



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Record of Meeting ABP-301680-18

<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	354 no. residential units (347 no. apartments and 7 no. houses), crèche, café and all associated site works. Griffith Avenue, Marino, Dublin 9.		
<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>	2 <sup>nd</sup> July, 2018	<b>Start Time</b>	11:00
<b>Location</b>	Offices of ABP	<b>End Time</b>	13:30
<b>Chairperson</b>	Tom Rabbette	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Lianna Slowey

### Representing An Bord Pleanála:

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

### Representing Prospective Applicant:

Aidan McLernon, Cairn Homes
Daibhi McDomhnaill, Cairn Homes
Jude Byrne, Cairn Homes
John Gannon, TPA Planning Consultants
Derbhile McDonagh, OMP Architects
Mariya Petrova, ARUP Consulting Engineers
Tony Lynch, ARUP Consulting Engineers
Luke Byrne, Dermot Foley Landscape Architects

### Representing Planning Authority

Mary Conway, Deputy City Planner: Planning and Property Development Department
Carol Smyth, Assistant Planner: Planning and Property Development Department

Edel Kelly, Senior Executive Planner: Environment and Transportation Department
Gareth Hyland, Traffic Planning: Environment and Transportation Department
Maria Treacy, Executive Engineer: Environment and Transportation Department

### **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 18<sup>th</sup> June, 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 23<sup>rd</sup> May, 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.

Please note the order of the agenda as circulated changed as matters were discussed during the meeting. The following record is reflective of these changes.

### **Agenda**

1. Griffith Avenue – Tree line and building line.
2. Building Height – City Development Plan, emerging national policy and Architectural Heritage.
3. Residential Amenity – Standards, apartment block separation distances, daylight/sunlight and overshadowing.
4. Management of community amenity spaces.
5. Traffic Impact Assessment – Access arrangements and junction design.
6. Water Services – third party consents and/or statutory consents?
7. Car Parking and Bike Parking – Quantum.
8. Any other matters

## **1. Griffith Avenue – Tree line and building line.**

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

- Design proposal re. tree line.
- Rationale behind building line.

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

- It is proposed to retain the double tree line along Griffith Avenue.
- It is proposed to remove 2 trees (1 young London plane and 1 lime tree) to allow for entrance.
- It is also proposed to remove a third tree line within the site boundary as these trees are not in good condition and to plant a similar tree line as outlined in the submitted landscaping plan.
- Boundary wall has deep foundations, trial pits were dug and no tree roots from Griffith Avenue were found within the site.
- This is a transitional site between the existing institutional and residential building lines along Griffith Avenue.
- The building line of the previous permission on site was more forward, it was decided to pull this back in line with the existing residential building line.
- Set back distance of 11.5m allows a deep threshold for landscaping.
- The proposed development does not front directly on to Griffith Avenue, it will sit behind and will be camouflaged by the existing trees.
- Orientation of building form/fingers works well for proposed apartment scheme, allows for views through and across the site.

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

- Accept the principle of removal of trees from the site, information should be provided re. the quality of trees and replacement proposals.
- Had regard to the previous permission and precedent re. building line.
- Consider the building form and setback to be satisfactory.
- Visual impact assessment should accompany the application.

### **ABP comments re. application stage:**

- Robust architectural and urban design rationale re. building line to be submitted with application.

## **2. Building Height – City Development Plan, emerging national policy and Architectural Heritage.**

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

- Dublin City Development Plan – 16m height threshold at this location.
- Emerging national policy re. high density.
- Architectural heritage of the area – Marino Institute of Education (MIE) and adjoining Architectural Conservation Area.

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- The proposed site is a good fit for high density – Z12 zoning, vacant/underutilised site located 4km from city centre, within walking distance of Quality Bus Corridor.
- 16m height threshold mitigates against achieving high density on this site.
- Emerging national policy (National Planning Framework and 2018 apartment guidelines) mention that high proportion of apartments should be located within inner urban areas.
- Satisfied able to deliver high density on site without impacting on existing residential amenity.
- Design is cognisant of the existing heights in the area, both institutional and 2 storey housing.
- Propose to locate 2 storey houses adjacent to existing 2 storey houses along site boundary. Height will transition to 5, 6 and 7 storeys towards MIE and will drop to 4 storeys to meet the existing school along Griffith Avenue.
- Terracing of gardens is proposed as site slopes upwards towards MIE.
- More photomontages towards MIE are proposed, as requested by DCC in their opinion report.

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Dublin City Development Plan cap on height at 16m.
- Acknowledge this is a large site and has potential to allow for additional height, acknowledge urban design rationale for higher density and acknowledge suitable location.
- Greater comfort needed re. visual impact on Griffith Avenue and MIE.
- Tallest building proposed on site would be taller than ridge height of MIE, would like to see additional photomontages/visual impact assessment.
- Concern re. ground floor units and shadow/sunlight analysis.

