the number of dwellings is less than 500 and the applicant questions whether the site in part of a built-up area under Section 10(b) of the Part 2 of Schedule 5 of the planning regulations. However an EIAR is submitted in accordance with the advice of the council. A screening report for appropriate assessment was submitted which determined that there was no requirement for a stage 2 assessment.
- 6.4.2. The proposed development of 467 homes would be in keeping with the government's policy set out Rebuilding Ireland – Action Plan for Housing and Homelessness issued in 2016. It would be consistent with objectives 11, 32, 33 and 34 of the National Planning Framework by providing more housing within an existing town. The proposed net density of 43dph is in keeping with the advice at section 5.11 of the 2009 guidelines on sustainable urban development that development on greenfield sites should be between 35 and 50 dph. The proposed housing would be close to schools and so would contribute to building communities in line with the advice in those guidelines. This proximity would also contribute to sustainable travel pattern by reducing the proportion of children who would have to be driven to school. A school capacity analysis is submitted with the application.

- 6.4.3. The apartments would comply with the apartment design guidelines issued in 2018. Only 18 of the 268 apartments would be one-bedroom units, well below the limit of 50% under SPPR1 of those guidelines. All apartments would meet the minimum floor areas required under SPPR 3, most of them by at least 10% as required under section 3.8 of the guidelines. 82 or 38% of the apartments would have dual aspect, in line with the minimum of 33% required under SPPR 4. The ceiling heights at ground floor level would meet the minimum of 2.7m required under SPPR 5, while the number of units per lift core on each floor of the apartment blocks would not exceed the limit of 12 set down under SPPR 6. The site would be an intermediate urban area under the guidelines because it is close the town centre and other employment areas and is well served by public transport. Section 4.21 of the guidelines advises that a reduced provision of parking must be considered. The proposed provision of one space per apartment with a visitor space for every 10 apartments would be in keeping with this advice, compared to the provision of a visitor space for every 3 or 4 apartments required for peripheral areas under 4.22 of the guidelines. The internal rooms and storage areas in the apartments meet the requirements in the appendix to the guidelines. All apartments would also be provided with the private amenity space required, while the provision of 2,945m<sup>2</sup> of communal space would significantly exceed the 1,576m<sup>2</sup> needed to meet the standard in the guidelines. 574 bike spaces would be provided in the basement of the apartment blocks, while the duplex units could store bikes on their private open space similar to the houses.
- 6.4.4. In relation to the 2018 guidelines on urban development and building height, the statement says that the proposed development would be in keeping with the policy for increased building heights in appropriate locations set out at section 3.1, and with the presumption in favour in higher buildings in urban locations with good public transport accessibility. The statement sets out how the development could comply with SPPR 3. At the scale city/town : the site is well served by public transport with bus and rail services nearby; it is not in an architecturally sensitive area; the site is relatively large and the proposed apartment blocks would provide enclosure along the Maynooth Road on a major approach route to the town; the site does not directly adjoin residential development; the proposal is not monolithic and has a range of building types and heights, with apartments providing supervision of the open space

to the north and the stream to the south; Block A would provide a landmark beside a major junction at the entrance to the town and improve the legibility of the wider area; and the proposed development would improve housing mix in Celbridge which currently has only 10.3% of its stock as apartments. At the scale of the site/building, the form, massing and height allow adequate light and ventilation, as set out in the submitted daylight analysis which demonstrates compliance with the BRE and BS guidance on the matter. So the proposed development meets the criteria set out in section 3 of the guidelines. It would also address the need for more one- and two-bedroom homes set out in section 3.4 of the guidelines, as well as providing higher buildings along wide streets and facing open spaces in line with the advice at section 3.6.

- 6.4.5. The proposed development would provide a creche with space for 89 children, which is less than the general standard of 20 childcare places for every 75 dwellings stated in the 2001 Guidelines on Childcare Facilities. This is justified under the terms of those guidelines by the proximity of existing facilities and also by the reduced standard set out in the LAP.
- 6.4.6. The site is within the Metropolitan Area of Dublin identified in the RSES which identifies Celbridge as a self-sustaining town. The proposed development is consistent with these provisions, as well as with the objective RPO 5.4 which states that higher residential densities should be provided in the metropolitan area in line with the 2009 guidelines.
- 6.4.7. The site is on a public transport corridor for buses, and so the proposed apartments upon it would comply with section 17.4.6 of the Kildare County Development plan which states that apartments shall only be considered in appropriate locations, primarily town centres and proximate to public transport. The net density of 43dph accords with the range of 30-50dph for greenfield sites set out in Table 4.2 of the plan. A housing mix statement is included which says that development would be split evenly between smaller one- and two-bedroom units and larger three-, four- and five-bedroom homes. This would accommodate a wide range of household types. A social infrastructure assessment and a design statement are also submitted under separate cover, as specified by the provisions of the development. The proposed development would meet policy NH1 of the development plan by retaining hedges along the eastern and western boundaries of the site and by planting of deciduous



species in accordance with the submitted landscape plans. The submitted EIAR addresses biodiversity. The Kilgowan stream and the vegetation along it will be protected with a biodiversity strip of 10m along it in accordance with objective GI 20 of the development plan.

- 6.4.8. The proposed site coverage is 19.3%, well below the maximum of 50% specified for residential development in section 17.2.2 of the development plan. The plot ratio of 0.43 is less than the limit of 0.5 set out in section 17.2.3. of the plan. Public open space of 1.93ha would be provided on the residentially zoned land which would be 18% of that part of the site and well above the requirement for 15% set out section 17.4.7 of the plan. Another 1.93ha would be provided on the land zoned for open space. The sizes of the houses and the provision of private open space for the houses and apartments would meet the standards. The proposed number of car parking spaces for the houses would meet the standard of the development plan. The number for the apartments would be 168 less than that required. This is justified by reference to the 2018 apartment design guidelines. The provision of parking for the commercial uses is 10 spaces which is less than the maximum of 46 that would be required under development plan standards. The reduced car parking is justified because the premises are designed to meet the demand from the proposed housing, so most of the customers and staff are likely to be local residents who would not need to travel there by car.
- 6.4.9. The proposed development would not exceed the housing allocation to Celbridge of 1,406 units in the period to 2026 set out by the core strategy in the proposed variation no. 1 to the county development plan, which was being considered by the council when the current application was lodged.
- 6.4.10. The proposed development would comply with the residential “C” and open space “F” zoning objectives that apply to different parts of the site under Celbridge Local Area Plan 2017-2023. The housing mix would comply with section 6.2.2 of the LAP which states that the need for smaller units should be considered. The density of 43dph exceeds the 25dph specified in the LAP for the KDA at Crodaun. However the specified density is outside the range of 30-50 dph specified in the county development plan for greenfield sites and the section 13.2 of the LAP states that the development plan takes precedence wherever this is a conflict with the LAP. Therefore the applicant does not consider that the proposed development materially

contravenes the local area plan. Nevertheless in order to address an alternative interpretation of the two sections of the LAP, the statement of consistency includes a short **statement justifying a material contravention** of the provisions of the LAP which was mentioned in the published notices of the application. It states that the contravention would be justified on the basis of section 37(2)(b)(i) of the planning act because the proposed strategic housing development is of strategic importance and under section 37(2)(b)(ii) because there are conflicting objectives in the development plan.

- 6.4.11. The design briefs for the KDAs in the LAP allow for a degree of flexibility. The proposed provision of two junctions on the Maynooth Road rather than the single one shown on the design brief in the LAP would increase permeability in line with DMURS. The council has confirmed that it does not intend to proceed with the link road from the roundabout shown on the brief. Two of the proposed internal roads could facilitate future access to the lands to the west of the site. Pedestrian and cycle routes would be provided from north to south through the site. The applicant cannot provide a crossing over Kilwogan stream as it does not own the southern bank. An east-west pedestrian and cycle link is shown parallel to the stream from which a bridge could be provided. The established built form of the neighbouring area is low density and its replication across the site would not be sustainable. The development is north of the neighbouring housing and could not overshadow it. The layout of perimeter blocks avoids cul-de-sacs. A hierarchy of streets and a mix of housing types is proposed. There is also a hierarchy of open spaces, with a public park at the north of the site on the land zoned for it, a central open space and linear spaces through and around the site. The open space network incorporates pedestrian and cycle routes.
- 6.4.12. The site is not subject to heightened flood risk and the submitted flood risk assessment concludes that the proposed development would not be at undue risk of flooding and would not give risk to an undue risk of flooding downstream. A Transportation Impact Assessment is submitted with the application. The site is not subjects to constraints relating to cultural or built heritage, The protected structure at Castletown House is 1.22km from the site and there is suburban housing between them. The childcare facility will be built as part of the first phase of the proposed development.

## 7.0 Third Party Submissions

7.1. 184 submissions on the application have been received. They objected to the proposed development on various grounds that can be summarised as follows-

- The proposed development would provide too much additional residential development in Celbridge. The number of proposed homes would materially contravene the settlement strategy and housing allocations for the town set out in the amended county development plan and its core strategy, as well as the capacity of the site described in the LAP. In this regard the proposed development should be considered in conjunction with the proposed SHD development of 372 homes on the other side of the road under ABP-306504-20, and the SHD development of 251 homes authorised on the western edge of the town under ABP-303295-18. The cumulative growth of Celbridge could result in an additional 1,300 homes in the town over a short period of time. This would contravene the policy at section 2.11.4 of the amended development plan that requires the self-contained compact growth of Celbridge. As the proposed development would contravene core strategy and settlement hierarchy set out in the county development plan, it would also contravene the provisions of the NPF and the RSES which required such a hierarchy to be put in place that was consistent with population projections at national and regional level. The proposed contravention is not justified by the 2009 sustainable urban residential guidelines because a development of 30dph would meet the minimum set down for greenfield sites in the guidelines while complying with the provisions of the county development plan and the LAP. The submitted statement justifying the material contravention of the LAP is inadequate as it only addresses the contravention of the density provisions and not the breach of the vision and allocated housing figures for this KDA. The population density of the area is already too high.
- The site is not the right location for significant residential development. Any additional growth in the town should be nearer the town centre and the railway station in line with the minister's direction on the LAP and the NPF. Growth on this site would result in car dependent development, contrary to national policy on climate change. There are three schools within walking distance of the site,

but Scoil Mochua is over-subscribed and Celbridge Community School will be moving to a permanent site that is 3km from the application site. The site is not well served by public transport with only infrequent and unreliable bus services along the Maynooth Road. There are no proposals for bus priority along that road. Proposals for improved services under BusConnects may not be realised. Railway stations are not accessible from the site and the cycle infrastructure in the town is poor. Statements to the contrary in the documents submitted with the application are incorrect. A transport management plan and public transport strategy were required within 12 months of the adoption of the LAP but they have not been prepared.

- The scale and form of the proposed development is not appropriate for the site. The density of the development and the height of the proposed apartment blocks would materially contravene the provisions of the LAP. They would be excessive on a greenfield site on the edge of a small town and would not provide a suitable transition to the countryside. They would also be out of keeping with the established single- and two-storey housing to the south and east of the site. They would dominate the entrance to the town along the Maynooth Road. As such the proposed development would damage the character of the area and contravene the 2009 guidelines on sustainable residential development in urban areas and its design manual. In particular it would breach the advice at section 5.1 of the guidelines against over-development and that at section 5.2 and 5.3 regarding the need for proposals to avoid overshadowing or overlooking existing housing. The proposed roof gardens would render the apartment blocks effectively 7 storeys high. The additional height of the apartments would not meet the performance criteria set out at section 3 of the 2018 guidelines on building height. Section 2 of those guidelines make it clear that the general policy in favour of greater density and height only applies to suitable urban areas. This site is not such an area but a suburban greenfield site with poor public transport and other services. The proposed apartment blocks would be unsightly and visually obtrusive. The statements in the EIAR regarding the visual impact of the development are not well founded and are incorrect. The board refused permission for 4-storey

apartment blocks in Dublin 14 because of their excessive height under ABP-305455-19

- The standard of urban and architectural design is poor and would not meet the criteria set out in the criteria set out in the 2009 urban design manual. It appears to be an unimaginative suburban low density scheme with a generic city centre style apartment scheme attached with a line of duplex units out of context. The modern design is not in keeping with the heritage status of Celbridge. The proposed open space and landscaping is inadequate. Connectivity would not be provided to the lands to the west at Bean's Land that have development potential as required by the LAP. The proposed pedestrian link at the south-western corner of the site is not acceptable as there is no footpath along Kilwogan Lane at this location. The proposed development would not provide the landscaped edge required along the Maynooth Road under the LAP. The line of duplexes would not provide proper overlooking of the linear open space. If permission were to be granted the line of duplexes should be omitted and the apartments moved 40m from the Maynooth Road and reduced in height. The apartments would not allow for social distancing and so would be hinder the restriction of Covid-19. An insufficient number of them would have dual aspect and so would contravene SPPR 4 of the 2018 apartment design guidelines. In fact none of the apartments would be truly dual aspect as they do not provide cross ventilation. The layout may not be in keeping with the Building Regulations due to the long corridors. The stone pillars at the front of the site should be retained due to their connection to the Castletown Estate and heritage value. . The provision of access to the Kilwogan Stream would be a risk to safety.
- The proposed shop and café would not be located in a sequential manner from the town centre in line with the retail planning guidelines. The EIAR refers to additional employment during construction but the workers would be unlikely to live locally, worsening traffic in the town without any significant local economic benefit. The proposed development would damage the bloodstock industry and the nearby Ballygoran Stud Farm
- The proposed development would seriously injure the amenities of existing houses due to overlooking, overshadowing, overbearing and light pollution.

