



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-304421-19

Description	624 no. residential units and associated site works at Holybanks, Swords, Co. Dublin.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	17 th June 2019	Start Time	10.07 am
Location	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	12.19 pm
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	E.O.	Mark Kielty

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Joanna Kelly, Senior Planning Inspector
Mark Kielty, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Aidan McLernon, Applicant
Emma Flanagan, Applicant
Daibhi Mac Domhnaill, Applicant
Joe Gibbons, Waterman-Moylan
Emma Caulwell, Waterman-Moylan
Alastair Ferrar, Cunnane Stratton Reynolds
Stephen M. Purcell, Future Analytics Consulting Limited
Eoghan Harteford, John Fleming Architects
John Fleming, John Fleming Architects

Representing Planning Authority:

Claire Mc Veigh, Senior Executive Planner
Eugenia Thompson, Executive Planner

Niall Thornton, Executive Engineer
Paul Carroll, Transportation
Sinead Murphy, Planning – Water Services
Ciarán Markey, Planning - Transportation

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 6th of June 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 the 10th of May 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 having regard to the provisions of the Draft Estuary West Masterplan**
- 2. Movement and Connectivity**
- 3. Urban Design and Layout to include interface with Jugback Lane and adjoining lands**
- 4. Wastewater network constraints:**
- 5. Surface water management and Flood Risk**
- 6. Any other matters:**

1. Development Strategy for the site having regard to the provisions of the Draft Estuary West Masterplan

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Status of Masterplan and if it becomes part of their Strategic Development Plan,
- Justification for release of lands at this stage having regard to the zoning objective and its link to the provision of Metrolink,
- How phasing will be conducted having regard to provision of the Masterplan including upgrades to road services,
- Whether the applicant has liaised with the Department of Education with regards the school site.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Set-down roundabout for school to be upgraded,
- Intends to make provision for road upgrades,
- Fingal to impose contributions towards upgrades where applicant is not providing,
- Phasing will take place in two parts – The lower density part of the development is envisioned to be conducted first,
- The applicant is concerned as the Planning Authority (PA) wishes for the Glenn Ellan road to be upgraded but the PA is unclear as to what these upgrades should be i.e. degree of set-back required from road,
- When responding to the PA's wish for the 9-metre set back on road, Applicant feels that this is excessive,
- Happy to allow for cycle lane but creating more car lanes may not be along national policy,
- When engaged with PA in 2017, applicant has created their own masterplan and is confident that amenities provided are appropriate,
- The development is logically designed around school and other amenities and is consistent with the PA's masterplan,
- The applicant has liaised with the Department of Education and has studied other similar developments around schools,
- Plans to have a one-way drop off for school, whether that's a tear-drop system or roundabout,
- The applicant also plans to provide parking for creche.

Planning Authority's (PA) comments:

- The Masterplan is agreed by elected councillors,
- The Masterplan is not "adopted" but rather "agreed" and it takes effect immediately,
- Phasing to be in line with Transport Study which was published in January 2019,
- Time-based phasing policy outlined in Masterplan,
- The PA hopes to engage with consultants to look at phasing and what needs upgrading and when,
- Appropriate that Special Development Contribution may be required,

- PA's wish for the 9-metre set back on Glenn Ellan road to facilitate cycle track and extra traffic lanes, however the PA needs to finalise upgrades for this road and other aspects of the development,
- Whilst the PA wishes for the provision of extra lanes of traffic, this does not necessarily mean the lanes are for general traffic. These could be reserved for bus lanes,
- In terms of the school, one-way drop off with either a teardrop or roundabout implementation preferred.

ABP further comments:

- Justify release of lands in absence of Metro Link
- In terms of infrastructural upgrades, it needs to be clear what happens when,
- Where roads are not proposed to be upgraded, the applicant needs to provide a rationale why,
- In terms of the 9-metre setback, the PA needs to be clear as to why this set back is required,
- The applicant and PA should establish an agreement where the Special Development contributions are concerned.

2. Movement and Connectivity

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Street Hierarchy and creation of active streets having regard to principles of DMURS
- Proposed connections from site to Jugback Lane and connections to Appplewood town centre
- Why hedgerow to Jugback lane is being retained and meaningful connections to Appplewood Main Street can be achieved.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Aware of the merits of hedgerow and intends to retain pre-existing hedgerow,
- Can accommodate more hedgerow if required,
- The proposed cul-de-sacs allows for cyclists and pedestrian connections but not traffic,
- Would like to retain the character of Jugback Lane,
- As for the playground, applicant can re-locate playground away from the junction as per ABP suggestion,
- Jugback lane must remain open to traffic as there is a right of way over it

Planning Authority's (PA) comments:

- Would discourage increase of traffic at Jugback Lane and would like to retain its character.

