

Planning Department,
Kildare County Council,
Áras Chill Dara,
Naas, Co. Kildare,
W91 X77F.

Date: 20th October 2026

Ref.: JN 24157 KK

Re: Further Information Response in relation to a Proposed Large-Scale Residential Development (LRD) Consisting of 272 No. Residential Units, a Childcare Facility, Commercial Uses, and all Associated Development on Lands within the Townlands of Newtown and Confey, Leixlip, Co. Kildare.

KCC Reg. Ref.: 26/60746

Dear Sir / Madam,

1.0 INTRODUCTION

On behalf of the applicant, Vanisland Limited (a Ballymore company), we hereby submit a response to the Further Information (FI) Request issued by Kildare County Council (KCC) on the 27th of August 2026 (Reg. Ref.: 26/60746) in respect of a proposed Large-scale Residential Development (LRD) on lands within the townlands of Newtown and Confey, Leixlip, Co. Kildare. The application site has an area of c. 7.5ha and is bound by the R149 to the east, the L1015 to the north, Paceland and Captains Hill (residential dwellings) to the north-east, greenfield lands to the west, and the Royal Canal to the south. The application site also includes a section of the L1015 to the north and a section of the R149 to the east and north-east, located within the townlands of Confey and Allenswood, and the associated verges and footpaths.

The proposed development provides for the construction of 272 no. residential units; 1 no. childcare facility; 2 no. commercial units (for Class 1- Shop, or Class 2- Office / Professional Services, or Class 11 Gym, or Restaurant / Café use, including ancillary takeaway use, or Class 8- Health Centre / Civic, or Cultural Use); a mobility hub; and a food and beverage unit (for Restaurant / Café use or Class 12 Public House).

The development will provide for 2 no. vehicular access points from the R149 to the east and the L1015 to the north, and associated internal roads, pedestrian and cycle paths, car and cycle parking, and the provision of the proposed infrastructure up to the application site boundary to facilitate future connections to adjoining lands.

The proposed development includes public open space, communal open space, landscaping, ESB substation and associated switch rooms, bin stores, plant rooms, and green roofs. The associated site and infrastructural works, provision of utilities and associated civil works, foul and surface water drainage and public lighting, along with all ancillary works.

This response has been prepared in association with the applicant, Howells Architects, ARUP Consulting Engineers, Donnachadh O'Brien & Associates (DOBA) Consulting

Engineers, Traffico, Bernard Seymour Landscape Architects (BSLA), EDC Engineers, Archaeological Consultancy Services Unit Ltd., and Altemar.

The following sections of this cover letter provide a response to the issues raised in the FI Request, which should be read in association with the accompanying FI response documentation consisting of the following:

- Transport Further Information Response prepared by Arup;
- Engineering Further Information Response prepared by DOBA, with associated appendices, including the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (Appendix B) and Quality Audit (Appendix 7) prepared by Traffico;
- Landscape Further Information Brochure, Pedestrian & Cycle Route Brochures and updated Landscape Masterplan (Drawing No. KE 2401-01-PLA) prepared by BSLA;
- Updated External Site lighting drawing (Drawing no. D25007-ZZ-ZZ-DR-EDC-E-70101) prepared by EDC;
- Updated Site Layout Plan Sheet 1 and Sheet 2 (Drawings Nos. 2583-HWS-SWD-XX-D-A-10103 and 10104), Housing Layout Plan (2583-HWS-SWD-XX-D-A-10110) and Taking in Charge (TIC) Sheet 1 and Sheet 2 drawings (2583-HWS-XX-D-A-10106 and 101017) prepared by Howells Architects;
- EIAR Addendum Report, including the updated Chapter 4- Archaeology, Architectural and Cultural Heritage and Chapter 15- Summary of EIAR Mitigation and Monitoring Measures prepared by JSA Planning and Archaeological Consultancy Services Unit Ltd.

As requested within the FI Request received, this completed FI response has been uploaded through the National Online Planning Portal.

The key design revisions and clarifications to address the items raised in the FI Request, are illustrated in the accompanying Further Information Response pack prepared by the Design Team, and can be described as follows:

- Further clarification in respect of required transport infrastructure and confirmation of provision of active travel routes along the L1015 and throughout the development;
- Provision of further engineering details / clarifications in relation to the proposed surface water drainage, SuDS, and the proposed outfall arrangement which includes utilising the existing provision on site;
- Revised Taking in Charge arrangements, including the revisions to the PG1 play area within the linear, revisions to the road / tabletop ramps to ensure that no residential access is impeded or conflicts with the ramp slopes, revised positioning of lighting poles and any other street furniture within home zones to ensure no obstruction to the carriageway or hazard, and clarification of areas to be taking in charge across the development;
- Updated archaeological assessment and mitigation following completion of the relevant archaeological investigations; and,
- Coordinated responses to the matters raised in the third-party submissions, prepared with input from the wider Design Team (see Appendix 1 of this Response letter).

The revisions and further clarification to the proposed scheme respond directly to the matters raised in the FI Request. The proposed amendments do not materially alter the nature, scale or overall design of the development, with only minor changes to the overall layout, and therefore are not considered to be of such significance in planning terms to result in a requirement for re-advertisement of this Further Information response. If there are any outstanding detailed design queries in respect of the proposed development, as amended, we suggest that they could be addressed through a condition of planning.

2.0 RESPONSE TO FURTHER INFORMATION REQUEST

The following lists each item of the FI Request and provides a response, which should be read in conjunction with the accompanying drawings and supporting documentation where relevant:

Item No. 1 – NTA Submission

“1. Please note that a submission has been received from the National Transport Authority (NTA) regarding the proposed development. The Confey Masterplan states that the delivery of the Northern Orbital Road is “proposed to be implemented as part of the development of the masterplan”. The NTA notes that the current application, Phase 1, does not include provision for the ‘western road upgrades’ or the ‘northern orbital road’. It is noted that the application documents state (as per the Masterplan) that ‘this road infrastructure is not proposed to be specifically associated with any particular phase, but the necessity for its construction will be determined based on more detailed traffic analysis undertaken in future stages with Traffic and Transport Assessments prepared to support planning applications to determine the phasing requirements for the roads infrastructure outside of the Masterplan lands and their specifications utilising the latest available information.

In terms of the ability of the lands to support future development, the NTA considers that the provision of the ‘western road upgrades’ and the ‘northern orbital link’, should be carefully tied into a phasing programme for the development of the lands in order to ensure that future vehicular movement, both private vehicles and public transport, can be adequately provided for and to ensure appropriate connectivity between neighbouring urban settlements and higher order services. In the interests of coherent planning and in order to provide a degree of certainty, the NTA recommends that the Applicant should indicate when the trigger for the ‘western road upgrades’ and the ‘northern orbital link’ will be met and should work with the local authority, Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII), the NTA and other stakeholders to establish the requirements in this regard.

The Applicant is requested to comment on the content of the NTA submission and submit proposals to address the comments in relation to the “western road upgrades’ and the ‘northern orbital link’.

In line with the NTA submission the Planning Authority require that the Applicant provides ‘pedestrian and bicycle only’ routes traversing the proposed development as per Confey Masterplan (Figure 40: Indicative Street Network with the Masterplan). The Applicant is requested to submit a drawing for same.

In line with the NTA submission the Applicant is requested to liaise with the NTA with regard to the provision of bus stop infrastructure for the proposed development.”

Response

In response to the above, we refer to the enclosed Transport Further Information Response prepared by Arup, in particular Items 1-1 to 1-3, and the Engineering Further Information Response prepared by DOBA, in particular Item 1-2, which should be read in tandem with the Pedestrian & Cycle Routes Drawing prepared by BSLA. These should be read in conjunction with the Traffic & Transport Assessment submitted with the Stage 3 LRD application, in particular Sections 4, 5.2, 5.3, 5.6 and 6.

Western Road Upgrades and Northern Orbital Road

In respect of the western road upgrades and Northern Orbital Road, as detailed in the Arup FI Response, the Confey Masterplan Strategic Transport Assessment established that up to 450 no. residential units could be progressed within Phase 1a with the existing Cope Bridge

arrangement in place. The subject application comprises 272 no. units and therefore falls within this assessed development envelope. The application-specific TTA further confirms that the proposed development can be accommodated on the existing road network and does not trigger the requirement for delivery of the remaining western road upgrades or the Northern Orbital Road.

Consistent with the Confey Masterplan approach, Arup advises that the appropriate timing and delivery triggers for these wider strategic infrastructure elements should be determined as subsequent phases are brought forward, having regard to cumulative development and the latest available transport information, with updated TTAs to accompany future planning applications. The response also confirms that Kildare County Council is separately progressing the Northern Orbital Road, with AtkinsRéalis undertaking the route-selection process. For clarity, Table 1 of the Arup FI Response sets out an indicative infrastructure delivery programme, including the Northern Orbital Road route-selection process, Phase 1a commencement and first occupation, the Captain's Hill scheme, the R149 and L1015 works, the Cope Bridge upgrade and the anticipated Phase 2 application, thereby providing an overall indication of how Phase 1a and the wider transport infrastructure are expected to progress in parallel.

