



Case Reference / Description	162 no. residential units (42 no. houses, 120 no. apartments/ duplexes), a crèche and a community room. Charlestown Place and St. Margaret's Road, Charlestown, Dublin 11.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
1st/2nd/3rd Meeting	1 st Meeting		
Date:	9 th January 2018	Start Time	14:30
Location	Office of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	15.50
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Lianna Slowey

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Sarah Moran, Senior Planning Inspector
Lianna Slowey, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Michael Bailey, Bovale Developments Unlimited
Yvonne Bailey, Bovale Developments Unlimited
Ray Ryan, BMA Planning
John Murphy, BMA Planning
Shane Walsh, McCrossan O'Rourke Manning Architects
Louise Heavin, McCrossan O'Rourke Manning Architects
Paul Moran, Pat O'Gorman Consulting Engineers
Ronan MacDiarmada, Ronan MacDiarmada Landscape Architects

Representing Planning Authority

Patricia Cadogan, Senior Executive Planner
Niall Thornton, Executive Engineer, Transportation

Apologies

Peter Byrne, Senior Planner, Fingal County Council

Introduction

The representatives of An Bord Pleanála (ABP) welcomed the prospective applicant, Planning Authority (PA) and introductions were made. The procedural matters relating to the meeting were as follows:

- The written record will be placed on the pre-application consultation file and will be made public, along with that file, should an application arise following the conclusion of this consultation process.
- ABP received a submission from the PA on 14th December, 2017 providing the records of consultations held pursuant to section 247 and its written opinion of considerations related to proper planning and sustainable development that may have a bearing on ABP's decision.
- The consultation meeting will not involve a merits-based assessment of the proposed development.
- The meeting will focus on key site-specific issues at strategic overview level, and whether the documents submitted may require further consideration and/or amendment in order to constitute a reasonable basis for an application.
- Key considerations will be examined in the context of the statutory development plan for the area and section 28 Ministerial Guidelines where relevant.
- A reminder that neither the holding of a consultation or the forming of an opinion shall prejudice ABP or the PA concerned in relation to any other of their respective functions under the Planning Acts or any other enactments and cannot be relied upon in the formal planning process or in legal proceedings.

The ABP representatives acknowledged the letter dated 20th November, 2017 formally requesting pre-application consultations with ABP. Prospective applicant advised of the need to comply with definition of SHD as set out in the Act of 2016, in relation to thresholds of development. It was also noted that the Inspector dealing with the pre-application consultation request would be different to who would deal with the application when it was submitted. Recording of the meeting is prohibited.

Agenda

1. Principle of development of 'TC' zoned lands in the context of the Charlestown Centre.
2. Building height, density, quantum and standard of residential development.
3. Urban design, open space, public realm, creation of a sense of place and enclosure, interaction with McKelvey AFC and McKelvey Avenue.
4. Access / traffic / parking layout, compliance with DMURS.
5. Potential effects on Natura 2000 sites.
6. Any other matters.

1. Principle of development of 'TC' zoned lands in the context of the Charlestown Centre.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Zoning – no LAP in place.
- Fingal County Development Plan objectives pertaining to Charlestown and Meakstown area – Objectives No. 1 and No. 2 in particular.
- Site history of Charlestown Shopping Centre.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Since the pre-application consultation request was submitted an application for 220 no. apartments was granted at podium site (2B).
- Zoning context – town centre status.
- Zoning follows footprint of the town centre.
- Desire to have more residential units incorporated in phase 2 of Charlestown Shopping Centre development.
- Retail level is adequate in terms of the retail hierarchy.
- Residential use is open for consideration.
- 60:40 mix of residential/retail units over entire Charlestown development lands.
- Lands adjoining proposed development site to the east – possible future extension of overall development, have flagged change of zoning of this site to the PA but no formal discussions have taken place.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Charlestown Shopping Centre is considered a level 3 centre within the County Development Plan.
- Acutely aware that the proposed development site is divided from the shopping centre by a major road.
- Balance to be achieved between the residential and commercial development on site which the proposed development seeks to address.
- The need for the proposed development site's current use as a temporary car park is no longer required as basement car park for the shopping centre has been completed.

2. Building height, density, quantum and standard of residential development.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Overall site layout.
- Anomalies between Housing Quality Assessment and drawings submitted.
- Childcare provision.
- Wayleave on site.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The architectural design rationale was outlined – the significant blocks at the shopping centre are to moderate towards lower level residential units at the

proposed development site's edges adjacent to existing residential area of McKelvey Avenue.

- A corner unit of 7 storeys is proposed to respond to the scale of the shopping centre.
- The scale of the proposal at the rear of the site is in response to the existing residential settlement at McKelvey Avenue.
- It is proposed to transition between buildings of similar heights.
- Attempt to adopt urban form which relates to suburban context.
- Crèche is accessible from within the site and the adjoining street/passing traffic.
- Slight variations in height of units are proposed including 4 storey 'duplex over duplex units' with communal stairs and 3 bed townhouses to address road frontage with duplex units above.
- Duplex units are to be arranged around courtyards with a half flight walk up being proposed in order to balance the transition from the outdoors.
- There is space on site to facilitate car parking spaces for the density proposed.
- If additional building heights were to be considered the associated cost factor re. underground car parking, provision of lift, etc. would make the scheme unviable.
- The proposed development scheme has evolved from lower density to a more family orientated mid density development.
- Landscaping proposal allows for interim space from the street.
- It is proposed to create shared space through material treatments.
- Acknowledged that the proposed development represents a stepdown in scale from existing shopping centre development and appreciates the shopping centre needs a strong urban form to address it.
- Creating open space off the street provides decompressing for residents, opens out residential area onto more friendly environment and provides residential streetscape edge to address retail streetscape of the shopping centre.
- Aware of new draft apartment guidelines.
- Will look at proposed frontage along St. Margaret's Road.
- Good relationship with existing McKelvey Avenue residential community and McKelvey Celtic Football Club who are insistent re. proposed scale having regard to overlooking.
- A 12m wayleave is in place on site to allow for an existing surface water drainage pipe.
- Dual frontage housing is proposed to allow for passive surveillance at the wayleave location. It is possible this area will be incorporated into the adjacent football grounds in future.
- Red line boundary represents the boundary as it is on the ground while the blue line boundary indicates legal boundary.
- An existing dry ditch which is no longer required for the drainage of lands is to be filled in and a boundary wall erected between the proposed development site and McKelvey Avenue.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Layout design has evolved over a series of pre-planning discussions.

