

WICKLOW COUNTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2016-2022

REPORT ON PRE-DRAFT CONSULTATION



Wicklow County Council
Forward Planning
February 2015

PART 1: INTRODUCTION

In accordance with Section 11 of Part II of the Local Government (Planning and Development) Act 2000 (as amended), Wicklow County Council has commenced the review of the 'Wicklow County Development Plan 2010-2016' and the preparation of the new 'Wicklow County Development Plan, 2016-2022'.

This report forms part of the statutory procedure for the review of the existing Plan and the preparation of the new Plan. Its purpose is to report on the outcome of the statutory consultation process and to set out the Chief Executive's response to the issues raised in the submissions received during the statutory public consultation period.

In accordance with the Planning Act, this stage of the review shall be **strategic** in nature for the purposes of developing:

- a) the objectives and policies to deliver an overall strategy for the proper planning and sustainable development of the area of the development plan, and
- b) the core strategy,

and shall take account of the statutory obligations of any local authority in the area and any relevant policies or objectives for the time being of the Government or of any Minister of the Government.

1.1 Legislative background to the preparation of the Chief Executive's Report

The Chief Executive's Report is prepared and submitted in accordance with the requirements of Section 11 of Part II of the Local Government Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).

Section 11(4) of the Act sets out the requirements in relation to the preparation of the Chief Executive's Report. The Chief Executive's Report is required to:

- List the persons or bodies who made submissions or observations, as well as any persons or bodies consulted;
- Summarise the issues raised in the submissions and during the consultations, where appropriate but shall not refer to a submissions relating to a request or proposals for zoning of particular land for any purpose;
- Give the opinion of the Chief Executive to the issues raised, taking in to account the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, the statutory obligations of any local authority in the area, and any relevant policies or objectives of the Government or of any Minister of the Government, and
- State the Chief Executive's recommendations on the policies to be included in the Draft Development Plan.

In the case of each planning authority within the Greater Dublin Area (of which Wicklow forms part), this report shall summarise the issues raised and the recommendations made by the DTA and outline the recommendations of the Chief Executive in relation to the manner in which those issues and recommendations should be addressed in the draft development plan.

This report must also summarise the issues raised and recommendations made by the relevant regional assembly and outline the recommendations of the Chief Executive in relation to the manner in which those issues and recommendations should be addressed in the draft development plan.

This report is required to be submitted to the members of the planning authority, or to a committee of the planning authority, as may be decided by the members of the authority, for their consideration. In this instance it is being submitted to the Members of Wicklow County Council.

1.2 Pre-draft consultation process

The pre-draft consultation stage commenced on the 28th October 2014 and ran for eight weeks until 23rd December 2014. The aim of the consultation process was to enable the public and interested parties to give their observations on the review of the existing Plan and the preparation of the new Plan, including what planning issues the new Plan should address. The consultation process included the following:

- Advertisements in local print media
- Advertisements in free newsletter 'Coutywise' (two editions in November and December 2014)
- Notification on Council's website, Facebook and twitter pages
- Setting up on an online portal for making submissions
- Creation of a online survey particularly aimed at younger citizens (all secondary schools were notified of this survey)
- Erection of posters in all Council offices and libraries
- Distribution of 'Wicklow County Development Plan 2016-2022 Issues Booklet' to all Council offices, libraries and secondary schools in the County
- Notification to all prescribed bodies
- Notification to all known community groups
- Notification to all known infrastructure providers
- Holding of public meetings in Bray, Wicklow, Arklow, Greystones, Blessington and Tinahely.

A total of **93** written submissions (hard copy and e-mail) were received within the statutory time period. A list of these submissions is included in Appendix 4. All written submissions are considered in this report; **however, any submission or any part of a submission relating to a request or proposals for zoning of particular land for any purpose does not appear in this report.**

All submissions have been scanned and are available for public viewing on Wicklow County Council's website. The original hard copies of the written submissions can also be examined at the County Buildings Planning Department public counter.

1.3 Members consideration of the Chief Executive's Report

This report is submitted to the Members for their consideration. The Members, following consideration of the report, may issue directions to the Chief Executive regarding the preparation of the Draft Development Plan and any such directions shall be **strategic in nature**, consistent with the draft Core Strategy and shall take account of the statutory obligations of the local authority and any relevant policies or objectives for the time being of the Government or of any Minister of the Government. In issuing directions, Section 11 (4)(f) of the Act states that the Members shall be restricted to considering the proper planning and sustainable development of the area to which the development plan relates.

Any such directions must be issued not later than 10 weeks after the submission of this report to the elected Members.

1.4 The next stage of the County Development Plan review

Appendix 5 includes an indicative timetable for the preparation of the new County Development Plan. Following the consideration of this Chief Executive's Report by the Elected Members and the issuing of directions regarding the preparation of the Draft Development Plan, a 12-week period is allotted by the Act for the preparation of the Draft Wicklow County Development Plan 2016-2022. This means that the Draft Plan will be due for submission to the members in July 2015. Members will then

consider the Draft Plan and have 8 weeks to adopt / amend it before it goes on public display in September/October 2015.

1.5 Format of this report

The purpose of this stage of the plan making process is to determine the objectives and policies to deliver an overall strategy for the proper planning and sustainable development of the area of the development plan, and to develop the core strategy.

To aid in reading this report, **Part 2** of the report will set out the proposed **Core Strategy** that has been crafted in light of the Council's statutory obligations, compliance with the Planning Act, with Ministerial guidelines, with higher order plans and taking into account the submissions received.

Following this, **Part 3** sets out a list of policy / objective recommendations arising from the public consultation process. It should be noted that it is intended to review and update if necessary all existing objectives in the current plan; as this review has not been completed, the policy / objective recommendations in Part 3 of this report will focus on any **new policies or objectives** that are being recommended, or any policies / objectives that it is proposed to **significantly alter**.

Thereafter **Part 4** will summarise and assess submissions received. Due to their special statutory status, submissions from elected representatives and prescribed bodies are each assessed individually and an individual response given to each issued raised. With respect to public submissions, the submissions are assessed according to topic.

Part 5 provide an assessment of submissions received with respect to Strategic Environmental Assessment / Habitats Directive (Appropriate) Assessment.

Part 6 provides a number of appendices referred to in the report.

1.6 Strategic Environmental Assessment & Habitats Directive Assessment

The new plan must undergo Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Directive (Appropriate) Assessment. Whilst submissions were being sought on the overall plan, including issues relating to the environment and environmental assessment, the designated Strategic Environmental Assessment/Appropriate Assessment environmental authorities and the public were invited to make submissions on the scope and level of detail required for the Strategic Environmental Assessment and on any issue relating to the Appropriate Assessment. A report on any submissions received from either the environmental authorities or the general public with respect to the Strategic Environmental Assessment / Appropriate Assessment is set out in **Part 5** of this report.

PART 2: PROPOSED CORE STRATEGY**1.0 Introduction**

The purpose of the Core Strategy is to articulate a medium to longer term quantitatively based strategy for the spatial development of the area of the planning authority and in so doing to demonstrate that the development plan and its objectives are consistent with national and regional development objectives set out in the National Spatial Strategy and Regional Planning Guidelines (RPGs) and especially as regards:

- (1) the hierarchy and role of gateways, hub towns, county towns, other towns and villages and rural areas outlined in the documents above; and
- (2) the process of giving effect to the hierarchy above by setting regional and national population targets and associated requirements for housing land.

Whether zoning objectives are outlined in the relevant development plan or in subsidiary local area plans, the Core Strategy of the development plan must be sufficiently specific in setting population targets and housing requirements across the overall area of the planning authority and the elements of the settlement hierarchy outlined above thereby to act as a clear framework for amendments to existing zonings or new zonings in lower-level plans. In turn, the population targets and housing requirements of lower-level plans must agree with the Core Strategy of the county development plan and this will be achieved either in subsequent amendments to such plans or in the preparation of new local area plans.

Furthermore, it is never possible to manage growth in any particular settlement to come in at an exact population figure at a set time, which is 2028 for the purposes of this plan. As development in 3 of the 6 growth towns, representing towards 35% of the projected county growth, is reliant on the cooperation and financing of the National Roads Authority and the Railway Procurement Agency (as is the case in Bray), or Irish Water (as is the case in Arklow and Blessington), it is not possible to predict this with any accuracy whatsoever. The town population allocations in this Plan have thus incorporated compensatory headroom of 15% to accommodate this uncertainty and to ensure that there will be sufficient capacity in other settlements if some growth towns are unable to deliver the necessary infrastructure to service their projected populations.

TABLE 1.3 PROPOSED COUNTY WICKLOW POPULATION TARGETS BY SETTLEMENTS 2011-2028

Designation	Town	2011	2022	2025	2028
Consolidation Town	Bray	29,339	36,237	38,119	40,000
Large Growth Town I	Wicklow / Rathnew	13,468	20,283	22,141	24,000
Large Growth Town II	Arklow	13,066	19,494	21,247	23,000
Large Growth Town II	Greystones/ Delgany	17,208	21,603	22,801	24,000
Moderate Growth Town	Blessington	4,780	6,540	7,020	7,500
Moderate Growth Town	Newtown	3,073	4,967	5,483	6,000
Small Growth Town	Ashford	1,484	2,675	3,000	3,250
Small Growth Town	Aughrim	1,315	1,758	1,879	2,000
Small Growth Town	Baltinglass	1,786	2,572	2,786	3,000
Small Growth Town	Carnew	1,145	1,698	1,849	2,000
Small Growth Town	Dunlavin	793	2,134	2,500	2,750
Small Growth Town	Enniskerry	1,940	2,302	2,401	2,500
Small Growth Town	Kilcoole	4,063	4,669	4,835	5,000
Small Growth Town	Rathdrum	1,638	2,843	3,171	3,500
Small Growth Town	Tinahely	956	1,308	1,404	1,500
Rural Town	Avoca	717	835	868	900
Rural Town	Donard	179	257	279	300
Rural Town	Kilmacanogue	799	897	923	950
Rural Town	Newcastle	817	1,065	1,132	1,200
Rural Town	Roundwood	780	1,052	1,126	1,200
Rural Town	Shillelagh	426	571	610	650
Urban total		99,772	135,761	145,576	155,200
Compensatory headroom			15%	15%	15%
	Large Villages	3,438	3,802	3,901	4,000
	Small Villages	1,087	1,354	1,427	1,500
	Rural clusters	1,009	1,133	1,166	1,200
	Open countryside	31,334	33,376	33,933	34,490
Rural Total		36,868	39,665	40,427	41,190
County total		136,640	158,000	167,000	176,000

Even in the scenario where there are no impediments to growth in any towns, and no town is allowed to growth by an additional 15% to compensate for lack of growth elsewhere, the combined total growth in the 'growth towns' would equate to c. 70% of total growth. Therefore this distribution is considered to be generally consistent with the principles of the RPGs.

1.4 Zoning

This development plan sets the population and housing targets for all 21 'towns' in the County up to 2028. However, it only provides 'zoning' for 13 settlements, the remainder of the settlements having their own stand-alone 'Local Area Plans', which will be reviewed after the adoption of this County Development Plan.

Local Area Plans

It is planned that these LAPs will be adopted during 2017-2019 period, in order of timeline priority (i.e. according to the date when each existing plan is due to expire). Each LAP will cover a period of 6 years (the latest plan to be reviewed having a timeline of 2019-2025) and zoning will be provided on the basis of the land needed to meet a 6 year horizon, plus 3 years zoning 'headroom' or 'market factor'², as recommended in the Development Plan Guidelines issued by the Minister. The horizons utilised for each plan will also be cognisant of the fact the LAPs have the potential to be extended to last for up to 10 years, but no plan will include a timeline beyond 2028.

Zoning Table A to follow shows the zoning requirements for the LAP towns, up to the year 2025, plus headroom.

This table shows that the majority of current LAPs do not have sufficient zoned land available to meet the 2025 population target (the exceptions being Blessington and Rathdrum which are very slightly 'over-zoned' to the tune of 2-3ha each). The review of each LAP will ensure that each plan is consistent with the CDP 'core strategy'.

Other town / settlement plans

With respect to the remaining towns and settlements, their plans form part of this County Development plan and are therefore being adopted with a 2016-2022 horizon. Zoning is therefore provided on the basis of the land needed to meet the 2022 population and housing targets, plus 3 years 'headroom'.

Zoning Table B to follow shows the zoning requirements for these settlements / towns, up to the year 2022.

Level 5: The majority of the town plans adopted for these towns prior to 2016 have a surplus of zoned land having regard to the population and housing targets set out in this new CDP. Where a surplus has been identified, the surplus land will be re-designated as a 'Strategic Land Bank' (SLB). The only exception is Enniskerry where a deficit has been identified. Therefore the new Enniskerry town plan forming part of this CDP will include additional zoned land to address this deficit.