Pedestrian and bicycle-only routes

In respect of the pedestrian and bicycle-only routes, we refer to the DOBA FI Response and also the accompanying Pedestrian & Cycle Routes Brochure prepared by BSLA. In summary it is confirmed that the proposed development provides for pedestrian and cycle routes in accordance with the Confey Masterplan. It is noted that the Figure 40 in the Masterplan is an 'indicative street network', and therefore it is not a requirement for the development to follow it exactly. However, the BSLA drawing clearly demonstrates 'pedestrian and bicycle only' routes traversing the proposed development, as required, including to the north of the site, a link through the centre of the site and a link through the southern and eastern portions of the site. Each of the pedestrian and bicycle only routes are also connected by the homezones which will comprise low traffic routes.

Bus stop infrastructure

In respect of bus stop infrastructure, as detailed in the Arup FI Response, provision has been made within the transport strategy for bus stop infrastructure serving the proposed development, including an indicative location close to the main entrance and an interim / long-term arrangement. We also refer to the DOBA FI Response, which confirms that the Applicant contacted the NTA on 3rd September 2026 regarding the future provision of bus stop infrastructure. However the application documents originally submitted and prepared by DOBA provide for an interim solution until Cope Bridge is delivered. This includes provision of a toucan crossing provided to connect the site with the existing footpath across cope bridge, along with the proposed long-term measures whereby the two active travel bridges are constructed alongside the existing cope bridge, along with provision of a bus stop if required. The Applicant is agreeable to a pre-commencement condition to agree the bus stop location, and as the bus stop would be included in the public road, under Section 34(4)(b) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, the Planning Authority may attach conditions '*requiring the carrying out of works (including the provision of facilities) which the planning authority considers are required for the purposes of the development authorised by the permission*' (34(4)(f) provisions are also relevant) and in this instance such a condition could relate to the final detail of the bus stop. Such conditions will ensure that the applicant, who is the owner of the application site, can implement the bus stop in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, and through liaison with the NTA and subject to agreement with KCC as a condition of planning.

Having regard to the above and the detailed technical responses submitted with this FI response, it is considered that the matters raised by the NTA and the Planning Authority under this Item have been satisfactorily addressed and that the proposed Phase 1a LRD development can proceed without prejudicing the delivery of the wider transport infrastructure identified for the Confey Masterplan lands.

Item No. 2 - Capacity of Surrounding Road Network

“2. Notwithstanding the response to Item 1, the Planning Authority have concerns regarding the operational capacity of Cope Bridge, Captains Hill, the R149 and the L1015. The proposed improvements and upgrades to the infrastructure required by the Confey Masterplan Phase 1a have not been provided in this application or by outside parties. The Applicant is requested to comment and submit proposals to address these concerns.”

Response

In response to the above, we refer to the enclosed Transport Further Information Response prepared by Arup, which should be read in conjunction with the Traffic & Transport Assessment submitted with the Stage 3 LRD application. This sets out the current position in respect of the relevant transport infrastructure identified under Phase 1a of the Confey Masterplan and confirms that the required measures are either being delivered as part of the subject application or are being progressed separately by the Applicant and Kildare County Council.

For clarity, Table 2 of the Arup FI Response sets out the status and delivery mechanism for each of the relevant Phase 1a infrastructure measures (see extract below). This should be read together with the transport assessment and indicative programme set out under Item 1, this demonstrates that the proposed Phase 1a development can proceed in a coordinated manner with the surrounding infrastructure upgrades and does not depend on completion of those wider works in order to operate satisfactorily.

Table: Status of the infrastructure identified under Confey Masterplan Phase 1a

Element	Requirement under Confey Masterplan Phase 1a (450 units in total)	Delivery mechanism and current status
Cope Bridge	Replacement and upgrade of the bridge, providing footpaths and cycle lanes in both directions	Upgrade included in the approved DART+ West Railway Order, with the associated CPO process commenced in September 2026. In parallel, the Applicant is bringing forward an enhanced design in coordination with KCC and Irish Rail, with a separate standalone planning application expected to be lodged in Q4 2026.
Captain's Hill and R149 corridor	Upgrade of the corridor for walking and cycling	Captain's Hill Active Travel Scheme, being delivered by Kildare County Council under Part 8 (Planning Reference P8202606). Public consultation completed and the scheme is further advanced. The project has been approved under HIIF.
R149 between Cope Bridge and the L1015	Footpath and cycle lane linking the development to Cope Bridge	Delivered as part of this application, on the western side of the R149, tying into the footpaths and cycle lanes carried across the upgraded Cope Bridge. Shown on the drawings submitted with this response.
L1015	2.0m footpath and cycle path in line with Phase 1a and the NTA submission	Delivered as part of this application, with the indicative continuation of the route beyond the application boundary shown on the drawings submitted with this response.

Source: Arup FI Response

In respect of Cope Bridge, and as detailed in the Arup FI Response, the TTA submitted with the application confirms that the proposed 272 no. residential units can be accommodated on the existing road network, including the existing signal-controlled one-way arrangement at Cope Bridge. Therefore the proposed development is not reliant on the Cope Bridge to be delivered at this stage. Notwithstanding this, the above status update demonstrates that the Cope Bridge upgrades are expected to come forward in the short term, noting upgrades are provided for under the approved DART+ West Railway Order. In addition, the Applicant is also progressing a separate enhanced Cope Bridge proposal in coordination with Kildare County Council and Irish Rail. Therefore whilst the TTA demonstrates there remains operational capacity of Cope Bridge if the proposed development is occupied in advance of the upgrades being delivered, notwithstanding this it is envisaged that the Cope Bridge upgrade will be brought forward at the earliest opportunity.

As demonstrated with the submitted application documentation, it is considered the proposals provide for sufficient flexibility to tie in with the upgrades to Cope Bridge as permitted, or can be adapted for any alternative design. Given the tie ins for Cope Bridge are either within the applicant's ownership or along the public road, under Section 34(4)(b) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, the Planning Authority may attach conditions *'requiring the carrying out of works (including the provision of facilities) which the planning authority considers are required for the purposes of the development authorised by the permission'* (34(4)(f) provisions are also relevant) and in this instance such a condition could relate to the provision of landscaping / open space and connections to Cope Bridge. Such conditions will ensure that the applicant, who is the owner of the application site, can implement the connections to the proposed development from Cope Bridge in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, and through agreement with KCC as a condition of planning.

In addition to the above, the Captain's Hill Active Travel Scheme (Planning Ref. P82026.06) was approved under the Part 8 process at the Celbridge-Leixlip Municipal District meeting on 16th October 2026. It has also received approved for funding under the Housing Infrastructure Investment Fund and will now move to detailed design. Finally, the required active-travel improvements along the R149 and L1015 are being delivered as part of the subject application.

For the avoidance of any doubt, the proposed development meets the other relevant phasing / infrastructure requirements associated with Phase 1a within the Confey Masterplan. This is set out in the TTA and the Planning Report and Statement of Consistency submitted with the application originally. The proposed development includes for 1 ha of OS1 lands west of Cope Bridge and also provides for a childcare facility. The size of the childcare facility has been designed to assist in providing a viable size to meet modern operator requirements, whilst also catering for future demand from the immediately adjoining Masterplan lands (within the applicant's ownership).

Item No. 3 – R149 Vehicular Access

"3. Please note that the Planning Authority have concerns regarding the operational capacity of the proposed vehicular access to/from the adjacent R149 public road as the proposed upgrade of Cope Bridge & Dart + west rail line is not complete and operational. This access is to be limited to Vulnerable Road Users (VRUs). The Applicant is requested to comment and to resubmit a revised drawing for same."

Response

In response to the above, we refer to the enclosed Transport Further Information Response prepared by Arup.

As detailed in the Arup FI Response, the Applicant has reviewed the Planning Authority's concern regarding the operation of the R149 access in advance of the Cope Bridge and DART+ works being completed. Should the Planning Authority consider it appropriate, the applicant proposes a left-in / left-out arrangement at the R149 access could be provided as an interim measure, rather than restricting the access to Vulnerable Road Users only, and secured by way of condition.

This arrangement removes right-turn movements at the junction, thereby avoiding interaction with queues associated with the existing Cope Bridge signal arrangement and preventing the development from operating as a through route between the R149 and the wider road network. It also retains a second point of access to the development for residential, refuse and emergency-service traffic and maintains direct vehicular access to the proposed childcare facility.

The Arup FI Response further confirms that the interim arrangement can be reviewed and upgraded to a full-movement junction following completion of the Cope Bridge upgrade, and that this can be secured by way of a condition.

Item No. 4 – L1015 Active-Travel Infrastructure

"4. Please note that a 2.0m footpath and cycle path to be provided along L1015 as per Phase 1a of Confey Lands Masterplan and in line with the NTA submission is required. The Applicant is requested to resubmit a revised drawing indicating this requirement."