Photographs to illustrate this injury are submitted including those taken from a drone at the same height as the proposed apartments. The submitted drawings fail to state the distance to the nearest existing dwellings and would contravene article 23 of the planning regulations. The sectional drawings stop at the Maynooth Road. The apartment block would be up to 23m high and just over 30m from an objector's property. The conclusions in the submitted daylight assessment that its impact on neighbouring houses would be not be significant is not correct. The overshadowing would impede the function of solar panels on the roof of neighbouring houses. The statement in the EIAR that its visual impact would be moderate is wrong. It would devalue properties in the vicinity. The arborist's report does not clarify how screening vegetation along the Maynooth Road will be retained or augmented. The loss of light to the nearest houses would be a threat to health contrary to article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights. Unsupervised open areas and pedestrian routes would facilitate anti-social behaviour. The submitted shadow analysis was deficient as it did not describe impacts in the evening in late summer. The construction of the scheme would injure the amenities of properties in the vicinity due to noise, dust and traffic, as well as the displacement of rodents. Excavations would cause vibrations that would threaten the structures of nearby houses. They would also mobilise aspergillus moulds that would be a threat to health. Heavy construction traffic would also endanger public safety.

- The social infrastructure in Celbridge cannot support the proposed development especially in cumulation with the other proposed and planned housing in the town as was shown in research by Kildare's Integrated Services Programme. There is inadequate capacity in the town's schools. Childcare facilities are deficient. The proposal to provide an additional 118 places in the development would not meet the additional demand to which the proposed housing would give rise. Medical facilities and ambulance services are deficient, as are Garda resources. The town does not have adequate recreational facilities, particularly for young people, and the proposed development would give rise to anti-social behaviour.
- The physical infrastructure in Celbridge cannot support the proposed development. The deficiencies would be exacerbated by the other proposed

and permitted developments around the town. The water supply is inadequate and pressure is often low. The sewerage system is not adequate to cater for the current loading or for the additional demands that the development would place upon it. The additional capacity in the foul network that would result from the removal of stormwater inflow at St Patrick's Park cannot be allocated twice: to this SHD proposal and the concurrent one across the road under 306504. Irish Water have not finalised their drainage plan for the area so it cannot be concluded that adequate foul drainage would be available to serve the proposed development. Irish Water also need to divert effluent from the Primrose Hill pumping station. The submitted Engineering Services report refers to an assessment of the system's capacity that was not included in the documentation submitted with the application, so the conclusion to that the that it could cater for the proposed development cannot be verified. The EIAR is therefore deficient in relation to its description and assessment of the likely impact of the proposed development on water. The wastewater treatment plant at Leixlip does not have the capacity to cater for additional development. The electricity supply in the area has suffered outages

- The road network in the area could not accommodate the traffic that would be generated by the proposed development which would exacerbate the congestion that already occurs and which restricts access onto the Maynooth Road from nearby estates. The current proposals would bring another 1,5000 cars on to the Maynooth Road. The turning movements across the road generated by the proposed development would be lead to traffic queues back up the R449. The roundabout between the R405 and R449 does not operate within capacity and the contrary statement in the documents submitted with the application are incorrect. A better access could be provided from the roundabout to the north. The layout of the proposed development would prejudice the construction of a western relief road from that roundabout in line with objective MTO3.11 of the LAP. The development would be premature until the second bridge has been built over the Liffey. The layout of the development has not been co-ordinated with the proposed development on the other side of the road under 306504 and would give rise to traffic hazard due to the proliferation on junctions and access points along a short section of the regional

road. The cycle and pedestrian infrastructure in the town is poor and would not justify the proposed development. The Maynooth Road is heavily used by cyclists and pedestrians from the schools to the north but their facilities are sub-standard. The proposed development would increase their number but would not improve the facilities. The development fails to provide cycle route along the south of the site which is an objective of the LAP which would be a feeder route for a cycle route that is part of the Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network Plan. Many of the proposed internal streets are wider than the standard of 5-5.5m for local streets set out in DMURS. No details have been submitted of junction radii. The submitted Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment is deficient because it fails to consider other development in the town and all of the junctions that would be affected by the proposed development including the signalised junction on the Aghards Road and at the Shackleton Road. It fails to address impacts on the junction at Croduan Forest Park Phase 2 Dates were not provided of the traffic surveys on which the assessment was based. The Road Safety Audit was insufficiently detailed and does not address hazards associated with the inadequate footpath and cycle tracks along the Maynooth Road or the conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists at the proposed crossing and bus stop

- Inadequate proposals are made for pedestrians and cyclists. The proposed development would fail to comply with the LAP's objective to provide a link to Kilwogan Lane to the south. The path along the front of the site on the Maynooth Road is already congested due to the location of schools to the north. The higher traffic generated by the proposed development would therefore cause a traffic hazard.
- Inadequate parking would be provided for the proposed housing and the set down facility for the creche would be inadequate. The standards at section 4.21 of the apartment design guidelines quoted in the application are not appropriate because this is a housing scheme with other uses on a peripheral urban site rather than an intermediate one.
- The proposals for surface water drainage are inadequate and the proposed development would give rise to a risk of flooding and threaten the quality of waters. The flood maps cited by the applicant do not record flood events which



have occurred on the site and been reported to the council. Groundwater vulnerability in the area is high with pockets of extreme vulnerability. Discharge into Kilgowan Stream could exacerbate flooding at the Griffinrath landfill. 120,000 tonnes of material was deposited in that landfill. The EIAR did not contain adequate information in relation to water or the landfill. It did not describe groundwater conditions or flow on the site, and did not consider the implications for water quality of disturbance of the unauthorised landfill in the area including the risk to drinking water and thus public health. The proposed development would damage the quality of water in Kilgowan Stream which flows the salmonid waters in the Liffey. It would also threaten Kilgowan Bog. Adequate information was not set out in the EIAR to assess these potential effects. The EIAR also fails to assess the likely efficacy of mitigation measures either with reference to the proposed development alone or in combination with the other proposed developments in Celbridge.

- The proposed development would damage biodiversity and the natural heritage of the area. This would arise from the loss of hedgerows and the threat to the Kilgowan Stream arising from the proposed development, in particular from the disturbance of unauthorised landfill. The loss of hedgerows would be contrary to section 17.4.7 of the development plan and objective GI11 and the vision for KDA 4 in the LAP. The mature hedgerows along the front of the site should be retained. The site accommodates several species of bats, including rare and protected ones. Adequate information has not been submitted in relation to bats, whose flightpaths would be blocked by the proposed high rise buildings. The EIAR is therefore inadequate.
- The proposed development was not properly described on the published notices and the application is invalid. The Covid 19 pandemic undermined the public's right to participate in the consideration of the proposed development. An oral hearing should be held on the application. The SHD process fails to allow adequate access to information on the environment and participation in decision making in line with the Aarhus Directive due to the pre-application consultation with the board. A decision should not be made on the application until a reference to the ECJ on the SHD process in relation to a judicial review of a permission at Clane has been determined. The efficacy of the SHD

process in providing housing should be reviewed. AS the government has decided to end the SHD process current applications should not be granted.

## 8.0 Planning Authority Submission

8.1. The submission from the council summarised the views of the elected members in the area committee as follows –

- Additional housing in Celbridge would be welcome
- The proposed development would not be in keeping with the character of the area. The proposed density and height would be excessive. The LAP requires heights to be restricted to 2 or 3 storeys.
- The high density development would have a negative impact on cyclists, pedestrians and the town's infrastructure. Development at this density should be nearer to the railway and high frequency bus services.
- The footpaths and cycleways are already overcrowded due to the proximity of schools.
- The proposed development would bring c700 more cars into an area where traffic is already congested.
- The groundwater is at risk from the unauthorised landfill.
- The sewerage system does not function properly and cannot take the additional load.
- There are issues with flooding in the area.
- Additional surveys are required on biodiversity
- The form of development would impede social distancing.
- The development could affect a planned western relief road.
- A traffic management plan has not been prepared under the LAP.
- Provision is required for bus services and delays at junctions.
- The proposed development needs to be phased in line with physical and social infrastructure.

8.2. The Chief Executive of the council recommended that permission be refused for five reasons relating to

- The height of the apartment blocks would contravene section 12.2.4 of the LAP which encourages heights of two and three stories. The transitional location of the proposed 5 and 6 storey buildings at the edge of the development boundary adjacent to single storey houses would be contravene to section 15.5.2, table 15.1 and section 17.4.6 of the development plan which state that apartments should be in suitable places such as town centres. The proposed 5 and 6 storey buildings would be contrary to section 3.2 of the 2018 guidelines on building height which seek to ensure that new development responds to its built environment and makes a positive contribution to the urban neighbourhood and streetscape. The proposed development would therefore seriously injure the residential amenity of the area and devalue property in the vicinity.
- The proposed development would not provide a pedestrian and cyclist crossing point to Kilgowan Lane in line with the transport map of the LAP and so would contravene objective MT00.7 and MT01.8 of the LAP which seek to enhance pedestrian and cyclist permeability within the urban environment.
- The car parking is inadequate and poorly distributed throughout the site. The layout has a number of long straight roads which create a level of jarring. The set down area beside the creche is inadequate. The detailed design of the apartment blocks is inadequate. The proposed development would therefore fail to comply with the 12 criteria of the urban design manual. The density would contravene section 12.2.4 of the LAP and would be at odds with the existing pattern of development in the area. The proposed development would therefore be seriously injurious to the existing residential amenity of the area.
- The proposed development would contravene SPPR 4 of the apartment design guidelines because it would not provide 50% of its apartments with dual aspect, and SPPR 3 because at least half the apartments would not exceed the minimum floor areas by 10%. The predominance of two-bedroom units is not appropriate.
- The development would not provide enough car parking to comply with the standards set out at table 17.9 of the development plan and section 4.22 of the

2018 apartment design guidelines. The inadequate provision of parking and its inappropriate distribution would result in unauthorised parking of vehicles on access roads and footpath and so endanger public health by reason of traffic hazard and objective traffic and vulnerable road users.

- 8.3. The submission from the council did not provide a list of conditions to be attached to any grant of permission.
- 8.4. The submission refers to a variation of the county development plan on 9<sup>th</sup> June 2020 and stated that it sought to bring the core strategy of the plan into line with the RSES and NPF. The RSES identifies Maynooth and Naas as the key towns on Co. Kildare. Celbridge is part of the metropolitan area of Dublin. It is designated as a self-sustaining town in the development plan. 10% of the county's growth is allocated to Celbridge which therefore has a housing target of 603 units from 2020 to the end of the development plan's lifespan in 2023.
- 8.5. The scale of the proposed commercial gym, café and shop would be such that they would be complimentary to the proposed residential use and so they would be in keeping with the 'C' zoning of the site under the LAP.
- 8.6. The proposed development would be on an outer suburban greenfield site where chapter 5 of the 2009 guidelines on sustainable urban residential development recommends densities between 35 and 50 dph and table 4.2 of the development plan sets a parameter of 30 to 50dph. Section 12.2.4 of the LAP states that KDA 4 at Crodaun would accommodate density around 25 dph up to 30 dph. The proposed development conjunction with that proposed under 306504 would provide more housing than that allocated to Celbridge under the new core strategy. Section 4.3 of the RSES states that core strategies should apply higher densities in higher order towns. The council therefore considers that the appropriate density for this site would be 30dph, in line with the LAP, and that the proposed density of 43dph is excessive.
- 8.7. The housing mix appears to comply with SPPR 1 of the 2018 apartment design guidelines. A housing mix statement was not submitted with the application as required under section 17.4.3 of the development plan. The exceptionally high proportion of two-bedroom units in the apartment blocks is not acceptable.

