



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-302698-18

Case Reference / Description	299 no. apartments, childcare facility, Café, class, gym, 26 no. car parking spaces and 360 no. bicycle spaces. Daneswell Place, Former Printworks/Smurfit Site, Botanic Road, Glasnevin, Dublin 9.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
1st/2nd/3rd Meeting	1 st Meeting		
Date:	7 th November, 2018	Start Time	2.45 p.m.
Location	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	4.10 p.m.
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Cora Cunningham

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Sarah Moran, Senior Planning Inspector
Cora Cunningham, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Kieran Gannon, Applicant
Fergus Lynch, Applicant
Riette Gora, Architect
Bernard Seymour, Bernard Seymour Architects
Derek Naughton, Bernard Seymour Architects
Shaun Grima, AECOM
Juliet Ryan, Tom Philips & Associates

Representing Planning Authority

Siobhan O'Connor, Senior Executive Planner
Marie Down, Executive Planner
Shane Dineen, 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 26th October 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 1st October, 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. Scale and height of development. Visual impacts. Urban design, public realm, landscaping. Proposed and existing residential amenity**
- 2. Impacts on the adjoining Protected Structure and the Glasnevin Architectural Conservation Area. Archaeological Issues**
- 3. Traffic impacts. Vehicular, pedestrian and cycle connections. Car and cycle parking provision**
- 4. Any other matters**

1. Scale and height of development. Visual impacts. Urban design, public realm, landscaping. Proposed and existing residential amenity

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- PA Opinion relating to design, scale, elevations and development plan policy
- Development plan policy on height
- Details of proposed childcare facility

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Introduction of second brick type into proposed development
- Walled garden included
- Greater details of balconies on 3-D modelling to be provided in planning application
- Orientation of blocks to provide light/views to open space areas
- Landscaping strategy in application to show how areas will work, middle section ramped down compared to sections on either side, consideration on how site may link to adjoining site to north in the future
- Discussions have taken place with Parks Department, PA prefer one open space area for proposed development

Planning Authority's comments:

- Specific height policy for site
- Have regard to PA Opinion and section 247 discussions regarding the inclusion of more variation in the proposed development, scope to improve design of scheme, not many changes to proposed development since section 247 meeting
- Comply with minimum standards but provide good quality development
- Concerns over fragmented nature of open space

Further ABP comments:

- Robust argument to be made in planning application if height is to be exceeded
- Have regard to ground landscaping and wind impacts in relation to overall development, provision of good quality of light, address single aspects
- Basement parking being higher at certain levels, provide rationale regarding parking provided
- Comply with apartment standards having regard to internal residential amenity including availability of daylight and sunlight inside apartments
- Consider ground floor layout of Block A
- Greater detail relating to crèche and how it will function to be provided in planning application

2. Impacts on the adjoining Protected Structure and the Glasnevin Architectural Conservation Area. Archaeological Issues

ABP comments:

- Civic area located around chimney, show reasons why open space is located in these areas
- Strong argument required regarding change of proposals from extant permission, proposed development needs to be of high quality

- Visual Impact Assessment required for wider area having regard to architectural sensitivity of area
- Conservation assessment to be included in planning application
- Reconsider aesthetics of buildings, show how proposed development has been designed having regard to the surrounding area, address how protected structures on adjoining site have been taken into consideration in the design of the proposed development
- Impacts on the adjoining residential conservation area.
- Archaeological issues raised in the submission of the DAU

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Extant permission did not have the required open space provision; removal of housing units was to provide 10% open space requirement
- Proposed development was a modern take on what is already in the area, will address in more detail in the planning application
- Full archaeological assessment carried out and submitted to DAU, will have regard to Conservation Officers comments in PA Opinion

3. Traffic impacts. Vehicular, pedestrian and cycle connections. Car and cycle parking provision

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Traffic impacts having regard to traffic numbers being lower for extant permission
- Crèche parking and traffic movements

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Draft Traffic and Transport Assessment submitted, new traffic surveys to be submitted
- Will have regard to other permissions in area
- Will provide clear rationale for parking in planning application
- Crèche being kept separate from residential development, main entrance will be used
- Lesser demand on parking due to lower number of unit occupancy
- Proposed Metro North located close to proposed development
- Meeting set up with NTA and PA to discuss traffic issues further

Planning Authority's comments:

- Updated letter of consent required from PA regarding entrance to proposed development, to be included in redline in planning application

Further ABP comments:

- Traffic and Transport Assessment to be submitted with planning application and address cumulative impacts in area
- Consider cycle infrastructure for the area
- Have regard to development plan policy in relation to parking provision, consider other transport providers e.g. GoCar (or similar service), strong arguments for proposed parking having regard to national and local policy and density of proposed development

- Show how parking will be managed, provide Mobility Management Plan

4. Any other matters

ABP comments:

- How to deal with extant permission, proposed development and red line site boundary
- Include comprehensive picture at application stage, show how any legal compliance and other issues are resolved
- Further discussions with PA to ensure compliance issues (and other issues) relating to extant permission and proposed development are covered
- Resolve Part V requirement with PA
- Applicant to consider if the development is a material contravention of development plan policy on building height. Must state in notices if so
- Applicant to satisfy themselves with EIA Regulations and screening requirements, due to the number of units and architectural heritage of the area it may be advisable to submit the information referred to in article 299B(1)(b)(ii)(II) and 299B(1)(c) [if applicable] of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001-2018 in a standalone document as part of the application documentation

Prospective Applicant's comments:

- PA advised to include houses built under extant permission in redline
- Units included in proposed permission to provide Part V requirement for extant permission
- Legal issues relating to extant permission can be included in letter of sale, applicant will still own entire site at time of application

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
Director of Planning
November, 2018