- Frontage onto St. Margaret's Road/Charlestown Place and existing tower – try to create a sense of residential community along quite a heavily trafficked road.
- Proposed development is seeking to create a sense of place and urban edge with lower density towards long-established residential area of McKelvey Avenue.
- Corner unit – create something that will address the existing landmark building at Charlestown Place.
- Satisfied overall with the layout of the proposal.
- Semi private open space areas around Charlestown Place, proposal addresses the streetscape/public realm area and residential amenity.
- Keen for access to be maintained to the football club grounds.
- Need to be satisfied there is no in-flow to the drainage ditch.

ABP comments re. application stage:

- Cross section of site should be included to show sense of enclosure with adjacent developments.
- Provide rationale/justification re. setback at St. Margaret's Place.
- Provide rationale/justification re. wayleave on site.
- Strongly advise as much agreement as possible be in place in relation to technical matters (drainage/roads) between the prospective applicant and Planning Authority before the application is lodged. Outline position and reasoning if no agreement is reached.

3. Urban design, open space, public realm, creation of a sense of place and enclosure, interaction with McKelvey AFC and McKelvey Avenue.

- This topic was included in the discussion above in relation to agenda item 2.

4. Access / traffic / parking layout, compliance with DMURS.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Proposed amendments to junction at Charlestown Place.
- Car parking provision relative to the County Development Plan requirements.
- Rationale re. roads and traffic layout.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- There is no displacement of car parking facilities, the existing temporary surface car park was always surplus to requirements.
- Single access point was considered.
- Have made provision to allow for connectivity to adjoining lands.
- Propose to downgrade the existing junction to a lower radii curve. The junction will still be signalised and will be readjusted to traffic lights sequence. Radii comply with DMURS.
- Length of car parking spaces to be addressed, as raised in PA's Opinion report.
- A raised table is proposed along the central spine road at the existing entrance to the football club. A plinth which is visually raised at both sides is proposed as a traffic calming measure.

- Shared surfaces are proposed off the main internal road spines.
- Propose to use different materials at central open areas as a traffic calming measure.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Concern re. parking/set down area at crèche. Ideally, set down area should allow forwards movement. A teardrop shaped arrangement would be preferable.
- The length proposed for car parking spaces is an issue re. encroachment into road space.
- In-curtilage car parking for units mitigates areas to be taken in charge and benefits from overlooking/passive surveillance.
- Areas to be taken in charge need to be clarified.
- Horizontal traffic calming measures are preferable.
- Traffic calming measures should be positioned at 100m intervals.
- If future residential development expands into the adjoining site there may be a need for a second access point.
- 288 no. car parking spaces are proposed. 308 no. car parking spaces are required by County Development Plan standards. Acknowledge location beside shopping centre and access to public transport.

ABP comments re. application stage:

- Provide details of public transport provisions.
- Outline details re. what is to be taken in charge by PA.
- Provide rationale/justification re. car parking provision and County Development Plan standards.

5. Potential effects on Natura 2000 sites.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- No Natura 2000 sites adjacent to the proposed development site.
- Appropriate Assessment Screening Report submitted with pre-application consultation request.
- PA noted in their opinion report that the proposal should be accompanied by a Natura Impact Statement

Prospective Applicant's response:

- PA asked that an ecologist be engaged in relation to a recent planning application, as previously referred to, at podium site (2B).
- Appropriate Assessment Screening Report prepared by Openfield and submitted with pre-application consultation request – no immediate Natura 2000 sites are identified and report concludes that no Natura Impact Statement is required.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Stage 1 Appropriate Assessment Screening Report would be appropriate.

6. Any Other Matters

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Part V proposals

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Will engage further with PA in relation to Part V proposal.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Revert to Housing Department – initial details appear acceptable.

ABP invited parties to raise any outstanding matters.

Prospective Applicant's comments:

- Intention to extend this residential scheme into adjoining lands. Will set out as holistic a scheme as possible at application stage showing clear connections to adjoining lands.
- The proposed central open space area contains attenuation for the shopping centre development across the road. The attenuation/open space area will be managed with only the internal roads proposed to be taken in charge by the PA. Will provide clarification re. size of attenuation at application stage.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Adjacent lands are zoned "GE", housing is not permitted.
- Clarification is sought re. size of attenuation area.

Conclusion

The representatives of ABP emphasised the following:

- There should be no delay in making the planning application once the public notice has been published.
- Sample notices, application form and procedures are available on the ABP website.
- Irish Water would like prospective applicants to contact Irish Water at cdsdesignqa@water.ie **between the Pre-Application Consultation and Application stages**, to confirm details of their proposed development and their proposed design.
- The email address to which applicants should send their **applications** to Irish Water as a prescribed body is spatialplanning@water.ie

Tom Rabbette
Assistant Director of Planning
January, 2017