Level 6: These are 'settlement plans' that don't have the same detailed zonings as LAPs or Level 5 'town plans'. The amount of residential development that is facilitated in these settlements is therefore not a function of the amount of 'zoned' land, but is dictated by the population and housing objectives set out in the CDP and the 'settlement plan' itself.

² "Headroom" or "market factor" which is 'extra' land that should be zoned over and above the minimum amount needed to accommodate the population target. Headroom is provided so as to allow for greater location choice and deal with any land supply inflexibility which may arise.

TABLE A: LAP SETTLEMENTS

Future Plan Type	Settlement	Population 2011	Housing Stock 2011	Core Strategy Population Allocation 2025	Total Housing Unit Requirement 2025	Housing Unit Growth Requirement 2011-2025	Housing Unit Growth Requirement + headroom ³	Total Housing Yield of existing zoned land ⁴	Shortfall/ Excess (UNITS)	Method of addressing shortfall / deficit
Level 1 LAP	Bray	29,339	11,518	38,119	17,651	6,133	7,934	4,689	-3,245	Future LAP
Level 2 LAP	Wicklow – Rathnew	13,468	5,399	22,141	10,252	4,853	6,272	5,640	-632	Future LAP
Level 3 LAP	Arklow	13,066	5,459	21,247	9,838	4,379	5,726	4,000	-1,726	Future LAP
Level 3 LAP	Greystones – Delgany	17,208	6,637	22,801	10,558	3,921	5,034	3,767	-1,267	Future LAP
Level 4 LAP	Blessington	4,780	1,865	7,020	3,251	1,386	1,782	1,840	+58	Future LAP
Level 4 LAP	Newtownmountkenedy	3,073	1,078	5,483	2,539	1,461	1,840	1,706	-134	Future LAP
Level 5 LAP	Kilcoole	4,063	1,402	4,835	2,239	837	1,030	782	-248	Future LAP
Level 5 LAP	Rathrum	1,638	657	3171	1,469	812	1,045	1,089	+44	Future LAP

TABLE B: OTHER SETTLEMENTS

Future Plan Type	Settlement	Population 2011	Housing Stock 2011	Core Strategy Population Allocation 2022	Total Housing Unit Requirement 2022	Housing Unit Growth Requirement 2011-2022	Housing Unit Growth Requirement + headroom ⁵	Total Housing Yield of existing zoned land ⁶	Shortfall/ Excess (UNITS)	Method of addressing shortfall / deficit
Level 5 Town Plan	Ashford	1,484	531	2,675	1,182	651	858	858	0	Balance
Level 5 Town Plan	Aughrim	1,315	592	1,758	777	185	278	373	+95	SLB surplus
Level 5 Town Plan	Baltinglass	1,786	769	2,572	1,136	367	521	649	+128	SLB surplus
Level 5 Town Plan	Carnew	1,145	491	1,698	750	259	365	515	+150	SLB surplus
Level 5 Town Plan	Dunlavin	793	313	2,134	943	630	840	845	+5	Balance
Level 5 Town Plan	Enniskerry	1,940	642	2,302	1,017	375	470	406	-64	Zone additional land
Level 5 Town Plan	Tinahely	956	419	1,308	578	159	231	463	+232	SLB surplus
Level 6 Settlement Plan	Avoca	717	282	835	369	87	120	127	+7	Amend Objectives
Level 6 Settlement Plan	Donard	179	92	257	114	22	37	96	+59	Amend Objectives
Level 6 Settlement Plan	Kilmacanogue	799	277	897	396	119	151	146	-5	Amend Objectives
Level 6 Settlement Plan	Newcastle	817	313	1,065	471	158	211	388	+177	Amend Objectives
Level 6 Settlement Plan	Roundwood	780	326	1,052	465	139	195	283	+88	Amend Objectives
Level 6 Settlement Plan	Shillelagh	426	200	571	252	52	83	80	-3	Amend Objectives

³ Equivalent of +3 years zoning i.e. to meet '2028' target

⁴ As per plans adopted pre 2016

⁵ Equivalent of +3 years zoning i.e. to meet '2025' target

⁶ As per plans adopted pre 2016

It is proposed to extend the Luas light rail system to Bray – this extension is identified in the RPGs as a **critical strategic transport project** and the vast majority of the population growth for Bray is allocated for areas to be served by Luas. This will reinforce the role of Bray as the primary settlement in the County and will provide an option for removing car traffic from the N11/M11 north of Bray with the provision of park-and-ride facilities.

- It is the strategy of this plan to encourage and facilitate significant improvements to heavy and light rail infrastructure, including the provision of new lines and new stations.
- Improvements to the Dublin-Rosslare rail line, the extension of Luas to Bray – Fassaroe, the provision of car and bus park-and-ride facilities and improved penetration of local bus services in designated growth towns are the priorities for public transport.

1.6 Retail

The development plan includes a retail strategy for the entire County, which is consistent with the GDA Regional Retail Strategy. In accordance with the Retail Planning Guidelines, the retail strategy for Wicklow will include the following:

- Confirmation of the retail hierarchy, the role of centres and the size of the main town centres;
- Definition in the development plan of the boundaries of the core shopping area of town centres;
- A broad assessment of the requirement for additional retail floorspace;
- Strategic guidance on the location and scale of retail development;
- Preparation of policies and action initiatives to encourage the improvement of town centres;
- Identification of criteria for the assessment of retail developments.

Table 3.4 GDA and County Wicklow Retail Hierarchy

RETAIL STRATEGY FOR THE GREATER DUBLIN AREA	WICKLOW COUNTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN	
	METROPOLITAN AREA	HINTERLAND AREA
LEVEL 1 METROPOLITAN CENTRE Dublin City Centre		
LEVEL 2 MAJOR TOWN CENTRES & COUNTY TOWN CENTRES Bray, Wicklow	Bray	Wicklow
LEVEL 3 TOWN AND/OR DISTRICT CENTRES & SUB COUNTY TOWN CENTRES Greystones, Arklow, Blessington, Baltinglass	Greystones	Tier 1 Towns serving a wide district: Arklow, Blessington, Baltinglass Tier 2 Towns serving the immediate district: Newtownmountkennedy, Rathdrum
LEVEL 4 NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES, LOCAL CENTRES – SMALL TOWNS & VILLAGES	Bray Area: Boghall Road / Ballywaltrim, Vevay, Dargle Rd, Dublin Road / Little Bray, Albert Road & Walk, Fassaroe, Southern Cross Road Greystones Area: Delgany, Blacklion, Charlesland, Killincarrig, Victoria Road	Ashford, Aughrim, Avoca, Carnew, Donard, Dunlavin, Enniskerry, Kilcoole, Kilmacanogue, Newcastle, Rathnew, Roundwood, Shillelagh, Tinahely
LEVEL 5 CORNER SHOPS / SMALL VILLAGES		Barndarrig, Ballinaclash, Coolboy, Glenealy, Hollywood, Johnstown / Thomastown, Kilpedder / Willowgrove, Kiltegan, Knockananna, Laragh – Glendalough, Manor Kilbride, Redcross, Stratford

The only minor deviation from the Regional Retail Strategy is the inclusion of Newtownmountkennedy and Rathdrum in Level 3. The County Development Plan makes a distinction between Tier 1 and Tier 2 centres in Level 3 to reflect this deviation. Newtownmountkennedy is selected as being appropriate

Delgany saw population growth in the last census and these towns require as much attention as Wicklow Town when it comes to planning future development needs.

The overall approach to the Settlement Hierarchy, which treats Wicklow's smaller settlements as if they were isolated and self-contained entities, requires a fundamental rethink. Kilmacanogue, for example, is at the bottom of the Settlement Hierarchy, yet is at the very core of one of the most critically needed infrastructure upgrades in the county, the alleviation of traffic congestion on the N11 at Bray. The quality of life for people living in Kilmacanogue is very much affected by the N11 plans and quality of life of hundreds of thousands of road users is dependent on what happens to the N11 in the area around Fassaroe and Kilmacanogue.

Enniskerry is also rated low on the Settlement Hierarchy yet in its position of 'a gateway town' to the Wicklow Mountains caters for a very high transient tourism population. This is not reflected in the Settlement Hierarchy.

Towns like Baltinglass also feature far down the Hierarchy despite attracting retail custom from a broad outer rural catchment.

9. Whatever population growth projections are adopted on an interim basis it would make sense for the Settlement Hierarchy to be related to the future population projections for each town and rural catchment. Currently this is not the case.
10. Future land zoning should attempt to prevent past mistakes from reoccurring. In this regard it would be beneficial to first review the effectiveness of the zoning strategy under the current CDP as a means of promoting strategies that have been successful and avoiding strategies which have been detrimental to society or to the landscape (e.g. ghost estates).
11. As part of the development of a new housing strategy under the umbrella of the CDP a full review of the existing public sector housing development capacity of Wicklow CC should be carried out. The local authority area requires a housing strategy that is directly linked to the housing need in the county but that is also related to the capacity of the Local Authority to fulfil that need. The Council needs a full assessment and report of the deliverable housing stock for the period of the CDP, including inter alia the quantity of appropriately located housing development and associated amenity land, the numbers of planned homes in each area that are ready to proceed from design to tendering and construction stages, the nature and extent of new and subsequent design phases, strategies for maintaining new builds.
12. The CDP needs to recognise more directly the influence of the adjoining capital city of Dublin on the population and employment patterns for the county. There is of course a strong requirement for local jobs but it is also the case that many people with jobs in Dublin choose to live in Wicklow for reasons of lifestyle and environment. The CDP needs to emphasise more its regional context within the Greater Dublin Area.

The development of the N11 within South County Dublin is every bit as strategic for many County Wicklow residents as the development of the N11 near Arklow. While it is essential to ensure that Wicklow is seen as an attractive employment base, it is also important to facilitate those residents of Wicklow whose jobs are not necessarily transferrable to Wicklow. These citizens require better transportation links including road, bus and rail. The improved links will have a dual effect of enhancing indigenous business by bringing shoppers and tourists into the county from the high population centre of Dublin and its international transport points.

13. The CDP needs to emphasise the desirability of better broadband infrastructure across the county.
14. The new CDP needs to take an overarching strategic view at tourism. As stated above, the Strategic Goals of the plan should be amended to include specific goals relating to tourism and landscape. The proximity of Wicklow to the high tourism traffic in Dublin and exploring the

8. With respect to the settlement hierarchy, this is for the most part (certainly for the larger settlements) set at a State and regional level, and is not open for debate through this county plan process. Wicklow Town was designated as 'growth town', higher in the hierarchy than Arklow and Greystones by the elected members of the regional authority, due to it being the County town, on a rail line, with potential to be a significant development pole in eastern Wicklow, away from the draw / influence of the Metropolitan area. It should also be noted that while Greystones is designated a 'large growth town 2' in Regional Planning Guidelines for the Greater Dublin Area, its location in the 'Metropolitan Area' in fact gives it a 'higher' development potential status than the hinterland towns of Wicklow and Arklow. Furthermore, it is not considered that Arklow and Greystones receive less 'attention' or 'priority' than Wicklow Town in terms of public investment nor in terms of development plan policies / objectives.

With respect to the smaller towns, it is correct that in terms of population targets each town is treated as a 'self contained' entity, but in many other regards, such as employment planning, schools provision etc this is not the case. The planning for these other sectors is done by both the Local Authority and other agencies on a more regional or 'catchment' basis, taking into consideration the sphere of influence of the larger towns in the County.

With respect to the issue raised regarding Kilmacanogue, it is agreed that the development of this village should be considered in a wider sense e.g. in a combined 'local area plan' with Bray and its environs. This is a matter that was discussed with the elected members when the first Bray environs plan was prepared in 2009 but at the time there was some concern regarding the concept as there were fears that such an approach would render Kilmacanogue no more than a 'suburb' of Bray. It is recommended that Kilmacanogue and its environs are included in the next Bray and environs plan, due to commence preparation as soon as the new County Development Plan is adopted.

With respect to the issue of traffic congestion on the N11 through Kilmacanogue, the Council executive had previously proposed that possible routes be identified and land be 'reserved' for the development of a new road directly from Kilmacanogue to Bray south, by-passing the N11 and the Kilcronej junction, to link Kilmacanogue more effectively with Bray and removing local traffic from the N11. However both the public and the elected members expressed objections to this idea and the concept did not move forward. It is recommended that this route be reconsidered in the next Bray Town and environs local area plan.

With respect to Enniskerry and its position in the existing hierarchy, it is not 'very low' in the hierarchy. Levels 1-4 are the 'growth towns' as defined by the RPGs. Enniskerry is not a designated growth town and therefore the 'highest' rank it could hold in the hierarchy is Level 5, which is its current designation.

With respect to Baltinglass, its position in the hierarchy is 'as high' as consistency with the RPGs would allow, but in recognition of its role, particularly as a service town for a wide hinterland, the existing Regional and County Retail Strategy has allowed for heightened 'retail status' for the town. Section 5.3.3 of the existing County Development Plan and the Baltinglass Town Plan re-emphasise the differences between Baltinglass and other towns in Level 5 in the hierarchy and provide for appropriate planning policies to reflect the nature of this town.