- 8.8. The amount of open space would meet the minimum standard at section 17.4.7 of the development plan that at least 15% of the site area is provided as such. The Parks Division is concerned about the removal of the hedgerow along the Maynooth Road. The loss of mature hedgerows is not considered to align with the green infrastructure policies of the development and local area plans.
- 8.9. The proposed houses appear to conform with the standards set out for internal floorspace set out in section 17.4.5 of the development plan. The submitted schedule of accommodation indicates that the proposed apartments would meet the minimum floor areas required under SPPR 3 of the 2018 apartment design guidelines. However the schedule indicates that on 82 of the proposed 216 apartments would exceed the minimum by 10%, therefore the proposed development would not comply with the requirement at section 3.8 of those guidelines that most apartments would exceed the minimum floor area by at least 10%. Only 38% of the proposed apartments would have dual aspect. Therefore it would not comply with the SPPR 4 that at least half of proposed apartments outside central locations would have dual aspect. The proposed ceiling heights and number of apartments per lift core would comply with SPPRs 5 and 6 respectively.
- 8.10. The proposed facility of 776m<sup>2</sup> would have spaces for 89 children. Under the 2001 guidelines on childcare the proposed development would require a facility with spaces for 125 children at a rate of 20 spaces per 75 dwellings. However the LAP has a standard of 20 spaces per 150 dwellings which would only require 62 spaces.
- 8.11. The proposed development would maintain the minimum separation distance of 22m between opposing windows specified in section 17.4.2 of the development plan and would not result in undue overlooking. However the higher apartment blocks will result in a perceived level of overlooking in Thornhill Court and Castle Village Avenue and Crodaun Forest Park. There would be no undue level of overshadowing of neighbouring properties or internally. Blocks B, C and D would have an overbearing impact on the existing single storey dwellings to the south at Thornhill Court, Castle Village Avenue and Crodaun Forest Park.
- 8.12. The Housing Section indicated that it was satisfied with the proposed Part V provision.

- 8.13. The car parking provision of 2 spaces for each house meets the applicable standard at Table 17.9 of the development plan. The proposed creche would require 30 spaces, the gym 21 spaces, the café 12 spaces and the shop 6 spaces, a total of 69. 10 spaces are proposed to serve those premises. The proposed 268 apartments would be served by one parking space each, but there would be no additional visitor spaces. Section 4.22 of the apartment design guidelines recommends one such space for 3 to 4 units, which in this case would mean 76 visitor spaces, although 33 spaces are dotted around the overall scheme. The council therefore considered that the number of proposed car parking spaces is deficient by 103. The distribution of spaces is also poor with the only 9 visitor spaces near the apartment blocks. Bicycle parking is provided throughout the site.
- 8.14. With regard to layout, the strong edge along the Maynooth Road is appropriate in terms of urban design but the height is excessive for the context. There is concern about the rigid grid layout which results in long stretches of straight road. Vehicular speeds should be reduced by providing curves and meanders along streets rather than relying on raised tables. The prominence of the real elevations of several of the houses would be jarring, being those number 1, 17, 32, 33, 74, 75, 82, 105, 111, 117, 132, 154, 160, 179, 211, 212, 222 and 223. Their visual impact would be exacerbated by the long straight roads in the scheme. There is concern about the lack of openings on the southern side of the H2 houses which could otherwise overlook streets and open spaces.
- 8.15. Table 15.1 of the development plan states that apartments will not normally be permitted on greenfield edge sites where development should be low intensity providing a transition to the countryside. Section 12.2.4 of the LAP states that two and three storey housing is encouraged in this Key Development Area. The proposed development would not comply with those provisions of the development plan or with section 3.2 of the 2018 guidelines on building height which state that a proposal should respond to its natural and built environment and makes a positive contribution to the urban neighbourhood and streetscape. Section 3.4 of the guidelines refers to development on greenfield sites at densities of 35-50dph with apartment buildings of 4 storeys and more. However this would not be appropriate for the site. In order to reduce the density of the development and integrate it into the existing housing heights of more than 3 storeys would be excessive. The proposed 6

and 5 storey apartment blocks would be completely at odds with this. Development of two to three storeys would achieve an appropriate density and mix of types that would integrate properly with the surrounding area as required by SPPR 4 of the building height guidelines. The proposed 5 and 6 storey apartment blocks would result in an inappropriate height and would be out of character with the area.

- 8.16. The Transportation Section has raised concerns with the proposed proliferation of residential accesses, pedestrian crossings, refuges and bus stops along this part of the Maynooth Road which has a high volume of traffic and vulnerable road users would result in traffic conflict. The proposed development would not include the upgrade of the footpaths and cycle tracks along the road, or upgrade the public lighting or recess the bus stop. The substandard facilities for vulnerable road users and the provision of two accesses to the proposed development would cause a traffic hazard. The submitted TIA has underestimated the volume of traffic that would be generated by the proposed development and its impact on the operation of the roundabout to the north. The proposed development does not provide pedestrian or cyclist footbridges over the Kilgowan Stream as required under the LAP and so would contravene its provisions. The noise assessment does not provide a comprehensive noise survey. The road noise monitoring survey points are limited and ignored peak road noise period from 1600 to 1900. The proposed development would therefore endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and obstruction of road users due to the movement of the extra traffic that it would generate.
- 8.17. The Water Services Section has reviewed the submitted site specific flood risk assessment and has no objection to the proposed development subject to conditions. However the board will have to decide the application.
- 8.18. In relation to the 12 criteria set out in the urban design manual, the site is a transitional location between suburban Celbridge and land zoned open space. The proposed apartment blocks are not suitable to this context which is distant from the town centre beside lower houses. It lacks connection to Kilgowan Lane. There is a variety of unit types and open space but there is an excessive degree of two bedroom apartments. The density should not exceed 30 dph. Character areas are proposed. The significant level of tree and hedgerow removal is unacceptable. There would be a loss of distinctive features such as the stone pillars along the R405. The strong urban edge is noted but the height is excessive and would not

transition of the rural area. There are long straight roads in the scheme. A number of houses would be jarring. Kilgowan Lane has not been incorporated into the scheme. The underground car parking takes cars away from the streets around the apartment blocks. The space between blocks A to C and the Maynooth Road needs further consideration and more landscaping. The ground floor toilets in the houses should be enlarged to enable showers to be installed. Private amenity space is provided to the rear of houses and for apartments. There would be perceived overlooking of gardens from blocks B, C and D. There is a shortfall in car parking for visitors and the commercial premises. There should be a set down area for the creche. The visitor car parking is not properly distributed throughout the scheme. The design of the apartment blocks is at odds with its context. Further landscaping proposals are required.

- 8.19. It is noted that the Transportation Section of the council had recommended refusal. The reports from the Water Services Section, Area Engineer, Fire Officer, Environment Section, Housing Section and Parks Section raised no objection subject to conditions. The Heritage Officer reported that inadequate information was provided on biodiversity in the EIAR and that the proposed development would not adversely affect the integrity of any European site either alone or in combination with any other plan or project.

## 9.0 Prescribed Bodies

9.1. Irish Water stated that

- A confirmation of feasibility for 491 residential units and a statement of design acceptance has been issued to the applicant. A condition should require the applicant to sign a connection agreement with Irish Water before any works commence.
- A water connection from this development is feasible without upgrade.
- In respect of wastewater works to divert effluent from the Primrose Hill station into another catchment will provide capacity in the local network in Celbridge. This is scheduled to be completed by 2021. The overall strategy for Celbridge will be determined by the Lower Liffey Drainage Plan which is scheduled to be



completed in 2021. The plan will determine whether or what statutory permissions are required.

- Storm events cause surcharging in the combined network in Celbridge and flooding in the town. The applicant proposes to remove storm water at St. Patrick's Estate to facilitate housing unit connection. Irish Water has no objection to this approach.
- In order to facilitate more than 192 residential units upgrades to the Crodaun foul sewer directly downstream of the development is required. This is separate from the storm water removal works at St. Patrick's Park. The applicant will be required to enter into a project works service agreement to progress the downstream upgrades and any consents. Engagement between the developer and Irish Water is ongoing.

9.2. The National Transport Authority stated that it supports the concept of Celbridge as a self-sustaining growth town. The provision of appropriate cycle tracks and pedestrian crossings should be ensure with links for cyclists and pedestrians from the site to the town centre and schools. Cycle parking in the basements should be secure and lit and use Sheffield stands. The site would be well served by the bus network envisaged under BusConnects including the C4 route to the city centre and the W8 route to Tallaght and Maynooth. There should be permeability to the surrounding road network to provide efficient and safe access to the bus network.

9.3. Transport Infrastructure Ireland state that the proposed development would adversely affect the national road network and associated junctions. The board granted permission for a development at Intel under Reg. Ref. 19/91 which includes a condition that junction 6 be monitored during construction and improved if necessary. The TTIA submitted with the application would need to be included in that context. The proposed development would therefore be at variance with official policy set out in the guidelines on spatial planning and national roads.

9.4. Inland Fisheries Ireland stated that the site was in the catchment of the Liffey which is an important salmonid system. Comprehensive surface water management measures are required during construction and operation of the proposed development and the mitigation measures set out in chapter 8 of the EIA must be adhered to. Planting along the stream should consist of native plants apart from

Alder. It is essential that the foul and storm water infrastructure has adequate capacity to accept predicted volumes from this development.

## 10.0 Screening for Appropriate Assessment

10.1. The proposed development would not be in or immediately adjacent to any Natura 2000 site. It would not have the potential, therefore, to have likely significant direct effects on any such site. The nearest Natura 2000 site is the Special Area of Conservation at Rye Water Valley/Carnton (sitecode 001398) c2km to the north. The conservation objective for that SAC is to maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of the Annex I habitat and the Annex II species for which the SAC has been selected, which are -

- 7220 Petrifying springs with tufa formation (Cratoneurion) \* a priority habitat, and
- 1014 Narrow-mouthed Whorl Snail *Vertigo angustior*
- 1016 Desmoulin's Whorl Snail *Vertigo moulinsiana*

10.1.1. There is no hydrological pathway from the application site that could result in the proposed development having a significant effect on the SAC. The surface water from the site would drain to the Liffey downstream of the SAC. The separation distance between the application site and the SAC is substantial and means that it is not likely that the proposed development could have significant effect on the SAC through groundwater. The proposed development is not likely to have a significant indirect effect on that SAC, therefore. There are no other Natura 2000 sites upon which the proposed development could have a significant indirect effect. These conclusions are consistent with the appropriate assessment screening report submitted with the application.

10.1.2. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that on the basis of the information on the file, which is adequate in order to issue a screening determination, that the proposed development, individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to have a significant effect the Special Area of Conservation at Rye Water Valley/Carnton sitecode 001398 or any other European site, in view of the site's

Conservation Objectives, and a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not required.

## **11.0 Environmental Impact Assessment**

### **11.1. Environmental Impact Assessment Report**

- 11.1.1. The current proposal is an urban development project that would be in the built-up area of a town but not in a business district. It is therefore within the class of development described at 10(b) of Part 2 of Schedule 5 of the planning regulations, and the submission of an environmental impact assessment report is mandatory because the site is in a built up area and it bigger than 10 hectares although the number of dwellings is less than threshold of 500. The applicant states that an EIAR is not mandatory because the definition of 'built-up area' under the planning regulations refers to the Local Government Act, 2001. However this position is not accepted. It would be contrary to the purposes of the EIA directive to interpret the word 'town' in national legislation implementing the directive in a way that departed from its ordinary meaning, which in this case is the same as the one used by professional planners, on the basis of a reference to a separate piece of legislation which codifies an arbitrary and historic pattern of administration and which does not set out an exclusive definition of 'town' that would exclude Celbridge.
- 11.1.2. The EIAR comprises a non-technical summary, a main volume and supporting appendices. Chapter 14 of the main volume provides a summary of the mitigation measures described throughout the EIAR. Section 1.9 describes the expertise of those involved in the preparation of the EIAR. Therefore I am satisfied that the information contained in the EIAR has been prepared by competent experts and complies with article 94 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2000, as amended. The EIAR would also comply with the provisions of Article 5 of the EIA Directive 2014. This EIA has had regard to the information submitted with the application, including the EIAR, and to the submissions received from the council, the prescribed bodies and members of the public which are summarised in sections 7, 8 and 9 of this report above.

## 11.2. Alternatives

11.2.1. Chapter 2.10 of volume 2 of the EIAR provides a description of the main alternatives studied by the developer and the reasons for his choice. The permissible uses on the site are prescribed by its zoning under the local plan. The alternatives that were considered were therefore largely restricted to variations in layout and building design. In the prevailing circumstances this approach was reasonable, and the requirements of the directive in this regard have been met.

## 11.3. Likely Significant Direct and Indirect Effects

11.3.1. The likely significant indirect effects of the development are considered under the headings below which follow the order of the factors set out in Article 3 of the EIA Directive 2014/52/EU:

- population and human health;
- biodiversity, with particular attention to species and habitats protected under Directive 92/43/EEC and Directive 2009/147/EC;
- land, soil, water, air and climate;
- material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape; and
- the interaction between those factors

## 11.4. Population and human health, including noise and vibration

11.4.1. The proposed development would facilitate a significant increase in the population of Celbridge. To the extent that this increase is in line with national and local policy to foster sustainable development (which is discussed below), this is considered to be a significant positive effect. Of course, if the board determined that the site was not the appropriate place to accommodate the proposed housing in line with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area then this effect would be negative.

11.4.2. Most of the development would be residential. The proposed commercial uses would be small in scale and mainly serve the residents of the proposed housing. The proposed development and ancillary uses would not introduce activities or processes into the area that would have the potential to have significant effects on human health.

