



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Record of Meeting ABP-301473-18

|   |  |                          |                 |
|---|--|--------------------------|-----------------|
| <b>Case Reference / Description</b>                         | 250 no. apartment units, crèche and all associated site works. Site comprising of the former residential properties of 'Tinagel', 'Auburn', Keelogues', 'Villa Nova' and 'Arda Lodge', Golf Lane, Glenamuck Road, Carrickmines, Dublin 18. |                          |                 |
| <b>Case Type</b>  | Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request   |                          |                 |
| <b>1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting</b> | 1 <sup>st</sup> Meeting  |                          |                 |
| <b>Date:</b>  | 29 <sup>th</sup> May, 2018   | <b>Start Time</b>        | 11.00 am        |
| <b>Location</b>   | Offices of An Bord Pleanála  | <b>End Time</b>          | 12.40 pm        |
| <b>Chairperson</b>  | Tom Rabbette   | <b>Executive Officer</b> | Cora Cunningham |

### Representing An Bord Pleanála:

|  |
|--|
| Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning |
| Una Crosse, Senior Planning Inspector        |
| Cora Cunningham, Executive Officer           |

### Representing Prospective Applicant:

|   |
|---|
| Trevor Sadler, McGill Planning Limited      |
| Igmar Ferreira, Ferreira Architects         |
| Willem Jacobs, Ferreira Architects          |
| Celia Harris, Mitchell Landscape Architects |
| Nick Fenner, DBFL Engineers                 |
| Kevin Sturgeon, DBFL Engineers              |
| Aidan Gallagher, Applicant                  |

### Representing Planning Authority

|   |
|---|
| Michelle Costello, Senior Executive Planner |
| Rebecca Greene, Executive Planner           |
| Bernard Egan, Senior Executive Engineer     |

|   |
|---|
| Elaine Carroll, Executive Engineer      |
| Claire Casey, Senior Executive Engineer |

## **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 17<sup>th</sup> May, 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 23<sup>rd</sup> April, 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. Height strategy for the site in context of inter alia, strategic location and key national policy including the National Planning Framework and Sustainable Urban Housing; Design Standards for New Apartments – March 2018**
- 2. Design and Finishes**
- 3. Traffic Impact, Access and Sustainable Parking**
- 4. Pedestrian/Cycle Connectivity & Legibility**
- 5. Residential Amenity**
- 6. Surface Water Management and Flooding**
- 7. Any other matters**

**1. Height strategy for the site in context of inter alia, strategic location and key national policy including the National Planning Framework and Sustainable Urban Housing; Design Standards for New Apartments – March 2018**

**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Consideration of taller/landmark building for the site
- Comments in PA Opinion regarding lack of variety in height and massing

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Previous proposal for the site incorporated landmark/taller element
- Constrained by building height strategy in Development Plan
- Submission made to PA regarding building heights for the site in relation to public consultation for proposed Ballyogan LAP
- Previous proposal outlined had greater number of units when taller elements proposed
- Noise attenuation previously proposed on Block E

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Proposed site comes within area of Ballyogan LAP, with higher buildings considered as part of LAP process
- Draft LAP possibly ready by end of summer, leaving site currently constrained by height strategy in the County Development Plan

**Further ABP comments:**

- Justification for a taller/landmark building could be provided with an application with high quality finishes particularly relevant if considering higher building
- Inclusion of Life Cycle Report in application

**2. Design and Finishes**

**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Need for high quality of designs and finishes

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Outline of proposed finishes provided including rationale for use of stone

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Comments in PA Opinion relating to design and finishes and noise attenuation measures proposed for Block E
- More variety of finishes required in order to create way finding, sense of place within the scheme
- Provision of vertical emphasis for design features on Block E

**Further ABP comments:**

- Question use of render in context of maintenance

### **3. Traffic Impact, Access and Sustainable Parking**

#### **ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- NTA submission regarding pedestrian crossing and potential impact on road network
- TII concerns regarding M50
- Delivery of Kiltiernan Link Road
- Sustainable parking measures including number of spaces, car sharing, electric cars

#### **Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Pedestrian/cycle connections proposed to Luas
- Disagree with some of the issues raised in TII submission including extent of modelling required
- Have used Cherrywood SDZ road layout as part of proposed development and included in drawings
- Will address treatment of reservation in application documents

#### **Planning Authority's comments:**

- Travel plan to outline alternative transport modes so as not to automatically rely on M50, problems will always remain on M50 even without this development
- Shortfall in parking proposed
- Space required near crèche for bus access and taxi
- Current situation regarding Kiltiernan Link Road outlined with no confirmed delivery date for Kiltiernan Link Road, Cherrywood SDZ may escalate delivery
- Concern over treatment of future road reservation along front of site

#### **Further ABP comments:**

- Have regard to TII and NTA submissions
- Sustainable parking measures to be outlined with reference to recent Apartment Guidelines
- Treatment of reservation area for Kiltiernan Link Road
- Proposals for pedestrian proposal across Glenamuck Road

### **4. Pedestrian/Cycle Connectivity & Legibility**

#### **ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Compliance with DMURS and Urban Design Manual in context of connections from/to and within site

#### **Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Constraints due to site topography outlined
- Provision of bridge and greenway to north of site
- Access through site facilitated on shared surfaces
- Will address area around Block B in respect of through route

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Proposals for pedestrian link across Glenamuck Road in current application across road
- Permeable pedestrian/cycle link required from Glenamuck Road to Golf Lane required
- Area around Block B may need to be redesigned

**5. Residential Amenity****ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Daylight/sunlight in vicinity of Block D
- adjacencies to adjoining properties

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Open spaces will have appropriate sunlight and daylight provision
- Single house with extant permission on adjacent site, balconies overlooking this can be removed

**Further ABP comments:**

- Application drawings to clearly outline adjacencies to adjoining properties
- All reports in relation to residential amenity to be cross-referenced

**6. Surface Water Management and Flooding****ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Use of soil type in assessment and impact on proposed discharge rates
- Extent of flood plain on proposed and current application site across Glenamuck Road

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Soil type chosen to provide conservative estimate but can be reviewed
- Flood risk assessment based on detailed topographical survey for adjoining area and subject site with flow modelling carried out on stream with extent of flood plain proposed reasoned

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Use of soil type for calculations
- More cautious approach regarding linear discharge
- Concerns regarding extent of flood plain in respect of flood plain shown in adjoining development

**Further ABP comments:**

- Application documentation should have regard to PA Opinion in relation to drainage with further consultation advised
- Address where relevant considerations outlined in Flood Risk Assessment for proposed development on adjacent site

## 7. Any other matters

### ABP comments:

- Size, use and opening hours of crèche with justification required
- Pre-application documents have been sent to National Monuments Services for comment, any response will be appended to ABP Opinion
- Address uses and access to residential amenity area
- Address phasing in relation to when each block will be completed

### Planning Authority's comments:

- Address issues raised in Biodiversity submission (circulated at meeting)
- Consideration of surface water management measures in phasing of proposal
- Address noise/vibration if rock breaking is required
- Provide usable quality open space
- Consider provision of community room
- Site specific construction management plan required
- Part V delivery if phasing proposed

### Prospective Applicant's comments:

- Justification to be provided for crèche which is proposed for use of residents only
- Proposed development not intended for build to rent
- Proposed building entire development without phasing over 5-year permission

## 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](mailto: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](mailto:spatialplanning@water.ie)

---

Tom Rabbette  
Assistant Director of Planning  
June, 2018