9. The settlement hierarchy is 'related to' the future population projections for each town, and the other factors that must be considered as detailed in response to Item 8 above, in particular consistency with the RPGs. It would not be consistent with the RPGs or the Planning Act to consider only population projections in setting the settlement hierarchy, as is suggested.
10. Wicklow County Council has taken a very responsible and restrained approach to zoning and it is not considered that significant 'mistakes' have been made in the past by the Council in this regard. There are few 'ghost estates' in County Wicklow and certainly no such unfinished estates are in that condition due to 'bad zoning'. There are no unfinished estates in the county

SETTLEMENT	SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY		RETAIL HIERARCHY	
	GDA	CDP	GDA	CDP
BRAY	1	1	2	2
WICKLOW / RATHNEW	2	2	2	2
ARKLOW	3	3	3	3
GREYSTONES / DELGANY	3	3	3	3
BLESSINGTON	4	4	3	3
NEWTOWNMOUNTKENNEDY	4	4	4	3
ASHFORD	5	5	4	4
AUGHRIM	5	5	4	4
BALTINGLASS	5	5	3	3
CARNEW	5	5	4	4
DUNLAVIN	5	5	4	4
ENNISKERRY	5	5	4	4
KILCOOLE	5	5	4	4
RATHDRUM	5	5	4	3
TINAHELY	5	5	4	4
AVOCA	6	6	4	4
DONARD	6	6	4	4
KILMACANOGUE	5	6	4	4
NEWCASTLE	5	6	4	4
ROUNDWOOD	5	6	4	4
SHILLELAGH	6	6	4	4

16. It is agreed that town centre shopping should be at the heart of the new retail strategy. It is not the case at present however that the town centres are considered only in the context of their retailing function. While the existing Retail Strategy does address the retail role of town centres, the 'Strategic Goals' and Chapter 5 of the current plan set out a vision for towns including all of the uses required to make town attractive, vibrant and liveable, such a residential, community and amenity uses. The existing plan does encourage a mixture of uses in town centres and in particular encourages residential use above ground floor commercial uses. In all 'housing' and 'land availability' assessments carried out for the core strategy and housing strategy, and indeed in local area plans, the development of new residential units in existing town centres is addressed and included.
- With regard to the infrastructure required in town centres, such as footpaths, public lighting, car parking as mentioned in the submission, the existing plan addresses all of these requirements in detail in both Chapters 5 and 11. It is recommended that the new plan will continue to address these topics.
17. It is agreed that the rural development objectives should be based on strong County landscape assessment; however, this cannot at this stage be based on a 'National Landscape Plan' which has not been produced by the Government to date (a draft 'National Landscape Strategy for Ireland' was published in July 2014). Furthermore, the Government has not provided any landscape character assessment guidelines for the state since 1999, which are now outdated. It should be further noted that during the course of previous development plans, the suggestion that rural development objectives e.g. with respect to rural housing, would be landscape zone specific i.e. different criteria would apply in different landscape zone types, was not accepted by the majority of the Council. It is however intended to undertake a fresh evaluation of the existing landscape character assessment for the County as part of this plan review process and so adjust the landscape categories where required. It is also recommended that the new plan will set out differing development criteria based on landscape vulnerability.

- The planning authority zones land for greenbelt uses, as appropriate, throughout the county, where it is an objective to prevent the urban boundary of separate settlements from merging. Settlements that are at a higher risk of 'merging' include Bray, Kilmacanogue, Enniskerry, Greystones and Kilcoole. The designation of lands for greenbelt uses in these areas will be considered in the context of the preparation of local plans.
- All roads objectives will be reviewed, taking account of the strategies of the various transportation authorities such as the NTA, the Department of Transport and the NRA. However, it is unlikely that a policy excluding major roads will be included.

4. Economic and employment development

- The plan shall include objectives for the promotion of a sustainable settlement and transportation strategy in urban and rural areas, including the promotion of measures to address climate change issues.
- It is the strategy of the current plan to generally require employment generating development to locate on zoned land within existing settlements, and to allow the development of appropriate rural based enterprises at appropriate locations where, amongst other considerations, there is a proven need to develop there. The Chief Executive is supportive of this strategy and agrees with the strategy to take advantage of the county's comparative advantages and to support the development of enterprise based on local indigenous resources. The forthcoming 'Local Economic and Community Plan' is due to provide a detailed economic and employment strategy for the county and it will be the role of the County Development Plan to underpin any land use and development objectives included in the LECP.
- 'Chapter 10: Retail' of the current plan includes an objective on farmers' markets. This objective should be reviewed, updated and carried forward into the new plan.
- The strategy for retail development shall be in accordance with the Retail Planning Guidelines for planning authorities (DoECLG, 2012) and the principles of the Retail Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2008-2016. In accordance with this guidance, retailing will be promoted in appropriate locations in accordance with the sequential approach, whereby the preferred location for retail development is within the town centre and edge or out of centre locations will only be considered in exceptional circumstances.
- Objectives will be included to support town centre revitalisation.
- An objective will be included on retail warehousing, in accordance with the guidelines. The guidelines indicate that there should be a presumption against further development of retail parks unless a particular need is identified. This matter will be considered in the updated retail strategy.
- Policy TR8 of the current plan states that positive consideration shall be given to the re-configuration of existing retail provision in higher order settlements to accommodate large modern retail units. This objective should be reviewed, updated and carried forward into the new plan.
- The development plan does not include objectives for the carrying out of compulsory purchase orders for any purpose, nor does it need to. This is a mechanism available in law to the Local Authority, should it consider it expedient.
- The plan will include objectives for the provision of infrastructure including transport, energy and communication facilities, water services infrastructure and ancillary facilities or services.

Submission No. 24**Name: Enniskerry Forum**

Note: Please also see public submissions with respect to Enniskerry under Section 4.4, Topic 11 - 'Level 5 settlements' of this report

Issues Raised

The following issues were raised in relation to the review of the plan for Enniskerry:

1. Population and settlement hierarchy
The population projections for the area are considered to be excessive, while the area's position within the settlement hierarchy is out of context with the character of the area.
2. Infrastructure
The area lacks the capacity to absorb the level of development currently envisaged in the County Development Plan's settlement hierarchy, while poor traffic management and parking impact on the visitor experience to the area.
3. Views
The view from Kilmolin/Parknasilloogue north east towards the sea and Carrickgallon should be included as view to be protected.
4. Community
The area lacks basic amenities such as a playground for children. This issue should be addressed in the new plan.
5. Heritage
The existing streetscape of the village centre should be afforded increased planning protection with greater controls on shop front design.

Response of Chief Executive

1. Enniskerry is designated a Level 5 'Small Growth Town' in the existing County Development Plan and this is considered an appropriate designation for a town of this size and function, in accordance with the RPGs:

"The classification of Small Growth Towns is largely synonymous with the centres identified by the NSS as yielding a population of between 1,500 and 5,000 persons. It is envisaged that major employment-generating investment companies will seek to locate in Large Growth or possibly Moderate Growth Towns, and not necessarily in these locations. Relatively small and locally financed businesses are expected to locate in Small Growth Towns; however, other economic investment could be supported where sustainable and in keeping with the size and services of the town. Retail is likely to be mainly in the convenience category, with a small supermarket and possibly local centres serving only the town and its local catchment area. Small Growth Towns would likely contain facilities such as a primary and sometimes a secondary school, as well as a health clinic".

The RPGs set out that within this category of settlement are a range of types, with local commuter type towns located close to other larger centres and small commercial towns, remote from core commuter areas and having strong trading tradition serving a large rural hinterland. Enniskerry is considered to fall within the first category, having regard to its location vis-à-vis Dublin and the larger Wicklow settlements of Bray and Greystones, and its dependence on these metropolitan areas for employment and higher order services.

It is not clear what would be achieved if Enniskerry were to be moved down the hierarchy to Level 6, other than perhaps reduction in the amount of housing that might be developed there. There current population target for Enniskerry for 2022 is 3,000. There appears to be general sentiment from submissions from Enniskerry residents that new housing development should

be severely curtailed in the town. However, the reality is that new housing growth needs to be accommodated throughout the County, and Enniskerry has to absorb its appropriate share. The town is serviced by water and roads infrastructure, there are primary schools in the town, there is a wide range of community and retail services and there are suitable land banks close to the town centre. It is considered appropriate that a suitable level of new housing growth is accommodated.

Nevertheless, as part of the review of the existing core strategy and population targets it is considered that the target of 3,000 is unrealistic for Enniskerry, and it is recommended that this be reduced to 2,500 for 2028.

2. In the crafting of the updated local plan for Enniskerry, existing objectives with regard to traffic management and car parking etc will be reviewed and improved if necessary. The role of a land use plan is to put in place a framework for future development, while the delivery of such improvements is an operational and budgetary matter.
3. It is intended that the existing schedule of listed views within the plan will be reviewed and updated as deemed appropriate.
4. As part of the review process for the Enniskerry Town Plan the issue of community facilities in the area will be addressed through appropriate objectives. The actual delivery of such facilities is an operational matter and a matter for the annual budgetary process.
5. The existing County Development Plan designates the entire core area of Enniskerry as an Architectural Conservation Area which, alongside the list of protected buildings in the area, aims to provide protection to the character of the area. The extent of the ACA and the list of protected structures will be reviewed during the development of a town plan for Enniskerry. The existing County Development Plan in Chapter 10 (Section 10.6) contains a number of objectives specifically relating to shop front design. The review of the Enniskerry Town Plan shall enhance and strengthen these existing objectives where deemed necessary in Enniskerry.

Recommendations of Chief Executive

1. To revised the population target for Enniskerry, as set out in the proposed 'Core Strategy'
2. To strengthen and enhance as appropriate all objectives of the existing Enniskerry Town Plan, particularly those relating to heritage including views, traffic and transportation and community development.

(b) Settlement hierarchy

Name	Issue raised
Ashford Property Services	New 'rural settlements' should be designated at the traditional rural settlements of Nun's Cross, Cronroe / Ballylusk, Killoughter and Coyne's cross
Ashford Studios	Ashford should be given a higher status in the settlement hierarchy. The status of the town should be based on infrastructure that will be needed to support and service the business brought about by the expansion of Ashford studios.
Elizabeth Battye	<p>Ballycoogue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The occupancy restrictions for developments in small villages are too restrictive and are compromising growth. - Ballycoogue is served by a new underutilised sewage treatment plant and an upgraded water supply. - Restrictions on housing in Ballycoogue should be relaxed by moving it up a level in the hierarchy to large village status. - Supporting growth in Ballycoogue is in line with Goal 6.
Blackditch Ltd	Newcastle is currently designated a Level 6 rural town. Having regard to the current target (of 1,750 persons in excess of that for Tinahely) and the RPG designation for Newcastle as a 'small growth town', combined with the existing critical mass and potential of the town that Newcastle should be re-designated as a 'Level 5 Small Growth Town' in the new plan.
Bluetone Properties Ltd.	Enniskerry: Enniskerry should retain its role as a Level 5 small growth town.
Eamonn Coleman	Enniskerry: The settlement strategy and designation of Enniskerry as a 'small growth town' is supported. Is the town a small commercial town remote from core commuting areas or a local commuter type town?
Rose Mary Craig	<p>Enniskerry: The existing 'Level 5' designation given to Enniskerry is inappropriate and damaging to Enniskerry. Its 'heritage village' status should be returned to it in the new County Development Plan and it should be redesignated 'Level 6'. The designation as Level 5 'small growth town' seems designed to enable planners to zone more land for further urbanisation in areas unconnected to the village itself.</p> <p>The settlement hierarchy definitions are unclear – why are different designations given to village – Avoca is classified as a 'village' but Enniskerry, which is also a village is classified as a 'small town'. Further Roundwood which is much larger in size is only designated Level 6 whereas Enniskerry is Level 5 – this clearly means that planners are to be allowed to zone more land for housing in Enniskerry than Roundwood which has greater flat land for expansion than Enniskerry.</p> <p>The settlement hierarchy should be based on other important issues such as environmental considerations, landscape designations and future climate change impacts.</p>
Laili de Buitlear	Delgany should not be included in the Metropolitan Area of the Regional Plan. Little has been achieved in Delgany from this designation, except more housing, but nothing by way of transport or infrastructure to support it.
Raymond Gaffney	<p>Barndarrig should be increased in status in the settlement hierarchy and a higher level of housing allowed in the settlement. The village is suitable for increased levels of housing for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - village is served by roads, street lighting, church, school, shops, post office, filling station licensed premises and transport bus stop - the wastewater treatment plant has recently been upgraded - there is ample water supply in the village for 200 houses - the local school has increased in size but is running on 2/3 capacity - Barndarrig is 7 miles from Wicklow town and 38 miles from Dublin - When the N11 upgraded is completed, the old N11 will be free of the volume of traffic that it currently has