- 11.4.3. Several submissions stated that the proposed apartments would be too small to allow the social distancing required to inhibit the spread of Covid-19 and would therefore have a negative impact on health. This assertion is not accepted. It would be an equally plausible and unsupported assertion that the proposed provision of more residential units would facilitate social distancing by providing separate dwellings for more households, and that the proposed one- and two-bedroom apartments which are suitable for smaller households would provide an alternative form of accommodation that would diminish the extent to which people who are not members of a nuclear family have to share homes. There is no evidence to support a conclusion that living in apartments as opposed to houses would be likely to lead to a significant increase in the spread of Covid-19 or any other disease. Nor are there reasonable grounds to presume that one type of housing might possibly be healthier than another such as would justify invoking the precautionary approach to support either a grant or a refusal of the current application.
- 11.4.4. The proposed development would not provide access to Kilwogan Stream in a manner that was a threat to public safety or human health.
- 11.4.5. The groundworks required to carry out the proposed development would disturb soil and could release spores including those of aspergillus species. This potential arises whenever the ground is disturbed. The characteristics of the site and of the proposed development do not indicate that any effect in this regard would be more significant or more likely to arise in this case compared to any other similarly sized residential development. The groundworks on the site would be separated from existing houses to the east by the Maynooth Road and from those to the west by Kilwogan Lane and the buffer zone along Kilwogan Stream. Measures to restrict emissions of dust are set out at section 8.4 of the EIAR which amount to standard construction practices whose efficacy is well established. Subject to their implementation, it is unlikely that the emissions to air from the proposed development would lead to the dispersal of spores that would be likely to affect human health. The proposed development would not unduly overshadow neighbouring residential properties (as discussed below).
- 11.4.6. The predominantly residential use of the proposed development means that its occupation would not be likely to generate noise or vibration that would have a significant effect on the environment. As discussed below, the impact of the

proposed development on traffic levels along the Maynooth Road would be contingent and marginal. The noise generated by traffic along that road is unlikely to increase as a result of the proposed development to an extent that would have a significant effect on the environment. This is apparent from the suburban location of the site, the residential nature of the proposed development and the fact that the Maynooth Road already operates as a main distributor road giving access to the motorway and will continue to do so whether or not the proposed development is carried out. In these circumstances the information in the submitted EIAR regarding the existing environment and the potential impact of the proposed development in relation to noise was sufficient. The construction of the proposed development has the potential to give rise to noise and vibration in a manner similar to other residential schemes on greenfield suburban sites. The characteristics of the site and the project are not unusual in this regard. The description and assessment of the potential emissions of noise and vibration at section 7 of the EIAR are consistent with these circumstances, as are the proposed mitigation measures set out in section 7.6.1 of the EIAR and the submitted construction management plan. Subject to their implementation, the proposed development would be unlikely to have significant effects on the environment with regard to noise or vibration..

11.4.7. It is therefore concluded that the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on human health.

#### **11.5. Biodiversity, with particular attention to species and habitats protected under Directive 92/43/EEC and Directive 2009/147/EC**

11.5.1. The potential for an impact from the development on Natura 2000 sites has been addressed in the screening for appropriate assessment at section 10 of the this report above. The site does not contain habitats which are protected under Directive 92/43/EEC and Directive 2009/147/EC, nor does it contain habitats upon which species protected under those directives depend.

11.5.2. The large majority of the site consists of agricultural land which does not contribute to biodiversity to any substantial extent. The proposed development would result in the loss of this habitat but this would not have a significant effect on the environment. The development would result in the loss of c480m of hedgerow along the internal field boundaries. This would diminish the extent to which wildlife corridors functioned

across the site for mammals and the extent to which the site supports foraging and commuting by bats. However the most significant hedgerow and wildlife corridors along the Kilwogan Stream and the western boundary of the site with the rural area beyond would be retained. As the proposed development would retain the more important hedgerows on the site, the extent to which it diminished wildlife corridors would not have a significant effect biodiversity or the environment. This is apparent from the description of the site and the likely impact of the development set out in section 4 of the EIAR. Further information is not required to assess the development's likely effects on biodiversity. In particular, the fact that most of the site is improved pasture; the location of a main road along its eastern boundary; its separation distance from the demesne at Castletown House; and the proposed retention of the main hedgerows on the site during the development mean that additional bat surveys are not required to assess the proposed development. The proposed development would also retain parts of the vegetation along the eastern boundary of the site which are less significant for wildlife due to their position beside a main road and the fact that the north end is not connected to other hedges. The extent to which the proposed development would retain hedgerows is therefore substantial and would render it in keeping with the provisions of the development plan and local area plan that seek to protected hedges, including section 17.4.7 and objective GI11 of the development plan. None of the provisions of the development plan or the local area plan require the preservation of any specific part of the vegetation on the site. Nor should they be interpreted as prohibiting the removal of any hedges during the development on lands zoned for residential development as this would unreasonably interfere with the achievement of a necessary standard of urban design.

11.5.3. Having regard to the foregoing, it is not likely that the proposed development would have significant effects on biodiversity.

## 11.6. Land and soil

11.6.1. The proposed development would result in the loss of c12ha of productive agricultural land. Given the extent of such land that would remain available in the region, this is not considered to be a significant effect. Section 5.2.1 of the EIAR sets out that the development would require the excavation of 103,000m<sup>3</sup> of material with some localised removal of bedrock to provide the attenuation basin and

basement car parks. c19,160m<sup>3</sup> of fill material is likely to be required. The extent of groundworks required for to carry out the proposed development is not extraordinary and it would not be likely to affect the stability of other lands in the vicinity or the integrity of structures upon them. Section 5.4 of the EIAR and the submitted waste and construction management plan site set out measures to mitigate any potential effect of the proposed development on land or soil, including the handling of soil and the disposal of material that would be removed from the site during construction. The measures amount to standard practice. Subject to their implementation, the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on land or soil.

#### 11.7. **Water, including flood risk assessment**

##### *Construction impacts*

11.7.1. The construction of the proposed development would involve groundworks across a large site. There is a potential that these works could affect the quality of waters through the release of sediments to watercourses, in particular to Kilwogan Stream along the south of the site, and from the spillage of cements, fuels or lubricants. Similar potential effects commonly arise in construction projects on greenfield sites. Several of the submissions from the public referred to landfilling that had occurred at Griffenrath and stated that the proposed works could lead to pollution of water courses. The application site is a significant distance from Griffenrath and works upon it would not have the potential to cause pollution from the filling there. The absence of a reference to the filling in the EIAR does not render that document inadequate. Section 6.7 of the EIAR and section 11.2 of the construction management plan set out measures to avoid the potential effects that could arise from the construction of the proposed housing, including the installation of a drainage system with silt fences before its outfall to the stream, monitoring of water quality in the stream, and management measures for handling spoil, cement and hydrocarbons that include a buffer zone along the stream. All of the measures are standard construction practice that would be implemented on any competently managed project. Their use would render it unlikely that the construction of the proposed development would have a significant effect on the environment with regard to water.



### *Surface water and flood risk assessment*

11.7.2. The site is not recorded as having a history of flooding or being at an elevated risk of flooding on maps issued by the OPW or CFRAMS. The proposed housing would be outside the flood risk zones designated in the local area plan. This indicates that the site is on flood zone C under the scheme set out in the 2009 Flood Risk Management Guidelines where housing development is acceptable in principle. This conclusion is consistent with the topography and drainage pattern that was evident on the site at the time of inspection, with a large pastoral field bounded by hedgerows drained by a single well defined watercourse at Kilwogan Stream. The proposed development would not be at an undue risk of fluvial flooding, therefore. The proposed development would include a surface water drainage system that would attenuate the volume and rate of stormwater runoff from the site to greenfield levels. Calculations have been submitted to demonstrate the adequacy of the proposed system in this regard which take into account climate change. The relevant technical section of the council reported that the proposed system was acceptable in this regard. The proposed development would not be an undue risk of fluvial flooding, therefore, and would not give rise to an increased risk of flooding on other lands. In particular it would not have the potential to cause flooding in or around the land at Griffinrath that had been filled. The outfall from the stormwater drainage system would be onto the Kilwogan Stream. As the discharge would be attenuated to greenfield levels the proposed development would not give rise to an increased risk of flooding along that stream. The installation of hydrocarbon interceptors in the surface water drainage system prior to its outfall means that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect on the quality of surface waters. It is not proposed to drain stormwater to the ground on the site. The proposed development would not have a significant effect on groundwater, therefore, and the information submitted in the EIAR on the topic was sufficient.

### *Wastewater drainage*

11.7.3. Foul effluent from the proposed development would drain to the public sewerage system serving the Lower Liffey Catchment Area. The size of the proposed development means that the additional effluent from it would not be likely to have a significant effect on the operation of the treatment plant at Leixlip, whose licence was

issued by the EPA on the basis of a population equivalent of 150,000, or on the quality of water downstream of that plant.

- 11.7.4. However there are constraints on the hydraulic capacity of the sewerage between the application site and the treatment plant. Numerous submissions from the public referred to the overloading of combined sewers in the town and consequent flooding during storm events, as did that from Irish Water. The submission from Irish Water stated that the long term strategy for foul drainage in Celbridge had not yet been determined although the current works to divert some effluent from the Primrose Hill pumping station would create additional capacity in the town's sewerage. Most of the submissions from the public argued that the constraints in the sewerage serving the town mean that the proposed development would be premature at this time. There is considerable merit in that position given that there is an existing deficiency in the town's sewerage, proposals to address it in the long term have not yet been finalised and a concurrent proposal for housing on the adjoining site under 306504 could absorb the additional capacity in the system that would be provided by the diversion of effluent from the Primrose Hill station.
- 11.7.5. Nevertheless I consider that the sewerage proposals submitted with the application are sufficient to demonstrate that the proposed development would have the benefit of adequate foul drainage. They also demonstrate that the proposed development would not be premature, prejudicial to public health, likely to overload the sewerage downstream or otherwise have significant effects on the environment in respect of water. It is relevant in this regard that Irish Water, the body responsible for the wastewater network, has issued a confirmation of feasibility and a statement of design acceptance in respect of the proposed housing on the site based on works on other lands to remove surface water from the existing sewers at St. Patrick's Park and to upgrade the existing foul sewer at Crodaun Park. The former proposed works have been described with reasonable precision in a report submitted with the application while the latter would be the subject of a project works services agreement between the developer and Irish Water. The proposed off-site works would be to existing public infrastructure and would not require statutory or third-party consents. It would therefore be reasonable to include them in the consideration of the proposed development. In this context, the existing condition of the town's sewerage would not require a refusal of permission for the proposed

development, although it would necessitate a condition delaying the occupation of the proposed housing until the constraints were addressed as was recommended by Irish Water.

- 11.7.6. Subject to this, it concluded that the proposed development is unlikely to have significant effects on environment in relation to water, and that it would not be an undue risk of flooding or give rise to an undue risk of the flooding of other land.

#### **11.8. Air and climate**

- 11.8.1. The impact of the proposed development on the climate would be negligible. The proposed housing and open space would not accommodate activities that would cause emissions that would be likely to have significant effects on air quality. The impact of the proposed development on the level of traffic in the area would be marginal and would not have a significant effect on the environment with respect to air, as set out in section 8.3.5 of the EIAR. There is a potential for dust emissions to occur during construction but standard measures are proposed to mitigate this potential as set out in section 8.4 of the EIAR. They are likely to be effective. It is therefore concluded that the proposed development is unlikely to have significant effects on air.

#### **11.9. Material assets**

- 11.9.1. The proposed development would provide another 467 homes in Celbridge, compared to the 6,544 that were recorded there at the 2016 census. It would therefore have a significant positive effect on the material assets available in the area. There is no information that would support the assertion that the proposed development would damage the assets used for breeding and keeping horses in the vicinity of the site or elsewhere.

#### **11.10. Cultural heritage**

- 11.10.1. The site does not contain any protected structures or recorded monuments. The proposed development would not directly affect any such feature of cultural significance. The existing gateposts along the eastern boundary of the site are not protected features and are not of high heritage or aesthetic value. Refusing permission or substantially amending the proposed development would not be justified to protect the gateposts. The site is a significant distance from the Architectural Conservation Area at the historic core of Celbridge and the demesne of

Castletown House and suburban housing was developed on the intervening land during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The proposed development would not injure the setting of those features, therefore, or indirectly affect any feature of heritage value. The proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect on cultural heritage, therefore.

### **11.11. The landscape**

11.11.1. The site is flat agricultural land on the outskirts of a town. Low density, late 20<sup>th</sup> century housing lies to its south and south-east. Functional commercial and institutional buildings stand to the north of the site. The roads between the north of the site and the motorway have been built to modern engineering standards for distributor routes with roundabouts at major junctions and no frontage development. The character of the area is therefore peri-urban. It has no particular landscape value. The statements in the submissions from the council and from the public that the site is at the transition between the urban and rural area are not correct. The site is an undeveloped piece of land largely surrounded by extensive urban development that is typical of a district near a motorway junction in a metropolitan region. The site and most of the land around it is already distinct from the rural lands to the west. The proposed development would retain the hedgerow forming the western boundary of the site, with lower two-and three-storey buildings in its vicinity. This is sufficient to protect the character of the rural area which is near the site. The rest of the proposed development would face an urban area. Given these circumstances, the information submitted in the EIAR and other documents submitted with the application regarding the visual impact of the proposed development and its likely effects on the landscape was adequate. It is evident that the proposed residential development would not have a significant effect on the landscape.

