



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-301097-18

Case Reference / Description	Demolition of the non-original fabric of Chesterfield House (a protected structure) and derelict sheds. Construction of 217 no. houses, resident's amenity facility and all associated works. Chesterfield, Cross Avenue, Blackrock, Co. Dublin.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
1st/2nd/3rd Meeting	1 st Meeting		
Date:	11 th April, 2018	Start Time	2.30 pm
Location	An Bord Pleanála Offices	End Time	4.40 pm
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Cora Cunningham

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Lorraine Dockery, Senior Planning Inspector
Cora Cunningham, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Jude Byrne, Cairn Homes
Aidan McLernon, Cairn Homes
Emma Flanagan, Cairn Homes
Daibhí MacDomhnaill, Cairn Homes
Paula Galvin, McCutcheon Halley Planning Consultants
Robert McCauley, MDO Architects
Emmet McNamara, MDO Architects
Bill Hastings, Arc Consulting
John Considine, Barrett Mahony Consulting Engineers
Kevin Fitzpatrick, KF Landscape Architects

Representing Planning Authority

Liam Walsh, A/Senior Planner
Stephen McDermott, A/Senior Executive Planner
Julie Craig, A/Conservation Officer
Mick Mangan, Senior Engineer
Dermot Fennel, Executive Engineer
Bernard Egan, Senior Executive Engineer
Marin Danciu, Executive Engineer
Aidan Conroy, Administrative Officer
Aidan French, Executive Planner
Darragh Holohan, Executive Planner

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 29th March, 2018 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 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 7th March, 2018 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. Architectural Heritage
2. Development strategy for the site to include layout, connectivity, Part V proposals, childcare facility
3. Infrastructural Matters- drainage
4. Any other matters

1. Architectural Heritage

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Demolition of Chesterfield House and the retention of the original drawing room, which is a protected structure
- Significance of drawing room and its context
- Summer house, no details submitted in pre-application consultation request

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Most of the house, apart from drawing room and some other elements, was demolished in 1970's, certain items including shutters were reused in the remodelled house
- Original house built in 1810, plasterwork in drawing room is original, fireplace used in the 1970s room come from original house
- Considered encasing drawing room in glazed box, not viable
- Apartments or retention of house also considered however there are issues with floor levels (4 different floor levels in the house)
- Retaining house would include removal of staircase and re-ordering of rooms in the house
- Gateway is original along with part of driveway
- Summer house to be retained as caretaker building, will clarify proposals in application

Planning Authority's comments:

- PA preference to retain the drawing room and upgrade original house and not to develop area to the north of house
- Further discussions needed to develop house
- Promote keeping older buildings in proposed development
- House should have its own amenity space

ABP Comments:

- Two divergent opinions noted, applicant advised to submit justification irrespective of what strategy is adopted
- If house is to be demolished, need for methodology statement including demolition and construction plans and details
- Correspondence from DAU to be submitted with application
- Details of proposed use and works to summer house to be included in application, together with details relating to interface between private gardens and public realm

2. Development strategy for the site to include layout, connectivity, Part V proposals, childcare facility

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on layout including height, scale density:

- How the proposed development will interact with what is existing on and adjacent to the site in terms of height, scale and density

- Rationale/justification for proposed layout should be submitted at application stage
- Address any possible/perceived impacts on amenity of adjoining properties at application stage
- Separation distances between Blocks 7 and 8, concern relating to amenity for future occupants- daylight/sunlight/overlooking

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Layout, which provides for individual blocks, allows for views through the site and also allows for the light to permeate through
- Permeable open design
- In terms of open space provision, tree removal in centre of site where open space is proposed, removal of trees due to condition/safety reasons- Tree Survey has been carried out
- Some proposed sewers being re-routed in relation to retention of certain trees
- In terms of Blocks 7 and 8, aim to maximise light and air into kitchen/dining areas

Planning Authority's comments:

- General agreement except for 7th floor as height is above the PA strategy
- Initial concern relating to height, prospective applicant has now stepped away upper floors from boundaries
- Trees provide screening, standard in development plan regarding retention of trees in proximity to buildings, further discussions needed to finalise
- Address issues raised in PA Opinion
- Concern over Blocks 7 and 8 having regard to County Development Plan (separation distances)

ABP comments:

- Extant permission on site for 90 units, however 2006 permission noted
- Site located within 'Residual Suburban Area not included in Cumulative Area of Control'- height to be addressed with regard to inter alia County Development Plan and national policy
- Additional photomontages, cross-sections, small scale model to be included in application
- Photomontages taken in summer months, consider including same for winter months
- Conflict in drawings received with pre-application, ensure no conflict in those submitted with application

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on connectivity:

- Allowance for possible connectivity to adjoining development

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Positive engagement regarding boundaries, 3rd parties not agreeable with proposals in relation to possible connectivity
- Amenable to deliver gate between properties, if required

Planning Authority's comments:

- Issues raised in section 247 meetings, connections suggested
- Consideration of emergency access at southern end of site to be used for evacuation only

ABP Comments:

- Application drawings should indicate possible/future connections to adjoining developments

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on Part V:

- In particular, the issues raised in PA Opinion
- Further discussions required in order to reach agreement

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Block 6 had been proposed for Part V during section 247 meetings, consideration now given to 10% of proposed units
- All building will be externally finished to the same specification

Planning Authority's comments:

- Indicative costs exceed PA costs threshold
- Further discussions required in order to reduce costs

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on childcare:

- No childcare facility proposed for development- need to submit justification for same at application stage

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Applicant has constructed similar developments and not provided childcare facilities, queries need/demand
- Had regard to viability in proposed development

Planning Authority's comments:

- There should be some provision in the proposed development
- Justification in application regarding childcare, include report to show where other childcare facilities are located and capacity in relation to the proposed development site

3. Infrastructural Matters – drainage

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Issues raised in PA Opinion
- Use of pond in centre of proposed development and water feature in central apartment area- flooding
- Site drainage
- Impacts of proposal beyond boundary sites

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Discussions with Irish Water confirm that surface water connections cannot be made to combined sewer
- Have looked at interception drainage and will investigate further
- Pond designed into landscape in 18th Century, dries out in summer months, included in SuDS strategy
- Water table is below the levels assessed, water not visible over winter months

Planning Authority's comments:

- Address issues raised in PA Opinion
- Attenuation issues from waters moving across site
- Consider interception drainage

ABP Comments:

- Agreement to be reached with PA relating to drainage issues prior to lodging planning application
- Identify ground water levels and underground streams, if any, and identify/clarify where pond water is coming from

- Consider possibility as to whether drainage works off site need to be included in application. If so, letters of consent would be required at application stage

4. Any other matters

ABP comments:

- Legible contour drawings to be submitted
- Residential Quality Audit to refer to new Apartment Guidelines (2018)
- Layout to be DMURS compliant
- Discussions required between the PA and prospective applicant regarding Bat Survey
- Prospective applicant to include response received from NPWS
- Safety issues relating to pond

Prospective Applicant's comments:

- Nearest surface water sewer is on Mount Merrion Avenue
- Development not visible from many vantage points in the surrounding area

Planning Authority's comments:

- Address transportation issues raised in PA Opinion
- In other applications, drainage works off site have been included in red line boundary at application stage

Conclusions

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
April, 2018