John Kinsella	Upgrade Glenealy Village's status from a Level 7 large village to a higher level settlement, similar to that of Ashford Village (Level 5), in order to facilitate a higher level of growth.
Knockree Developments Ltd.	This is a very detailed submission that addresses a number of issues, but with respect to the settlement hierarchy, it sums up by requesting that the County Development Plan should reflect the fact that Kilcoole is part of the Level 3 settlement of Greystones-Delgany-Kilcoole and any reference to the town as a stand alone, small growth town should be eliminated.
Clodagh O'Brien	<p>The settlement hierarchy definitions are unclear – why are different designations given to villages – Avoca is classified as a 'village' but Enniskerry, which is also a village is classified as a 'small town'. Further Roundwood which is much larger in size is only designated Level 6 whereas Enniskerry is Level 5 – this clearly means that planners are to be allowed to zone more land for housing in Enniskerry than Roundwood which has greater flat land for expansion than Enniskerry.</p> <p>The settlement hierarchy should be based on other important issues such as environmental considerations, landscape designations and future climate change impacts.</p> <p>Enniskerry: Enniskerry should be given lower status as village in Level 6.</p>
Gerard Roe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For fiscal reasons and to ensure efficient use of infrastructural resources and services, it would appear to make most sense to ensure that growth is concentrated in the towns and settlements where these limited resources currently exist and where they are capable of being upgraded to service planned and controlled development (based on secured funding for any necessary upgrades) - Bray, Greystones-Delgany, Wicklow, Arklow, Blessington and Newtown should be designated for significant new housing growth but only in conjunction within planned objectives and with appropriate infrastructure and social resources provided to improve quality of life for all residents. - The priority for investment in infrastructure should be Bray, Greystones-Delgany, Wicklow, Arklow, Blessington, and Newtown first. - While the current approach may be appropriate for towns as they exist at present, there must be some recognition of the fact that smaller towns may be listed further down the development scale as a direct result of previous lack of investment and planning priority. The council must be careful to ensure that the current system does not turn out to be a self fulfilling prophecy where the towns that have historically benefited from investment and planning input continue to do so, to the detriment of smaller towns that have been starved of investment and planning priority. - In areas where there is limited scope for new development, priority should be given to young people from the area trying to build or purchase in their own neighbourhoods. - Newtownmountkennedy has suffered badly from lack of investment in waste water treatment provision in particular. Its current designation has resulted in lack of investment, development and an associated lack of services. It should therefore be given a higher status. It would be prudent to provide appropriate services for the current population first and then look to see what future development could/should be undertaken. This argument could well also apply to other small towns in the county Wicklow area.
Patricia Walker	Enniskerry should be a level 6 as a key village and exploited for tourism, heritage and quality of like potential.
David Walsh	Delgany should not be included in the Metropolitan Area. Little has been gained in Delgany from this designation, except more housing, but nothing by way of transport or infrastructure to support it.

Enniskerry: Enniskerry is designated a Level 5 'Small Growth Town' in the existing County Development Plan (not a village) and this is considered an appropriate designation for a town of this size and function (see the function of Level 5 settlement set out above under 'Ashford').

The RPGs set out that within this category of settlement are a range of types, with local commuter type towns located close to other larger centres and small commercial towns, remote from core commuter areas and having strong trading tradition serving a large rural hinterland. Enniskerry is considered to fall within the first category, having regard to its location vis-à-vis Dublin and the larger Wicklow settlements of Bray and Greystones, and its dependence on these metropolitan areas for employment and higher order services.

The position of **Roundwood** in the hierarchy is raised to contrast with the position of Enniskerry. It is put forward that Roundwood is large in size and function, yet is in Level 6, while Enniskerry is small in size and role, yet is designated Level 5. It is suggested that Enniskerry should therefore be also designated Level 6.

This is not quite correct, in that Roundwood had a population of 780 in the 2011, while the population of Enniskerry was 1,940 – almost 2 ½ times bigger. While Roundwood might have a larger 'hinterland' that it services compared to Enniskerry (given Enniskerry's proximity to Dublin and Bray), its function is more a match with that of a 'Rural Town' as described in the County Development Plan while Enniskerry's is better matched to the 'Small Growth town' role.

Rural towns: These are strong rural towns, with a good range of infrastructural services and are suited to accommodating a significant element of urban generated housing demand, with necessary controls in place to ensure that local demand can also be met. These towns are differentiated in this plan from Small Growth Towns having regard to their more rural character and the rural nature of their catchments. Such rural centres are considered to contain the potential to consolidate rural development needs and support the maintenance of essential rural social and community infrastructure such as schools, shops, public houses, post offices and local sporting organisations.

Furthermore, it is not agreed fully that Enniskerry is *more* environmentally sensitive than Roundwood, when one considers the environmental vulnerabilities of Roundwood including its location in the Wicklow Mountains, its proximity to the Vartry Reservoir, the principal water source for north Wicklow and south Dublin, and environmental designations surrounding the town including the Vartry Reservoir NHA and the Wicklow Mountains SAC and SPA.

It is not clear what would be achieved if Enniskerry were to be moved down the hierarchy to Level 6, other than perhaps reduction in the amount of housing that might be developed there. The current population target for Enniskerry for 2022 is 3,000. There appears to be general sentiment from submissions from Enniskerry residents that new housing development should be severely curtailed in the town. However, the reality is that new housing growth needs to be accommodated throughout the County, and Enniskerry has to absorb its appropriate share. The town is serviced by water and roads infrastructure, there are primary schools in the town, there is a wide range of community and retail services and there are suitable land banks close to the town centre. It is considered appropriate that a suitable level of new housing growth is accommodated.

Nevertheless, as part of the review of the existing core strategy and population targets it is considered that the target of 3,000 is unrealistic for Enniskerry, and it is recommended that this be reduced to 2,500 for 2028.

The designation of **Avoca** is also raised in response to a submission with regard to the position of Enniskerry. It is put forward that Avoca is designated a 'village' while Enniskerry is designated a 'small town' when it is in fact a village. Again, this is not quite correct, in that Avoca is not designated a 'village' but a 'rural town'. It is not clear what definition the submitter is using when they say Enniskerry is in fact a 'village', but it certainly is not in accordance with the definitions utilised in either the County Development Plan or higher level planning documents such as the Regional Planning Guidelines for the Greater Dublin Area, or indeed the Census, which identified 'towns' as having over 1,500 in population. As set out above with respect to Delgany, the emotional connection

to the word 'village' is strong it seems with Enniskerry residents but the designations in the County Development Plan are to simply categorise towns in relation to their populations and overall spatial composition of the County.

Just to further clarify, Enniskerry has never been designated a 'heritage village' in the County settlement hierarchy and therefore it is not appropriate to request that this designation be 'returned' to the settlement. There is no such designation in the settlement hierarchy as 'heritage village'. The submitter may be getting confused with the Bord Failte administered a scheme initiated in the 1990s but now discontinued, whereby towns could be designated as 'heritage towns' for the purposes of tourism literature and marketing, subject to them fulfilling certain criteria, but this did not confer any sort of legal or statutory heritage status on the town. Furthermore, Enniskerry was not in designated as a 'heritage town' through this scheme.

With respect to the hierarchy failing to take into account environmental issues, protection of outstanding areas of natural beauty and tourism considerations, it is considered that the modest growth levels now being proposed for Enniskerry, reflect the consideration that has been given to these factors. It proposed to reduce the growth target from 3,000 in 2022 to 2,500 in 2028, which will mean that very limited additional land will require to be zoned, if any, to meet the target, thereby safeguarding the environment from further 'suburbanisation'.

Glenealy: It is requested that Glenealy be 'improved' in designation from 'Level 7' – Large Village to 'Level 5' – Small Growth Town. This request came accompanied by a proposals for a new 'village centre' development, which could in reality only be facilitated if the designation and housing target for Glenealy were increased (the current County Development Plan allows for the development of 30 additional houses in Glenealy between 2010 and 2016).

However, the RPG description of 'Small Town', generally towns with an existing / planned population in the 1,500 – 5,000 range would not be appropriate for Glenealy, that has an existing population of approximately 600 and would therefore be most suited to the 'key village' designation⁹. Furthermore, Glenealy is not considered suited for substantial new mixed use and housing development as is proposed in this submission, given its proximity to a number of existing large towns, such as Wicklow – Rathnew, Rathdrum and Ashford, which are the designated drivers for growth in this area of the County; substantial development in a location like Glenealy would be likely to draw development and investment in public services away from the designated growth towns. It should also be noted that there is a lack of water services in the area, including a lack of assimilative capacity in the watercourse running through the town, which has presented a barrier to development in the past.

Kilcoole: While a combined LAP was prepared for the settlements of Greystones – Delany and Kilcoole, there is absolutely no suggestion that Kilcoole forms part of Greystones – Delgany and that it should be 'redesignated' as part of this Level 3 settlement. In fact one of the reasons why a joint Local Area Plan was proposed was to protect the green belt between the towns. Kilcoole has its own identity and should not somehow be considered a 'suburb' of Greystones. Kilcoole is clearly identified in the Regional Planning Guidelines for the Greater Dublin Area as a stand alone 'small growth town', separate from Greystones – Delgany, and in order to ensure consistency with the RPGs, it is recommended that no changes are made to this designation.

Newcastle: It is requested that Newcastle be elevated to Level 5 in the hierarchy. Newcastle is designated a Level 6 'Rural Town' in the existing County Development Plan having regard to its size and function, which is considered to be more akin to the other towns in this category, rather than the settlements in Level 5 above. Newcastle had a 2011 population of 817, similar to Avoca (717), Dunlavin (793), Kilmacanogue (799) and Roundwood (780), which are all in Level 6. In contrast, the settlements in Level 5 for the most part have over 1,000 in population with many significantly above this.

⁹ It is accepted that towns with a smaller existing population are designated as 'Rural Towns' in Level 6, such as Donard and Shillelagh. However, these settlements are considered to warrant a 'Level 6' designation as opposed to 'Level 7' given their catchment and function.

(c) Population

Name	Issue raised
Blackditch Ltd	Newcastle: The current growth target of 1,750 people by 2022 is reasonable. An appropriate target for the period up to 2028 would be 2,500 people.
Bluetone Properties Ltd.	Enniskerry: Despite its designation, the town has experienced little development over the plan period. The population targets set out in the current core strategy are appropriate and will allow for expansion.
Eamonn Coleman	Enniskerry: Population figures do not correspond with CSO data – these should be reconsidered. Current population targets are unrealistic given CSO population of 1,811 in 2011.
Mark Colley	Enniskerry: Growth planned for Enniskerry is small in the context of its destination for large numbers of tourists visiting Powerscourt and for recreational outdoor activities. Overall population growth of the village should be limited. Large scale housing development puts strain on infrastructure including traffic, water services etc. and will compromise the heritage value of the village centre
Rose Mary Craig	Enniskerry: The population figures proposed for Enniskerry (1,900) in 2011 are puzzling when compared to Roundwood (780) a village which is already much larger in size than Enniskerry. This appears to mean that a much larger area of the rural hinterland is being counter as population for Enniskerry, which appears to not be the case for Roundwood. With regard to the population figures, using the 2006 census is unrealistic; the 2011 census results should be used to be more realistic. Population catchment areas should not include rural zones, this appears to be the case in Enniskerry but it does not appear to have been included in Roundwood's figures e.g. Roundwood's population (790 in 2011) seems to be low compared to that of Enniskerry (1900 in 2011) given it also has housing estates.
Tom Redmond	Newcastle: Population growth target to 1,750 by 2022 is conservative. A higher target should be built into the new plan in order to support local business and community activities.
Brian Stokes	A target population of 227,710 should be adopted for County Wicklow in 2028, of which there would be a projected increase of 21,972 in the urban population amongst the various urban settlements in County Wicklow. Of this c. 22,000 increase, the Council is requested to direct at least 1,000 of this projected increase to Ashford and thus set a target population of 4,000 for Ashford in 2028. Analysis of targeted population figures: Based on growth patterns identified in the Issues Booklet, the projected population for County Wicklow in 2022 should be 207,752. There is an error in the County Total figure as $164,750+43,002=207,752$ and not 176,800 as stated in the table. The error is repeated from the current CDP. Applying the 1.2% growth rate for the Mid East region from the CSO December 2013 projections, the population target for County Wicklow in 2028 would be 227,710. Apply an urban-rural split of 82%/18%, consistent with change between 2011-2022. Accounting for 1.2% growth rate, the urban population target would be 186,722 between 2022-2028 and rural target of 40,988.
Julia Strickland	Enniskerry: Projected growth by one third to 2022 is too much and will overload village and be detrimental to the character and amenity of the village.
Knockree Developments Ltd.	This is a very detailed submission and sets out complex and detailed population calculation and projections. However, its purpose is to make the case that there is a need for additional zoned land in Kilcoole , given the existing population target and request that the core strategy table in the new plan should reflect this. It is requested that this lack of adequate zoned land should be addressed with an immediate review of the Kilcoole LAP. With respect to the population targets, it requests that the target for Kilcoole be increased, reflecting its

	current size and propensity to grow.
Sean McGiollapadraig	Enniskerry: Further housing development in Enniskerry should be curtailed as the settlement does not have the infrastructure to accommodate further development and it is already well served by housing.
Clodagh O'Brien	With regard to the population figures, using the 2006 census is unrealistic; the most recent census figures should have been used. Future figures should be more realistically based. Enniskerry: The catchment areas for Enniskerry village appears to include major rural zones, which does not appear to be the case for other villages e.g. Roundwood's population (790 in 2011) seems low compared to that of Enniskerry (1,900 in 2011) given it also has housing estates.
Patricia Walker	With regard to population projections, Enniskerry's population should not be bound by a population number but rather a quality indicator for the resident population and visitors.