Response

In response to the above, we refer to the enclosed Engineering Further Information Response prepared by DOBA, together with the updated Road Layout (Drawing Ref. 2423-DOB-XX-SI-DR-C-0500) enclosed at Appendix C of the DOBA FI Response.

As detailed in the DOBA FI Response, the proposed development as originally proposed provides a continuous 4.0m wide shared pedestrian and cycle facility along the L1015 as part of Phase 1a, in lieu of separate 2.0m wide footpath and 2.0m wide cycle tracks. As confirmed by DOBA, separate facilities would require frequent tactile paving and shared-surface crossings to serve the duplex units fronting the L1015, resulting in an impractical arrangement.

The proposed shared facility provides the active-travel infrastructure relevant to Phase 1a and is designed to continue along both sides of the L1015 as future phases of the Confey Masterplan are delivered.

Item No. 5 – Stage 2 Road Safety Audit

"5. The Applicant is requested to submit a Road Safety Audit (RSA) Stage 2 on the detailed design by an independent approved and certified auditor. The RSA Stages 2 is to assess:

- (a) The internal areas of the proposed development.*
- (b) The interface with the existing public road/footpath network/existing residential development.*
- (c) The internal shared pedestrian/cycle paths.*
- (d) Pedestrian/cycle access points."*

Response

In response to the above, we refer to the enclosed Engineering Further Information Response prepared by DOBA, together with the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit enclosed at Appendix B of the DOBA FI Response.

As detailed in the DOBA FI Response, a Stage 2 Road Safety Audit is not considered appropriate at the current planning design stage, having regard to the applicable TII standards, which provide for a Stage 2 RSA following completion of detailed design and prior to tender of the construction contract. DOBA also confirms that this matter was discussed with Kildare County Council Roads Department on 30th September 2026, when it was advised that a Stage 1 RSA is sufficient at this stage.

The Applicant is agreeable to the preparation and submission of a Stage 2 Road Safety Audit by way of a pre-commencement condition, once the detailed design has been completed.

Item No. 6 – Stage 1 RSA Recommendations

“6. The Applicant is requested to provide RSA stage 1 recommendations including:

- termination of cycle lanes*
- relocation of parallel parking*
- provision of pedestrian crossing at internal junctions*
- provision of footpaths.”*

Response

In response to the above, we refer to the enclosed Engineering Further Information Response prepared by DOBA, together with the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and completed feedback form enclosed at Appendix B, and the updated Road Layout (Drawing Ref. 2423-DOB-XX-SI-DR-C-0500) enclosed at Appendix C of the DOBA FI Response.

As detailed in the DOBA FI Response, the recommendations arising from the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit have been reviewed and addressed through the audit feedback process. The relevant mitigation measures and design amendments have been incorporated into the updated site layout, including the matters raised by the Planning Authority in relation to cycle-lane terminations, parallel parking, pedestrian crossings at internal junctions and footpath provision.

Accordingly, it is considered that the matters raised under this Item have been satisfactorily addressed through the revised layout and accompanying Road Safety Audit documentation.

Item No. 7 – Quality Audit

“7. The Applicant is requested to submit a Quality Audit, addressing pedestrian/cyclist permeability, tactile paving, safe zones in shared spaces and cycle facility details.”

Response

In response to the above, we refer to the Quality Audit prepared by Traffico and enclosed in Appendix D of Engineering Further Information Response prepared by DOBA.

Item No. 8 – Surface-Water Drainage / SuDS

“8. Notwithstanding the details submitted, it is noted that underground attenuation storage systems form part of the proposed development. Please note that it is the intention of Kildare County Council to remove underground surface water tanks (Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029 Objective INO24). The surface water drainage design should include but not be limited to:

- (a) Limiting discharge rates from the site to as close as reasonably practicable to the greenfield runoff rate from the development for the same rainfall event for the 1-in-1 year and 1-in-100- year rainfall events using Nature Based Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) designed in accordance with Kildare County Council’s SuDS Design Guide.*
 - (b) Provide sufficient surface water management so that the runoff volume is discharged at a rate that does not adversely affect flood risk and that unless designated to flood that no part of the site floods for a 1-in-30-year event, and 1-in-100-year event in any part of a building, utility plant susceptible to water within the development.*
 - (c) Provide sufficient water management to ensure no off-site flooding because of the development during all storm events up to and including the 1-in-100 year plus climate change event (+30%) and 10% for urban creep.*
 - (d) The appropriate level of treatment for all runoff leaving the site.*
 - (e) Detailed engineering drawings of each component of the drainage scheme.*
- The Applicant is requested to submit revised details to address the above.”*

Response

In response to the above, we refer to the enclosed Engineering Further Information Response prepared by DOBA, which should be read in conjunction with the Infrastructure Design Report submitted with the Stage 3 LRD application, together with the relevant surface-water drainage and SuDS drawings.

As confirmed in the DOBA FI Response, the surface-water strategy prioritises above-ground SuDS measures, with supplementary underground attenuation used only where required having regard to site constraints, including existing trees and hedgerows, site levels and outfall levels. DOBA confirms that less than 19% of the overall storage volume is provided as underground attenuation and that the proposed approach is consistent with Objective IN O24 of the Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029, as varied, which allows underground retention solutions where other options have been exhausted.

In response to Item 8(a), DOBA confirms that surface-water discharge from the site will be restricted to the calculated greenfield runoff rate of 22.63 l/s.

In response to Items 8(b) and 8(c), the drainage network has been designed to accommodate the relevant storm events, including the 1-in-30 year and 1-in-100 year events, together with the applicable 30% climate change and 10% urban creep allowances. The submitted calculations confirm that no flooding of the site, internal properties or adjoining areas is predicted.

In response to Item 8(d), the proposed drainage design incorporates a minimum two-stage treatment process, whereby runoff is treated at source prior to discharge to the existing surface-water network.

In response to Item 8(e), the relevant SuDS components and drainage details are illustrated on the engineering drawings identified in the DOBA FI Response.]

With respect to the above, it is considered that the information provided by DOBA comprehensively addresses the matters raised by the Planning Authority under Item 8 and

demonstrates that the proposed surface-water drainage and SuDS strategy is appropriate for the development and consistent with the relevant Development Plan requirements.

Item No. 9 – Outfall to River Liffey

“9. The Applicant is requested to submit a hydraulic analysis inclusive of longitudinal and cross sections of the proposed outfall route through the Confey GAA grounds to the River Liffey. The Applicant is requested to demonstrate that flood risk is not increased for peak rainfall events for land and properties downstream of the discharge point. A CCTV survey and report is also required for any piped or culverted sections of the Surface water discharge route.”

Response

In response to the above, we refer to the enclosed Engineering Further Information Response prepared by DOBA, together with the supporting hydraulic calculations enclosed at Appendix E, the long section and cross section drawing (Drawing Ref. 2423-DOB-XX-SI-DR-C-1403) enclosed at Appendix F, and the CCTV survey of the existing 675mm diameter outfall sewer enclosed at Appendix G of the DOBA FI Response.

As confirmed in the DOBA FI Response, the hydraulic calculations enclosed at Appendix E assess the existing 675mm diameter surface-water outfall route through the Confey GAA lands, taking account of both the existing drainage from the GAA lands and the proposed discharge from the subject development at the restricted greenfield runoff rate of 22.63 l/s. The assessment confirms that the proposed discharge does not increase flood risk to lands or properties downstream of the discharge point.

The response also includes Drawing Ref. 2423-DOB-XX-SI-DR-C-1403 at Appendix F, which provides the requested longitudinal and cross sections through the existing outfall sewer to the receiving watercourse.

A CCTV survey of the existing 675mm diameter outfall sewer is enclosed at Appendix G and confirms that the existing infrastructure is in good condition to receive the proposed flows from the development.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the information submitted by DOBA satisfactorily addresses the hydraulic capacity, downstream flood-risk and existing outfall-condition matters raised by the Planning Authority under Item 9.

Item No. 10 – Waterways Ireland Consent

“10. Please note that written consent is required from Waterways Ireland for the proposed surface water discharge from the development to the Oranstown stream. The Applicant is advised to obtain written consent and to submit a copy of this consent to the Planning Authority.”

Response

In response to the above, we refer to the enclosed Engineering Further Information Response prepared by DOBA, which should be read in conjunction with the Infrastructure Design Report submitted with the Stage 3 LRD application, in particular Sections 5.5, 5.6 and 5.9.2.

At the outset, it is noted that the existing site drains to the Oranstown Stream via the existing 675mm diameter surface water sewer beneath the Confey GAA lands. The proposed

development will utilise this existing outfall arrangement, with no new connection proposed. The Oranstown Stream flows south and discharges to the River Liffey at Castle Park, Leixlip. The stream is culverted under the Royal Canal and there is no direct hydrological connection between the Oranstown stream and the Royal Canal. As detailed in the DOBA FI Response discharge from the proposed development will be restricted to the calculated greenfield runoff rate of 22.63 l/s, such that there will be no increase in runoff from the proposed development compared with the existing situation. On this basis, written consent for a new connection is not considered to be required.

