

**SUBMISSION ON LEIXLIP DRAFT AREA PLAN AND CONFHEY URBAN DESIGN FRAMEWORK**

**PATRICK HOGAN** [REDACTED]

**10<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2019**

DEAR Sir/Madam,

As a resident of Confey since 1981, I wish to make to following submission to the above documents and the proposals and content therein.

**Introduction**

**Consider this introduction to give the topographical location of Confey/Leixlip that will be affected by the LAP and Urban Design Framework: Planning representatives have visited the area and have not convinced people who engaged with them that they understand the nature of the area and the pressure it is under from existing traffic and population issues along with the lack of upgraded infrastructure.**

Leixlip is a town contained between the Liffey on the south side and the Royal canal on the eastern side. The N4 motorway constricts the southern side, the Intel plant on the western side and St. Catherine's Park to the east. The rail line runs east to west parallel to the canal.

Living in Glendale/Riverforrest/GlendaleMeadows/Avondale/DunCarraig/Riverdale means that the only access road to homes is Captains Hill/ Cope Bridge, which runs from the village main street up to the canal and over the railway line . This road has not seen any infrastructural improvements, other that surface dressing and making Cope bridge one direction controlled by traffic lights, in the past 30 years.

Despite traffic increases and the additional impact of N4 and N3 traffic the proposal to build over **3000 in the Leixlip area** is not viable without impacting the lives of residents severely both from a commuting to work and social perspective. **The proposal will increase the population of Leixlip by 27%.**(over 20,000) with similar increases to Celbridge and Maynooth all using roads, public transport and facilities.

The N4 initially provided some relief to the village traffic however this has disappeared over the last 10 years with traffic in the village and Captains Hill back to its worst conditions in the morning and evening commuter time.

Bus traffic from Confey college also adds to the traffic on Captains Hill each morning and afternoon with very poor egress from Riverforrest area during these times.

**Submission points:**

1. The proposed plan has not the supporting infrastructure within to provide appropriate community objectives and a right to proper access to work and recreation.
2. No decision on the strategic transport assessment for Confey has been made, therefore the entire LAP is defective
3. With the proposed LAP, Cope bridge on Captain's Hill will not support the increased traffic to or from the village and any major alterations to the bridge will result in

residents not being able to exit adjoining housing estates along the route for a considerable period of time, associated with construction.

4. The impact on water, sewage and traffic by the LAP and expansion of Intel Plant are not addressed in the documents.
5. **Water has been disrupted**, for up to three days, in each of the past three years in Confey from breaks in the water mains. **Sewage has been a problem in Leixlip Village** for the past ten years with a smell that is worse in summer. The smell of sewage at new Aldi shop in the village is a case in point. Any planner who has visited the village could not have missed this presence.
6. The **scale of the plan for Leixlip is far too large** given the existing topography of the town. This is further complicated with the proximity of Celbridge and Maynooth and the proposed development of these two towns also.
7. The **proposal to move Confey GAA** club grounds takes no account of the community involvement in the facility and the disruption this proposal will deliver to families in the community. I have three children playing there for 15 years with safe access and local access to all team levels.
8. It is **wrong to suggest that the grounds are underutilises** as stated in the PLAN, and reflects the lack of understanding as to what this facility means to residents. It will not be accepted to interfere with the GAA Club in Confey in a manner proposed in the plans.
9. **Confey schools, primary and secondary** use the GAA grounds and walk there with their teachers, this LAP will destroy this safe and secure option for the community, a facility not provided by County Council or Government but by the Confey Community. Moving the club will not permit a 30 year establishment to transition to facilitate further away from the existing community with players at all ages and levels. **Visit the area at weekends to see the contribution this facility delivers** to sport, youth engagement and health. The club also provides a social facility to residents of all ages.
10. The policy is to provide a minimum **3315 new housing** units in Leixlip. This is being achieved by **increasing housing unit densities at Key Development Areas** and inserting new Key Development Areas into the Plan without any documented acceptable reasoning or demand to justify these decisions.
11. The plan proposes **road and building/engineering work in the Leixlip area for possibly ten years**. This activity in Confey and Captain's Hill will present an unacceptable level of disruption to the community.
12. Rezoning land that won't be developed within the lifetime of this LAP should not be agreed
13. The LAP fails to provide a Master Plan as directed by Ministerial order.
14. **Key Development Areas** that were removed from the last Local Area Plan by unanimously backed **Material Alterations** have been included again without any reasoned argument to support same.
15. **Previous objective removed from Plan** - *'To protect the amenity of St. Catherine's Park. No road proposal shall be considered by this Council through the park within the Council's ownership or jurisdiction.'* In a **complete "U" turn the LAP** is now in fact proposing a road into the park to facilitate a major housing development at Black Avenue. This change is despite 1021 submissions in 2017 regarding protection of St Catherine's Park from road development.

