



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting

ABP-303825-19

Description	153 no. residential units (15 no. duplex/Masionettes and 138 no. apartments) and associated site works. Lands East of the Assumption National School, Long Mile Road, Walkinstown, Dublin 12.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	4 th April 2019	Start Time	14:30 p.m.
Location	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	15:45 p.m.
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	E.O.	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Stephen Rhys Thomas, Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Michael Moran – TPS traffic consultant
Lauren Quinn McDonogh – MCORM Architects
Stephen Manning – MCORM Architects
Alastair Ferrar – CRS Landscape Architecture
Trevor Sadler – McGill Planning
Brenda Butterly – McGill Planning
Roger Mullarkey – Mullarkey Civil Engineering
Noel Greene – Jackie Greene Construction

Representing Planning Authority

Rhona Naughton – Senior Planner
Tadhg Daly – Transport Planning
Nicola Conlon – Senior Executive Planner (Transport Planning)

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 21st 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 25th 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. Street Interface and Perimeter Detail**
- 2. Building Height and Street Presence**
- 3. Pedestrian connectivity**
- 4. Car Parking – Quantum and Design**
- 5. Any other matters**

1. Street Interface and Perimeter Detail

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- How the proposed development relates to the Long Mile Road
- Describe rationale for setback, boundary treatment and explain site levels
- Rationale for the perimeter of the site in terms of amenity space and opportunities for passive supervision

Planning Authority's comments:

- The design of the perimeter allows passive surveillance
- 1 unit near the lane is isolated and not well integrated

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The setback is due to a large diameter surface water pipe running behind the boundary wall along the Long Mile Road
- The setback required by the Council is 3 meters and this also allows relief for future occupants from road noise and other activity
- The surface water pipe has determined the setback
- The aim is to create a new built edge
- Regarding the perimeter of the site, there is a separation of distance (40 metres) from apartment balconies to the rear elevations of existing houses
- The boundary proposal along the Long Mile Road includes lowering the wall and adding railings
- The site levels are raised and there is ramped access
- The existing ground levels were raised up by 1.1 metres, this will be lowered by half a metre
- There is no impact on the surface water main
- A pedestrian link is proposed around the perimeter of the site, 6 meters in width and which allows for own door access
- Own door access creates active frontage and passive surveillance
- There are 4 points of entry from the street level frontage
- Apartments at ground floor have access to the perimeter route

Further ABP comments:

- Site sections through the site would be essential to determine relationship between building edge, pedestrian walkway and Long Mile Road

2. Building Height and Street Presence**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Proposed height in relation to the building height guidelines and the City Development Plan objectives on height in the area
- Street presence as viewed from the street approach from east and west, in this instance the gable elevations of block 1

Prospective Applicant's response:

- This is an urban location and the site is 800 meters from the Luas Line
- Conscious that the height is above the city plan
- Concerning street presence, there is a stepping down in scale through the site
- In terms of the gable ends of block 1, corners are being turned so windows are facing down onto the road
- The approach from the east end has an active and animated function

Planning Authority's comments:

- It needn't be that more windows are added to the gable ends of Block 1, but some form of relief on the gable ends could give visual interest

- There are sensitivities of overlooking the school grounds to the west and impacting on the future development potential of adjacent sites

Further ABP comments:

- Submitting visual representations and computer generated images would be of benefit
- A design rationale should examine sites in the wider area, in terms of context and setting

3. Pedestrian connectivity

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Is there merit to achieving pedestrian access through the back-lane way on to Walkinstown Road

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The back-lane way is in private ownership (approx. 12-14 owners)
- Lack of access through the back-lane means pedestrians have to take a different route to access amenities
- This route only adds an extra one minute and a half

Planning Authority's comments:

- The back-lane way is not taken in charge

Further ABP comments:

- Explain the difficulty of how the back-lane way cannot be utilised and include in the overall design rationale for the scheme

4. Car Parking – Quantum and Design

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Rationale for car parking numbers should be demonstrated, given the locational attributes of the site, public transport, communities facilities, employment etc
- In terms of design, the approach to position and scale of the car parking vents at podium level

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The number of car parking spaces being provided is 0.82% per unit
- There is close proximity to public transport
- Go car and car clubs are being examined
- Car parking spaces of 1 to 1 won't be achieved
- Vents are behind railings and hedging and have been screened out from view on the podium level

Planning Authority's comments:

- Car parking spaces of less than 1 to 1 require a rationale
- Concerned about car storage

- Car clubs are welcome and there should be engagement and details sought regarding how it will work
- Detail barrier entry if any, service vehicle access and the parking strategy

Further ABP comments:

- Clarity regarding car clubs is required (management, ownership, costs etc)
- Consider submitting a building life cycle report that includes discussion around car parking element of scheme

5. Any other matters

ABP comments:

- Ensure any drawing inconsistencies are addressed prior to the making of an application
- In order to ensure optimal residential amenities for units at lower levels it may be more appropriate to locate residential amenities such as gyms/exercise rooms at lower levels that suffer from diminished access to light

Planning Authority's comments:

- A swept path analysis is important regarding refuse vehicles
- Cycle parking is front loaded at the northern end, more suitable locations could be examined

Applicants Comments:

- Swept path analysis will be prepared
- The requirement of a wayleave along the site frontage has not been brought up by Irish Water

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
- Proposed development must be specifically described in public notices as build to rent housing for long-term rental housing
- 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

April 2019