The Applicant and DOBA has continued to engage directly with Waterways Ireland in relation to the proposed discharge. As set out in Section 5.6 of the submitted Infrastructure Design Report, DOBA had previously liaised with Waterways Ireland regarding the discharge to the Oranstown Stream, and confirmation was received that Waterways Ireland had no objection in principle to the proposed discharge.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the proposed discharge arrangement has been appropriately assessed and that the Applicant had previously engaged with Waterways Ireland, and given there is an existing connection (and no direct hydrological connection with the Royal Canal), no written consent is required. We note that for similar scenarios on other sites, particularly where there is an existing connection / outfall arrangement, written consent was not required. For example, precedents include a permitted logistics/warehousing development of c. 56,932 sq.m at a site within the townlands of Gollierstown and Milltown, Newcastle, Dublin (SDCC Reg. Ref.: SD23A/0301) where it proposed to discharge surface water to the Tobermaclugg Stream, which is routed under the Grand Canal via an existing culvert, and no written consent was required in that case.

Furthermore and notwithstanding the above, we refer to Section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, which remains applicable to the subject application having regard to the transitional arrangements under the Planning and Development Act 2024. Section 34(13) provides that:

“34.—

(13) A person shall not be entitled solely by reason of a permission under this section to carry out any development.”

It is also noted that the equivalent provision is retained under Section 83(3) of the Planning and Development Act 2024. These provisions clarify that the grant of planning permission does not, in itself, confer the legal entitlement to carry out development, and that any separate third-party consent required to undertake works remains a separate matter.

Item No. 11 – Taking in Charge / Linear Park / Play Areas

“11. (a) The Applicant is requested to revise the Taking in Charge arrangements for the play areas (PG1) within the linear park, which are currently indicated to be managed by an Owners' Management Company (OMC). These play areas should instead be designed and constructed to facilitate taking in charge by the local authority.

(b) The proposed play equipment incorporating movable parts should be removed and replaced with equipment comprising non-movable elements only.

(c) The bespoke play equipment should be revised or removed and replaced with an alternative play solution acceptable to the local authority.

(d) All safety surfacing within the play areas shall be revised to provide safety grass matting only. No loose-fill or wet-pour rubber surfacing shall be permitted.

The Applicant is requested to submit revised details to address the above.”

Response

In response to the above, we refer to the enclosed Landscape Further Information Response prepared by BSLA, together with the revised Taking in Charge (TIC) drawings prepared by Howells Architects (Drawing Nos. 2583-HWS-SWD-XX-D-A-10106 and 10107) and the updated Landscape Masterplan prepared by BSLA. The revised TIC drawings distinguish the areas proposed to be taken in charge by the Planning Authority from those to remain in private / OMC management, and the associated revisions have been coordinated and reflected in the updated Site Layout Plan, Proposed Housing Layout and Site Lighting Plan prepared by Howells Architects.

As detailed in the BSLA FI Response, liaison has been undertaken with KCC Parks & Open Spaces in relation to the proposed revisions, and the amended approach has been agreed in principle prior to the submission of this FI response.

In response to Item 11(a), the PG1 play area within the linear park has been revised with input from the playground certifier, KOMPAN, to reflect the requirements identified by KCC and to facilitate the area being taken in charge by the Planning Authority. The revised arrangement is reflected in the updated TIC drawings prepared by Howells Architects. The BSLA FI Response confirms that the revised proposals demonstrate how the PG1 play area can meet the relevant TIC requirements.

In response to Items 11(b) and 11(c), the play equipment has been revised to remove movable elements and provide non-movable play equipment. BSLA will also continue to work with KOMPAN to develop a signature play element specifically for this play area, which would replace the Tall Multideck Tower, while ensuring compliance with the relevant TIC requirements. Any revised play equipment would be agreed with KCC Parks prior to any works and the details could be secured by way of condition.

In response to Item 11(d), the proposed safety surfacing has been revised to provide grass-based fall-protection surfacing, including Safagrass matting beneath the standard play equipment, focused on the relevant high-wear areas. Further details of the proposed surfacing and the input from the playground certifier are set out in the BSLA FI Response.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the revised arrangements for the PG1 play area within the linear park, including play equipment and safety surfacing appropriately address the matters raised by the Planning Authority under Item 11.

Item No. 12 – Taking in Charge / Home Zones

“12. (a) The submission of a proposed Taking in Charge plan is noted. However, there are clear discrepancies between Sheet 1 and Sheet 2 which indicate different proposals for the area around the commercial units. The Applicant is requested to submit a revised Taking in Charge plan which clearly shows the proposed areas to be taken in charge across the overall development. There should be clear delineation by way of physical separation (kerbing, fencing, walls etc.) between all areas intended to be taken in charge and those areas not intended to be Taken in Charge.

(b) The provision of home zones is noted. The Applicant is requested to comment on the positioning of lighting poles and any other street furniture within home zones noting that such features should not obstruct the carriageway in any way or pose a hazard to road users. Street lighting poles which are within areas intended to be Taken in Charge must not be positioned within curtilage in order to facilitate future access for maintenance.

(c) The Applicant is requested to review the positioning of road/tabletop ramps to ensure that no residential access to driveways is impeded or conflicts with ramp slopes.”

Response

In response to the above, we refer to the enclosed Taking in Charge (TIC) drawings prepared by Howells Architects (Drawing Nos. 2583-HWS-SWD-XX-D-A-10106 and 10107), together with the Engineering Further Information Response and updated Road Layout Plan (Drawing No. 2423-DOB-XX-SI-DR-C-0500-S2.P11) prepared by DOBA, the Landscape Masterplan prepared by BSLA and the updated site lighting plan prepared by EDC. The revisions to the Road Layout Plan is coordinated across the updated Site Layout Plan, Proposed Housing Layout and Site Lighting Plan prepared by Howells Architects.

In response to Item 12(a), the TIC drawings have been updated to ensure there are no discrepancies between Sheet 1 and Sheet 2, in particular for the area around the commercial units. The revised drawings distinguish the areas to be taken in charge by the Planning Authority from those to remain in private / OMC management. The updated layout has also been coordinated to ensure clear physical separation between these areas, where required.

In response to Item 12(b), we refer to the updated lighting plan prepared by EDC and landscape masterplan prepared by EDC which demonstrates the positioning of lighting columns and associated street furniture within the home zones has been reviewed as part of the coordinated update to the Site Layout Plan and Site Lighting Plan. The revised arrangement ensures that such infrastructure does not obstruct the carriageway or create a hazard for road users, and that lighting columns within areas proposed to be taken in charge are positioned to allow appropriate access for future maintenance and are not located within private residential curtilage.

In response to Item 12(c), we refer to the enclosed Engineering Further Information Response prepared by DOBA, together with the updated Proposed Site Layout Plan (Drawing Ref. 2423-DOB-XX-SI-DR-C-0500-S2.P11) enclosed at Appendix I of the DOBA FI Response. As confirmed in the DOBA FI Response, the positioning of the road / tabletop ramps has been reviewed and the layout amended to ensure that no residential access is impeded or conflicts with the ramp slopes.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the revised Taking in Charge arrangements, home-zone lighting / street furniture and road / tabletop ramp positions appropriately address the matters raised under Item 12.

Item No. 13 – Archaeology

“13. Please note that a submission has been received from the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, in which it is indicated that the Department reviewed the documentation and notes that the licence for archaeological pre-development testing has been issued (25E0385) but due to the presence of the crops, archaeological pre-development testing has now been scheduled to commence in September 2026. In light of the above, the Department recommends that further information is required to assess the impact the proposed development will have on potential new archaeological heritage as follows:

(a) The Applicant is requested to engage the services of a suitably qualified archaeologist (licensed under the National Monuments Acts 1930–2004) to carry out pre-development testing over the entire site. No sub-surface work shall be undertaken in the absence of the Archaeologist without his/her express consent. The Archaeologist is required to notify the Department in writing at least four weeks prior to the commencement of site preparations. This will allow the archaeologist sufficient time to obtain a licence/consent to carry out the work.

(b) The Archaeologist shall carry out any relevant documentary research and may excavate test trenches at locations chosen by the Archaeologist, having consulted the proposed development plans.

(c) Archaeological testing should be informed and supplemented by licensed metal detection survey.

(d) Having completed the work, the Archaeologist should submit a written report to the Planning Authority and to the Department in advance of the planning decision. Where archaeological material/features are shown to be present, preservation in situ, preservation by record (excavation) or monitoring may be required. If significant archaeological remains are found, refusal might still be recommended, and/or further monitoring or excavation required. It is the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage view that a final decision should not be made on this application until the Planning Authority and the Department has had the opportunity to evaluate the Archaeological report and will forward a recommendation based on the Archaeological report to the Planning Authority."