Response of Chief Executive

General:

The issue raised about the difficulty in setting population targets without knowing what services will be provided is noted; however, the reality is that planning in Ireland is not dictated by the capacity of existing services but sustainable spatial planning principles, and the service providers are required to deliver the services to area where they are required, to service existing population and planned growth. The service providers, such as Irish Water, ESB, Department of Education etc cannot be allowed to be the bodies that determine where growth will occur, as their priorities cannot be expected to align. They must follow the lead of planning and the Core Strategy for any County, which will be drafted to accord with the principles of regional and national spatial plan.

With regard to the submission that the County population figures are miscalculated, the submitter has fundamentally erred in the interpretation of the existing County Development Plan figures. The current population target for the County for 2022 is 176,800, as set by the Regional Planning Guidelines for the Greater Dublin Area. The existing table in the County Development Plan, along with supporting text, sets out that of this 176,800 population, 43,022 is targeted to be located in the rural area (large / small villages, clusters, open countryside). The remainder (133,798) is targeted to be located in the 21 towns in the County. However, when one totals the individual population targets for these 21 towns, the result is 164,750. The difference between this figure and 133,798 is the 'headroom between towns' i.e. an extra factor that has been added to make allowance for the fact that some towns will not grow as envisaged in the plan period, and allows growth in other towns to make up for this deficiency. The submitter has erroneously assumed that the total growth allowed in the towns for 2022 is 164,750, added this to the 'rural growth' and determined that the current county population target for 2022 is 207,752 – this is not correct.

As set out in the Appendices to this Report, a new County population figure for 2022 has been derived, based on updated Census data and CSO predictions. It is recommended that the new County population target for 2028 be 176,000. It is also recommended that the 'headroom' between towns is reduced, as there has been extra infrastructure provided in the County since the last Plan, and thus there are less constraints to development in these towns, and less of a need for compensating headroom between towns.

Based on this new County target, new targets for each of the towns / area have been derived and are set out in the recommended Core Strategy provided at the start of this report. With respect to Ashford specifically, it is recommended that a population target of 2,675 be utilised for 2022, growing to 3,250 in 2028.

With regard to the use of 2006 Census figures and not 2011 figures, all of the new calculations set out in the Appendices attached to his report and the recommended Core Strategy, are based on the more recent figures. However, targets used in the current Regional Planning Guidelines for the Greater Dublin Area are based on 2006 Census figures. There is an acknowledgement by the Regional authority that these figures and targets are outdated at this time, and therefore new targets have had to be derived.

The majority of the submissions with regard to the settlement hierarchy relate to the position or designation of specific towns, so each will be addressed separately:

Enniskerry: As set out in the preceding section, a review of all population targets has been carried out as part of this plan review process, taking into account new population data available, new targets for 2022 and 2028, and the capacity of various settlements to expand.

As already set out in this report, there appears to be general sentiment from submissions from Enniskerry residents that new housing development / population growth should be severely curtailed in the town. However, the reality is that new housing growth needs to be accommodated throughout the County, and Enniskerry has to absorb its appropriate share. The town is serviced by water and roads infrastructure, there are primary schools in the town, there is a wide range of community and retail services and there are suitable land banks close to the town centre. It is considered appropriate that a suitable level of new housing growth is accommodated.

This review of the existing population / housing targets has led to the recommendation that the existing target for Enniskerry of 3,000 is unrealistic, and it is recommended that this be reduced to 2,500 for 2028. If this recommendation is accepted, the existing parcels of zoned land in the town would be likely to accommodate all of the growth required up to 2022, but a small amount of additional zoning may be required just to ensure 'headroom' in zoning (to accommodate the scenario where zoned lands aren't released to the market).

With respect to suggested errors in the population data used, the CSO population figures for Enniskerry were 1,881 in 2006 and 1,811 in 2011 i.e. a decline in population. However, the boundaries that CSO use for Enniskerry do not match the 'town' boundaries as utilised in the development plan and using small area statistics and other sources of information, the Forward Planning Unit has determined the real population within the plan boundary as 1,940 for 2011. Therefore the population figures from 2006 cannot accurately be compared to the new 2011 figure, as they describe a different sized settlement. Therefore it is unclear if population grew or fell between 2006 and 2011 in Enniskerry, although data from the GeoDirectory recorded 47 new residential addresses being created between 2006 and 2011.

The population figure for Enniskerry utilised of 1,940 in 2011 is deemed to be correct and has been cross checked with both the Census result for 2011 (1,811), the small area statistics for this area and the GeoDirectory. In contrast Roundwood has been determined to have a 2011 population of 780, which again has been checked against various data sources. In 2011, there were 650 residential properties recorded by An Post in Enniskerry, compared to 347 in Roundwood. Clearly the perception that Roundwood is 'bigger' than Enniskerry is erroneous.

Kilcoole: Based on the new population targets that have been prepared for the County as set out in Appendices 1 and 2 to this report and the recommended Core Strategy, it is recommended that the existing target of 5,000 population for Kilcoole is maintained, for the target year of 2028.

As set out in the recommended Core Strategy, based on the new population figures, there will be a need for additional zoning in Kilcoole in due course, not due to increased population target, but due to falling household size and in particular to address the fact that an artificially high household size figure was employed in the 2013 Kilcoole LAP which resulted in less land being zoned than required. These matters will be addressed in more detail after the adoption of the new County Development Plan, upon review of the existing Kilcoole LAP, which does not expire until 2019.

With respect to some of the more specific issues raised:

Film based tourism

The current County Development Plan supports film based tourism projects, with Section 9.3 providing objectives to facilitate the development of tourism projects in general in the County subject to best practice, proper planning and protection of the environment. Outside of the County Development Plan, the County Wicklow Film Commission of Wicklow County Council plays an important role in the film industry in Wicklow and play an important role in film tourism along with other public bodies like Failte Ireland, Wicklow County Tourism and Bray Tourism. An example of the Wicklow Film Commission's film based tourism projects are the 'Wicklow Film Drives' and the 'County Wicklow – the Hollywood of Europe' initiative.

Transport/access to attractions

The existing County Development Plan has a number of objectives in relation to tourism and recreation infrastructure, including objectives regarding proposals for developments that place a particular emphasis on improving traffic flow, sign posting, car parking facilities, service/rest facilities at tourist attractions. It is intended that the new plan will contain similar provisions. The bus routes and location of bus stops are a matter for the provider of the bus service however the development plan fully facilitates a linked up and an increased access approach subject to proper planning and sustainable development. The provision of certain infrastructure at public locations, under the ownership of WCC, is a matter for the Transportation and Roads Section and this matter will be referred on to this section for their information.

Walking / cycling routes for tourists

It is acknowledged that there is potential for the development of walking / cycling routes for tourists in certain areas of the county. The Development Plan fully supports such projects with section 9.3 providing objectives to facilitate the development of tourism projects in the County subject to best practice, proper planning and protection of the environment. The provision of cycling and walking routes is further supported in section 11.3 of the existing plan with objectives for cycling and walking infrastructure and section 17.8 with objectives for recreation use of natural resources. The provision of walking and cycling routes at specific locations is a matter for the Transportation and Roads Section and this matter will be referred on to this section for their information. Wicklow Tourism also plays a main role in promoting walking/cycling /hiking routes throughout the County.

Facilities at public amenity sites

With regard to the different facilities sought to be provided at different public amenity site, the County Development Plan facilitates the provision of such facilities subject to proper planning and protection of the environment. The funding and provision of such facilities at public locations, under the ownership of WCC, is a matter for the Transportation and Roads Section and/or the Community, Cultural and Social Section of the Council. This matter will be referred on to both of these sections for their information.

Provision of tourist office

The objectives of both the existing County Development Plan and the Greystones - Delgany Local Area Plan would facilitate the provision of a tourist office in Greystones. The delivery of such a service would be a matter for Wicklow County Tourism and/or Bord Failte.

Potential of tourism in different areas of the County

It is acknowledged that the County must continue to provide for the positive sustainable development of tourism and the County Development Plan sets out a land use framework to ensure the potential of tourism projects/facilities are managed in a sustainable manner so as to protect against any potential detrimental impacts on the environment and local communities. The tourism potential of Enniskerry, Powerscourt, Wicklow Town, Mount Usher, Glen of the Downs and South Wicklow are all noted and it is considered that the current plan provides numerous objectives to facilitate the tourism potential in these areas having regard to proper planning and sustainable development. Wicklow Tourism has a number of initiatives to promote the development of tourism in these areas for example promotion of the attractions in over 30 of the towns and villages in the County.

TOPIC 6: INFRASTRUCTURE

While a number of submitters make reference to infrastructure in their submission, the majority of such submissions relate to specific **local** service issues. These submissions and local issues are addressed in the part of this report addressing specific towns. This submission addressed here are those that reference to wider, County-wide issues.

Name	Issue raised
Ashford Studios	Roads infrastructure in the County needs improvement, particularly if economic activity is to be facilitated.
Blackditch Ltd	The plan has a role to play in the strategic planning of regional infrastructure provision by Irish Water and the associated allocation of funding and timing of development.
Clodagh O'Brien	Roads infrastructure to locations like the Wicklow Mountains, Glencree Valley, Glencullen Valley from important starting points like Enniskerry Village require improvements, particular safety improvements for cyclist and walkers.
Heather Darker	Roadside signage: The erection of temporary signage for local events being run by community groups should be facilitated, but in a more structured manner e.g. by the designation of certain locations for such signage and for sign to be of standard templates. This would discourage illegal signage and decrease workload of litter wardens and would also help to make event more successful, build community spirit and show Council support. The road junction at Glendalough should be redesigned so that people can equally consider turning left (to Glendalough) or right (to west Wicklow) as this would encourage tourists to visit west Wicklow
Joan Campbell	Congestion on the N11 should be addressed. Roads improvements required in Delgany including pedestrian crossings and traffic calming.
Julie Strickland	Off road footpaths should be provided, particular through new developments, to amenity areas. Such routes should be provided even if they don't immediately join up to existing complete routes, in order to prepare for further connections.
Karen Cowen	There is a need for enhanced cycling infrastructure in the County, including bike parking beside all public parks / green areas and cycle lanes to and from such locations
Michael Carey	Improvements are required to cycling infrastructure, particularly along the coastal route from Greystones to Wicklow, through Newcastle, to ensure safety of cyclists, pedestrians and other road users.
Mary Rose Craig	Roads infrastructure to locations like the Wicklow Mountains, Glencree Valley, Glencullen Valley from important starting points like Enniskerry Village require improvements, particular safety improvements for cyclist and walkers.
Padraig O'Duill	There is a lack of public transport serving settlements outside of the major towns, which are dependant on taxis and Bus Eireann, which can be a difficult particularly for older people, who are forced to keep their cars on the road. Wicklow County Council should promote and subsidise a local bus service.

Response of Chief Executive

1. Transport Goals and Objectives

In regard to the provision of public transport it should be noted that while Wicklow County Council is not itself a public transport provider, and cannot force providers to deliver services in any particular area, the existing County Development Plan puts in place the necessary policy framework to encourage and facilitate the improvement of public transport. It is intended the new plan will carry forward such a policy framework.

TOPIC 9: HERITAGE**(a) Natural heritage**

Name	Issue raised
Rose Mary Craig	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Areas of outstanding natural beauty (AONB) and areas of special amenity must be protected. - Dargle and Glencullen valleys should be designated special areas of conservation. - There is a need for more coastal paths. - Rights of way should be preserved.
Paul and Senan Sexton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Glen of the Downs Garden Centre site should be moved from AONB to Corridor Area landscape designation. The characteristics of the site have changed in recent times with the development of roads and culverts – These changes to the landscape diminish the scenic quality of the landscape.
Charles & Collette Kavanagh & Family	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The landscape needs to be protected from the negative visual impact of wind farms.
Clodagh O'Brien	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Both the Dargle and Glencullen valleys in Enniskerry should be designated Special Areas of Amenity/Conservation and protected for future generations with a focus on the use for recreation and as greenways. - With regard to landscape, areas of outstanding natural beauty and Areas of Special amenity must be subject to strict planning laws that are non-negotiable. There is sufficient space for developers outside these areas so there should be no case made for development where an area is designated. - With regard to Rights of Way the Council can facilitate the preservation of these by officially mapping them and defending walkers rights in court rather than leaving it to individuals and walkers to try to keep them open.

