



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-303724-19

Case Reference / Description	126 no. residential units (87 no. apartment, 12 no. duplex/apartment, 27 no. houses, creche and associated site works. Walkers Road, Annacotty, Limerick.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	27 th March, 2019	Start Time	11.30am
Location	Offices of Limerick City and County Council	End Time	1.20pm
Chairperson	Rachel Kenny	Executive Officer	Cora Cunningham

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Rachel Kenny, Director of Planning
Erika Casey, Senior Planning Inspector
Cora Cunningham, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Mary Hughes, HRA Planning Consultants
Richard Rice, Healy Partner Architects
Karolina Mach, Healy Partner Architects
Red Tobin, RedArc Consulting Limited
Pat O'Brien, BDB Consulting Limited
Devon Kerins, BDB Consulting Limited
Francis Fidgeon, CST Group
Tim Austin, Austin Associates
Ewan O'Donnell, Austin Associates

Representing Planning Authority

Stephane Duclot, A/Senior Planner
Donogh O'Donoghue, A/Senior Executive Planner

Jennifer McNulty, Area Planner
Trevor McKechnie Senior Executive Engineer
Tony Carmody, Senior Executive Technician
Dan Slavin, Executive Engineer
Sarah McCutcheon, Executive Archaeologist
Tom O Neill, Heritage Officer
John Sheahan,

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 13th March, 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 15th February, 2019 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 overall site layout and architectural approach, transition of scale and height, open space layout, building typology and urban design
 - 1.2 Landscaping proposals including tree retention policy/rationale, quantum, design and purpose open space

- 1.3 Archaeology
- 1.4 Architectural design particularly the landmark building as well as finishes and materials
- 2. Density
- 3. Roads infrastructure, access and parking in particular measures to address wider pedestrian, cyclist and public transport connectivity and measures to reflect DMURS
- 4. Surface water drainage including SuDs
- 5. Wastewater infrastructure
- 6. Childcare/provision of crèche – location within the site, design, scale, catchment, etc.
- 7. Any other matters

1. **Development strategy for the site including overall site layout and architectural approach, transition of scale and height, open space layout, building typology and urban design**
 - 1.2 **Landscaping proposals including tree retention policy/rationale, quantum, design and purpose open space**
 - 1.3 **Archaeology**
 - 1.4 **Architectural design particularly the landmark building as well as finishes and materials**

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Development strategy
- Strategically located development
- Layout and constraints on site including setbacks
- Apartment locations

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Gradual fall on site from southeast to northwest
- Creation of residential entrance into all development to south of proposed development site
- Open space proposed along 3 sides of perimeter
- Low density on southeast increasing to higher density on northwest of proposed site
- Apartments used as indicator to entrance to proposed development on roundabout, intention to front end apartments, used to create visual link to proposed development, ground floor apartments will have patio areas
- Proximity of proposed development to schools, retail and technology park, development mix to sustain family living
- Archaeology had led to apartment location, raised bank has pushed back edge of proposed development
- Open space unlikely to change, clarified on drawing
- More urban element required along Dublin Road
- Trees providing screening along Dublin Road including Category A and bat roost
- Part V units make be managed by housing group, further discussions to be held with PA
- Orientation of units along Dublin Road to assist with noise control
- Brick and rendering to be used for finishes with metal cladding attached to balconies
- Opportunity to create different spaces, apartments have extensive landscaping, creation of recreational routes,

Planning Authority's comments:

- Agree with ABP comments, archaeology is key issue on proposed site
- Policy in relation to development on buffer of archaeological site, testing carried out on site, consider excavating entire site, option to remove and record
- Consider better mix of house types
- Have regard to PA Opinion and address issues raised

Further ABP comments:

- Fragmented approach to proposed development, angled apartment blocks give oblique views
- Poor quality trees on site
- Consider creation of stronger urban edge
- Address issues raised by PA in relation to proposed layout, use urban design principles
- Area identified as metropolitan area, objective in NPF for Castletroy
- Significant percentage of open space does not add value
- No urban form or streetscape proposed, have regard to other SHD applications in relation to urban form, justification will be required if proposed development submitted in this form
- Removal and recording of archaeology on proposed site will allow for different layout, have regard to DAU submission and comments from PA in relation to same, ensure optical solution proposed
- Submit CGI's and photomontages in application, sections and elevations, daylight/sunlight analysis
- High quality landmark design required to east and west of proposed development and leading to technology park
- No constraints on site will assist in creation of stronger urban edge
- Have regard to phasing and typology including delivery of Part V units
- Lack of coherency in relation to archaeological language in relation to houses/duplexes/apartments
- Agree Part V with PA prior to lodging application
- Ensure open space calculations are correct
- Lack of sunlight along Dublin Road, proposed development heavily car dominated
- Hierarchy of open space may need further justification having regard to Statement of Consistency and meeting principles, show what will be public and communal open space
- Have regard to orientation of units and fronting onto open space
- No optimal layout along Dublin Road, have regard to 12 principles in Urban Design Manual
- Detail finishes and materials of apartment elevations and crèche, have regard to rendering and pollution from road, high quality rendering to be used
- Building Lifecycle Report to be submitted including costs
- Treatment and landscaping of underground parking
- Consider wider views to and from proposed site
- Create appropriate linkages
- Address landscaping having regard to overall layout, proposed car parking