Response

In response to the above, we refer to the enclosed accompanying EIAR Addendum Report and updated Chapter 4- Archaeology, Architectural and Cultural Heritage, which incorporate the results of the archaeological investigations and the proposed mitigation measures. The revised Chapter 4 incorporates the archaeological test excavation programme under Licence No. 25E0385 in September 2026. The test excavation was carried out by suitably qualified archaeologists and was supplemented by metal detection, as requested by the Department.

A total of 53 no. test trenches were excavated across the site, including trenches targeted at anomalies identified through the geophysical survey. The testing identified one archaeological feature, comprising a spread of burnt stone and charcoal within Trench 9. No other archaeological features or deposits of significance were identified during the testing. The results of the investigations have been incorporated into the updated Chapter 4 of the EIAR. The proposed mitigation provides for preservation by record through archaeological excavation of the identified feature prior to construction, together with archaeological monitoring of topsoil stripping across the development site, including areas which were not accessible during the test-trenching programme. The works will be undertaken by a licence-eligible archaeologist in consultation with, and under licence from, the National Monuments Service. Any further archaeological mitigation arising during the works will similarly be agreed with the National Monuments Service.

Accordingly, the archaeological testing, documentary assessment and metal-detection survey requested under Items 13(a) - (c) have been completed, and the resulting Archaeological Test Excavation Report is submitted in response to Item 13(d) for consideration by the Planning Authority and the Department. The updated EIAR assessment concludes that, subject to implementation of the identified mitigation measures, the proposed development will not give rise to significant residual adverse effects on archaeological, architectural or cultural heritage resources.

Item No. 14 – Third-party Submissions

"14. Please note that 18 no. third party submissions were received in relation to the proposed development. The Applicant is advised to review the content of the third-party submissions and to submit responses to the issues raised."

Response

In response to the above, we confirm that all third-party submissions received in relation to the proposed development have been reviewed by the Design Team. Appendix 1 of this

letter summarises the submissions and concerns raised in the third-party submissions relating to the Confey Phase 1a LRD, together with the responses prepared in coordination with the wider Design Team with reference to other application documentation and the supplementary information included as part of the FI response.

Having reviewed the matters raised in the third-party submissions, the Applicant and Design Team are satisfied that no material planning issues have been identified that have not already been addressed through the submitted application documentation, or through the supplementary information provided as part of this Further Information response. The concerns raised primarily relate to matters that have been considered during the design and assessment of the proposed development and are addressed through the accompanying planning, environmental and technical reports. Having regard to the responses provided and the supporting documentation submitted, the proposed development remains consistent with the relevant national, regional and local planning policy framework and continues to represent an acceptable form of development for the site.

Other Relevant Items

The application was accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR), and the Further Information Request received from the Planning Authority also included a note to the application that the further information request may require revisions to EIAR chapters and that any revisions to the EIAR should be clearly highlighted.

In response to Item 13 of the FI request (see FI Cover Letter Response), it was considered appropriate to prepare this Addendum to the EIAR through the updated EIAR Chapter 4 and accompanying archaeological reports. As part of this Further Information submission, EIAR Chapter 15: Summary of EIAR Mitigation and Monitoring Measures has also been updated to reflect revised and additional mitigation measures arising from the updated Chapter 4.

No further updates to other EIAR chapters are considered necessary, as the proposed revisions do not give rise to any significant new or materially different environmental effects beyond those previously assessed. The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process is inherently iterative and continues throughout the design development and assessment stages up to the making of the planning decision. The Further Information process forms part of this ongoing assessment, allowing design refinements, additional analysis and updated mitigation measures to be considered by the competent authority prior to determination. In this regard, the Further Information submission, including the EIAR Addendum Report and updated technical documentation, has reviewed the amendments arising from the evolution of the project design and assessed whether these changes result in any new or altered environmental effects. This approach is consistent with established EIA practice, whereby amendments are assessed in the context of the original EIAR rather than requiring wholesale revision where the nature and significance of environmental effects remain unchanged.

The updated Chapter 4 and the revised and additional mitigation measures (as set out in Chapter 15) collectively provide sufficient and up-to-date environmental information to enable Kildare County Council, as competent authority, to undertake a full and informed Environmental Impact Assessment of the proposed development.

Having regard to the nature and scale of the amendments, and the confirmation from the relevant specialists that the predicted environmental effects remain unchanged, a full reissue of the EIAR is neither necessary nor proportionate. The EIAR, together with this Further Information response and accompanying addendum documentation, therefore, provides an adequate and robust basis for assessment and determination.



Accordingly, the Applicant considers that the EIAR, as supplemented by this Further Information submission and associated addendum material, provides an adequate and complete basis for Environmental Impact Assessment.

3.0 CONCLUSION

This FI Response document, in addition to the accompanying documentation and drawings, respond clearly to each of the items raised in the FI Request and fully addresses each item. It is respectfully submitted that it has been demonstrated that the concerns of the Planning Authority raised in the FI request have been satisfactorily addressed and that sufficient information has been provided to allow for a decision to be made. It is submitted that the response to each item is acceptable in regard to the nature of the proposed scheme and that sufficient justifications are provided throughout in relation to the proposed design solutions.

We trust that this response to the request for FI is sufficient and to the Planning Authority satisfaction. Please do not hesitate to contact us should you have any queries in respect to the information submitted.

Yours sincerely,


JSA Planning

APPENDIX 1- RESPONSE TO CONCERNS RAISED IN THIRD-PARTY SUBMISSIONS (ITEM NO. 14 OF THE FI REQUEST)

The following table summarises the concerns raised in the third-party submissions relating to the Confey Phase 1a LRD, together with the responses prepared in coordination with the wider Design Team.

No.	Key Issue	Summary Commentary / Concerns	Response / Reference to Response
1	Transport Matters - NTA	Recommends the provision of active-travel infrastructure along the L1015 and the pedestrian and cycle routes identified in the Confey Masterplan; liaison with NTA regarding future bus-stop provision; and further consideration of the western road upgrades and Northern Orbital Road in the context of the wider transport strategy.	We refer to the response to FI Item 1 above which responds comprehensively to the NTA submission. This includes the Arup Transport FI Response Letter, in particular Item 1-1 (Western Road Upgrades and Northern Orbital Road), Item 1-2 (Pedestrian and Bicycle-Only Routes) and Item 1-3 (Bus Stop Infrastructure), together with Sections 4, 5.2, 5.3, 5.6 and 6 of the submitted Traffic & Transport Assessment at Stage 3 LRD submission. Further reference is made to the enclosed Pedestrian & Cycle Routes Drawing prepared by BSLA, which presents Figure 40 of the Confey Masterplan alongside the proposed road and active-travel network for the Confey Phase 1a LRD, demonstrating the relationship between the Masterplan routes and the proposed development. We also refer to Item 1 and Appendix A of the DOBA FI Response, which confirm the Applicant's liaison with the NTA regarding the future bus stop provision.
2	Uisce Éireann	Confirms that water and wastewater connections are feasible subject to completion of a planned water-network upgrade in Leixlip, for which the delivery programme has not yet been confirmed. UE recommend conditions, including no occupation until completion of the water network upgrade project in Leixlip by Uisce Éireann.	Submission Noted. We refer to Sections 6.2 and 6.3 and Sections 7.1 to 7.3 of the Infrastructure Design Report prepared by DOBA and submitted at Stage 3 LRD, together with the Uisce Éireann Confirmation of Feasibility at Appendix D, Statement of Design Acceptance at Appendix E and the previous Confirmation of Feasibility relating to the wider Confey Masterplan watermain upgrade at Appendix H (not reliant on the water network upgrade project in Leixlip). The submitted documentation confirms that the proposed water and wastewater connections have been subject to consultation with Uisce Éireann and are feasible subject to the identified network requirements.
3	AA/NIS - DoHLGH	In respect of AA, broadly agrees with the NIS conclusion of no adverse effect on European sites, subject to strict implementation of the mitigation and pollution-control measures, adherence to the CEMP, ecological supervision, and compliance with all drainage and water-quality safeguards. In respect of the EIAR biodiversity assessment, the Department	Submission acknowledged. We refer to the Natura Impact Statement and Chapter 5 (Biodiversity) of the submitted EIAR, together with the mitigation and enhancement measures identified therein. The applicant confirms that all mitigation measures set out in the Natura Impact Statement (NIS) and the relevant chapters of the EIAR will be implemented in full. A suitably