### **11.12. Interaction between the factors**

11.12.1. The potential impact of the development on soil, water and biodiversity interact due to the need to avoid emissions of sediment to surface waters to protect water quality and aquatic. The potential impact on land and soil interacts with that on air due to the need to control dust emissions during ground works. The potential impact of the development on material assets interacts with that on the population due to the provision of a substantial amount of housing for the population. The

various interactions were properly described in the EIAR and have been considered in the course of this EIA,

### **11.13. Cumulative Impacts**

11.13.1. The proposed development could occur in tandem with the development of other sites that are zoned in the area, including the neighbouring site to the east which is the subject of the SHD application 306504. Such development would occur on land zoned for development under the local area plan which has been subject to Strategic Environment Assessment. Its location and use would be limited by the provisions of those the development and local area plans and its form and character would be likely to be similar to the development proposed in this application. It is not likely to give rise to environmental effects that were not envisaged in the plans that were subject to SEA. It is therefore concluded that the cumulation of effects from the planned and permitted development and that currently proposed would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the environment other than those that have been described in the EIAR and considered in this EIA.

### **11.14. Reasoned Conclusion on the Significant Effects**

Having regard to the examination of environmental information set out above, including the EIAR and other information provided by the developer, and to the submissions from the planning authority, prescribed bodies and public in the course of the application, it is considered that the main significant direct and indirect effects of the proposed development on the environment are as follows:

- Significant positive effects with regard to population and material assets due to the increase in housing that it would provide in the town
- A potential negative effect on water due to the generation of foul effluent which would be mitigated by the submitted proposals to upgrade the wastewater network in the town
- Potential effects on air during construction due to the emissions of dust and noise which would be mitigated by appropriate measures

The proposed development is not likely to have significant adverse effects on human health, biodiversity, soil, land, climate, cultural heritage or the landscape.

The likely significant environmental effects arising as a consequence of the proposed development have therefore been satisfactorily identified, described and assessed. They would not require or justify refusing permission for the proposed development or requiring substantial alterations to it.

## **12.0 Assessment of other issues**

12.1. The other planning issues arising from the proposed development can be addressed under the following headings-

- The principle of development
- The amount of housing proposed
- The mix of building and dwelling types
- Building height
- Layout and design
- Residential amenity
- Access and parking

### **12.2. The principle of development**

12.2.1. The part of the site where housing is proposed is zoned for residential development. Public open space is proposed on the part zoned for open space and amenity. This compliance with the zoning of the site under the applicable statutory plan supports the principle of the proposed development. It does not determine the issue, however. Even if land has been zoned, it remains open for people to make submissions on an application for permission that a site is not suitable for housing and for the board to come to that conclusion if other factors would justify it.

12.2.2. The site adjoins the existing built-up area of the town of Celbridge. Suburban housing has been built on the neighbouring land to the south and south-east and there is no significant area of undeveloped land between the proposed development and the centre of the town. Residential development on the site would therefore follow a sequential pattern of growth from the centre of the town. Commercial buildings and schools have been built to the north of the site. Their presence means that the current site does not stand at a transition between the urban and rural area, except on its western side. Most of the boundaries of the proposed development

would face land that has already been built upon and it would not increase the extent of the town as measured by the distance from its centre to its northern edge. The absence of development on the current site leaves the buildings to the north as a rather isolated part of the town. The site is therefore within the existing footprint of Celbridge. These physical circumstances of the site support the principle of its development because this would help provide the town with a more coherent and consolidated built form, and because the formerly rural character of the site has been substantially changed by the urban development that has occurred to both its north and south.

12.2.3. The higher level planning policy that provides the context for the local area plan also supports the principle of the site's development for housing. It would provide accommodation for the growth in the population of the Eastern and Midland Region projected under objective 1b of the National Planning Framework. The location of that accommodation within the footprint of a town would be in line with objectives 3a and 3c of the framework. Celbridge is equivalent to a self-sustaining town under the hierarchy set out in the RSES and is within the designated metropolitan area. The development of the site would consolidate the town. This is the appropriate policy response for such towns according to table 4.3 and section 4.7 of the RSES. The development of the site would provide more housing in a settlement that is designated as a moderate sustainable town by the county development plan and so would be in line with the settlement strategy set out in that plan.

12.2.4. The residential development of the site is therefore supported, in principle, by its zoning under the local area plan, by higher level planning policy at national, regional and county level, and by the physical circumstances of the site. Against this, numerous submissions from the public state that the supporting infrastructure is not available in Celbridge and at the site to support its residential development. In particular it is asserted that the physical infrastructure provided by the road network, water supply, wastewater drainage, surface water drainage and electricity supply are inadequate to service the proposed development, as is the social infrastructure provided by the town's schools, childcare facilities, health services, recreational amenities and Garda resources. North county Kildare has experienced significant population growth in recent decades and the accounts provided in the submissions of the stresses upon its infrastructure are accepted as well founded. Nonetheless

they would not justify setting aside the zoning of the site and concluding that it was not suitable for residential development. There is no evidence to indicate that there is a critical deficiency in the physical or social infrastructure serving the site that would justify refusing the current application. The pressures described in the submission are typical of developing areas. The development of the current site would increase those pressures to a marginal extent only. The additional demand upon physical and social services arises from an increase in population that has to be accommodated somewhere and which consequently requires the improvement of services there. Determining where this should be is the central function of the forward planning system. It would not serve the public good to revisit such determinations in the course of an application for permission on the basis of an increase in the demands upon infrastructure that would be likely to occur wherever a growing population was accommodated, as opposed to revisiting the principle of development on the basis a unique or particular defect that applied to a specific site. No such particular defect arises in this case.

12.2.5. Having regard to the foregoing, the principle of the proposed development is accepted and the site is considered to be suitable for the development of housing and open space in accordance with its zoning.

12.2.6. The proposed shop, gym, café and creche in the south-eastern part of the development would be relatively small in comparison to the proposed residential development. It is likely that they would mostly serve the demand for lower order services from residents of the proposed housing. As such they would be ancillary to the proposed residential development and in keeping with the zoning of this part of the site. They would not likely to affect the function of the town centre or any other retail or service centres in the area. The proposed creche would have space for fewer children than the general standard of 20 spaces per 75 dwellings set out in the 2001 guidelines on childcare facilities. However it would comply with the reduced standard set out in the local area plan which can be presumed to better reflect local circumstances. The proposed non-residential uses on the site are therefore acceptable in principle.



### 12.3. The amount of housing proposed

- 12.3.1. As the site is suitable for residential development, the question arises as to how much housing it could accommodate and the proper form of that housing. Although the site is within the built up area of a town in a metropolitan region, it is not adjacent to the town centre or any public transport corridor with high capacity services. Rather the range of services within walking distance of the site are typical of a suburban area, including bus services which are not frequent and which do not have physical priority along their routes. The site is therefore in an outer suburban or peripheral urban site. There is clear and consistent national guidance on the amount and form of residential development that is suitable on such sites. Section 5.11 of the 2009 Guidelines on Sustainable Urban Residential Development encourages development between 35 and 50 dwellings per hectare. The proposed development would be at a density of 43dph and so in the middle of that range. SPPR 4 of the 2018 Guidelines on Urban Development and Building Height requires urban development on greenfield sites to meet the minimum densities specified in the 2009. The proposed development would comply with that SPPR. Section 2.4 of the 2018 Guidelines on Apartment Design indicates that peripheral urban areas may be suitable for schemes with some apartments at densities of less than 45 dph. The proposed development would be at a density of less than 45 dph. The amount of housing proposed in the current application would therefore be in keeping with relevant national planning policy.
- 12.3.2. Table 4.2 of the county development plan states that residential development on greenfield sites should be at densities of 30-50dph. The proposed development would be within that range. The number of homes that is proposed in this application would not lead to a breach of the housing target of 3,250 additional units allocated by the core and settlement strategy of the development plan to Celbridge in the period 2016-2023, taking into other previously completed and permitted development and the concurrent proposal under ABP-306504-20. The amount of housing proposed in the current application would therefore be in keeping with the provisions of the development plan.
- 12.3.3. The amount of the development that is proposed on the site is therefore supported by national planning guidelines and the development plan. The proposed 467 units would, when taken in conjunction with the 372 unit proposed across the road under

ABP-306504-20 exceed the estimated capacity of 600 at the Crodaun KDA set out at table 4.1 of the LAP by c40%. However the LAP states that this is an estimate only and so the fact that a final design for the lands has resulted in more housing being proposed there is not a breach of any limit or a contravention of the LAP. Section 12.2.4 of the LAP does explicitly state that the maximum density of development in this area would be 30dph, which is a specific target that the current proposal would exceed. However that limit is not consistent with the policy at section 5.11 of the 2009 sustainable urban housing guidelines to encourage densities of 35-50dph, which is reinforced by SPPR 4 of the 2018 building height guidelines. There are no compelling reasons why a lower density should be allowed on this particular greenfield outer suburban site than would otherwise be the case. A material contravention of this provision of the development would therefore be justified under section 37(2)(b)(iii) of the planning with reference to the above guidelines issued by the minister. It would also be justified, as set out in the statement submitted with the application, under Section 37(b)(2)(i) as the current proposal is a strategic housing development and under section 37(2)(b)(ii) because the LAP's limit on density at Crodaun conflicts with table 4.2 of the county development plan which takes precedence over the provisions of the LAP.

12.3.4. Having regard to the foregoing, the amount of housing proposed on the site would be in keeping with national policy and with the provisions of the county development plan and so is acceptable.

12.3.5. With regard to the variation of the development plan whose implementation in Celbridge has been stayed by the High Court, the amount of housing proposed in this application would not, in itself, exceed the housing target of 606 more units in the period 2020-23 allocated to Celbridge by the revised core and settlement strategy. The combined total of the two proposed strategic housing development at Crodaun would exceed this target. However the normal period of a planning permission is five years and it is unlikely, for practical reasons, that the number of houses that could be built before 2023 under both applications would exceed 606. The completion of both developments within 5 years would not lead to a breach of the figure of 1,406 more dwellings in Celbridge that the varied settlement strategy indicates would conform with the NPF projections to the year 2026. It is not considered, therefore, that the proposed development would breach the revised

housing targets that would be imposed in Celbridge by variation no. 1 of the development plan. Granting permissions that rely on the projected housing figures after 2023 could prejudice the review of the extent and location of zoned lands that is required under policy SS4 of the varied plan. However development on the current site would consolidate the existing built up area of the town and would be self-contained growth on the existing footprint of the town in line with section 2.11.4 of the varied plan. It is therefore unlikely that a grant of permission in this case would hinder or prejudice such a review.

#### **12.4. The mix of building and dwelling types**

- 12.4.1. SPPR 4 of the 2018 Guidelines on Urban Development and Building Height requires a greater mix of building heights and types in housing developments on greenfield suburban sites. Section 3.4 of those guidelines refers to the need to provide more one- and two-bedroom units to meet the needs of the community in line with demographic changes. Section 2.4 of the 2018 Guidelines on Apartment Design also envisaged housing developments at peripheral urban locations that are a mix of apartments and houses. The proposed development would include a mix of houses and apartments with substantial proportion of two-bedroom units and so would comply with those guidelines. The provision of a significant additional number of apartments in the proposed development would have a beneficial effect in widening the range of housing types in the town as a whole, 89% of which were recorded as being houses in the 2016 census. This broadening of the range of housing types would be appropriate to the demography of the town where 39% of households were recorded as consisting of one or two people. The proposed mix of housing types is therefore acceptable despite the qualified advice against apartments in greenfield suburban developments set out at section 15.5.2, Table 15.1 and 17.4.6. of the county development plan. Those provisions of the development plan do not prohibit apartments on suburban sites and so the proposed development would not materially contravene them. A strict interpretation of those provisions of the development plan would also run contrary to the higher level national guidance set out above.
- 12.4.2. The mix of dwelling and building types in the proposed development is therefore acceptable and in accordance with relevant planning policies.

## 12.5. Building height

12.5.1. In relation to height, section 3.6 of the guidelines on building height establishes that buildings of between two and four storeys are generally appropriate for development on suburban greenfield sites such as the current one. The proposed apartment blocks would be higher than this. However that section of the guidelines allows for higher buildings where they can be accommodated by particular circumstances, including along wider streets and parks. The main part of the front wall of the proposed apartment blocks B and C would be 14.25m over the ground floor level and c30m from the structures and buildings along the opposite side of the Maynooth Road. There is a fourth floor that would be set back by 2m from that wall and which would reach a height of 16.8m. The walls of Apartment Block D would reach a height of 21.3m over its ground level and would be c40m from the opposite side of the Maynooth Road. Apartment block A would reach a height of c20m over its ground level with the highest part of the that wall c35m from the other side of the road, which in that instance forms part of the site on the concurrent application under 306504. Therefore, although there is some variation in the particular heights and setbacks along the front of the proposed development, it would provide a consistent ratio of building height to street width along the Maynooth Road of 1:2. This would provide a strong street frontage and a sense of enclosure that would be appropriate for a main thoroughfare in a suburban area. The slightly higher ratio at Block C would be appropriate due to its position beside the proposed park at the northern end of the site which would benefit from more enclosure and supervision.

