



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Record of Meeting ABP-302461-18

<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	184 no. residential units (134 no. apartments, 14 no. maisonette units, 36 no. houses) and associated site works. Res 2 site, Development Area 2, Cherrywood Planning Scheme (Plot TC6), Laughanstown, 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>	10 <sup>th</sup> October, 2018	<b>Start Time</b>	14:30 p.m.
<b>Location</b>	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	<b>End Time</b>	16:00 p.m
<b>Chairperson</b>	Rachel Kenny	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Ciaran Hand

### Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Rachel Kenny, Director of Planning
Stephen Rhys Thomas, Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

### Representing Prospective Applicant:

David Murphy – Hines Applicant
Keara Kennedy – BMA Planning
Ray Ryan – BMA Planning
Sebastien O'Mahony – McCrossan O'Rourke Manning Architects
Stephen Manning - McCrossan O'Rourke Manning Architects
Mark Boyle – Murray & Associates Landscape Architects
Gary Lindsay – CS Consulting Engineers
Mary Rose O'Donnell – Virtus Project Management

## Representing Planning Authority

Michele Costello, Senior Executive Planner
Rebecca Greene, Executive Planner
Vivienne Byrne, Senior Planner
John Bowes, Senior Executive Engineer
Tracey Flanagan, Senior Executive Planner
Sarah McCullough, Landscape Project Manager
Rob Fahy, Executive Engineer
Patrice Ryan, 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 27<sup>th</sup> September, 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 31<sup>st</sup> August, 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. **Cherrywood Planning Scheme - building heights, phasing and quantum.**
2. **Public realm - active frontage and building set back.**
3. **Landscape design - refinements.**
4. **Detail design – surface water and street sections.**
5. **Any other matters.**

### 1. **Cherrywood Planning Scheme - building heights, phasing and quantum**

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

- Building heights rationale in the proposed development in the context of the Planning Scheme heights objective
- How does the Bishop Street development link with the overall wider town centre development?
- Is there a material impact of phasing and quantum on the Planning Scheme objectives?

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

- Site has varied typology, which causes many constraints on the site
- Examined that apartments on the hill can overlook the gardens of houses at the end of the hill.
- Proposing a two-sided street which allows a building buffer, so apartments don't overlook the gardens of the houses
- Views from Tully Park are not obstructed
- Phasing is gone beyond phase 1

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

- Typology of the site is difficult
- Site is between the town centre and Tully Park
- Tully Park has views to the sea and Bray head
- 5 storey apartments on the Tully Park side will block views
- If any deviation from the overall SDZ scheme- rationale is required
- Do not want to set a precedent
- Satisfied that the site accords with density and phasing
- Phasing – gone beyond phase 1 and is acceptable
- Infrastructure outside of the scheme falls under TII and NTA – desirable to get submissions from them

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

- A clear rationale required regarding how the scheme does not impact on Tully Park and Bishop Street
- Justify the reasons for building heights chosen and not chosen
- Work on visualising a design response- how the proposed development links with the wider scheme
- Any deviation from the overall SDZ scheme will require a rationale
- Decisions are case specific- not to set a precedent, if an application is made it will be an SHD decision not a SDZ decision

## **2. Public realm - active frontage and building set back**

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

- Details of the active frontage and building set back

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

- Site is RES2
- On Bishop Street there was an examination of own door housing – not possible
- 7 entrances on Bishop Street with pedestrian walkways are proposed
- Street slope would present challenges, with additional entrances requiring significant ramps
- Decision to leave intermediate areas as landscaping as opposed to ramps, as considered a better street/urban design solution
- Hidden car parking was required as part of scheme, and this added further complexity to the provision of additional own door hall doors.
- Further consultation with P.A will take place

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

- Not compliant with Section 2.8 of the scheme – own door access
- Disagree with applicant's arguments, as there should be direct access to units from Bishop Street
- On other applications this objective is being implemented
- In the A3 Drawings provided, it was not possible to measure the access points clearly

### **Further ABP comments:**

- Provide rationale regarding number of entrances, and any reduction in active frontage and design rationale for building set back
- Explain why other alternative access arrangements are not chosen
- Further consultation with P.A to take place

## **3. Landscape design – refinements**

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

- Vents from the underground car parking
- Design of car parking and open space at Tully Park

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

- Different vent types chosen to avoid mechanical ventilation
- Not possible to have all vents designed/operated the same way
- Some street vents are visible – every effort will be made to minimise visual impact
- There are engineering constraints- due to number of square metres of vent space required
- Car parking spaces can be examined with regards to numbers and open spaces
- More discussion to take place with the planning authority regarding vents and car parking in open spaces

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Vents are proposed in open spaces
- Cherrywood is a dense area – could present a risk or hazard in the public realm
- There have been vent strategies conditioned on previous applications
- Number of parking spaces exceeds the requirement – some can be omitted
- More discussion to take place regarding vents, car parking spaces and open spaces

**Further ABP comments:**

- More detail required to avoid undue visibility of vents in relation to the public realm
- More discussion required regarding vents, car parking spaces and open spaces

**4. Detail design – surface water and street sections**

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

- Ensuring that surface water calculations of the proposed applicant are the same as the P.A
- How SUDS is being managed? Details as to how SUDs is managed for each phase of development also required.
- Consistency of approach regarding street sections

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Accepts that a meeting with the P.A is required to ensure that surface water calculations are the same
- Attenuation split into 2 zones due to typology of the site
- Agreed SUDS to be addressed in phasing
- To communicate more with P.A regarding street sections

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Agrees to further discussion on calculations
- Welcomes the SUDS measures and modular storage tanks
- Satisfied with attenuation split into 2 zones and controlled discharge
- More communication required with prospective applicant regarding street sections

**Further ABP comments:**

- Ensure a consistency of approach regarding surface water calculations
- There needs to be consistency with street sections within the SDZ
- Ensure that street sections are as close as possible to what is going out at ground

**5. Any other matters**

**ABP comments:**

- Informed the prospective applicant regarding EIAR and procedures

- Ensure that the public notices clearly detail the proposal in the context of an SHD application in an SDZ

**Prospective Applicant's comments:**

- The vehicular access point to the school on the plans will be removed

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- No access point to a school should be included in proposal

**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)

---

Rachel Kenny  
Director of Planning  
October, 2018