No.	Key Issue	Summary Commentary / Concerns	Response / Reference to Response
		recommends full compliance with the bat derogation licence, ecological supervision throughout construction, protection of retained hedgerows, treelines and drainage features, implementation of the assessed lighting strategy, and securing biodiversity enhancements, including bat and bird boxes and native planting, by condition. Subject to these measures, the Department broadly agrees that significant residual ecological effects are unlikely.	qualified Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) will be appointed prior to the commencement of development and will remain in place for the duration of the construction phase. The ECoW will oversee all construction works and carry out post-construction monitoring to verify that all mitigation measures have been implemented and complied with.
4	Prematurity / infrastructure before development	Third parties raise concern that the residential development is proceeding ahead of the road, public transport, water, drainage, school, healthcare and community infrastructure needed to support it; infrastructure should be delivered / operational before occupation or further phases proceed.	<p>The proposed development is supported by the relevant infrastructure that will be delivered as part of the development, or delivered prior to occupation. In respect of transport infrastructure, refer to Arup Transport FI Response Letter, in particular Items 1 and 2, together with Sections 4, 6, 7 and 8 of the submitted Traffic & Transport Assessment at Stage 3 LRD submission.</p> <p>In respect of physical infrastructure, including drainage, foul and surface-water management and associated engineering infrastructure, we refer to the Engineering Further Information Response prepared by DOBA, in particular Items 8 to 10, together with Sections 5 to 7 of the Infrastructure Design Report submitted at Stage 3 LRD.</p> <p>In respect of social and community infrastructure, the concerns regarding the timing of supporting infrastructure are acknowledged. Reference is made to the Social & Community Infrastructure Audit Assessment prepared by JSA Planning and submitted with the Stage 3 LRD application. The assessment considers the additional demand arising specifically from the proposed 272 no. dwellings and the existing, permitted and planned infrastructure available within the wider Leixlip / Confey area.</p> <p>In particular, the proposed development itself provides a 500.4 sq.m childcare facility, with capacity for c.100-124 childcare places, compared with an estimated demand of c.62 places generated by Phase 1a. The audit also identifies 8 no. existing childcare facilities within the 1-2 km catchment and 138 no. additional permitted childcare places within that catchment.</p> <p>In relation to education, Phase 1a is estimated to generate approximately 87 primary-school pupils and 55 post-primary pupils, equivalent to</p>

No.	Key Issue	Summary Commentary / Concerns	Response / Reference to Response
			<p>approximately 4% and 3.5% respectively of current enrolment across the schools assessed within the 1-2 km catchment. The wider Confey Masterplan separately reserves provision for a primary school at Phase 3 and a post-primary school at Phase 4, reflecting the phased increase in demand as the wider lands are developed.</p> <p>The development will also deliver a mixed-use neighbourhood centre incorporating 3 no. flexible commercial units and a café / restaurant, together with public and communal open space and the OS1 linear park, while the audit identifies an established network of healthcare, community, recreation and retail facilities within the surrounding 1-2 km catchment. Accordingly, Phase 1a includes direct provision for the principal additional needs arising at this stage, while the larger-scale infrastructure identified in the Confey Masterplan is phased in response to the build-out of the wider Masterplan lands.</p>
5	<p>Confey Masterplan phasing / infrastructure triggers</p>	<p>Third parties raise concern that Phase 1a permits substantial housing before strategic infrastructure is triggered; lack of firm delivery milestones, funding or certainty; request to re-evaluate / masterplan phasing and front-load infrastructure. Concern also expressed that the Phase 1a housing allocation could be built and subsequent infrastructure / phases not proceed.</p>	<p>We refer to the FI Response for Items 1 and 2 above which confirm that Phase 1a will be supported by the required infrastructure for the 272 no. units. We refer to the Arup Transport FI Response, in particular Item 1-1 and Table 1 (Indicative Infrastructure Delivery Programme), together with Section 6 of the submitted TTA.</p>

No.	Key Issue	Summary Commentary / Concerns	Response / Reference to Response
6	Cumulative development impact	Third parties raised concern that the development should not be assessed in isolation from other SHD / LRD permissions / applications and the remaining Confey Masterplan lands; cumulative pressure on transport, water/wastewater, drainage, schools, healthcare, biodiversity, green space and community facilities. Fitzpatrick / Smith specifically reference c.1,114 previously approved units plus other Phase 1a development.	In respect of cumulative development impacts, reference is made to Chapter 2 of the submitted EIAR, in particular Section 2.2.2 (Relevant Planning History / Cumulative Assessment). The EIAR does not assess the proposed development in isolation; relevant existing, permitted and proposed developments were identified through a review of the surrounding planning history and were circulated to the specialist EIAR consultants for consideration within their respective cumulative assessments. The review initially considered developments within c.500m of the site and was extended to c.1km due to the limited number of relevant permissions within the immediate catchment. Larger developments with potential for cumulative construction or operational effects, including permitted Strategic Housing Developments beyond this radius, were also included where relevant. The assessment focused on substantial residential and commercial schemes, generally considering permissions from the preceding 5 years, together with longer-term permissions where applicable. Each EIAR discipline then considered the relevant schemes at the appropriate geographic scale for that environmental topic. Accordingly, the potential cumulative effects on matters including transport, water and drainage, biodiversity, population and human health, landscape / open space and material assets are addressed within the relevant technical chapters of the submitted EIAR, with the scope of each assessment reflecting the nature of the potential cumulative effect.
7	Existing road-network congestion / capacity	Third parties raise concern that Cope Bridge, Captain's Hill / R149, L1015 / L1014 and accesses from River Forest / Glendale are already congested / constrained; additional development traffic would worsen peak queues, journey times and access to homes, employment, schools and services. Through-traffic between the N3/M3 and N4/M4 is also cited as contributing to existing pressure.	As noted above refer to the FI Response above, including the Arup Transport FI Response Letter, in particular Item 2, together with Sections 3.2.3 and 7 of the submitted Traffic & Transport Assessment at Stage3 LRD submission which demonstrates sufficient capacity for the proposed development.
8	Cope Bridge / DART+ West upgrade sequencing and certainty	Third parties request that the bridge be upgraded to two-way traffic with safe segregated pedestrian / cycle provision before additional development / loading occurs. Separate concern that the	Refer to Arup Transport FI Response Letter, in particular Item 2, including the status and indicative programme for the Cope Bridge upgrade, together with Sections 4 and 6 of the submitted TTA.

No.	Key Issue	Summary Commentary / Concerns	Response / Reference to Response
		timing, funding and/or Irish Rail delivery of the upgrade is uncertain and should not be assumed.	
9	Construction access / HGV suitability	Third parties refer to the Cope Bridge 3.5t restriction; Kellystown Bridge / L1014 3t and width restriction; L3005 3.5t restriction; L1015 described as unsuitable for heavy commercial traffic and R149 as narrow / constrained. Concern that no safe / legal construction access exists and that HGV traffic would create additional road-safety risk.	Refer to Section 7.2 (Construction Traffic Impact) of the submitted Traffic & Transport Assessment prepared by Arup, which should be read in conjunction with Sections 4.4 and 4.5 of the Outline Construction & Environmental Management Plan prepared by DOBA and submitted as part of the Stage 3 LRD application. The TTA estimates peak construction HGV activity at c.50 two-way movements per day, representing less than 1% of existing daily traffic on the R149, with the majority of HGV movements expected to occur outside network peak hours. The Outline CEMP further identifies the R149 and L1015 as the proposed construction / haulage routes, specifically avoiding residential estates, roads subject to weight restrictions and Cope Bridge, which has a 3-tonne weight limit and will not be used for construction access. As a mitigation measure and as noted in Section 5.1.1 of the Outline CEMP, 'the Contractor is required to develop a Site-Specific CEMP and CTMP in order to implement the requirements as outlined in this CEMP and shall be agreed with Kildare County Council and An Garda Síochána prior to commencement'.
10	Proposed R149 access	Third parties state the proposed access is too close to Cope Bridge traffic signals and the R149 / L1015 junction, with poor / restricted visibility; concern regarding absence of a controlled pedestrian crossing and potential for the development to become a through-route / rat-run. Relocation of access towards the L1015 is suggested by the Jordan submission.	Refer to the Arup Transport FI Response, in particular Item 3, together with Section 5.4 of the submitted TTA and the revised engineering drawings submitted with the FI response.
11	Western Road Bypass / Option 4 s / Northern Orbital Link	Concern that the strategic bypass should be delivered before large-scale development; development should safeguard its alignment and future connectivity. It is alleged that the route is not shown on the construction plan / sufficiently integrated into the development strategy. Existing roads considered constrained; strategic upgrades described as aspirational with no confirmed funding / delivery date. Fitzpatrick / Smith also question deliverability due to potential CPO	Refer to Arup Transport FI Response Letter, in particular Item 1-1, together with Sections 4 and 6 of the submitted TTA.

