



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-303265-18

Case Description	Demolition of all structures on site, construction of 560 no. apartments and associated site works. 1-4 East Road, Dublin 3.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
1st/2nd/3rd Meeting	1 st Meeting		
Date:	6 th February, 2019	Start Time	14:30 p.m.
Location	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	16:00 p.m.
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Sarah Moran, Senior Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Shane Scully, Glenveagh Living
Catherine Bennett, Glenveagh Living
Justin Farrelly, Glenveagh Living
Tom Sweetman, O'Mahony Pike Architects
Derek Murphy, O'Mahony Pike Architects
John Macken, O'Mahony Pike Architects
Dan Reilly, DBFL Engineers
Thomas Jennings, DBFL Engineers
Pauline Byrne, Brady Shipman Martin
Sorcha Turnbull, Brady Shipman Martin

Representing Planning Authority

Mary Conway, Deputy Dublin Planning Officer

Claire Sheehan, Acting 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 23rd January 2019 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 18th December 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. Principle of development, Z14 zoning objective, objectives for SDRA 6, building height.**
- 2. Design of development, visual impacts and interaction with the public realm. Impacts on residential amenities.**
- 3. Quality of residential accommodation.**
- 4. Traffic, transportation, parking provision, works to East Road to facilitate the development.**
- 5. Site Services**
- 6. Any other matters**

1. Principle of development, Z14 zoning objective, objectives for SDRA 6, building height.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- The overall development strategy for the site
- Details of proposed residential, commercial, community and other land uses.
- Management company for the commercial development
- Proposed heights in the context of national and local planning policy.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- This is a SDRA site
- The site is zoned for mixed use to link East Wall to the Docklands
- It is zoned Z14 which allows for mix residential and employment uses
- Residential units are already predominant in the area
- The development includes a proposed enterprise zone, to have multiple occupants with tenancy from 6 months to 4 years.
- A rationale for the proposed "Enterprise Space" will be submitted
- The management company will be Element 78 who have significant experience in this field
- Small start-up companies will be included, and this is a tested model
- There will be 79 parking spaces for the enterprise area, all of these will be managed
- This is the right place for a landmark building
- This is a SDZ area and it is submitted that the development site can take the proposed height

Planning Authority's comments:

- This is a transitional location
- Enterprise uses are encouraged at the site under the Z14 objective, as a counterweight to the growing amount of corporate space in the Docklands. Site to be developed as an intermediate space with a residential context.
- There is scope for limited retail development at this location.
- The PA is satisfied with the space provided and with the overall mix of land uses in the context of the Z14 objective.
- This development complies with the objectives of SDRA6
- The proposed 7 storey buildings with stepped down elements fit in with this area.
- The 15 storey building is not compliant with the LAP and is a residential building that is higher than business buildings in the docklands
- Consider this building as a landmark as it is in a two-storey hinterland
- Building could have a more slender profile.
- Applicant to consider the quality of residential units within the scheme and impacts on adjoining residential amenities.

Further ABP comments:

- Clarify the quantum of the proposed land uses.
- Submit photomontages from Merchants Square (amongst other areas)
- Detailed cross sections and boundary treatments are required

- Detail the construction stage impacts
- Provide a lighting scheme and explain any light over spill to adjacent residential areas
- Consider noise impacts from the railway line, the management of the site and address any security concerns
- Consider screening proposals for antenna (if proposed) on high buildings

2. Design of development, visual impacts and interaction with the public realm. Impacts on residential amenities.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Proposed landscaping scheme and provision of hard and soft landscaping.
- Which areas of the scheme are to be public / accessible to residents only.
- The visual impact of the development on adjacent residential areas and on the wider area.
- Rationale for use of undercroft parking rather than basement provision.
- Amenities for tenants
- Use of brick finishes

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The undercroft parking design is due to the location of the site within Flood Zone A. Also possible presence of contaminated land at the site.
- There is flexibility regarding hard landscaping provision in the public open space.
- The architecture has a modernist element however it will fit in with the surrounding area
- Kitchen and food hubs accessible to the public are included in this development
- There will be an active street frontage to East Road
- This is an active zone with heavy pedestrian and cycle use and a creche is included on the first-floor level
- Talks have taken place with local enterprises regarding their general needs
- A community infrastructure assessment will be done

Planning Authority's comments:

- Open space will work to draw people in
- Consider the planting of trees or more greening

Further ABP comments:

- Submit a strong rationale on how the units integrate with the established area
- Submit a building life cycle report
- Show the differences between the public and private open spaces
- Highlight how SUD's measures are integrated
- Explain how the public realm is managed

3. Quality of residential accommodation.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Sunlight and daylight penetration to rooms
- Single aspect units

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Sunlight and daylight penetration to rooms can be submitted
- The 2 beds and 3 beds have bays facing outwards
- The single aspect containing a bay window can be addressed
- Predominately brick finish proposed with some areas such as the internal residential courtyard to be finished in render

Planning Authority's comments:

- Many units are single aspect facing north west and they should have a bay window
- Sunlight to rooms is a concern

Further ABP comments:

- Submit a housing quality assessment
- Examine sunlight and daylight penetration to rooms
- Submit a microclimate impact assessment
- Justify the use of render at certain locations
- Submit a Lifecycle Report

4. Traffic, transportation, parking provision, works to East Road to facilitate the development.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Undercroft parking and basement provisions
- Is there dedicated parking provision for the creche.
- Car parking management.
- MUD Act in the context of this development

Prospective Applicant's response:

- There are 241 car parking spaces in 3 zones
- Undercroft parking will be under podium levels which will be managed
- There is a designated loading bay
- The quantum measurement is based on existing car ownership and the 2016 Census
- Car parking is 40 per cent for units
- 2 car club spaces are provided at the front which the existing community can use
- Provision to be made for facilitating electric cars
- It's possible to have 3 spaces close to the traffic junction
- East Road has a secondary cycle plan and cycle lanes have been included
- There are two dedicated creche spaces
- When buying an apartment there is an opportunity to apply for a car space
- This will be operated by a management company
- Clarity will be sought regarding the control and management of spaces in the context of the MUD Act

Planning Authority's comments:

- 3 spaces should be provided close to the junction to address local demand

- The junction is subject to improvements
- Ensure cycle lanes are managed

Further ABP comments:

- Highlight cycle access into the car park
- Submit a Mobility Management Plan
- Clarify the parking management in the context of the MUD Act

5. Site Services

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Flood risk
- Irish Water

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Historically reclaimed land. Contaminated land may be present at the site
- The site is in Flood Zone A
- The site is paved with no attenuation
- There is enough drainage capacity with no constraints
- Irish Water have identified the required connection points
- Consultation with Irish Water is at an advanced stage

Planning Authority's comments:

- No objection to drainage
- Further talks can take place if required regarding site services

Further ABP comments:

- Submit a site-specific flood risk assessment

6. Any other matters

ABP comments:

- Is an EIAR and AA being submitted?
- Examine Part V and how all units are located in one block
- Further discussions to take place between both parties

Prospective Applicant's response:

- An EIAR will be submitted and the AA has been screened out
- Further talks can take place if required

Planning Authority's comments:

- Further talks can take place if required

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
February 2019