**ABP comments re. application stage:**

- Robust design rationale re. height to be submitted with application.
- If a material contravention re. height is proposed then this must be stated in the public notices and a statement re. material contravention should be submitted as part of the application.

**3. Residential Amenity – Standards, apartment block separation distances, daylight/sunlight and overshadowing.****ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Private amenity space, semi open space and how narrow strips of open space at margins of the site are proposed to function.
- Residential amenity for future occupants – ground floor units' access to daylight/sunlight.
- Narrow separation space between blocks 3 and 5 – design rationale.

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Daylight/sunlight analysis has been prepared – public open space fully compliant with BRE requirements, no overshadowing of adjoining lands.
- 98.3% of units within the proposed development are fully compliant with BRE requirements, approx. 5 units are marginally below and will be resolved.
- 50% of the proposed apartment units are dual aspect.
- Private amenity areas such as terraces exceed the guidance standards.
- 2m defensive buffer including a clipped hedge will act as the interface between private terrace at ground floor level and communal open space
- Shared garden space with paths through to bike parks under podium levels.
- Minimal traffic is envisioned through core of the site.
- Blocks 3 and 5 – windows are proposed along elevation orientated to the south, opaque/obscure glazing can be used along the opposite northern elevation to allow light into units at this location.
- Queried how to delineate communal and public open space at application stage.
- Intend to maintain pedestrian gateway along Griffith Avenue.
- Proposed footpath along boundary of site will be for maintenance purposes only.
- The road and services underneath were considered for taking in charge by DCC.
- Proposed open space is not considered as suitable for being taken in charge and will be managed as part of the development's management company.
- Propose to remove the boundary wall/railing to allow for public access to the open space which is envisioned will act as a neighbourhood park.

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Greater clarity is needed re. blocks 3 and 5 in terms of how these units relate to each other, 10m separation distance is too tight. Demonstrate sufficient privacy for units.
- Suggest the use of visual clues for members of the public re. where they can or cannot access.
- Imperative that the open space is publically accessible, not necessarily to be taken in charge.

**ABP comments re. application stage:**

- Apartment guidelines – show the additional from standard requirements.
- Submit a drawing to illustrate areas to be taken in charge, if any.
- Submit a building lifecycle report identifying the different spaces and how they will be managed, management costs, etc.

**4. Management of community amenity spaces.****ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Proposed concierge and residential amenity.

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Residents are using the facility in other schemes operated by Cairn Homes.
- Costs are included in annual service fee.

- Queried if central spine road linking Griffith Avenue to public amenity of MIE should be taken in charge.

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- If the road is intended to be taken in charge it needs to be designed to DCC standards in terms of materials and maintenance.

**ABP comments re. application stage:**

- Outline how management of concierge facility will work, ties into building lifecycle report.

**5. Traffic Impact Assessment – Access arrangements and junction design.**

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

- Road permitted from Griffith Avenue to MIE lands, construction started and form in place, details re. proposed junction with MIE lands.
- What importance is placed on new junction - main access to MIE campus?

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- The design of the junction at Griffith Avenue was included in the previously permitted application but the design of the junction with MIE lands was not.
- It is proposed to decant access to MIE lands from existing Charlemont entrance through the proposed development.
- Contractually obliged to deliver road on prospective applicant's lands, MIE to have right of way over the road.
- Should any alteration re. signalisation, bus stop, etc. be required this can be accommodated.
- Traffic flows were based on the previously permitted application and the traffic figures through existing Charlemont entrance to MIE.
- Dublin City Development Plan policy to minimise trip generation at this location.
- Typically, less traffic is associated with apartment schemes than housing, will reassess traffic rates and junction to allow for more traffic movements.
- Capacity at junction with Griffith Avenue is 30%, capacity to accommodate additional traffic, if required.
- Will liaise further with DCC Transportation Department.
- Queried if red line boundary should include proposed road works/services.

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Need to understand what is happening on the local road network to ensure best traffic flow. Make best use of existing services, i.e. public transport, pedestrian permeability. Suggest the use of modal split traffic model.
- Consider traffic impact given the scale of development, the number of units proposed is triple the number previously granted on site.
- Consider whether pedestrian crossings are required along the spine road to facilitate access to proposed crèche and MIE campus.
- Queried if SHD process allows for further pre-planning discussions with prospective applicant.

- A transport assessment should be submitted with the application.
- Red line boundary – provide sufficient level of detail to inform the public of any proposed changes to the public road.
- Will require further discussions with Works Department within DCC.