No.	Key Issue	Summary Commentary / Concerns	Response / Reference to Response
		requirements / appeals and seek clearer phasing triggers.	
12	Captain's Hill Active Travel Scheme / Safe System concerns	Concern that the Part 8 scheme does not resolve R149 traffic pressure or Cope Bridge capacity. Incorrect speed-limit classification, missing 30 km/h zones, excessive signalisation and shared pedestrian/cycle sections near schools; the scheme as unsafe and likely to impede traffic/public transport.	Refer to the Arup Transport FI Response Letter, in particular Item 2, It is noted Captain's Hill Active Travel Scheme Part 8 Planning Report, Appendix B of that has been approved and has received funding to progress.
13	Pedestrian / cycle safety and Royal Canal Greenway connectivity	Concern that Cope Bridge, canal towpath and surrounding network cannot safely accommodate increased walking/cycling; questions how the stated 412 bicycles are accommodated, identifies pedestrian / cyclist conflict on the narrow towpath and seeks segregated facilities along the R149 / L1015. Other observers raise safety accessing Confey Station / Greenway and existing bus stops.	Refer to the Arup Transport FI Response, in particular Item 1-2, together with Items 4 to 7 of the Engineering FI Response prepared by DOBA, Sections 3.2.1, 5.2, 5.3 and 9 of the submitted TTA, and the Quality Audit prepared by Traffico.
14	Collision history / existing high-risk corridor	RSA collision history cited as evidence that Captain's Hill / R149 and Leixlip Village are already a high-risk environment; 51 recorded collisions between 2016-2024 are cited, including serious injuries among pedestrians, cyclists, motorcyclists and e-scooter users.	Refer to the Arup Transport FI Response, in particular Item 2, together with the Captain's Hill Active Travel Scheme Part 8, in respect of the existing road-safety context along Captain's Hill / R149.
15	Traffic-generation / car-ownership assumptions	TRICS estimates of 1,088-1,496 additional daily car journeys. Traffic modelling may underestimate actual car ownership, noting two-, three- or four-car households and questioning assumptions of reduced car dependency.	Refer to Section 7.1 of the submitted TTA, including the trip-generation, mode-share and cumulative-development assumptions. It is also noted that the car parking provision accords with SPPR3 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines.
16	Emergency and essential-service access Confey Station traffic and parking capacity	Concern that increased congestion could delay ambulances, fire services, Gardaí and other essential / service vehicles; Potential impacts on school transport and buses. Existing commuter drop-off, pick-up and parking already puts pressure on local roads; station parking considered insufficient, with concern about additional informal / on-street parking and reduced accessibility if additional rail demand is generated.	Refer to the Arup Transport FI Response Letter, in particular Item 3 and the submitted TTA which demonstrates sufficient capacity. Refer to Sections 3.2.2.1, 5.4 and 8 of the submitted TTA, which address the relationship of the proposed development to Confey Station, the development's car-parking strategy and the wider sustainable transport strategy. The proposed development provides its associated car-parking provision within the application site

No.	Key Issue	Summary Commentary / Concerns	Response / Reference to Response
17	Rail capacity / reliance on DART+ West-	Maynooth line described as already overcrowded; concern that future DART+ capacity and delivery dates are uncertain and should not be relied upon to justify development now. Delays/uncertainty regarding trains, signalling and the Traffic Management System.	Refer to Sections 3.2.2.1, 3.2.2.3 and 8.2-8.4 of the submitted TTA which provides a public transport capacity assessment. We also refer to Item 1 and Appendix A of the DOBA FI Response in respect of liaison with the NTA regarding bus stop infrastructure.
18	Bus capacity, reliability and accessibility-	existing services affected by congestion, with no bus lanes/priority measures; concern that new development will worsen journey times/cancellations. Concerns also raised regarding limited bus stops / services north of Captain's Hill, absence of additional service for new residents and the walk over an un-upgraded Cope Bridge to existing stops.	Refer to the Arup Transport FI Response Letter, in particular Item 1-3, together with Sections 3.2.2.2, 5.6 and 8.1-8.4 of the submitted TTA. We also refer to Item 1 and Appendix A of the DOBA FI Response in respect of liaison with the NTA regarding bus stop infrastructure.
19	River Forest direct bus service / former 66A	Seeks restoration of a direct, high-frequency River Forest / Confey-city-centre service before further growth; objects to existing services being removed / diverted from River Forest to serve new development and argues this would increase car dependency.	Refer to Sections 3.2.2.2 and 8 of the submitted TTA in respect of existing and planned bus provision. The routing and operation of individual public bus services, including any potential reinstatement of the former 66A service, are matters for the NTA and relevant public transport operators and do not fall within the control of the Applicant.
20	Water-supply reliability/capacity	Existing water system considered unreliable/not fit for additional demand; repeated outages are cited, including c.65 interruptions over three years. Requests evidence that drinking water, wastewater and surface-water infrastructure can accommodate the development without reducing service to existing residents.	Refer to Sections 7.1 to 7.3 of the Infrastructure Design Report prepared by DOBA, together with the Uisce Éireann Confirmation of Feasibility at Appendix D and the previous Confirmation of Feasibility relating to the wider Confey Masterplan watermain upgrade at Appendix H. Further reference is made to Sections 6.2 and 6.3 in respect of wastewater infrastructure.
21	Flood risk, drainage and impacts on adjoining low-lying properties	Reference to severe flooding of a third party adjoining/nearby low-lying property in 2000 and 2002, evacuation and extensive flooding of surrounding fields, and asks that this historical information inform local hydraulic modelling; it also refers to a 2004 Fingal refusal on nearby land because of seasonal flooding/drainage problems. Increased runoff from hard surfaces, attenuation/drainage exceedance, climate change, risk transfer to surrounding properties/roads and impacts on the railway/Confey Station during extreme rainfall.	Refer to the Engineering Further Information Response prepared by DOBA, in particular Items 8 and 9, together with Section 5.11 of the Infrastructure Design Report submitted at Stage 3 LRD and the Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment prepared by JBA Consulting which confirm no increase in flood risk from the development.
22	Royal Canal / wider water environment	Concerns about the relationship between drainage/flooding and the Canal; The Canal should not act as an outlet for development runoff and raises impacts on feeder waters, drainage channels, groundwater, surface-water quality	Refer to Items 8 to 10 of the Engineering Further Information Response prepared by DOBA, together with Sections 5.2 and 5.6 to 5.9 of the Infrastructure Design Report submitted at Stage 3 LRD, which address the existing water

No.	Key Issue	Summary Commentary / Concerns	Response / Reference to Response
		and the Canal's environmental/recreational/heritage function.	environment, proposed surface-water outfall, SuDS strategy, treatment measures and discharge arrangements. This confirms that surface water does not discharge to the Canal.
23	Biodiversity / protected species / ecological connectivity	Potential loss/disturbance of established woodland and wildlife habitat; Reference to bats/bat roosts and derogation licensing, nesting birds/swans, foxes, habitat fragmentation, lighting, noise, traffic disturbance and loss of feeding/commuting corridors along the Confey/Royal Canal lands.	A Biodiversity Enhancement Plan has been prepared for the development and was submitted with the application, which includes enhancement measures including additional nesting habitat and the installation of nest boxes. The Landscape Plan was designed in consultation with the project ecologist. The lighting scheme has been designed to be wildlife-sensitive, with no light spill onto the adjacent Royal Canal. The linear park along the southern boundary will be kept as a dark corridor so wildlife can continue to forage and commute along it. The majority of the ecological corridors on site will be retained and enhanced. A derogation licence was granted by NPWS in relation to the single soprano bat roost. For further details, refer to Chapter 5 (Biodiversity) of the submitted EIAR, the Natura Impact Statement and the Biodiversity Enhancement Plan.
24	Proposed pedestrian/footbridge connection towards Glendale	Concerns regarding security, anti-social behaviour and privacy for existing residents; potential impact on a resident-maintained area of woodland/biodiversity/wildlife; observers question whether the connection is necessary and whether it is being relied upon because of inadequate site exits/access arrangements.	The proposed Confey Phase 1a LRD does not include a pedestrian footbridge or connection to Glendale Meadows. Chapter 5 (Biodiversity) assessed the potential effects of the proposed development on habitats, wildlife and biodiversity. The assessment was informed by a desk study and by field surveys of habitats and fauna. Chapter 5 sets out a range of designed-in mitigation measures and also proposes a number of biodiversity enhancement measures across the development. With these in place, no significant residual effects on biodiversity are predicted.
25	Loss of strategic green buffer / settlement coalescence	Concern that development would erode the open-land buffer between Leixlip, Lucan and Maynooth, reducing visual separation as well as biodiversity, flood attenuation, drainage, recreation and community value.	Refer to the Leixlip Local Area Plan 2020-2023, as extended, and the incorporated Confey Lands Masterplan, which confirms the lands are zoned for residential development. In addition Section 2.6.5 (Landscape and Open Space) of the submitted EIAR Chapter 2, Chapter 6 (Landscape and Visual Impact) of the submitted EIAR, the Architectural Design Statement prepared by Howells, and the submitted Landscape Pack prepared by BSLA informed by Arboricultural Assessment carried out