12.5.2. Section 12.2.4 of the LAP states that housing types of 2 to 3 storeys will be encouraged in Crodaun. This provision does not prohibit higher buildings on the site and to interpret it in a strict manner would not be consistent with the higher level guidelines of building height issued by the minister in 2018. Nonetheless the development management criteria set out at Section 3.2 of those guidelines are relevant to the proposed apartment blocks because, at 5 to 6 storeys, they would be higher than existing buildings in the town and higher than the development envisaged in the LAP at Crodaun. With regard to the criteria at the scale of the town, it is relevant that the application site is relatively large and is not within an architecturally sensitive area, and the proposed apartment blocks would make a positive contribution to the place making and create visual interest in the streetscape. At the

scale of the district or street the proposed development would make a positive contribution to the urban neighbourhood and streetscape and would enhance the context for the key thoroughfare along the Maynooth Road and the proposed public space at the northern end of the site by enhancing a sense of scale and enclosure. The higher buildings would improve the legibility of the wider urban area and positively contribute to the mix of buildings and dwelling types there. The proposed properly responds to the natural and built environment by maintaining the hedge and stream along its western and southern boundary and providing strong frontage onto the Maynooth Road which addresses the existing lack of any clear character for that street. The existing single and two-storey housing at Crodaun Forest Park makes little or no contribution to the streetscape along the Maynooth Road. Similarly the single and two-storey houses to the south of Kilwogan Lane are barely visible from the site and makes no particular contribution to architectural context. It would be counterproductive in urban design terms for development on the current site to attempt to replicate the character of the late 20<sup>th</sup> century low density housing to its south and east, as well as being contrary to general planning policies to achieve a more sustainable use of urban land. At the scale of the site/building the detailed design of the proposed apartment blocks achieves a satisfactory standard of urban design and not unduly overshadow other properties. The proposed development would therefore comply with the criteria in section 3.2 of the 2018 guidelines on building height and the assertions to the contrary in the submissions from the planning authority and others are not accepted.

12.5.3. The height of the proposed development is therefore acceptable and in keeping with the applicable planning policies.

## 12.6. **Layout and design**

12.6.1. The layout of the proposed development provides a strong frontage and streetscape along the Maynooth Road. It would achieve a proper degree of legibility and permeability, particularly for pedestrians, with several access points from the Maynooth Road and clear and direct routes through the site including those through the site along Kilwogan Stream and towards the park and schools at the northern end of the site. The proposed layout would properly facilitate future access to the lands to the west that could be used if they were ever zoned for development. The layout would provide adequate supervision of open space and the proposed

pedestrian routes across them and would not give rise to an undue risk of anti-social behaviour.

12.6.2. The proposed grid is an acceptable way to lay out streets. The length and straightness of the streets is not a defect. The submission from the council which asserts otherwise is not accepted. As set out in DMURS, the appropriate way to restrain traffic along such local streets by a proper frontage of buildings onto the streets, by restricting the width of the carriageway to 5.5m and by having junctions at short intervals with block dimensions of generally no more than 100m. The proposed development would include these features. The proposed streets would have coherent streetscapes. It is noted that some of the corner units with two elevations facing streets would be set forward of the front of houses on one of those streets. This would interfere with building lines in a manner to which the council objects. However I would consider it an acceptable way to emphasise corners and reinforce a hierarchy of streets that would improve the overall legibility of the scheme without unduly undermining streetscapes. If the board prefers the position of the council on the matter, it could be adequately addressed by a condition requiring the omission of the houses to which the council objects.

12.6.3. The detailed design of the proposed apartment blocks, duplex buildings and houses achieves a satisfactory architectural standard with a suitable level of both visual interest and coherence.

12.6.4. The layout and design of the proposed development are therefore acceptable.

## 12.7. Residential amenity

12.7.1. The proposed buildings would be at least 30m from the existing dwellings to the south. The proposed buildings would be separated from the existing dwellings to the south by a stream, hedgerow and a public road. The separation between the proposed development and the existing housing to the south and their relative orientation means that the proposed development would not overshadow the existing housing there and would not unduly overlook or overbear them or give rise to undue disturbance to them. This conclusion takes account of the fact that the southern elevation of the proposed Block D facing the boundary of the site would be 5 storeys high and would include balconies and a roof garden. The proposed apartment buildings would be 30m or more from the existing houses to the east and south-east

of the site at Crodaun Forest Park and would be separated from them by the main thoroughfare along the Maynooth Road. The proposed apartments would face the sides of the existing houses which are laid out along cul-de-sacs that are generally perpendicular to the Maynooth Road. The separation between the proposed development and the existing housing to the east and south-east and their relative orientation means that the proposed development would not unduly overshadow the existing housing, nor would it not unduly overlook or overbear them or give rise to undue disturbance to them. This conclusion takes account of the fact that the proposed apartment blocks facing the eastern edge of the site along the Maynooth Road would be 5 or 6 storeys high and would have extensive elevations with balconies. The statement in the daylight and sunlight analysis submitted with the application that the proposed development would comply with the BRE guidance regarding its impact on adjoining properties is well founded and is accepted, notwithstanding the fact that the proposed apartment building would cast some shadow over parts of some residential properties at certain times of the year. The assertions in several of the submissions from occupiers of houses in the vicinity of the site which state that the proposed development would unduly disturb, overshadow, overlook or overbear their homes and would devalue their properties are not accepted.

- 12.7.2. It is therefore concluded that the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential amenities of properties in the vicinity of the site.
- 12.7.3. The proposed development would include extensive areas of public open space that would meet the standards set out in the county development plan. The layout and location of that open space and the submitted proposals for its landscaping are generally adequate. The proposed houses would have adequate levels of internal accommodation and private open space. The private space for the proposed houses of the H types to the west of the apartment blocks would be contained in terraces within the envelope of the building rather than back gardens. The size and shape of those terraces and their relationship with the internal rooms of the houses are such that they would provide a reasonable standard of amenity. The layout of the development would provide an adequate level of privacy and natural light for the proposed dwellings, as illustrated in the submitted Daylight and Sunlight Analysis.

- 12.7.4. The proposed apartments would comply with the requirements of the 2018 Guidelines on the Design of New Apartments, including its SPPRs. The number of studio and one bedroom units is well below the limit of 50% specified in SPPR 1. The minimum floor area of each apartment would meet the standards under SPPR 3, as well as the minimum sizes for each room and private open space set out in the appendix to the guidelines. 134 of the proposed 268 apartments would exceed the minimum floor area by at least 10%, including 82 of the 216 proposed apartments in the blocks and all of the 52 apartments proposed elsewhere on the site. These are also the apartments that would have dual aspect. The proposed development would therefore comply with the requirement for additional floor space in section 3.7 of the guidelines and the requirement that 50% of units have dual aspect under SPPR 4. Apartments at the corners of blocks with external elevations at right angles to each other are dual aspect for the purposes of SPPR 4. The ceiling heights of the apartments comply with SPPR 5, while the number of apartments per core on each floor in the blocks would comply with SPPR 6. The proposed 2,945m<sup>2</sup> of communal open space to serve the apartments would exceed the 1,567m<sup>2</sup> required to comply with the requirement for such space set out in the appendix to the guidelines.
- 12.7.5. It is therefore concluded that the proposed development would provide an acceptable standard of residential amenity for its occupants.

## 12.8. Access and parking

- 12.8.1. The proposed development would increase the demand upon the road network in the area. Its impact in this regard would be marginal in the context of the existing demands on the network. The impact arises from the increase in the population which the proposed development would accommodate. As stated in section 12.2.4 above, if more housing to accommodate the growing population in the region is not provided on this site, then a similar amount of housing would have to be provided somewhere else. While the current site is not in a town centre or on a public transport corridor, it is within the built up area of a town where additional residential development is planned under applicable statutory plans. If housing development is prevented on this site, there is no reason to believe that the demand would be displaced to a more accessible or suitable location in a way that would reduce the number or the length of journeys by car that the people living there would undertake or that it would reduce the overall demand on the public road network. In this



context the traffic analysis contained in the Transportation Assessment submitted with the application was adequate. The allocation of the limited capacity on a public network is a matter that is appropriately determined by the forward planning process through national guidelines and local plans that are made by politicians who are democratically accountable for their choices. It would be wrong to regard it as an entirely technical issue that can be determined solely or even mainly on the basis of a numerical model.

- 12.8.2. Therefore the assertions in the submissions on this application regarding general traffic congestion in the area and the submitted traffic analysis would not justify refusing permission for the proposed development or substantially amending it. This includes the submission from Transport Infrastructure Ireland. The assertion in that submission that the proposed development of zoned land in a town would have an adverse impact on the national road network in a manner that was contrary to the policy set out in the 2012 guidelines on spatial planning and the national road network is not well founded and is not accepted. The proposed development would have no inherent connection to the permitted extension of the Intel factory that would be different to any other development or established use in north Co. Kildare or south Meath that people might use the M4 to access. It would be unreasonable to make any permission that was granted for development on the current site dependent on the implementation of the conditions for the extension of that factory.
- 12.8.3. The particular impact on the safety and convenience of road users of the specific access arrangements that are proposed is, of course, a key issue for consideration in the course of an application for permission. The LAP shows an indicative layout for the Crodaun KDA where a single four-arm junction that would provide vehicular access to the zoned lands in that KDA on both sides of the Maynooth Road which are the site of this application and the concurrent one numbered ABP-306504-20. The current proposals before the board under the two applications present a different arrangement on the Maynooth Road with a staggered junction providing an access to each site with the benefit of right-turning lanes, with a signalised pedestrian crossing at both ends. The revised junction is an acceptable manner to facilitate the coherent development of the zoned land on both parts of the KDA. The provision of right turning lanes would mitigate the impact of the proposed housing on the capacity of the Maynooth Road to carry vehicles. This mitigation would be as much as could

be practicably achieved while still developing the lands that zoned for housing in the LAP. The proposed development would include a second vehicular access towards the southern end of the site's frontage. The submission from the council objects to the proliferation of accesses to the development. However this position is not accepted. The various proposed junctions maintain a reasonable separation distance between them to protect traffic safety. The second access would improve the permeability of the street network in this developing part of town, which is beneficial in itself. Moreover in conjunction with the proposed street frontage, the proposed increase in the number of junctions would have a significant positive effect by altering the character of the Maynooth Road to an arterial street within a town rather than distributor road on the urban fringe which it now resembles. This will have the effect of constraining vehicular speeds and driver behaviour with a consequent improvement in road safety compared to the current character of the road, which is not appropriate for its location within a town. Therefore, notwithstanding the objections in the submission from the council and members of the public, it is concluded that the proposed layout of the vehicular access for the proposed development would not give rise to a traffic hazard or unduly obstruct road users and would therefore be acceptable.

12.8.4. Several submissions stated that the proposed development would prejudice the selection of a route for a by-pass road around the west of the town which should logically begin at the roundabout at the northern end of the site. That roundabout has three arms. The indicative layout for the KDA shows a road forming a fourth arm there. The proposed development would not be compatible with a road that began at a fourth arm of the roundabout. So the submissions on this point have a reasonable basis. However the northern part of the site is zoned for open space and amenity under the local area plan. The proposed development would provide such an open space. The size and shape of this space mean that it could function as a small park that provided a useful recreational amenity for local residents. The space could not function as a park if a road was built through it. What would be left would be oversized landscaped strips on either side of a busy road. It is the zoning of the northern part of the site for open space that would prevent the laying out of a by-pass road over it, rather than the current proposal that is in accordance with that

zoning. The issue would not justify refusing permission for the development, therefore.

- 12.8.5. The site has already been zoned for housing under the local area plan. The objectives of the plan to prepare further transport strategies for the town do not state that the development of zoned land would be prohibited until the completion of those strategies. The issue would not justify refusing the current application.
- 12.8.6. The submission from the council objected to the failure of the proposed development to upgrade the footpath, cycle track and bus stops along the Maynooth Road or to provide a link over the stream to Kilwogan Lane in line with the objectives of the LAP. These improvements and links would be highly beneficial for the town, particularly the improvement of the pedestrian and cycle facilities along the Maynooth Road which provide access to the schools to the north of site and are currently substandard, as was pointed out in many of the submissions on the application. However the failure of the proposed development to include works to implement those objectives of the LAP would not justify refusing permission because those upgrades are not necessary to provide reasonably safe and convenient access for the proposed housing, they require works outside the land owned by the applicant and the proposed development would not hinder their completion by the roads authority. The current condition of Kilwogan Lane beyond the entrance to Thornhill Court is that of a rural road with heavy traffic. It has a surface that facilitates vehicular speed and no margins at the edge of the carriageway. It is not safe for pedestrians and it would not be safe to provide a pedestrian link to it without works to the entire lane. This would be more properly done by the council than by a private developer on a site that does not have frontage onto the lane.
- 12.8.7. The proposed development would not significantly impair the facilities for pedestrian and cyclists along the Maynooth Road. Safe facilities would be provided for pedestrians to cross the access roads to the scheme, and the treatment of the cycle track across the junction in a manner in keeping with the current standards in the National Cycle Manual can be required by condition. Furthermore, the proposed development would include a safe and convenient pedestrian route from south to north through the site with links to the Maynooth Road at both ends. This means that pedestrians from the proposed housing would not have to use the substandard facilities on the Maynooth Road and that an alternative route would be in place for

other people walking from the town towards the schools on its northern fringe. The impact of the proposed development would therefore be beneficial in terms of the safety and convenience of pedestrians. The submitted documents also refer to a cycle link through the site. Details of such a route could be required by a condition that would not involve significant changes to the overall scheme. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not have a negative impact on the safety and convenience of vulnerable road users. The submissions to the contrary from the council and various members of the public are not accepted.