16. The **National Planning Framework states that development** will be achieved through infill and Brownfield development rather than an over-reliance on greenfield, edge of town development. The LAP as proposed does the opposite.
17. We have a large **Brownfield option at the HP site** that should be used to resolve the current and future housing requirements of the town. This site already also has access to the motorway system.
18. The **failure to deal with existing problems within the town** and provide the required infrastructure upgrades in advance of any new development shows total lack of appreciation of the current problems the town faces and disregard for the people of Leixlip.
19. The plan **does not adequately factor in the major expansion of Intel's impact** on our existing transport infrastructure.
20. **Any plan for Leixlip cannot be considered in isolation** as the town forms part of the greater north Kildare area that includes the sister towns of Celbridge and Maynooth. The combined development **proposed for the towns is absolutely without justification.**

<u>Current Residential Homes</u>	<u>Planned Increase</u>
<b>Leixlip</b>	<b>5219</b>
Celbridge	6544
Maynooth	4674
<b>Total</b>	<b>16,437</b>
	<b>8534 (+3315) + 38%</b>
	9794 (+3250)
	8216 (+3542)
	<b>26,554 (+10,107) 39%</b>

21. The impact on travel for residents will be substantial given that the public transport at the moment, during commuter high periods, is under severe pressure:

<u>Currently using Bus/Rail</u>	<u>Projected to use Bus/Rail</u>
<b>Leixlip</b>	<b>1489</b>
Celbridge	1457
Maynooth	1291
<b>Total</b>	<b>4237</b>
	<b>2321 (+ 55%)</b>
	2071 (+ 42%)
	1676 (+ 30%)
	<b>6068 (+1831) +43%</b>

22. The combined new build will **double the size of the residential areas in north Kildare.** The numbers in the plan are very misleading in regard to the actual size of the development.
23. There is **limited capacity at the water treatment** works in Leixlip. Improvement works earliest will take place is Q4 - 2022.
24. MT1.4 **No ecological analysis** has been completed on the effects of this LAP
25. This proposed **LAP is contrary to S8 which commits the council to protect, enhance, create and connect natural heritage, high quality amenity areas** and other green spaces throughout Leixlip for both biodiversity and recreational use. The LAP is in fact threatening and destroying natural heritage, high quality amenity areas and other green spaces in the Leixlip area.
26. The LAP proposes pedestrian/cycle routes throughout the town. Their design and scale are unknown. The knock-on effect on existing residents will be very negative creating a flow of activity into settled residential areas that is unwanted and provides no benefit to the people living in these areas.

27. Ministerial decision 6<sup>th</sup> Mar 2018 - *"The revised Draft Leixlip Local Area Plan shall be published not later than 6 months following the issuing of a Direction."* **Provided more than a year later is a breach of timeframe** so the council are in fact operating ultra vires.
28. The LAP is *"Encouraging a strong night time economy and presence of residents outside of work hours"*. **Leixlip is a residential area that has very limited night time activity outside of the main street. Residents do not want a night time economy** and planners should address reality.
29. The **park and ride facility** will not be close enough to the train station to encourage use particularly during inclement weather. To have a **max 50 spaces is ridiculous** and an area of at least 400 space would be required.
30. **Currently train users are parking outside people's homes in Glendale** and other adjacent estates from early morning until late evening. which is the source of ongoing concern to the safety of children and residents. The entrance to Glendale estate is down to a single lane traffic flow because of parking.
31. The KCC SEA **Environmental Report** indicates the LAP has **potential significant negative** effects on local services and utilities such as water supply and wastewater infrastructure and electricity demand, air quality, noise and climate- due to increased emissions & pollution.
32. **Features of archaeological and architectural heritage**, biodiversity, ecological, land and soil and the environment will also be affected as will human health & amenities
33. Leixlip village **has not grown because of a lack of parking, traffic and facilities** to walk and engage as a community. The LAP will not improve this negative condition and will in fact disapprove it further.
34. The draft LAP proposes a phasing/sequencing programme to enable and ensure adequate infrastructure is provided alongside new development. The actual detail in the draft **LAP provides no assurance** that this development will in fact take place in tandem with the required infrastructure being put in place.
35. Experience tells us that the housing development which is developer funded will be constructed and the new community will then have to fight for decades to get the required infrastructure to match the needs. This is unacceptable.
36. Any proposed compulsory purchase of residences adjacent to the Captain's Hill area is unjust and will encourage community resistance.

In conclusion, I wish to acknowledge the need for housing to facilitate existing families with adult children and encourage new residents, however the scale of the proposed LAP will disrupt the existing community and further strain the existing infrastructure of Leixlip.

Sincerely



Patrick Hogan  
10<sup>th</sup> July 2019