



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-301477-18

Case Reference / Description	305 no. apartment units in 2 no. blocks ranging from 3-8 storeys, provision of a crèche, gym and all associated site works. Lands at Palmerstown Retail Park, Kennelsfort Road Lower, Palmerstown, Dublin 20.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
1st/2nd/3rd Meeting	1 st Meeting		
Date:	25 th May, 2018	Start Time	
Location	Offices of ABP	End Time	
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Lianna Slowey

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Stephen Rhys Thomas, Planning Inspector
Lianna Slowey, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Mary McGrath, Randleswood Holdings Ltd
PJ McGrath, Randleswood Holdings Ltd
John Downey, Downey Planning
Eva Bridgeman, Downey Planning
Justin Halpin, Downey Planning & Architecture
Zubi Efobi, Downey Planning & Architecture
Mary Kennedy, AECOM Consulting Engineers
Michael Dunne, AECOM Consulting Engineers
Jane McCorkell, Jane McCorkell Landscape Architects

Representing Planning Authority

Siobhán Duff, Senior Executive Planner
--

Eugenia Thompson, Area Planner

Introduction

The representatives of An Bord Pleanála (ABP) welcomed the prospective applicant and Planning Authority (PA), 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 17th 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 opinion.
- 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 24th April, 2018 formally requesting pre-application consultations with ABP. 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. Digital recording of the meeting is prohibited.

Agenda

1. Residential Amenity – Standards, noise, daylight/sunlight and overshadowing.
2. Development Plan – Zoning Objectives, height and mixed-use development.
3. Pedestrian/cycle permeability and public realm.
4. Traffic - Junction Design.
5. Open Space - Roof Gardens – Access and Surveillance.
6. Building finishes – quality and durability.
7. Any other matters

1. Residential Amenity – Standards, noise, daylight/sunlight and overshadowing.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Context of the residential amenity and design treatment for future occupants and consequences on the receiving environment.
- Potential noise impacts and proposed mitigation for balconies along the N4 road.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Proposed development comprises 2 apartment blocks with 11% open space.
- Pedestrian permeability through the back of the scheme to adjacent foodstore.
- Independent shadow analysis report submitted re. impact on adjacent properties, including No. 15 Kennelsfort Road.
- Projecting balconies are proposed with glazing/a sliding track of glass doors as noise mitigation for balconies along the N4.
- Site coverage is 34%, this allows for a lot of light penetration.
- Full analysis of light penetration will be submitted at application stage.
- It is proposed to step up the tall, narrow apartment block from adjacent 2 storey residence to 6-8 storeys.
- No windows are proposed to overlook No. 15 Kennelsfort Road; architectural cladding is proposed on this elevation.
- If 6 storey element is removed it would result in the loss of 5 units.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Overlooking and overshadowing of existing houses to be addressed, particularly those to the north of the site and No. 15 Kennelsfort Road.
- Overbearing impact on adjacent 2 storey residences in terms of visual aspect on streetscape and street context.
- A more vertical treatment should be considered for apartment block at prominent corner.
- Concern re. 6 storeys proposed in close proximity to No. 15 Kennelsfort Road, a sensitive transition is required having regard to streetscape and overbearing.
- Suggest that translucent glass be used on elevation overlooking No. 15 Kennelsfort Road to allow for more light to enter these units.
- Objective in the Development Plan that building height on this site should not exceed 2-3 storeys. This is an elected members point in response to local views on height in the area following a previous grant of permission.
- Have regard to noise impacts at locations of gym and crèche, consider levels of insulation and possible noise complaints.

ABP comments re. application stage:

- Have regard to 'Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities' and provide strong argument at application stage.
- Daylight/sunlight analysis should address the impact on the site itself as well as off site.

- Provide details of the ongoing use and management of buildings, outline management of community room, etc.

2. Development Plan – Zoning Objectives, height and mixed-use development.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Material contravention of Development Plan re. height.
- Context of village centre zoning and the proposed residential development.
- Relationship between the proposed development site and site to northwest.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Public consultation meeting held in March 2018 attended by over 300 people.
- Traffic impacts were discussed; the proposed height was not necessarily a major issue.
- Oversupply of retail in this area, the retail aspect of village is in decline due to low footfall. The proposed residential development seeks to reinvigorate the existing retail facilities.
- A detailed social infrastructure audit will accompany the application.
- Change of use from gym to retail to be sought on the site to the northwest of the proposed development, which has a right of way onto Lucan Road, will look into permeability between the two sites.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Objective re. height was brought in by elected members in response to residents' views in relation to a previously granted application on site. The objective may not stand up against emerging national guidance on height.
- Reinforcing existing retail with increased residential population is a suitable approach for this area.
- Full pedestrian and cyclist permeability to the village is critical.

