

Record of Meeting

ABP-303961-19

Description	287 no. apartments Former Crown Equipment Site, Junction of Monivea Rd and Joyces Rd, Mervue, Co. Galway.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	18 th April 2019	Start Time	11:30 a.m.
Location	Offices of Galway City Council	End Time	12:45 p.m.
Chairperson	Rachel Kenny	E.O.	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Rachel Kenny, Director of Planning

Una Crosse, Senior Planning Inspector

Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Padraic Rhatigan, Crown Square Developments Ltd (applicant)

Niamh Conlon, Crown Square Developments Ltd (applicant)

Ronan Stokes, Punch Consulting Engineers

Martin Donnelly, Henry J Lyons Architects

David Graham, Henry J Lyons Architects

Pamela Harty, MKO

Representing Planning Authority

Liam Blake, Senior Executive Planner

Caroline Phelan, Senior Planner

Stephen Walsh, Senior Executive Parks Engineer

Frank Clancy, Senior Executive Engineer Water Services

Joan Higgins, Planning Administration

Norann Keane, Senior Staff Officer

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 10th April 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 March 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. Compliance with SHD/Environmental Legislation
- 2. Zoning Provisions
- 3. Development Strategy for the site to include inter alia:
 - Layout and internal interfaces with proposed adjoining development
 - Design/distinctiveness including materials and finishes
 - > Phasing
 - > Tenure
- 4. Car parking Rationale
- 5. Site services
- 6. Any other matters

1. Compliance with SHD/Environmental Legislation

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- While Phase 1 granted current appeal on same which includes car parking and services which are proposed to serve current pre-app proposal.
- > SHD proposal must not be dependent on any ancillary elements which do not have the benefit of permission
- > Submission of EIAR with documentation

Planning Authority's comments:

Proposal should comply with development plan and given zoning, proposal considered on the basis of overall development of the site including Phase 1.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- No 3rd party appeals on Phase 1 and envisaged that first party appeal will be withdrawn.
- > EIAR was submitted for Phase 1 so in public domain.

Further ABP comments:

- Development could be potentially premature if relying on elements which have not been permitted prior to making of SHD application.
- > Need to outline how the car parking area, for example, can be divided
- Car parking and services to facilitate the development need to be standalone/extant
- > EIAR documentation will not be addressed at pre-application stage

2. Zoning Provisions

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Documentation relating to zoning provisions to be further detailed.
- Use of the crèche and inclusion of crèche within ancillary residential services.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Documentation regarding the zoning provisions will be augmented.
- Crèche initially proposed for residents and Phase 1 but will be included as commercial space

Planning Authority's comments:

Proposal considered appropriate given overall development of the site

3. Development Strategy for the site to include inter alia:

- Layout and internal interfaces with proposed adjoining development
- > Design/distinctiveness including materials and finishes
- > Phasing
- > Tenure

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Consideration of interfaces within the scheme particularly from the public realm towards the basement car park and towards the public road.
- > Areas to be taken in charge/management of public open spaces.
- Permeability within the scheme and into the scheme to be outlined in detail.
- Design and distinctiveness of the proposed development particularly treatment of backlines, commercial frontages and detailing of materials.
- Phasing of proposal to be detailed.
- ➤ Tenure proposed to be clarified and procedural requirements of BTR to be addressed if proposing same.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- More CGI's will be submitted
- Access to the public realm can be examined and outlined in operational management plan, not proposed that any areas will be taken in charge and proposed phase 2 will be managed as per phase 1
- Providing event space is conditioned in phase 1
- Permeability of the site to be addressed with requirement that gates closed for very limited times and can be addressed in operational management plan.
- Envisage as much permeability and integration as possible alongside necessary security and maintenance
- Examining ways to reduce the visual impact and to eliminate projecting balconies
- Phasing proposed to comprise completion of the basement, hotel (standalone), office and then residential (standalone)

Planning Authority's comments:

- Concern remains as to accessibility of public open space and availability of event space
- > Balconies on Mervue road need to be re-examined
- Photomontages should be provided
- Phase 1 and 2 have crossovers with amenities with detailed conditions regarding open space in Phase 1 permission and recommend conditions on phase 1 should be replicated on phase 2 as Phase 1 would not have been considered without phase 2
- Clarification required regarding tenure of proposal given CDP policies on tenure.
- ➤ Consideration of unit mix with requirement for greater number of 3-bed units and lesser number of 1-bed units.

Further ABP comments:

- Consideration of both internal and external interfaces particularly from public realm
- Treatment of street frontage and commercial units addressing public road.
- Consideration of permeability and connections with public permeability to be maximised.
- Consideration of management of public spaces and event space
- Justification of proposed unit mix in respect of proposed new neighbourhood and existing neighbourhood within which the site is located.

- Architects Design Statement to provide detail on materials and finishes including commercial frontages.
- More detail is required with phasing
- > Build to rent developments require a covenant
- > Operational management Plan should be a standalone document.

4. Car parking rationale

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Detail regarding car parking strategy for the residential element.
- > Provision of electric charging points

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Documents will provide a clear parking strategy
- Provision can be made for charging points and ducting

Planning Authority's comments:

The issue of car parking rationale was addressed in phase 1

Further ABP comments:

- Car parking strategy to be outlined in detail.
- Provision of sufficient charging points

5. Site services

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

> Any issues with the site services

Prospective Applicant's response:

Proposal is part of overall site with strategy outlined for same.

Planning Authority's comments:

Note works undertaken to date on site and consider proposed strategy acceptable.

Further ABP comments:

If there are any changes consult with Irish Water

6. Any other matters

ABP comments:

There is no further information sought at application stage

Planning Authority's comments:

No comment

Applicants Comments:

No comment

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 <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 spatialplanning@water.ie

	_
Rachel Kenny,	
Director of Planning	

May 2019

ABP-303961-19 An Bord Pleanála Page 6 of 6