No.	Key Issue	Summary Commentary / Concerns	Response / Reference to Response
			<p>by CM Arbor Ltd demonstrate no unacceptable impact on the surrounding area.</p> <p>The subject lands form part of the area specifically identified for residential and mixed-use development within the Confey Masterplan. The Masterplan provides for this development within an integrated green-infrastructure framework, including the retention and enhancement of existing hedgerows and ecological corridors and the provision of a linear park along the Royal Canal. The Masterplan expressly identifies this linear park as a development buffer which will enhance the existing ecological network and visual containment of the area.</p> <p>Consistent with this framework, the proposed development provides approximately 9,430 sq.m of public open space, together with 1,272 sq.m of communal open space and c.1ha of the OS1 strategic linear park adjoining the Royal Canal. The landscape strategy also incorporates a central green spine, retained and enhanced ecological corridors, SuDS features and pedestrian / cycle connections through the site.</p> <p>We further refer to Chapter 6 of the EIAR, which assesses the landscape and visual effects of the proposed development in the context of the existing urban, peri-urban and rural landscape surrounding Confey. The assessment recognises that the proposal will result in a substantial change from the existing agricultural edge, but concludes that the operational landscape effects are significant positive, having regard to the plan-led nature of the development and its alignment with the landscape and urban-design principles of the Confey Masterplan. The visual effects assessed from the 19 viewpoints are also classified as neutral or positive. Accordingly, while the proposed development will result in the planned urbanisation of lands identified for development under the LAP and Confey Masterplan, it has been designed to retain and reinforce the principal green-infrastructure, ecological, drainage and recreational functions identified for the lands, including the strategic open-space corridor along the Royal Canal.</p>

No.	Key Issue	Summary Commentary / Concerns	Response / Reference to Response
26	School capacity	concern that existing primary/secondary schools are already under pressure and that Phase 1a does not deliver additional school capacity; observers request school places/infrastructure to be available before housing is occupied. Fitzpatrick/Smith cite estimated demand of 60 primary and 36 secondary places from the 272 units.	Refer to Section 4.1.2 (School Demand Assessment) of the submitted Social & Community Infrastructure Audit Assessment prepared by JSA Planning at Stage 3 LRD submission. The assessment identifies 7 no. primary schools and 2 no. post-primary schools within c.1-2 km of the site, with current enrolments of 1,748 primary pupils and 1,549 post-primary pupils. Based on the anticipated population arising from the 272 no. dwellings, Phase 1a is estimated to generate c.87 primary-school pupils and 55 post-primary pupils, equivalent to c.4% and 3.5% respectively of current enrolment levels. The Confey Masterplan separately provides for a primary school at Phase 3 and a post-primary school at Phase 4, with no school required to be delivered as part of Phase 1a.
27	GP / healthcare capacity	Local GP availability and primary-care provision considered inadequate for existing population; concern that additional population will worsen access to healthcare unless additional capacity is delivered.	Refer to Section 4.2 (Healthcare Facilities) of the submitted SCIAA prepared by JSA Planning at Stage 3 LRD submission. The audit identifies, within c.1-2 km of the site, 7 GP / family practices, 1 health centre, 3 dental practices, 2 physiotherapy providers, 6 pharmacies and 1 nursing home. The Confey Masterplan does not identify a specific healthcare facility as a Phase 1a requirement; however, the proposed mixed-use area includes 3 no. flexible commercial units capable of accommodating Class 8 Health Centre / Civic use, providing flexibility should additional local healthcare provision be required.
28	Sports, recreation and community facilities	Shortage of active recreation/community infrastructure; requests consideration of sports pitches, public open space, walking routes, youth/community facilities and, in the concluding request, a public swimming pool/gym.	Refer to Sections 4.3-4.5 of the submitted SCIAA prepared by JSA Planning at Stage 3 LRD submission. The audit identifies a range of existing community and recreational facilities within c.1-2 km, including Confey Community Centre, Leixlip Youth and Community Centre, Leixlip Library, Confey GAA Club, Leixlip Amenities Sports Centre, Leixlip Tennis Club, playgrounds, gyms and established parks / open spaces. In addition, Phase 1a itself provides c.9,430 sq.m of public open space (16% of the site area), 1,272 sq.m of communal open space and c.1 ha of the OS1 linear park along the Royal Canal, providing both active and passive recreational space as part of the first phase. Reference is made to the submitted Landscape Pack by BSLA at Stage 3 LRD submission for design details of the proposed public open space, communal open space and OS1 linear

No.	Key Issue	Summary Commentary / Concerns	Response / Reference to Response
			park, including the distribution of active and passive recreational areas, play provision, pedestrian routes and connections through the site.
29	Garda / policing resources	Concern that increased population will require a greater Garda presence and that no additional policing/security provision is identified.	Refer to Section 4.4 (Religious & Community Provision) of the submitted SCIAA prepared by JSA Planning, which identifies the existing Leixlip Garda Station and Leixlip Fire Station within the wider community-infrastructure catchment. The SCIAA assesses the availability and distribution of community infrastructure but does not assess operational Garda staffing or policing-resource requirements. It is also noted that the scope of a planning application is necessarily limited to matters that can reasonably be addressed through the proposed development, and the provision or resourcing of Garda services falls outside the remit of the applicant. Notwithstanding this, the design of the proposed development has been informed by principles of passive surveillance, including the orientation of residential and mixed-use development towards streets, pedestrian / cycle routes and public open spaces, to support a safe and well-overlooked public realm. Accordingly, while Garda resourcing is not a matter that can be directly addressed through this application, the scheme seeks to respond to broader community-safety considerations through its layout and design.
30	Scale, height and character of apartments	Observers support housing in principle but consider 4-5-storey apartments inappropriate to the established Confey context; preference expressed for 2-, 3- and 4-bed houses and lower-rise duplexes with outdoor space, avoiding a perceived overly urban/"concrete jungle" character.	The proposed development responds to the wider objectives of the Confey Masterplan and its density strategy, which provides for 35-50 dph within the R1 lands and a target density of 50 dph within MU1, making efficient use of land in a location well served by public transport, particularly Confey Railway Station. The Confey Masterplan establishes a building height strategy for this location that envisages buildings of 2 to 5 storeys within the higher-density areas, with Section 3.13 identifying heights of 2-4 storeys within R1 and 2-5 storeys within MU1. This approach is

No.	Key Issue	Summary Commentary / Concerns	Response / Reference to Response
			<p>reflected in Section 3.8 (Scale & Density) of the submitted Architectural Design Statement (ADS). The proposed apartment buildings are therefore consistent with the intended scale and density of development identified in the Masterplan, rather than representing an isolated departure from the established planning framework.</p> <p>The design approach seeks to balance these density requirements with a varied and attractive residential environment. The ADS describes a mix of houses, duplexes and apartments, with building heights and forms responding to their location within the site. Lower-rise housing provides a transition towards adjoining residential areas, while apartments are concentrated around the station and mixed-use areas, supporting a more compact and sustainable urban form. As illustrated in Section 3.8 of the submitted ADS, building heights and density reduce westwards from the canalside hub towards the lower-rise residential streets. The apartments provide a diverse range of housing typologies, sizes and layouts to accommodate the needs of different households and stages of life, supporting a socially inclusive and balanced community alongside the traditional housing.</p> <p>The apartment buildings have been carefully articulated as a series of smaller building forms arranged around a central courtyard, breaking down the overall massing and creating a more intimate, human-scaled residential environment. The architectural approach draws inspiration from the traditional canalside warehouses found along the Royal Canal, referencing their robust, simple forms, repeated bays, vertical proportions and understated material palette. This provides a strong local identity rooted in the canal's industrial heritage, while interpreting these characteristics in a contemporary residential context. The resulting composition seeks to avoid the appearance of a single, monolithic apartment block, instead creating a collection of distinct buildings with a coherent architectural language that responds to the character and history of the wider Confey landscape. Further details of the architectural approach and design rationale are provided in Sections 3.4 (Canalside Living) and 5.5 (Canalside Wharf) of the submitted ADS.</p>

No.	Key Issue	Summary Commentary / Concerns	Response / Reference to Response
31	Housing affordability / meeting local need	Concern that homes priced around €450,000+ would be beyond the reach of many local residents, younger households and workers and therefore may not adequately address local housing need.	The concern regarding housing affordability and access to housing is acknowledged. However, the future market price of individual units is not a matter that can be determined through the planning application process. The application is assessed against the relevant statutory planning framework, including housing delivery, unit mix, density and applicable Part V requirements (with the proposed development providing 20% Part V housing).
32	Public consultation / accessibility of application documents	Concern that application material available in the library was provided in a difficult-to-read A4 lever-arch file rather than drawings being clearly displayed; timing during peak summer holidays also criticised. Local residents had not been adequately consulted.	The application was advertised and made available for public inspection in accordance with the applicable statutory requirements for an LRD application. In addition, the full application documentation was made available on the dedicated project website, https://confeylrd1a.com/ , which remains live. The Further Information response and accompanying documentation will also be uploaded to the project website following submission. All third-party submissions received during the statutory consultation period have been reviewed by the Applicant and Design Team and are addressed within this Appendix.
33	Public / taxpayer financial risk	Concern that approving housing ahead of roads, drainage, flood protection, water, transport, schools, healthcare and community infrastructure may leave public authorities / taxpayers funding corrective measures later.	The allocation of public expenditure and funding for wider infrastructure falls outside the scope of this planning application. The application has been accompanied by the relevant technical assessments to demonstrate that the proposed development can be appropriately serviced and delivered in accordance with the applicable planning and infrastructure requirements.