2. Density

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Density having regard to proposed development being outer suburban or metropolitan site

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Will have regard to providing a density greater than 45

Planning Authority's comments:

- PA satisfied with proposed density and concur with ABP comments

Further ABP comments:

- Have regard to evolving context in metropolitan area where a density of 50 expected
- Have regard to inefficient use of land and different housing mixes

3. Roads infrastructure, access and parking in particular measures to address wider pedestrian, cyclist and public transport connectivity and measures to reflect DMURS

ABP Comments:

- Upgrade works to be indicated in application documents in relation to who is carrying out the different works, PA should indicate works they propose to carry out
- Have regard to national guidance in relation to pedestrians and cyclists, look at other SHD applications
- Clarity required regarding connection to wider services in area
- Upgrades both inside and outside of proposed development to show when and how they will be implemented, justification to be given if not including works in proposed development
- Consider including context of public realm and landscaping
- No pedestrian linkage from west of proposed development to Annacotty village
- Have regard to cycle and parking provision on site
- Have regard to apartment guidelines, justification to be submitted in relation to parking provision

Prospective Applicant's response:

- PA require extra land in relation to Annacotty roundabout
- Prospective applicant to provide provision for additional lane in application
- Issues relating to ownership as some may be in 3rd party ownership
- Land does not appear to be taken in charge
- Road on opposite side of road in 3rd party ownership
- Setback provided but not clear who will carry out works
- Cycle lane to be provided but not connecting to anything
- Proposed development can facilitate future works outside scope of prospective applicant, can't justify putting burden of works on prospective applicant
- Prospective applicant happy to provide special contribution to PA if not including works

- Footpaths to be provided on all 3 sides of proposed development including internal connections
- Statement included in relation to compliance with DMURS
- Not providing full quantum of visitor parking for apartment units

Planning Authority's comments:

- PA require works to be included in application
- Important to have connections to Annacotty village
- PA have issue with proposed parking provision

4. Surface water drainage including SuDs

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Surface water and attenuation in particular attenuation proposed under tree

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Attenuation driven by archaeology on proposed site, swails looked in relation to archaeological feature
- May now change on foot of comments from meeting in particular in relation to layout and SuDs

Planning Authority's comments:

- PA have issue with use of swails and public liability

Further ABP comments:

- Have regard to attenuation tank, submit full suite of SuDs measures in application
- Opportunity to introduce swails not necessarily in areas to be taken in charge, consider use of green roofs
- Rationale to be given in relation to what is and isn't being used

5. Wastewater infrastructure

ABP comments:

- Detail design with PA and Irish Water

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Irish Water have given preliminary issues but no constraints, connecting to storm network, no issues relating to flooding

Planning Authority's comments:

- Can discuss network issues further with prospective applicant

6. Childcare/provision of crèche – location within the site, design, scale, catchment, etc.

ABP comments:

- Document and justify scale of crèche in application, proposed location will encourage high level of traffic into proposed development, rationale of number proposed and if crèche is required

- Design/material and elevations of crèche to be submitted

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Undertook analysis of crèches in area, PA looked for crèche to be included
- Crèche moved into proposed development away from roads, large turning circle provided

Planning Authority's comments:

- Consider moving crèche closer to entrance if proposed development is redesigned

7. Any other matters

ABP comments:

- Address Part V in application
- Section 247 minutes refer to land grab, address in application
- Have necessary legal consents in place
- Waste Management Plan to be submitted

Applicants Comments

- Concern in relation to traffic queuing in relation to housing development opposite
- Entrance to proposed development to be removed from roundabout, will discuss further with PA
- Issues raised by PA in relation to Mobility Management Plan

Planning Authority's comments:

- Possible portion of site along Old Dublin Road belongs to PA
- Access to proposed development, consider staggering, will discuss further with prospective applicant
- Concern over level of bike parking
- Waste Management Plan to be submitted

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

Rachel Kenny
Director of Planning
April, 2019