12.8.8. The proposed development would provide two parking spaces for each of the proposed houses in line with the standards set out in the development plan. The location and scale of the shop, café, gym and creche are such that they should primarily serve people living in the proposed housing or the immediate vicinity of the site who would be able to walk to them. The reduced parking provision for them and the access to the creche are acceptable in this context, notwithstanding the submission from the council to the contrary. The provision of bike parking for the proposed apartments is generous. However the site is not in a central location or on a public transport corridor with high frequency services. The appropriate rate of car parking would therefore be that specified for less accessible urban locations at section 4.22 of the 2018 guidelines on apartment design, which is one space per unit with a visitor space for every 3 or 4 apartments. The proposed development would provide one car parking space for every apartment but only with only 33 visitor spaces in total. I would therefore agree with the submission from the council that the amount of visitor car parking for the proposed apartments is deficient. It is not clear how or where additional parking could be provided on site, and therefore a condition to that effect might not be sufficiently precise. It is not considered that the matter would justify a refusal of permission, however, given the limited extent of the shortfall. It would not be likely to result in haphazard or dangerous parking in any of the residential areas around the site because they are not that close to the proposed apartments. There is a risk that parking could occur along the Maynooth Road that would be obstructive and dangerous. However this risk would arise no matter how much parking was provided in the proposed development and would need to be addressed by the relevant authorities under the Road Traffic Acts in any event.

12.8.9. Having regard to the foregoing, it is concluded that the proposed development would be acceptable with regard to access and parking and that it would not give risk to traffic hazard or the obstruction of road users. In particular it would not have a negative impact on vulnerable road users.

## 12.9. Procedural issues

12.9.1. The submitted drawings and the description of the development on the published notices were adequate to describe it and to facilitate the making of submissions on the application. It would not be useful or appropriate to use the power under the planning acts to determine whether a proposal is in keeping with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area in order to determine whether it would be implemented in accordance with the building regulations. Several submissions criticised the SHD process and referred to ongoing court challenges to it. Their arguments in this regard may or may not be justified. However the board is obliged to carry out the procedures for SHD set down by the Oireachtas in the Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 2016, as amended, and the consequent regulations. It does not have the power to question the propriety or validity of that legislation. Certain submissions stated that an oral hearing should be held on the application although a formal request to do so was not made. The nature, scale and location of the proposed development do not give rise to circumstances that would establish a compelling case for an oral hearing as set out in section 18 of the act. It is not considered, therefore, that there is any procedural restriction on the consideration of the current application in the normal manner at this time.

## 13.0 Material Contravention

13.1. Section 12.2.4 of the LAP envisages that buildings of two to three storeys are 'encouraged' in this area, while table 15.1 of the development plan says that apartments will not 'normally' be permitted on greenfield sites and section 17.4.6 says that suitable sites would for apartments would 'primarily' be in town centres or along public transport corridors. Given the qualified wording of those provisions it is not considered that the proposed development would materially contravene them,

especially if they are interpreted in a manner consistent with the national guidelines on building height and apartment design issued in 2018.

- 13.2. As considered at section 12.3 of this report above, the proposed development would be at a density of 43dpha and so would clearly exceed the maximum density of 30dph for the site set out at section 12.2.4 of the Local Area Plan for Celbridge. Permission should be granted for this material contravention of this provision of the development plan under in accordance with section 37(2)(iii) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, having regard to the guidelines issued by the minister under section 28 of the act in 2009 on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas which, at section 5.11, encourages development on outer suburban greenfield land such as the current site at densities of between 35dph and 50dph. The development of the current site at the absolute minimum density 30dph specified in that section would not be justified by the circumstances of the site and would not provide an efficient or sustainable use of zoned land and so would not be in keeping with those guidelines. Section 37(2)(b)(i) of the act would apply in this case because the amount of housing proposed on zoned land meets the definition of strategic housing, and section 37(2)(ii) would apply because the density of the proposed development on a suburban greenfield site would be within the range of 30-50dph specified at Table 4.2 of the county development plan which conflicts with the provisions on density at the Crodaun KDA set out in the LAP. Were permission granted under application ABP-306504-20 prior to the board's consideration of the present application, then section 37(2)(iv) of the act would also apply to the proposed material contravention of the local area plan.

#### **14.0 Chief Executive's Recommendation**

- 14.1. The pertinent issues raised in the report from the council have been considered in the course of the assessment above. However for the purposes of clarity this section summarises why the reasons for refusal cited by the Chief Executive of the council were not accepted.
- 14.2. In relation to reason 1, the height of the proposed apartment blocks would be in keeping with the 2018 Guidelines on Urban Development and Building Heights and would properly reflect the natural and built environment in the vicinity of the site and

would make a positive contribution to the character of this developing urban area. In particular they would comply with the criteria set out at section 3.2 of those guidelines because the 5 and 6 storey buildings would provide a strong and visually interesting streetscape along the wide street on Maynooth Road and beside a significant proposed public open space at the northern end of the site. As such it would improve the legibility of the urban area and the mix of building and dwelling types in the town. The apartment buildings would stand along an arterial street in a suburban area and would not be at the transition with the rural area. The low density housing on adjacent lands does not establish a pattern of development that would be appropriate to continue on the site and the proposed apartments buildings would be adequately separated from it. The departure from the advice at section 12.2.4 of the LAP and sections 15.2.2 and 17.4.6 and Table 15.1 of the development plan is justified by the above cited guidelines and circumstances of the site. The proposed development would not seriously injure the residential amenity of the area and would not tend to depreciate the value of property there.

- 14.3. In relation to reason 2, the proposed development would provide safe and adequate access for its occupants and would not unduly interfere with the safe and convenient use of the public road by others, including by pedestrians and cyclists. The proposed development would not hinder or prevent the council improving pedestrian and cycle facilities on existing public streets or providing a link over Kilwogan Stream in accordance with the objectives of the local area plan.
- 14.4. In relation to reason 3, the layout and design of the proposed development achieves a satisfactory standard of urban design. It would provide an attractive residential environment and make a positive contribution to the character of the area. It would comply with the criteria set out in the Urban Design Manual and DMURS. The layout of the scheme achieves a suitable level of permeability and the block sizes and frequency of junctions accord with the advice in section 3 of DMURS. The length and straightness of the streets is acceptable. The vehicular access to the creche is acceptable for a facility whose size means that it would serve primarily residents in the same estate. The amount of visitor parking for the proposed apartments is deficient, but not to an extent that would result in haphazard parking in other residential areas or warrant refusing permission for the development. The density of

the proposed development is appropriate and in keeping with the provisions of the development plan and national guidelines.

- 14.5. In relation to reason 4, 50% of the proposed apartments would have dual aspect and would exceed the minimum required floor area by at least 10%. The proposed development would therefore comply with SPPR 4 and section 3.8 of the 2018 apartment design guidelines. The chief executive's report seems to only consider the proposed apartments in the higher blocks and not the others ( as does the applicant's statement of consistency). The proposed housing mix is acceptable and would broaden the extent to which the housing in Celbridge reflected the range of households there. The mix would be in keeping with SPPR 1 of the guidelines. Refusing permission on the basis of the housing mix based on an opinion formed in the course of an application for permission would be contrary to SPPR1.
- 14.6. In relation to reason 5, the deficiency in the number of proposed car parking spaces arises in relation to visitor parking for the apartments only and is minor in the overall context of the development. The layout of parking is appropriate. The proposed development would not be likely to lead to haphazard parking in other residential areas. Parking control would have to be exercised in relation to the Maynooth Road in any event. The proposed development would not endanger public health or cause a traffic hazard and would not lead to the obstruction of traffic or vulnerable road users.

## 15.0 Recommendation

- 15.1. I recommend that permission be granted subject to the conditions set out below.

## 16.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the following:

- (a) the policies and objectives set out in the Kildare County Development Plan 2017-2023,
- (b) the provisions of the Local Area Plan for Celbridge LAP 2017-2023 including the zoning of the site for residential development



- (c) Urban Development and Building Heights, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2018
- (d) the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS), 2013, as amended
- (e) the Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas, 2009
- (f) the Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, 2018
- (g) the Planning System and Flood Risk Management (including the associated Technical Appendices), 2009
- (h) the pattern of existing and permitted development in the area, and the situation of the site adjoining the built-up area of Celbridge and within the footprint of the town
- (i) the nature, scale and design of the proposed development,
- (j) the availability in the area of a range of social, community and transport infrastructure,
- (k) the submissions and observations received, and
- (l) the report of the Chief Executive of Kildare County Council

the board considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would provide housing of an appropriate form and density at a suitable location; that it would achieve an acceptable standard of urban design and make a positive contribution to the character of the area and the town; that it would provide a proper standard of residential amenity for its occupants; that it would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity; that it would have the benefit of adequate water supply and drainage and would not give rise to an undue risk of flooding; and that it would be acceptable in terms of safety and convenience of road users. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

The board considered that a grant of permission that materially contravened the provisions at section 12.2.4 of the Local Area Plan for Celbridge 2017-2023 restricting the density of residential development in the Crodaun Key Development Area would be justified in accordance with section 37(2)(b)(iii) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, having regard to the advice contained at section 5.11 of the guidelines issued by the minister in 2009 on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas that residential development on outer suburban greenfield sites should be at densities between 35 and 50 dwellings per hectare, with which the proposed development would comply..

### **Appropriate Assessment Screening**

The Board completed an Appropriate Assessment Screening exercise in relation to the potential effects of the proposed development on the Special Area of Conservation (SAC) at Rye Water/Carton sitecode 001398 taking into account the nature, scale and location of the proposed development, the Appropriate Assessment Screening Report and Environmental Impact Assessment Report submitted with the application, the Inspector's report and the submissions on file. In completing the screening exercise, the Board adopted the report of the Inspector and concluded that, by itself or in combination with other development in the vicinity, the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect on the above European Sites or on any other European Site in view of the sites' conservation objectives and that a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment is not required.

### **Environmental Impact Assessment**

The Board completed in compliance with Section 172 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, an environmental impact assessment of the proposed development, taking into account:

- (a) the nature, scale, location and extent of the proposed development,
- (b) the environmental impact assessment report and associated documentation submitted with the application,

- (c) the submissions from the planning authority, the prescribed bodies and the public in the course of the application, and
- (d) the Inspector's report.

The Board considered that the environmental impact assessment report, supported by the documentation submitted by the applicant, identifies and describes adequately the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the proposed development on the environment.

The Board agreed with the summary and examination, set out in the Inspector's report, of the information contained in the environmental impact assessment report and associated documentation submitted by the applicant made in the course of the application.

The board considers that the main significant direct and indirect effects of the proposed development on the environment are as follows:

- Significant positive effects with regard to population and material assets due to the increase in housing that it would provide in the town
- A potential negative effect on water due to the generation of foul effluent which would be mitigated by the submitted proposals to upgrade the wastewater network in the town
- Potential effects on air during construction due to the emissions of dust and noise which would be mitigated by appropriate specified measures for management of construction

The proposed development would not be likely to have significant adverse effects on human health, biodiversity, soil, water, climate, cultural heritage or the landscape.

The Board completed an environmental impact assessment in relation to the proposed development and concluded that, subject to the implementation of the mitigation measures proposed, as set out in Chapter 14 of the environmental impact assessment report, and, subject to compliance with the conditions set out herein, the effects on the environment of the proposed development by itself and

cumulatively with other development in the vicinity would be acceptable. In doing so, the Board adopted the report and conclusions of the reporting inspector.

## 17.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars. In default of agreement, such issues may be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.

**Reason:** In the interest of clarity

2. Mitigation and monitoring measures outlined in the plans and particulars, including the Environmental Impact Assessment Report submitted with this application as set out in Chapter 14 of the EIAR 'Summary of Mitigation Measures', shall be carried out in full, except where otherwise required by conditions attached to this permission.

**Reason:** In the interest of protecting the environment and in the interest of public health

3. Prior to the commencement of development the developer shall submit the following details for the written agreement of the planning authority—
  - Details of the proposed vehicular accesses from the Maynooth Road shown in conjunction with the access to the permitted housing development on the eastern side of the road. The submitted details shall demonstrate how safe and convenient facilities for pedestrians and cyclists shall be maintained along the Maynooth Road. In particular priority shall be maintained for the cycle

tracks along the Maynooth Road across the entrances to the proposed development in accordance with section 4.9.2 of the National Cycle Manual.