ABP comments re. application stage:

- Make clear and robust argument re. land use zoning at application stage.
- Include details of any current/future proposals for adjacent lands within the prospective applicant's ownership.

3. Pedestrian/cycle permeability and public realm.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- How the scheme addresses the street at the location of proposed gym and crèche, opportunity to create plaza onto street.
- Long site with all permeability appearing to come from one side.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Public realm strategy is outlined in the submitted documentation, acknowledge potential to create plaza onto street.

- Good bank of vegetation proposed along the N4 to dampen traffic noise.
- Trees to act as transition from buildings down to human scale.
- Outlined pedestrian route through the site.
- Main courtyard area envisioned to be the centre outdoor space for social interaction with more biodiversity encouraged towards the back of the site.
- Drop off area for crèche is beside the proposed facility, all other vehicular traffic will continue to the underground basement car park.
- It is proposed to allow for pedestrian and cyclist permeability through the site, these routes will be outlined at application stage.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Permeability through the site towards the village is key to the proposed scheme.

4. Traffic - Junction Design.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Development Plan maps indicate a junction improvement objective.
- Car parking standards and provision.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- A left in, right in, left out entrance was agreed in principle with the Roads Department.
- Proposing a left out only arrangement with signage and a splitter island.
- Pedestrian crossing located 10m from proposed entrance.
- No detailed discussions with PA re. car parking provision.
- Proposed development located within zone 2 – lower car parking requirement given the proximity to public transport.
- Car ownership may be high but car use will be low given the close proximity to QBC.
- This proposal does not preclude any further grade separation proposals at the junction with the old N4.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Roads Department's preference is to enter the site one way and leave the site one way, onto the Old Lucan Road.
- Allow for the opening up of access from the rear gardens of adjacent residences.
- The junction improvement objective is currently shelved.

ABP comments re. application stage:

- Strongly advise as much agreement as possible be in place in relation to technical matters (e.g. roads/drainage, etc.) between the prospective applicant and Planning Authority before the application is lodged. Outline position and reasoning if no agreement is reached.
- Ensure any necessary consents are in place with the PA/adjoining landowners before an application is submitted.

5. Open Space - Roof Gardens – Access and Surveillance.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Open space provision and how it is set out.
- Management/maintenance of proposed roof gardens.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The proposed development meets the PA's requirements for open space provision and is in close proximity to other areas of active and passive open space.
- Roof gardens will be more heavily managed to ensure viability and will be maintained by horticultural staff.
- Roof gardens will require a fob for access and CCTV will be in place.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Broadly happy with the open space proposal.
- Maintenance issues with roof gardens as they can become redundant over time.

ABP comments re. application stage:

- Outline management of roof gardens at application stage.

6. Building finishes – quality and durability.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Design proposal of materials given the proposed development's prominence along a main road and tying into the village centre.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Sustainability and low maintenance key in choice of materials.
- High quality finishes are proposed, predominantly brick with aluminium and stone cladding.
- Conscious of materials and finishes that will stand the test of time and the Irish weather.

ABP comments re. application stage:

- Consider the streetscape and possible overlooking, have regard to long-term maintenance of buildings and materials.
- Provide a Building Life Cycle Report, as per recent apartment guidelines.

7. Any Other Matters

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Potential impacts on Casement Aerodrome given the height of the proposed development.
- Liffey Valley Special Amenity Area Order (SAAO) referred to by PA.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Suggest engagement with Casement Aerodrome and Weston Aerodrome, tend to require a condition re. height of cranes above 45m.
- Liffey Valley SAAO visual impact assessment currently being undertaken.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Will consult with Irish Aviation Authority and Dublin Airport Authority before an application is lodged.

ABP invited parties to raise any outstanding matters.

Prospective Applicant's comments:

- Welcome the feedback and will take on board comments, particularly re. entrance and streetscape.
- Ongoing discussions with PA and Irish Water re. drainage.
- Ongoing discussions with Roads Department.
- Wind query in PA report, arose in initial pre-planning discussions, this proposal does not lend itself to wind tunnel effect.
- New guidance/policy from Department re. height could be delayed up to 6 months due to SEA.

Planning Authority's comments:

- No further issues/comments.

ABP comments re. application stage:

- Have regard to influence of hills and other buildings, as necessary, in terms of wind and comfort at street/ground level. Important to be clear in any wind study.
- Ensure there is no conflict between architectural, engineering and landscaping drawings.

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
June, 2018