Response of Chief Executive**Protection of the natural heritage**

The current development plan and local plans include a significant amount of objectives for the protection of the natural heritage, including listed views, prospects and landscape characterisation, in accordance with national planning guideline documents. The objectives set out in Chapters 16, 17 and 18 will be reviewed and updated as appropriate.

Designation of new sites

The designation of new sites is the responsibility of the Department of the Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht and the National Parks and Wildlife Service and is not a matter for the planning authority.

Rights of Way and Coastal paths

As part of the plan preparation process, it is intended to investigate key public rights of way and amenity walking routes, in order that they can be identified on the plan maps and objectives include with respect to same. The routes mentioned will certainly form part of the list examined.

Landscape Characterisation

The existing Landscape Character Assessment, particularly in relation to its impact on the wind energy strategy, contained in the current County Development Plan will be reviewed and improved as necessary as part of the plan review process. The locations highlighted here will form part of the areas reviewed.

Recommendations of the Chief Executive

1. To review, strengthen and enhance as appropriate all natural heritage objectives of the new County Development Plan particularly those relating to;
 - The protection of buildings of heritage value

Architectural Conservation Areas

With regard to ACAs in general, the existing County Development Plan provides a number of objectives and development standards, in section 16.4.3 and it is intended that the new plan will contain similar provisions. It should also be noted that the Burnaby ACA designation is part of the Greystones-Delgany and Kilcoole Local Area Plan, and is not open for review/amendment through the County Development Plan review process. With regard to the implementation of the objectives of the ACA, the County Development Plan sets the framework/objectives for the ACA, while it is the role of the development management section to implement these objectives. In this regard, each application is assessed on its merits and using the same principles, but different outcomes are of course to be expected given different circumstances.

Recommendations of the Chief Executive

To carry out a review of the existing Record of Protected Structures and add/remove/amend buildings as appropriate.

(c) Coastal Zone Management

Name	Issue raised
Clodagh O'Brien	- Wicklow should be seeking to develop more coastal pathways for walkers as Wales has done which has immense tourist potential.

Response of Chief Executive

As part of the plan preparation process, it is intended to investigate key amenity walking routes in order that they can be identified on the plan maps and objectives include with respect to same. Coastal pathways will certainly form part of the list examined.

Recommendations of the Chief Executive

To investigate key amenity walking routes in particular those linking established amenity areas and where considered appropriate to identify them on the plan maps and include objectives in the plan with respect to same.

(d) Green Infrastructure

Name	Issue raised
Clodagh O'Brien	- Both the Dargle and Glencullen valleys in Enniskerry should be designated Special Areas of Amenity/Conservation and protected for future generations with a focus on the use for recreation and as greenways.
Joan Campbell	- Opportunity for development of greenway along Three Trouts Stream in Greystones to the sea.

Response of Chief Executive

The County Development Plan has no role in the designation of special areas of conservation, which is a function of the DoE / NPWS. It is within the Council's power however to designate Special Areas of Amenity (SAAOs). The Dargle Glen is identified in the current County Development Plan as an area to be considered for a future SAAO. This will be reviewed, along with the proposals with respect to the Glencullen Valley as part of the plan review process, taking into account the experience gained during the course of the current plan where a proposed SAAO for the Great and Little Sugarloaf Mountains was not approved by the members.

Topic 11: Level 5 towns

Any submissions relating to the position of these towns in the settlement hierarchy or the target population for any town, are already dealt with in this report under the heading 'Vision and Core Strategy'. Similarly, issues relating to the position of these towns in the 'retail hierarchy' are dealt with under the heading 'Retail'. All other issues raised that are local and specific to the town only are set out hereunder.

(a) Ashford

Name	Issues raised
Padraig O'Duill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strong growth will be experienced in the Wicklow town, Rathnew, Ashford and Glenealy area. Growth should be managed so as to ensure that the social mistakes of past are not repeated, e.g. west Dublin area. - Growth from Wicklow town should be directed north towards Miltown. Growth from Rathnew should head west to Miltown. Growth from Ashford should be directed towards Glenealy.
Ashford Studios	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ashford Studios plan to provide further infrastructure in the future to accommodate the demand for use of its studios. There is potential for significant future employment. It is hoped that this growth can be facilitated.

Response of Chief Executive

During the preparation of the Ashford Town Plan careful consideration will be given to the characteristics of all lands in order to determine which lands are most suitable to be zoned for varying uses including active open space over the lifetime of the plan.

With regard to the Film Industry it should be noted that the existing Ashford Town Plan zones c. 10ha of land as part of the plan to consolidate and facilitate the expansion of the Film Industry in this area. It is intended that this plan will be reviewed as part of the new development plan.

Recommendations of Chief Executive

To strengthen and enhance all objectives of the existing Ashford Town Plan as appropriate.

(b) Enniskerry

Name	Issue raised
Noel Barry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The northern development boundary for Enniskerry should be south of Ballyman Road, having regard to proposed housing at Monastery and Country Brook - The existing protected view of the Scalp and the Scalp Valley from the Ballyman Road should be retain in the new plan
Bluetone Properties Ltd.	<p>This submission is from the development company that owns a substantial portion of land at Kilgarron / Parknasillogue, designated as AA1 in the current Local Area Plan. It is indicated that a proposal for the lands is currently being prepared for submission to the Local Authority for approval.</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Despite its designation as a small growth town under the current Enniskerry LAP, the town has experienced relatively little development over the plan period. In this regard there is adequate capacity for the town to support additional housing and development over the next plan period. The continued designation of zoned lands within the town to be developed in accordance with an AAP will ensure the planned, co-ordinated and phased development of further residential development in tandem with appropriate associated infrastructure over the next plan period. - Since the 2009 LAP a new primary school has been developed in Enniskerry. The Department of Education does not foresee the need for a further primary school in the town. This should be considered in light of the requirement set out in the current Kilgarron AAP for 1.2ha to be provided for St.Mary's and St. Gerard's national school.
Eamonn Coleman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enniskerry should be maintained as a compact settlement using vacant land opportunities for development – in support of Strategic Goal 3, 4 and 5 - The policy adopted in the previous local area plan to zone lands primarily on the outskirts of the town runs counter to the strategic goals. - New town plan should build on the uniquely attractive urban fabric and develop improved pedestrian permeability by providing new routes and links and as much as possible develop high quality new buildings including residential development in the central area, rather than at the periphery , e.g. AA1, AA2, AA4 lands.
Mark Colley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The future development and population growth of Enniskerry seems to be very rarely taken from an overall perspective. Rather specific subjects are viewed in isolation and decisions taken which may not be the correct decisions / direction. The whole of Enniskerry is in a rather unique position in relation to the historic nature of the village, the largest tourist location in Leinster (Powerscourt) and the jumping off point for hundreds of thousands of tourists both national and international to the greater Wicklow area. - Has the plan considered the hundreds of thousands of visitors to the village and area for the purposes of walking, cycling, hiking and recreation of various other varieties including horse riding - Throwing additional traffic into an already congested village will cause huge health and safety issues as the local and indeed tourist traffic both vehicular and pedestrian continues to grow each year. - The village and surrounds need to be treated almost as a national heritage site, the flora , fauna , monuments and existing historical buildings need to be protected from over urbanisation or the village will lose the character which attracts so many visitors each year .

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sporadic development in the area needs to be controlled and quickly, whether one of houses or mini-medium, quick win, estates do little to enhance the touristic attractiveness of the area and detract from the numerous areas of outstanding natural beauty and amenity in the area - The key to developing Enniskerry is not in building more houses to increase the population but is to develop tourist amenities in the area such that access to the area is improved (feeder links from the Dart and Luas), car parks for additional visitor parking (which is a serious issue in the village), bicycle racks for cyclists, a tourist information centre, renovation of the historic shop fronts and in particular renovation of the many stone walls (which have fallen into disrepair) which border all roads into the village and also development of the many pedestrian walks in and around Enniskerry as an amenity to be enjoyed by the existing and future visitors - Improving access to the village, amenities in the village and the physical attractiveness of the area will increase hugely the number of visitors to the area and to the whole North Wicklow area as a result from an amenity perspective.
<p>Rose Mary Craig</p>	<p>This is a very long and detailed submission, and most of it is reproduced here in the interests of completeness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current vision needs to recognise as significant that Enniskerry is a historic heritage village with considerable current and future tourism potential. - Enniskerry-Powerscourt has major potential for development. Enniskerry with its bus link to Dublin is a major entry point to Wicklow. Unfortunately until now there has been little linked up planning between the village and Powerscourt estate to jointly manage problems generated by increased traffic and draining by the estate of tourism revenues from the village. Joint planning could be perhaps be incentivised by the opening of discussions on possible walking /cycling routes through the estate from the village. This would have some quid pro quo for the village and the estate, which would also benefit from increased tourist numbers who are not car or bus based. Joint financial incentives would help this process. - Enniskerry is a major destination for walkers and cyclists for whom no safe pathways or walking routes out of the village to the mountains currently exist. Instead they are forced onto narrow roads with no footpaths which is dangerous and a deterrent to development of tourism. Safe walking paths and cycle tracks are needed into the Glencree and Glencullen valleys. In particular the stunning rock gorges along the Dargle should be opened up for walkers and rights-of-way brought back into more general use. The road (now closed off) that runs all the way alongside the river from the N11 to the Powerscourt Waterfall could also be a major walking and cycle access up from Bray. - The landscape around Enniskerry should be recognised as a landscape of outstanding natural beauty, in particular the Dargle and Glencullen rivers which should be both designated Special Conservation areas along their full length and protected for future generations. The focus should be on preserving natural areas, habitats, use for recreation and as greenways (currently only the Knocksink reserve provides any protection to the Glencullen river near Enniskerry). - Enniskerry should not be forced to grow beyond its natural boundaries and historic curtilage to the detriment of the quality of life of its residents, natural beauties of the area and tourism potential. Further expansion can only be on hillsides leading to further erosion, flooding and

	<p>detrimental impact on the quality of life. Therefore it would be appropriate to ensure the pace of growth takes account of these realities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased employment in recent years has been provided by expanded village retail sector, cafes, Powerscourt estate and hotel and two golf clubs in the area. Further expansion can be expected if tourism potential further developed - The retail sector has expanded and improved in Enniskerry and now covers day-to-day shopping needs and some services. The café sector has also increased. There is little need or room for further expansion as Bray is so near and also easily accessible for employment opportunities. The new art school is also a welcome addition generating visitor interest and local shoppers. - Currently Enniskerry appears to be adequately provided with sports fields and community structures; there are three buildings for community use in the village. A children's playground would be a welcome addition. - The public realm in Enniskerry is certainly deficient. For too long the village, crisscrossed by several roads, has been at the mercy of motorists, and in recent years, heavy traffic, lorries and buses, to the Powerscourt estate. Only minimal traffic calming measures have been installed and residents remain at danger from speeding cars and bicycles down the hills. Several studies have been carried out but no schemes are yet in place to give the village back to the pedestrian and help develop its full potential as an agreeable shopping/ cafe experience for residents and visitors. Historic shop-fronts need to be protected, and empty protected structures actively monitored for deterioration - More needs to be done to protect Enniskerry's built and natural heritage. Currently there are dangers posed by a major development under consideration by Wicklow County Council on a AA4 designated site along the Cookstown Road overlooking the Dargle River which poses a direct threat to the Dargle valley and views of the Sugarloaf. There should be a review of the current AA4 designated zones which are impacting on historic landscapes, particularly those on the Powerscourt Estate side of the village overlooking the Dargle river valley. Currently an application for an urban development on this sensitive site is being considered which, if granted, will further erode the loss of this stunning landscape which has been well protected up to now. - Enniskerry faces a dilemma in trying to attract more car-based tourism due to lack of parking which will always be limited by its geographic situation. Therefore more attention must be paid to walkers and cyclists which are currently the main groups that bring revenues to the village.
<p>Julia Strickland</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ideal location for development is at lower altitude in valleys so that views to and from higher ground are not lost or blighted. It allows people to 'look up' to nature from the town. The Eagle Valley houses built on the skyline looming over Enniskerry badly affected the approach into the village. - People using public roads should be able to see 'distance' rather than having land completely 'blocked off' for estate development. Houses should not be built too close to the existing public roads leaving room for nature strips, cycle paths and safe footpaths. There should be occasional sight lines from the main roads through the new estates ideally across green areas. This will prevent a feeling of exclusion to the public, preventing 'stealing' of views for the few living in the estate from the public at large and a feeling of being hemmed in by developments and suburbia. - Although Ireland is behind other countries in this regard it is essential we