- Details of the pedestrian and cycle route from the Maynooth Road at the south eastern corner of the site through the authorised housing and park to the Maynooth Road at the northern boundary of the site, including details of the width, surface treatment and lighting of the route and of any gates, bollards or other restrictions on access and how they would be managed. The submitted details shall demonstrate that the route through the permitted development would provide a safe and convenient route for pedestrians and cyclists from the schools to the north of the site to other parts of the town to the south which would be available at all times of the day when it would be needed.
- Details of the streets within the development that demonstrate compliance with the specifications of DMURS in relation to the width of carriageways and footpaths and the corner radii at junctions. A single route from the proposed northern junction on the Maynooth Road to the location of the potential road link to the land to the west of the site may have a carriageway 6m wide. Other all streets within the development shall conform to the standards for local streets in DMURS and the carriageway shall not exceed 5.5m in width. Where additional space is required to facilitate access to perpendicular parking spaces it shall be provided in the manner set out in figure 4.82 of DMURS without widening the carriageway.

**Reason:** To ensure that the streets in the authorised development facilitate safe movement by sustainable transport modes in accordance with the applicable standards set out in DMURS and the National Cycle Manual

4. The materials, colours and finishes of the authorised buildings, the treatment of boundaries within the development and the landscaping of the site shall generally be in accordance with the details submitted with the application, unless the prior written agreement of the planning authority is obtained to minor departures from those details

**Reason:** In the interests of visual amenity

5. The site shall be landscaped in accordance with the detailed comprehensive scheme of landscaping, which accompanied the application submitted, unless otherwise agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

**Reason:** In the interest of residential and visual amenity

6. The areas of public open space shown on the lodged plans shall be reserved for such use and shall be soiled, seeded, and landscaped in accordance with the landscape scheme submitted to An Bord Pleanála with this application, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority. This work shall be completed before any of the dwellings are made available for occupation and shall be maintained as public open space by the developer until taken in charge by the local.

**Reason:** In order to ensure the satisfactory development of the public open space areas, and their continued use for this purpose

7. Proposals for street names, house numbering scheme and associated signage shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, all signs, and numbers shall be provided in accordance with the agreed scheme. The proposed names shall be based on local historical or topographical features, or other alternatives acceptable to the planning authority.

**Reason:** In the interest of urban legibility and to ensure the use of locally appropriate placenames for new residential areas.

8. All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground. Ducting shall be provided by the developer to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development.

**Reason:** In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

9. A plan containing details for the management of waste (and, in particular, recyclable materials) within the development, including the provision of facilities for the storage, separation and collection of the waste and, in particular, recyclable materials and for the ongoing operation of these facilities for each apartment unit shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority not later than 6 months from the date of commencement of the development. Thereafter, the waste shall be managed in accordance with the agreed plan. This plan shall provide for screened communal bin stores, the locations and designs of which shall be included in the details to be submitted. This plan shall provide for screened bin stores, which shall accommodate not less than three standard sized wheeled bins within the curtilage of each house plot.

**Reason:** In the interest of residential amenity, and to ensure the provision of adequate refuse storage.

10. The management and maintenance of the proposed apartment buildings and their associated land, as set out on the 'Taking-in -Charge' plan submitted with the application, shall be the responsibility of a legally constituted management company. Detailed proposals in this regard shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to occupation of the development.

**Reason:** To ensure the satisfactory completion and maintenance of this development.

11. Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

**Reason:** In the interests of public health

12. The development shall be carried out on a phased basis, in accordance with a phasing scheme that shall be agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of any development. The scheme shall provide that none of

the authorised dwellings shall be occupied until the proposed works to remove storm water from the sewers at St. Patricks Park has been completed to a satisfactory standard and have been certified as such by the planning authority and Irish Water, and that the occupation of any subsequent dwellings may not occur until Irish Water has certified that the foul sewerage system downstream of the site has been upgraded to cater for the effluent from those dwellings.

**Reason:** To ensure the timely provision of services in the interests of public health for the benefit of the occupants of the proposed dwellings

13. The applicant or developer shall enter into water and waste water connection agreements with Irish Water, prior to commencement of development.

**Reason:** In the interest of public health.

14. A minimum of 10% of all communal car parking spaces should be provided with functioning EV charging stations/points, and ducting shall be provided for all remaining car parking spaces, including in-curtilage spaces, facilitating the installation of EV charging points/stations at a later date. Proposals to achieve this shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the development.

**Reason:** To provide for and/or future proof the development such as would facilitate the use of Electric Vehicles

15. The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including:

(a) Location of the site and materials compounds including areas identified for the storage of construction refuse; areas for construction site offices and staff facilities; site security fencing and hoardings; and on-site car parking facilities



for site workers during the course of construction and the prohibition of parking on neighbouring residential streets;

(b) The timing and routing of construction traffic to and from the construction site and associated directional signage, to include proposals to facilitate the delivery of abnormal loads to the site; measures to obviate queuing of construction traffic on the adjoining road network; and measures to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble or other debris on the public road network;

(c) Details of the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures for noise, dust and vibration, and monitoring of such levels;

(e) Containment of all construction-related fuel and oil within specially constructed bunds to ensure that fuel spillages are fully contained. Such bunds shall be roofed to exclude rainwater;

A record of daily checks that the works are being undertaken in accordance with the Construction Management Plan shall be kept for inspection by the planning authority. The developer shall provide contact details for the public to make complaints during construction and provide a record of any such complaints and its response to them, which may also be inspected by the planning authority.

**Reason:** In the interest of amenities, public health and safety

16. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

**Reason:** In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.

17. Construction and demolition waste shall be managed in accordance with a construction waste and demolition management plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of

development. This plan shall be prepared in accordance with the “Best Practice Guidelines on the Preparation of Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects”, published by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government in July 2006.

**Reason:** In the interest of sustainable waste management

18. The developer shall facilitate the preservation, recording and protection of archaeological materials or features that may exist within the site. In this regard, the developer shall -
- (a) notify the planning authority in writing at least four weeks prior to the commencement of any site operation (including hydrological and geotechnical investigations) relating to the proposed development,
  - (b) employ a suitably-qualified archaeologist who shall monitor all site investigations and other excavation works, and
  - (c) provide arrangements, acceptable to the planning authority, for the recording and for the removal of any archaeological material which the authority considers appropriate to remove.

In default of agreement on any of these requirements, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.

**Reason:** In order to conserve the archaeological heritage of the site and to secure the preservation and protection of any remains that may exist within the site.

19. Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company, or other security to secure the provision and satisfactory completion and maintenance until taken in charge by the local authority of roads, footpaths, watermains, drains, public open space and other services required in connection with the development, coupled with an agreement empowering the local authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory completion or maintenance of any part of the development. The form and amount of the

security shall be as agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of agreement, shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.

**Reason:** To ensure the satisfactory completion and maintenance of the development until taken in charge

20. Prior to commencement of development, the applicant or other person with an interest in the land to which the application relates shall enter into an agreement in writing with the planning authority in relation to the provision of housing in accordance with the requirements of section 94(4) and section 96(2) and (3) (Part V) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, unless an exemption certificate shall have been applied for and been granted under section 97 of the Act, as amended. Where such an agreement is not reached within eight weeks from the date of this order, the matter in dispute (other than a matter to which section 96(7) applies) may be referred by the planning authority or any other prospective party to the agreement to An Bord Pleanála for determination.

**Reason:** To comply with the requirements of Part V of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and of the housing strategy in the development plan of the area

21. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or,

in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

**Reason:** It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission

---

Stephen J. O'Sullivan  
Planning Inspector

28<sup>th</sup> August 2020

## **Appendix – List of persons who made submissions**

Aileen and Martin Kelly

Aine Grace

Aisling Ni Dhoibhilin and Paul Whelan

Amy Kilbane

Andrea Patterson

Angela McFarlane

Ann Nicholson

Anna Van Haeften

Anne Mc Quaid

Annette and Derek Murray

Aoife Gilchriest

Beans Land

Bernard J Durkan

Betty O Donovan

Bill Elliffe

Brendan and Deirdre O Sullivan

Brendan Reid

Bridie Quinlan

Bronagh and Tony Kavanagh

Caoimhe O Halloran

Caoimhin MacCionnaith

Catherine Murphy

Cathy and Derek Stenson

Celbridge Community Council

Celbridge Guided Tours

Celbridge Tidy Towns

Celine Hanratty

Celine Molly

Chloe and Monica Davis  
Christian Vaudrion  
Ciara Galvin  
Ciara O'Donoghue  
Clare Crowley  
Cllr Íde Cussen  
Colin Mulkerrins  
Crodaun Forest Park Residents  
Daniel Findon and Catherine Murray  
Daragh Ffrench  
David and Sylvia Buckley  
David Kiernan  
Dean and Michelle O'Brien  
Declan Moloney  
Deirdre and Liam Nolan  
Deirdre Browne  
Deirdre Pierce McDonnell  
Denis Ceban  
Denis Conlan  
Des and Ann McCloskey  
Desmond Rooney  
Doireann Murtagh and Michael Lowther  
Donal and Brid Cotter  
Donal and Mary Cotter  
Dr.Sarah-Jane Ellife and John Whitty  
Eamonn Glennon  
Eamonn Nugent  
Edmund Scanlon  
Eileen English  
Elaine Quayle

Elizabeth Hutton  
Elm Park Residents Association  
Emma Haughton  
Emmet and Niamh McGauran  
Fergal Reidy  
Flora McDonnell  
Frances and Eddie Palmer  
Frank Phelan  
Gayle Thompson  
Geraldine O'Brien  
Gerard and Catherine McConville  
Gerard Mc Grath  
Hans Van Haeften  
Helena and David Burke  
Hilary Boylan  
Ingrid and Kevin Murray  
James Lawless TD  
James MacNamara  
James Richards  
Jason and Evelyn O'Sullivan  
Jeanne and Jim Walsh  
Jeanne Doyle  
Jessica Kelly  
Jim McCarthy and Audrey White  
Jim Sheridan  
Joe and Finola Bean  
John and Grainne O'Keefe  
John Breslin  
John Gleeson  
John Hickey

John McFarlane  
John Morrison Healy and others  
John Regan and Marylee Wall  
John Ruane  
Joseph and Noeline Murtagh  
June A Stuart  
June Galligan  
Karin and Martin Duffy  
Kate Carroll  
Kate McQuaid  
Keith Halligan and Edel Lawlor  
Ken Curley  
Kevin McHale  
Kristian Szenasi  
Kristina and Matus Banas  
Liam and Lisa McCarthy  
Linda Jackson Ryan and others  
Lisa and Des Palmer  
Liz Mahon  
Lorcan Shelley  
Lorraine and William Daly  
Lucy Monaghan  
Margaret and Joseph O'Connor  
Margaret and Martin Markey  
Marie Lowther  
Mark and Gosia Bradford  
Mary Carroll  
Mary Mahon  
Mary McDermott  
Maureen Ruttledge



Maureen Ruttledge and John Duignan  
Maurice and Frances Long  
Max Percy and Sharon Lynch  
Michael McKenna  
Miriam Breslin  
Miriam Fleming  
Monica and Tony Cullen  
Ms Grattan  
Mustafa and Mary Anne Cezaroglulari  
Nelon Joo  
Nelson D Souza  
Niall and Margaret Mannion  
Nicola Keenan  
Noel and Olive McClean  
Nora and Patrick O Grady  
Nuala Killeen  
Nuala Walker and Richard Kenny  
Paddy and Kate Kenna  
Paraig and Maureen Conaghan  
Pat and Josephine Byrne  
Pat Byrne  
Patricia Logan  
Patricia Murphy  
Patrick and Breda Kiernan  
Patrick and Mary Neligan  
Patrick Fitzgerald and Catherine Dunne  
Patrick M Kerr  
Paul and Katrina Dillon  
Paul and Sarah Jane Keegan  
Paul Carroll

Paul Fitzgerald  
Paul Taylor  
Peter and Eileen O Toole  
Peter Connell and Valerie Seymour  
Peter Finnegan and Treasa Ni Dharsaigh  
Phil Fitzgibbon  
Phyl Lynch and Roisin Eliffe  
Raymond Daly  
Réada Cronin  
Rebecca Ford  
Regina Cummins  
Richard and Mags Ellis  
Richard Hodson  
Robert and Carol Galavan  
Robert Barry  
Robin Campbell  
Rory and Lorena Behan  
Saoirse and David Thompson  
Sarah Kerr  
Seamus Fitzgibbon  
Sean and Patricia Doolin  
Sean Darcy  
Sean Mulvihill and Fiona Begley Mulvihill  
Sinead and Mark Mansfield  
Stephen and Janette Byrne  
Tara Hurl  
Teresa and David Redmond  
Theresa and Cyril Channey  
Tim O Meara  
Tony and Helen Burke

Tracey Kelly

Treasa Keegan

Una Campion

Valerie and Séamus O'Neill

Vanessa Liston and Sonja Moore

William Nicholson

Yvonne Waldron