

# Record of Meeting ABP-303130-18

Case Description	Demolition of existing buildings, construction of 132 no. residential units (19 no. houses and 113 no. apartments) and associated site works.  Our Lady's Grove, Goatstown Road, Goatstown, Dublin 14.		
Case Type Meeting	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request  1st Meeting		
Date:	16 <sup>th</sup> January, 2019	Start Time	09:30 a.m.
Location	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	10:30 a.m
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Ciaran Hand

### Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Joanna Kelly, Senior Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

### **Representing Prospective Applicant:**

Neill Durkan, Durkan Estates Clonskeagh Limited	
Liam Durkan, Durkan Estates Clonskeagh Limited	
Phillip Assaf, Durkan Estates Clonskeagh Limited	
Tom Sweetman, O'Mahony Pike Architects	
Richard Bannon, O'Mahony Pike Architects	
Kevin Sturgeon, DBFL Consulting Engineers	
Carlo Sidoti, DBFL Consulting Engineers	
Thomas Jennings, DBFL Consulting Engineers	
Ronan Mac Diarmada, Ronan Mac Diarmada Associates	
Andy Worsnop, The Tree File Limited	
Julie Costello, Tom Phillips + Associates	

Susan Clarke, Tom Phillips + Associates

#### **Representing Planning Authority**

Bernard Egan, Senior Executive Engineer
Elaine Carroll, Executive Engineer
Mick Mangan, Senior Engineer
Thiago Bodini, Executive Engineer
Louise Mc Gauran, Senior Planner
Shane Sheehy, Senior 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 20<sup>th</sup> December 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 28<sup>th</sup> November 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. Local policy context with particular regard to educational policy SIC 8
- 2. Response to matters raised in Planning Authority's opinion in relation to transportation (including report from Transportation Section)
- 3. Response to matters raised in Planning Authority's opinion in relation to drainage (including report from Drainage Planning)
- 4. Part V
- 5. Any other matters
- 1. Local policy context with particular regard to educational policy SIC 8

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

- The local planning policy for this site area
- Educational policy objective 'SIC 8'
- > The possibility for future expansion of existing schools

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

- There have been discussions with the Department of Education and there is no indication that the lands are needed for new schools or for future expansion of existing schools
- > This has been verbally confirmed by the Department of Education
- > The schools in this area have no desire to expand their buildings
- ➤ A new hockey pitch has been granted by the planning authority (Ref.no. D18A/0387) however this has been appealed by a third party to An Bord Pleanála (Ref 302898-18)
- > The lands are too small to accommodate a new secondary school
- When the lands were being bought the Department of Education should have expressed an interest at the time
- ➤ The symbol "INST" was relocated during a CDP process to reflect the actual location of educational institutions
- Legal opinion has been sought regarding the educational issue and is on file

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

- All potential school sites are zoned "Objective A" as this allows the possibility to protect or improve residential amenities
- ➤ The policy SIC 8 allows for the reservation of primary or post primary school sites
- > Two school sites (Primary and Post Primary) are required in the Goatstown Area
- ➤ The "INST" symbol is indicative and covers the overall site and is not specific to the primary school site

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

- ➤ It would be helpful to have a letter from the Department of Education stating that the lands are not needed for new schools or for future expansion
- If there is an appeal on the hockey pitch an application for this site which includes part of the hockey pitch which is to be re-positioned could be deemed premature

➤ Both the applicant and planning authority can seek legal opinion to clarify their positions with regards to the zoning and application of local policy objectives to the lands in question

## 2. Response to matters raised in Planning Authority's opinion in relation to transportation (including report from Transportation Section)

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

- Re-location pedestrian crossing
- Recommendations of the Design Stage Audit
- Basement car park
- Crèche car parking

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

- The pedestrian crossing will be included in the red line boundary subject to letter of consent from local authority
- Phasing can be examined with view to taking PA's comments on board
- Recommendations of the design stage audit will be incorporated into the design proposals
- Did not want the entrance of the ramp to the basement car park close to the entrance of site due to visual impact
- > The location of the basement car park entrance can be examined
- > The traffic audit showed no issues
- ➤ The crèche car parking includes 7 spaces with a disabled space and an electric charge point. Drawings will be submitted to show the parking spaces

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

- > The pedestrian crossing needs to be included in the red line boundary
- > Phasing needs to be examined
- > The location of the basement car park is too far into the site
- > There needs to be more clarity with crèche car parking spaces

# 3. Response to matters raised in Planning Authority's opinion in relation to drainage (including report from Drainage Planning)

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

Drainage and flood risk having specific regard to the Drainage report contained in the PA opinion

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

- > There will be further engagement with the drainage department of the planning authority
- ➤ The ditch referred to along the southern boundary is a dry ditch but will refer to it in the Flood Risk Assessment

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

➤ There needs to be calculations for discharge rates and attenuation rates

Not considered to be flood risk from ditch but report should acknowledge it exists and refer to flow patterns

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

➤ The applicant is to liaise with the drainage department of the planning authority as no FI mechanism

#### 4. Part V

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

Part V costings as prospective applicant will need to satisfy the requirements of the Regulations when making an application.

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

Further discussions will take place regarding Part V

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

Further discussions will take place regarding Part V

#### 5. Any other matters

#### **ABP** comments:

- A landscaping proposal which identifies the extent of tree removal/retention should be submitted
- Address the P.A concerns with phasing as raised in their opinion
- Should ensure application addresses the issue of impact on existing residential amenity
- > There is no further information sought at application stage

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

An EIAR is not required

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

> The educational issue is a key concern and needs to be addressed

#### **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 <u>cdsdesignqa@water.ie</u> 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 <a href="mailto:spatialplanning@water.ie">spatialplanning@water.ie</a>

Tom Rabbette
Assistant Director of Planning
January, 2019