



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-302757-18

Case Reference / Description	535 no. build to rent residential units, crèche, cafe, management office, communal facilities and associated site works. Former Chivers Factory Site, Coolock Drive, Coolock, Dublin 17.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
1st/2nd/3rd Meeting	1 st Meeting		
Date:	16 th November, 2018	Start Time	11.30 a.m.
Location	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	1.05 p.m.
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Cora Cunningham

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

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

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Andrew Gillick, Applicant
Maurice Gillick, Applicant
Nathan Smith, McCutcheon Halley Associates
Paula Galvin, McCutcheon Halley Associates
Ciaran McCabe, Metec
Feargus McGarvey, Mitchell Associates
Kevin O'Mahony, Cora Consulting Engineers
John Brady, Applicant

Representing Planning Authority

Bryan Ward, Senior Planner
Shane Healy, Executive Planner
Maria Treacy, Executive Engineer

Marie Down, Executive Planner
Feng Yawei, Planner
Kieran O'Neill, Senior Executive Architect

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 8th November, 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 25th 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. Development strategy for the site including height, scale, design, density and impact on adjoining properties including their development potential
2. Residential support amenities
3. Residential Amenity (internal and external) and open space
4. Mobility management, parking and permeability including public realm upgrades
5. Surface water management
6. Any other matters

1. Development strategy for the site including height, scale, design, density and impact on adjoining properties including their development potential

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Height/scale/density/mass of proposed development
- Justification provided in respect of material contravention of height policy
- Reference to PA Opinion where some height may be absorbed along river
- Density proposed having regard to high quality public transport
- Scale and quantum of development within courtyards to rear of river facing blocks and along Coolock Drive
- Treatment of elevation along Coolock Drive
- Treatment of frontages and separation distances proposed to adjoining sites within third party ownership

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Will consider points raised and address in application
- Height can be absorbed to front of site, visual impact assessment to be submitted with application
- Scale of blocks to south of site are modest in height
- Old industrial site suitable for redevelopment on sustainable transport route
- More detail to be included in Transport Report
- Will reconsider how blocks along the boundaries with adjoining properties are configured
- Removal of 14 trees proposed with replanting proposed on site and biodiversity to be increased along river

Planning Authority's comments:

- Current development plan has cap of 16 metres on outer suburban site with proposal materially contravening same
- Rationale/criteria for high building standards are outlined in City Plan and should be addressed
- Insufficient justification for height proposed at this location
- Height of proposed development along Coolock Drive substantial having regard to residential development on opposite side of road
- PA would consider density proposed similar to densities permitted in the Docklands
- Concern relating to treatment of blocks addressing boundaries including boundary with pitch and putt course and potential integration with future development
- Significant tree screening belt which could be retained along Coolock Drive having regard to street view creating buffer

Further ABP comments:

- Proposed density not justified in documents submitted and requires significant consideration given site context and distance from high quality transport routes
- Justification outlined for materially contravening height policy not sufficiently robust given public transport in vicinity of site and site not being landmark/key site
- Detailing of materials and finishes requires significant consideration

- While proposal is required to address development potential of adjoining sites, the development should be able to function as a residential community in its own right
- Potential for pedestrian/car conflict at entrance to Block B/underground car park;
- Treatment of Coolock Drive elevation requires revision with incorporation of relief/punctuation
- Proposed residential development and creation of residential community must integrate with receiving environment
- Requirement for draft legal agreement/covenant as per requirements of SPPR7

2. Residential support amenities

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- SPPR 7 criteria outlines the types of support amenities/services envisaged
- Details of proposed uses not clearly outlined in drawings with uses proposed in documents not reflective of requirements for build to rent schemes, no communal area for scheme of this size
- Creation of appropriately sized communal spaces for variety of uses, sports facilities etc.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Will review SPPR 7
- Will have further discussions and consolidate some of the spaces proposed
- Communal facility would be hidden in a single block, will provide more visual entrance

Planning Authority's comments:

- Like to see central enhanced facility

Further ABP comments:

- Support/Amenity facilities central to principle of BTR schemes and should be appropriately addressed
- Quantum, nature and quality of facilities within the development as a whole and within each proposed block to be addressed

3. Residential Amenity (internal and external) and open space

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Provision of satisfactory amenity for proposed units particularly units at ground and first floor
- Creation of high quality open spaces and courtyards with satisfactory amenity

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Compliance with BRE Guidelines and provision of details to outline same using appropriate factors
- Amenity space criteria achieved, play areas located in sunniest locations

Planning Authority's comments:

- Provision of adequate sunlight in courtyards
- Location of play areas questioned
- Creation of quality open spaces

Further ABP comments:

- Daylight/sunlight analysis required for the proposed units and amenity spaces within the proposed scheme
- Wind assessment required
- Separation distances to properties opposite the site on Coolock Drive to be clearly outlined

4. Mobility management, parking and permeability including public realm upgrades**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Car parking strategy proposed for BTR scheme
- Upgrades required to local junctions and public realm including provision of pedestrian crossings

Planning Authority's comments:

- Upgrades required to public realm and local junction as specified in PA Opinion
- Mobility management plan required

Further ABP comments:

- Justification required for amount of parking proposed, examine other build to rent schemes
- Inclusion of car sharing with letter of support from same
- Documents should address how parking will be allocated
- Public realm upgrades required as per PA Opinion
- Address permeability along frontage and through proposed development
- Area not conducive to pedestrian permeability with consideration of connections to Malahide Road required
- Further consultations required between applicant and PA
- Finishes and materials proposed to facilitate pedestrian priority within and adjoining the proposed development

5. Surface water management**ABP comments:**

- No report received from PA, ensure agreement reached between applicant and PA prior to lodging planning application

Planning Authority's comments:

- Surface water management strategy submitted directly to PA and not included in pre-application documentation

6. Any other matters

ABP comments:

- EIA mandatory given scale of current proposal, if development proposal changes applicant to address requirements of EIA Regulations concerning screening.
- Ensure notices state proposed development is build to rent scheme
- A draft covenant is to be submitted at application stage in accordance of SPPR7 of Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments' (2018)

Prospective Applicant's comments:

- Neighbouring park gated at night and would propose similar opening hours
- Clarification of school capacity to be included in application to show how figures proposed were reached

Planning Authority's comments:

- Permeability within the site and to surrounding sites with avoidance of gates
- Consideration of reasonable commuting distances to local schools

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
Assistant Director of Planning
December, 2018