**ABP comments re. application stage:**

- A more site specific transport assessment is required, encourage further pre-planning discussions between DCC and prospective applicant.
- Strongly advise as much agreement as possible is 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.
- Inclusion of works within the red line to be negotiated between the prospective applicant and DCC, ensure any necessary consents are in place from the Planning Authority before an application is submitted.
- Appropriate red line boundary should include works required for purposes of serving the scheme, letter of consent appropriate for informing the public.

**6. Water Services – third party consents and/or statutory consents?**

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

- Proposed works to pipes under public road towards Malahide Road.

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Currently there is a combined pipe for storm water and foul water – Irish Water would like these to be split, prospective applicant will deliver these works.
- Proposed works included in red line boundary in the interest of public transparency.
- Extensive area of pipes to be laid along Griffith Avenue towards Malahide Road, a management plan is to be put in place and the proposed works could be carried out during school holidays to minimise disruption.
- Relevant engineer was unable to attend meeting, design team will revert with matters discussed and ensure matters area addressed at application stage.

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- DCC asked for a solution re. separation of storm water for the proposed development site and are satisfied with the proposal.
- A road opening licence could facilitate these works.
- A letter of consent was given to prospective applicant for clarity.

**ABP comments re. application stage:**

- Ensure any necessary consents are in place from the Planning Authority before an application is submitted.
- Prospective applicant needs to be aware if any separate consent process is involved re. Irish Water capital works. An SHD application may be considered premature if any required infrastructural works rely on a separate consent process.

## **7. Car Parking and Bike Parking – Quantum.**

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

- Transport assessment and approach having regard to location of the site within Area 3 of Dublin City Development Plan and recommendation of apartment guidelines re. reduction of car parking spaces.

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

- Site is located 4km from city centre, the proposed scheme is orientated towards use of public transport/sustainable transport.
- Car storage as a residential amenity is market driven, residents may not use their cars every day but may require a place to store their cars.
- Car parking proposals are less than guidance standards.
- Provision of bike parking is close to the apartment guidelines standards.
- Volume of bike storage to encourage bike use.
- Quality Bus Corridor – access to a number of bus routes.
- The road will transition through the proposed open space towards MIE lands, 3 character areas are proposed within the open space.
- Have not proposed footpaths along the spine road but have proposed footpaths through the open space which are divorced from the road.
- Envision the road as a campus road or a road within a park as opposed to a park around a road, reluctant to separate road with footpaths or railings as this would over dominate the space.

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

- Car storage is an issue, there is a market for car parking spaces.
- Would welcome seeing a reduction in the car parking proposal, consider car clubs/management of car parking spaces.
- Consider the receiving environment and capacity for overspill.
- Submit a mobility management plan with the application.
- Concerns remain re. road through public open space – demonstrate the nature, character and layout of the road vis-a-vis the public open space.
- Need to consider desire lines through to MIE campus, how will people move up and cross over the road, demonstrate through landscape strategy how pedestrians will move through it.
- Provision of bike parking – Dublin City Development Plan standards provide for more spaces than those in the apartment guidelines, demonstrate that DCC's bike parking standards can be met, should it be required.

### **ABP comments re. application stage:**

- Consider provision of charging points for electrical vehicles.
- Overall rationale re. car parking provision to be submitted with application.
- Demonstrate access road treatments at application stage.
- Submit a DMURS compliance statement with the application.
- Provide rationale at application stage if proposed bike parking provision does not meet the provisions of development plan/national guidance.



## 8. Any Other Matters

### ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Whether road and/or open space is to be taken in charge?
- Adjoining house along Griffith Avenue, any jarring at end?

### Planning Authority's response:

- Proposed open space is complicated by the road, less inclined to take in charge.

### Prospective Applicant's response:

- Competing demands re. road and open space.
- Adjoining gate lodge at Griffith Avenue pushes forward of the whole street, vacant site behind the house is zoned for development.

### ABP comments re. application stage:

- Layout of road to be agreed as much as possible with DCC.
- Works to be agreed with roads authority in advance of the application.
- Clearly outline what is to be taken in charge, if applicable.
- Surface water requirements, ensure as much agreement as possible in place between the prospective applicant with DCC and/or Irish Water.

### ABP invited parties to raise any outstanding matters.

### Prospective Applicant's comments:

- Site boundary adjoins a school, have met with school officials and no concerns raised from DCC during pre-application discussions.
- 10m separation distance between proposed development and school.
- It is proposed that bedrooms and not living spaces will overlook the school building and yard.
- Will submit documentation to address potential/perceived impacts on the school at application stage.

### ABP comments re. application stage:

- Submit information re. any impacts on the existing school with the application.

## 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](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

*TR* July, 2018