	<p>provide for attractive new routes as part of new development permissions granted. Even if the footpath doesn't join up immediately we should plan for the future when the adjoining private land becomes available. For example if a path was planned for from Kilmolin (on the Glenree Rd from Enniskerry across farm land zoned AA1 for development) to Knocksink wood, then we would have the makings of a spectacular circular walking route (from Enniskerry village up to Kilmolin and back down through Knocksink to the village) and perhaps even join up with the Wicklow way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current views in the county plan are 1) from the Summerhill House Hotel, 2) from the lands at Monastery House, 3) from Cookstown Rd to Sugarloaf. These benefit a few people. The view from Kilmolin/Parknasilogogue north east towards the sea and Carrickgollogan should be included as a view to be protected as it benefits many more of the public including tour buses and cyclists. The County plan should consider what is of maximum value to everyone, not just a few lobbyists. - It is planned to incorporate 210 residential units plus school and businesses and pitches/courts/playgrounds on 16.25 hectares in Enniskerry but the only required green space will be the 'existing' GAA pitch on this land. This means all amenity space planned is for use by children and is largely concrete/asphalt there is no public park / natural area required. Please plan your amenity space to be more inclusive and to provide quality of life for all sections of society, not just children.
Sean McGiollapadraig	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enniskerry Village is already well served with housing, particularly one-offs in all directions in the hills around. The village does not have the infrastructure to cater for more traffic, water supply and treatment, and sewerage treatment. - It is unique in being relatively unspoilt and has been preserved from overdevelopment. It is a lovely place to visit, stay in, walk from, eat and/or drink in, and photograph.
Clodagh O'Brien	This submission was prepared in conjunction with Mary Rose Craig (above) and addresses all of the same issues.
Patricia Walker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enniskerry has the potential to support mixed employment from local craft and outdoor pursuit to highly skilled small scale web-based enterprises. Maintaining Enniskerry character as a gateway village with easy access to the airport (via the M50) is key to this. Any land development, for shops, services and facilities must be pursued very cautiously in order not to jeopardise the town's character - To attract more tourism to the village, the role of the town can be marketed as unique upland location a short way from Dublin, accessible by public transport. All planning applications could be rigorously examined and tested against this benchmark of adding to the attraction of the town i.e. architectural concerns, materials used, aspect etc.

Response of Chief Executive

Plan zonings and boundary

The issues relating to zonings are not relevant at this stage of the plan making stage. The existing local plan boundary will be reviewed as part of the overall review of the plan. However, given that the core strategy has identified that there is a slight shortfall in the amount of zoned land required to meet the population target, unzoned land within the existing plan boundary and land contiguous to the existing boundary will be evaluated to determine if it is optimal for zoning. With respect to Ballyman Road in particular, this evaluation will include an assessment of impacts of new development on existing views and prospects and the desire to maintain as compact a settlement as possible, and limiting further extension into undeveloped areas.

Enniskerry plan format and vision

It is important to note that it is intended to integrate the current Enniskerry Local Area Plan 2009-2016 into the Wicklow County Development Plan (CDP) 2016-2022 as a 'town plan' which is considered to be more suited to its size and place in the settlement hierarchy. The issues raised regarding the vision of the Enniskerry Plan are noted. The existing plan provides a vision for the village and it is intended that as part of this review process, the vision shall be reviewed and updated.

Tourism in Enniskerry

The issues raised in relation to the tourism development potential in Enniskerry with Powerscourt, recreational outdoor activities and the historic heritage potential are noted; the existing County Development Plan and Local Area Plan for Enniskerry provides a land use framework that facilitates the development of appropriate tourism projects and infrastructure in the town and the surrounding area subject to proper planning and sustainable development. It is not the role of the County Development Plan to provide a strategy for tourism in a specific town / area or within the County. The County Development Plan is not a 'tourism' plan – it is a 'land use' plan. The tourism strategy for the County is provided by both the tourism agencies at work in the County, such as Failte Ireland, Wicklow County Tourism and Bray Tourism and the Economic Development Division of the Council, for example through the forthcoming Local Economic and Community Plan. The role of the County Development Plan is to underpin the land use and development aspects on any strategies / objectives that these bodies adopt for the County and the plan is unequivocal in its support for tourism projects, subject to best practice and protection of the environment.

Walking / cycling routes for tourists

It is acknowledged that there is potential for the development of walking / cycling routes for tourists in and around Enniskerry. The Development Plan fully supports such projects with section 9.3 providing objectives to facilitate the development of tourism projects in the County subject to best practice, proper planning and protection of the environment. The provision of cycling and walking routes is further supported in section 11.3 of the existing County Development Plan with objectives for cycling and walking infrastructure and section 17.8 with objectives for recreation use of natural resources. It is also an objective of the existing Enniskerry plan that Action Area 4 shall be developed with *an amenity zone shall be established along the full southern and western boundaries of the action area, which shall comprise an amenity walk area along the existing tree lined field boundaries connecting through the development to regional road R760 (Enniskerry – Kilmacanogue) and to the existing pedestrian route along the Dargle*. The actual provision of walking and cycling routes is a matter for the landowner/developer or by the Local Authority at public locations and it is a matter for the annual budget process and for the investment priorities for any area drawn up by Local Municipal District and the Transportation and Roads Section. Wicklow Tourism also plays a main role in promoting walking/cycling /hiking routes throughout the County.

Infrastructure in Enniskerry

In the crafting of the updated plan for Enniskerry, existing objectives with regard to traffic management, local roads, footpaths, cycle lanes, public realm and car parking etc will be reviewed and improved if necessary. The role of a land use plan is to put in place a framework for future development, while the delivery of such improvements is an operational and budgetary matter.

Housing in Enniskerry

The issues raised in relation to not permitting large scale housing estates and the heritage character of Enniskerry are noted. The existing County Development Plan and Local Area Plan for Enniskerry provides a number of objectives and development standards with respect to residential development and it is intended that as part of this review process and drafting of a new Town Plan for Enniskerry, these provisions shall be reviewed and updated where required.

Listed Views

It is intended that the existing schedule of listed views within the County Development Plan, including those highlighted here, will be reviewed and updated as deemed appropriate.

Community Facilities in Enniskerry

As part of the review process for the Enniskerry Plan the issue of community facilities, including the provision of a playground, in the area will be addressed through appropriate zonings and objectives. It is not the role of the County Development Plan to deliver social/community/open space projects in the County. These issues would be more a matter for the forthcoming Local Economic and Community Plan, as well as the annual budgetary process, and the issue raised will be brought to the attention of the LECP team. The new development plan and its objectives will take into consideration the LECP.

Schools in Enniskerry

During the preparation of the previous Enniskerry LAP, it was drawn to the Council's attention that St. Mary's and St. Gerard's national school was suffering severe overcrowding, with portacabins being utilised for classrooms, which were taking up the limited open play area. In light of the targeted population expansion provided in that plan, the option of either extending this school or relocating it were provided for in the plan, both which could be accommodated by lands in AA1. It is considered reasonable to maintain such a provision.

Retail in Enniskerry

Enniskerry is a Hinterland Area Tier 2, Level 4 Local Centre/Small Town in the Retail Hierarchy. Small Towns are considered to perform the equivalent role within the Hinterland as Neighbourhood centres perform in the Metropolitan Area, which typically comprise a parade of convenience stores, the occasional lower order comparison outlet and limited local services, primarily served by a 'walk-in' population and will have limited parking. The existing retail provision in the town will be reviewed in light of Enniskerry's retail function and the policy and objectives updated where necessary.

Space needed for all sectors of community in Enniskerry

The issue of the need for community facilities to be provided for all sectors of society, e.g. the elderly as well as the youth is noted. The existing County Development Plan provides a number of objectives and development standards with respect to general community facilities, and it is intended that as part of this review process, these provisions shall be reviewed

Heritage in Enniskerry

The existing County Development designates the entire core area of Enniskerry as an Architectural Conservation Area which, alongside the list of protected buildings in the area, aims to provide protection to the character of the area. The extent of the ACA and the list of protected structures will be reviewed during the development of a town plan for Enniskerry. Chapter 10 section 10.6 contains a number of objectives specifically relating to shop front design. The review of the Enniskerry Plan shall enhance and strengthen these existing objectives were deemed necessary in Enniskerry.

Landscape and designation of sites

With regard to protection of the landscape and designating certain areas in Enniskerry, these points are noted; however, the designation of new sites is the responsibility of the Department of the Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht and the National Parks and Wildlife Service and is not a matter for the planning authority. The existing Landscape Character Assessment, contained in the current County Development Plan will be reviewed and improved as necessary as part of the plan review process. The locations highlighted here will form part of the areas reviewed.

Employment in Enniskerry

The issues raised with the existing employment in the town centre and the potential in the town to support mixed employment from local craft and outdoor pursuit to highly skilled small scale web-based enterprises are noted. The County Development Plan and existing local plan provides a land use framework for the development of employment in the settlement subject to proper planning and sustainable development. It is intended that as part of this review process, these provisions shall be reviewed and updated where required. These issues would be more a matter for the forthcoming Local Economic and Community Plan, and the issue raised will be brought to the attention of the LECP team. The new development plan and its objectives will take into consideration the LECP.

Development principles for new plan

A number of points are raised with regard to maintaining the town as a compact settlement, build on the uniquely attractive urban fabric, control sporadic development, density of development, building lines, control development on the periphery, use of vacant land/sites and the design of new development. Sections 5.4, 6.3, 6.4 and 10.6 of the current County Development Plan contain a number of objectives specifically relating to design of housing and village centre shop front design. These sections and their objectives shall be reviewed and updated where necessary. With regard to Enniskerry specifically, the town centre is a designated architectural conservation area, with objectives in the plan detailing the design of new development in the town centre area, the plan also includes residential development objectives regarding the use of vacant sites and the design of new and infill development. The review of the plan shall enhance and strengthen the existing objectives with regard to design of development where deemed necessary.

Recommendations of Chief Executive

1. Review and update where appropriate the vision for the Enniskerry plan.
2. To strengthen and enhance as appropriate all objectives of the existing Enniskerry Town Plan, particularly those relating to; heritage including views and landscape, retail, residential development, employment, traffic and transportation and community development.

	<p>hydrological connections a whole river catchment or a groundwater aquifer may need to be included. Similarly where bird flight paths are involved the impact may be on an SPA more than 15 km away.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policies to increase employment, tourism and recreation in Wicklow must be screened for their impact on the environment. 2. Natura Sites which are under particular threat (especially if development or recreational pressure builds up again) are: Ballymaan Glen SAC (000713) – water pollution, Knocksink Wood SAC (000725) – recreational pressure and anti-social behaviour, Buckroneys Fen SAC (000729) – water abstraction and groundwater issues, Kilcoole/Newcastle (The Murrrough SAC 0002249+SPA) – airport usage/expansion, recreational pressure, development of coastal walks, coastal defences for railway 3. Community Development (Open Spaces) Dog owners need to exercise their dogs and with 1 in 3 homes having at least one dog that is a considerable amount in Wicklow. There is considerable disturbance to SPA, SAC and Nature reserves near urban areas. Nature reserves such as Knocksink in Enniskerry and paths around Poulaphuca SPA are not suitable for dogs off leads. Dog owners need to be considered within the plan along with their impacts on local biodiversity. Recreational areas need to be developed where dog owners can walk their dogs and leave them off the lead without fear of harm to their dogs, members of the public and local wildlife. 	<p>consulted as part of the SEA Scoping process and told that submissions on AA issues will be taken into account. It is noted that impacts may occur in excess of 15km away from source.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.All Plan policies will be assessed by the SEA and AA. 2.These potential pressures are noted and will be identified in the SEA and AA documents. 3.Potential disturbance to designated sites as a result of recreation will be noted in the SEA and AA documents.
v		
No. 9	<p>Department of Communications, Energy and Natural Resources</p> <p>An audit of the Geological heritage of County Wicklow will be available from the GSI early 2015.</p>	<p>This document will be considered by the SEA when it is published. Sites of Geological Heritage are within the scope of the SEA.</p>
a	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The challenge of meeting potentially conflicting aspects of the current Plan's Vision is identified. 2. Challenges facing Wicklow's tourism and recreational package include protection of the natural and built environment of the county. 3. The Department identifies that until the risk of hazards identified in a Health & Safety Audit are reduced or eliminated, the Avoca mining area is unsafe for access by the public. 4. Environmental issues are identified at Avoca mines (mines are contaminated with heavy metals and arsenic that pose a risk to human health and environmental receptors through various pathways, potential for slab slides, failures and rock fall). 5. To achieve the SEA aim 'to provide a high level of protection to the environment' along with consideration of the untapped potential of Avoca mines and built heritage, it is important that the spoil piles/mine waste is made safe and as such the designation of this 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. When prepared, the new Draft Plan provisions will be assessed by the SEA and AA. More detailed Plan policies and objectives (into which environmental considerations will be integrated through the SEA and AA processes) will help to overcome this challenge. 2. Noted. See response above. 3. This issue will be identified in the SEA Environmental Report and integrated into SEA recommendations for insertion into the Plan.
b		

	2006		2022		Growth in Housing Units
	Population	Housing Units	Population	Housing Units	
Large Villages	3,135	1,220	4,635	2,150	930
Small Villages	1,059	412	1,809	839	427
Rural clusters	980	381	1,280	594	213
Open countryside	30,328	11,800	35,278	16,364	4,564
Rural Total	35,502	13,814	43,002	19,947	4,858

TABLE 1: EXISTING RURAL GROWTH DISTRIBUTION (2010 COUNTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN)

Assumptions:

- Growth in 'large villages' by 500 persons every intercensal period
i.e. development and occupation of c. 200 units, or 40 per annum, across 13 villages or 3 per village per annum
- Growth in 'small villages' by 250 persons every intercensal period
i.e. development and occupation of c. 100 units, or 20 per annum, across 19 villages or 1 per village per annum
- Growth in 'rural clusters' by 100 persons every intercensal period
i.e. development and occupation of c. 40 units, or 8 per annum, across 34 clusters or 1 per cluster every 5 years
- Growth in 'open countryside' by 1,650 persons every intercensal period
i.e. development and occupation of c. 660 units, or 130 per annum

Therefore, were the RPG allocation and distribution objectives to be rigidly adhered to, of the 9,549 units available to be allocated around the County outside of the metropolitan area and growth towns, just over 50% would require to be allocated to the rural area. This left a remainder of 4,691 units to be distributed across 15 remaining towns in the County.

Step 3

Consideration was then given to the distribution of these **4,691 units** across the 15 remaining towns. The first step was to consider the existing population and housing growth targets for these towns as provided for in the existing County Development Plan (2004-2010) and the Local Area Plans / Town Plans that had been adopted on foot of the 2004 County Development Plan targets :

Town	2006 population	2016 population targets (set out in 2004 CDP)	Growth
Ashford	1,494	3,000	1,506
Aughrim	960	2,000	1,040
Baltinglass	1,735	2,500	765
Carneu	892	1,500	608
Enniskerry	1,881	2,450	569
Kilcoole	3,252	4,500	1,248
Rathdrum	1,528	4,500	2,972
Tinahely	965	1,000	35
Avoca	622	700	78
Donard	182	240	58
Dunlavin	897	2,000	1,103
Kilmacanogue	839	934	95
Newcastle	938	1,500	562
Roundwood	571	700	129
Shillelagh	311	600	289
Total	17,067	28,124	11,057

TABLE 2: 2016 SMALL AND RURAL TOWN POPULATION TARGETS AS PER 2004 CDP

It was evident therefore that strict adherence to RPG requirements would require a significant reduction in the population and housing targets in this group of settlements (reduction by 6,366 units or 58%). This was also be coupled with a longer timeframe (up to 2022 instead of 2016) to achieve these reduced targets.

This was considered counter intuitive and contrary to the principle of sustainable planning, whereby development in established towns, where there are existing services, would be encouraged. Development in such town also plays an important role in encouraging those that desire an alternative lifestyle to 'urban' living (i.e. cities / large towns) to build / live in a smaller town and not push to develop in the rural area.

Therefore it was determined that alternative methodologies for population distribution must be considered, all the time having regard to the requirements of the RPGs.

Step 4

The total 2022 population available to be distributed to all 21 towns (including growth towns) had already been determined at 133,798 persons (i.e. total 2022 County population allocation of 176,800 less 43,002 natural rural growth).

This total population target was then considered for distribution across the 21 towns of the County, taking into account, if feasible, the requirements of the RPGs. The 2006 population of these 21 towns was 90,694 persons. Therefore total growth to be distributed – 43,104 persons.

The first stage was to determine if this level of growth could be reconciled with existing population targets for each town. The previous 2004 County Development Plan provided population targets **up to 2016 only** upon which Local Area Plans were adopted and land zoned in the majority of these towns.

Town	2006 population	2016 population targets	Growth
Bray	28,814	35,000	6,186
Wicklow / Rathnew	11,919	22,500	10,581
Arklow	11,759	21,000	9,241
Greystones/ Delgany	14,569	22,000	7,431
Blessington	4,018	6,500	2,482
Newtown	2,548	6,000	3,452
Ashford	1,494	3,000	1,506
Aughrim	960	2,000	1,040
Baltinglass	1,735	2,500	765
Carnew	892	1,500	608
Enniskerry	1,881	2,450	569
Kilcoole	3,252	4,500	1,248
Rathdrum	1,528	4,500	2,972
Tinahely	965	1,000	35
Avoca	622	700	78
Donard	182	240	58
Dunlavin	897	2,000	1,103
Kilmacanogue	839	934	95
Newcastle	938	1,500	562
Roundwood	571	700	129
Shillelagh	311	600	289
Total	90,694	141,124	50,430

TABLE 3: 2016 TOWN POPULATION TARGETS AS PER 2004 CDP

Clearly even the 2016 population targets for the towns exceeded the new 2022 population allocations from the 2010 Regional Planning Guidelines for the Greater Dublin

Area, by a factor of c. 17%. This problem would be compounded when additional growth between 2016 and 2022 was added.

In order to address this conflict, the option of reducing all or certain town population targets was considered. Again, this seemed counter intuitive and a waste of significant resources that had been spent on improving infrastructure in these towns on the basis of these 2016 population targets.

This also presented political difficulties, with elected representatives being fearful that any lowering of population targets would reduce the 'standing' of any town and the ability of that town to attract new employment development and funding for community projects.

Furthermore, it was determined that it was appropriate and generally consistent with the spirit of the RPGs to allow for an extra 'factor' in the growth of the towns. This factor was called '**headroom between towns**' and was considered to reflect the fact that some towns would be able to reach their population targets, while some would not (because of infrastructural deficiencies, or just a slower pace of development).

It was considered that the total growth in the towns, even if **in theory** was allowed to exceed 43,104 persons by 2022, would highly unlikely to do so, and the populations would be monitored on an ongoing basis to ensure that the overall total growth of 43,104 was not exceeded before 2022.

Final adopted population distribution of the 2010 County Development Plan:

Settlement type	Settlement	1996	2002	2006	2011	2016	2022
Metropolitan Consolidation	Bray	25,760	28,002	28,814	30,000	40,000	45,000
Large Growth Town 1	Wicklow / Rathnew	8,727	10,776	11,919	14,000	19,000	24,000
Large Growth Town 2	Arklow	8,557	9,993	11,759	13,000	19,000	23,000
	Greystones/ Delgany	11,296	11,913	14,569	16,000	21,000	24,000
Moderate Growth Town	Blessington	1,860	2,509	4,018	4,500	6,000	7,500
	Newtown	2,528	2,521	2,548	3,500	6,000	7,500
Small Growth Towns	Ashford	1,215	1,356	1,494	1,600	2,500	3,000
	Aughrim	745	871	960	1,200	1,500	2,000
	Baltinglass	1,127	1,260	1,735	2,000	3,000	3,500
	Carnew	795	809	892	1,200	1,500	2,000
	Enniskerry	1,275	1,904	1,881	2,000	2,500	3,000
	Kilcoole	2,694	2,826	3,252	3,750	4,500	5,000
	Rathdrum	1,234	1,387	1,528	2,000	3,000	5,000
	Tinahely	630	692	965	1,050	1,250	1,550
Rural Towns	Avoca	490	564	622	700	800	900
	Donard	162	201	182	200	300	400
	Dunlavin	693	914	897	1,000	2,000	2,500
	Kilmacanogue	818	834	839	915	1,000	1,100
	Newcastle	763	851	938	1,000	1,500	1,750
	Roundwood	446	518	571	700	1,100	1,300
	Shillelagh	324	278	311	450	600	750
Total town population		72,139	80,979	90,694	99,850	138,050	164,750
Headroom between towns						12%	23%
Large villages				3,135	3,635	4,135	4,635
Small villages				1,059	1,309	1,559	1,809
Rural clusters				980	1,080	1,180	1,280
Open countryside				30,328	31,978	33,628	35,278
Total rural				35,502	38,002	40,502	43,002
County total		102,683	114,676	126,196	138,691	164,280	176,800

TABLE 4: ADOPTED POPULATION DISTRIBUTION OF THE 2010 COUNTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Designation	Town	2011	2022	2025	2028
Consolidation Town	Bray	29,339	36,237	38,119	40,000
Large Growth Town I	Wicklow / Rathnew	13,468	20,283	22,141	24,000
Large Growth Town II	Arklow	13,066	19,494	21,247	23,000
Large Growth Town II	Greystones/ Delgany	17,208	21,603	22,801	24,000
Moderate Growth Town	Blessington	4,780	6,540	7,020	7,500
Moderate Growth Town	Newtown	3,073	4,967	5,483	6,000
Small Growth Town	Ashford	1,484	2,675	3,000	3,250
Small Growth Town	Aughrim	1,315	1,758	1,879	2,000
Small Growth Town	Baltinglass	1,786	2,572	2,786	3,000
Small Growth Town	Carnew	1,145	1,698	1,849	2,000
Small Growth Town	Dunlavin	793	2,134	2,500	2,750
Small Growth Town	Enniskerry	1,940	2,302	2,401	2,500
Small Growth Town	Kilcoole	4,063	4,669	4,835	5,000
Small Growth Town	Rathdrum	1,638	2,843	3,171	3,500
Small Growth Town	Tinahely	956	1,308	1,404	1,500
Small Growth Town	Avoca	717	835	868	900
Rural Town	Donard	179	257	279	300
Rural Town	Kilmacanogue	799	897	923	950
Rural Town	Newcastle	817	1,065	1,132	1,200
Rural Town	Roundwood	780	1,052	1,126	1,200
Rural Town	Shillelagh	426	571	610	650
Urban total		99,772	135,761	145,576	155,200
Compensatory headroom			15%	15%	15%
	Large Villages	3,438	3,802	3,901	4,000
	Small Villages	1,087	1,354	1,427	1,500
	Rural clusters	1,009	1,133	1,166	1,200
	Open countryside	31,334	33,376	33,933	34,490
Rural Total		36,868	39,665	40,427	41,190
County total		136,640	158,000	167,000	176,000

TABLE 5: RECOMMENDED POPULATION DISTRIBUTION FOR THE 2016-2022 COUNTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

4.0 Housing

These are the housing unit targets for the plan period and up to 2028 based on the population recommendations above:

Year	2011	2022	2025	2028
Population	136,640	158,000	167,000	176,000
Housing Stock (existing)	54,351			
Housing Stock (required)		69,822	77,328	85,589
Increase (from 2011)		+15,471	+22,977	+31,238

TABLE 6: COUNTY WICKLOW HOUSING TARGETS 2011-2028

5.0 Evaluation

While the proposed new 2028 population target is compatible with the existing 2022 target from the RPGs of 176,000, the 'housing stock' target differs slightly due to an assumption being made about household size – it is assumed that household size will continue to fall following current trends. The RPGs in 2010 allowed for a total housing stock in Wicklow of 82,012 units in 2022 to meet this 176,800 population target – this is proposed to be increased to 85,589 for 2028.

To reach this target, it will be necessary to delivery an annual average housing completion rate of 1,838 units per annum 2011-2028.

APPENDIX 4
LIST OF SUBMISSIONS

Group 1: Elected Representatives

No.	Surname	Forename	Page
1	Ferris	Anne	33
2	Lawless	Nicola	46
3	Matthews	Steven	50
4	McLoughlin	Grainne	54
5	Mitchell	Derek	55
6	Whitmore	Jennifer	57

Group 2: Prescribed bodies

No.	Name	Representative	Page
7	An Taisce	Tomas Bradley	63
8	Dept of Arts, Heritage & Gaeltachta	Michael Murphy	70
9	Dept of Communications, Energy & Natural Resources	Mary Brady	72
10	Dept of Education & Skills	Lorraine Brennan	74
11	Eirgrid	Gael Gibson	75
12	EPA	Cian O'Mahony	77
13	Faillte Ireland	Paddy Matthews	79
14	Fisheries Ireland	Greta Hannigan	80
15	IAA	Deirdre Forrest	85
16	Irish Water	John Casey	86
17	Meath County Council	Patrick Gallagher	88
18	NRA	Michael McCormack	89
19	SERA	Stephen Blair	94
92	National Transport Authority	Hugh Creegan	102

Group 3: Public groups

No.	Group name	Representative	Page
20	Age Friendly Ireland	Pat Doherty	106
21	Bray Head Residents Association	Clare O'Connor	107
22	Delgany Community Council	T.W. Scott Golden	108
23	Disability Action Greystones Together	Catherine Dollard	110
24	Enniskerry Forum	Kieran Conlon	111
25	Glendalough & District Devt Association		113
26	Greystones Tidy Towns	John Harrington	113
27	Irish Heart Foundation	Cliona Loughnane	114
28	Keep Ireland Open	Roger Garland	117
29	Roundwood & District Community Council	Monica Byrne	138