ABP further comments:

- Consider how it is intended to disperse traffic in the immediate area? Is one vehicular access enough, given the large existing residential development,

- Consider further what the focal points within the proposed development are,
- Applicant needs to consider street hierarchy,
- Play area at junction of two main streets may need further consideration
- Hedgerow not great in some areas so consider if worth retaining,

3. Urban Design and Layout to include interface with Jugback Lane and adjoining lands

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Design strategy in particular how the apartment blocks and car parking area present to Glen Ellan Road and the site context in general
- How a sense of place is created within the scheme
- Interface of development with Jugback Lane and creation of strong streetscapes
- Open space provision and disposition including passive surveillance
- Use of external finishes and need for quality/durable materials

Prospective Applicant's response:

- States that there is a walkway through the proposed development,
- Against underground parking as the land rises away from Glenn Ellan Road,
- Will consider PA's suggestion of using podiums, however, applicant would prefer not to use them,
- In terms of parking for houses, easily fits one car per house, however, can accommodate two,
- In terms of duplexes, an outdoor half flight of steps leads up to the door. Despite PA suggesting that perhaps the stairs should be put indoors, the applicant feels that this design works well.

Planning Authority's (PA) comments:

- Opportunity for re-design that would result in higher density,
- Suggests looking at podiums as an alternative to underground parking,
- Quantum of parking to be addressed. Shortfall of 263 spaces for the two phases,
- Suggests increasing cycle parking for apartments,
- Not enough information has been submitted in relation to trees around parking facilities,
- Suggests moving stairs for duplexes indoors as steps may attract anti-social behaviour and in their experience, do not weather well.

ABP further comments:

- Should consider how the layout responds to the site context and adjoining lands
- High quality durable finishes should be implemented,
- Parking management plan should be clear at application stage,

4. Wastewater network constraints:

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Waste Water constraints having regard to Irish Water's Submission
- Asks whether Irish Water have been consulted.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Irish Water have engaged with consultants with regards the issues
- Irish Water will implement an upgrade to service the new development,
- Can accommodate up to 350 units and the applicant will be levied re: upgrade,
- Applicant expresses that there's a difference of opinion from various organisations, for example, Fingal County Council and Irish Water, as to where the Waste Management System should be located,
- Therefore, the applicant will engage in their own waste management assessment.

Planning Authority's (PA) comments:

- Wastewater pumping station near flooding area – there needs to be a stage 3 flooding, assessment. The PA will engage with the applicant in this matter,
- Need to review the location of the pumping station given its proximity to residential units and potential impacts on residential amenity

ABP further comments:

- Need clarity regarding nature of upgrades and timeframe for when the waste water upgrades will take place. Advises the applicant to engage with Irish Water and The PA's Water Drainage Section,

5. Surface water management and Flood Risk

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- This issue having regard to the comments from the planning authority in particular that the flood risk assessment does not comply with the Strategic Flood Risk assessment completed as part of the Swords Surface water management masterplans.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Most Planning Authorities would account for medium range rainfall due to climate change and this is accounted for. The applicant believes that high range would be excessive,
- While the PA suggests tree pits, the applicant believes that Irish Water do not want this. Again, there are differences between what each organisation wants.

Planning Authority's (PA) comments:

- The PA will be accounting for high range rainfall due to climate change,
- Housing at flood-zones to be avoided,
- Reiterated the need for a stage 3 flooding assessment,
- PA has clear guidelines in relation to drainage and what should be above ground,

- The PA is promoting tree pits,
- In relation to trees, the PA would like to make the app aware of “taking in charge” issues. The PA will work with the applicant on this.

ABP further comments:

- Advised to liaise further on this issue and address concerns of the planning authority
- Need to identify outfalls to the Broadmeadow river and consider issue of displaced waters and potential impacts further downstream
- The applicant should address how SuDS measures are integrated into the overall scheme and contribute to the creation of a sense of plan
- Need to make clear the ownership of trees, whether they’re public or private.

6. Any other matters:

ABP comments:

- Applicant indicates NIS (Natura Impact Statement) to be submitted, should consider, inter alia, surface water run-off in this context
- Development Applications Unit (DAU) satisfied that enough information has been submitted in relation to archaeology to allow for an informed decision to be made at application stage.

Prospective Applicant’s comments:

- Will need to liaise with PA in relation to the Masterplan,
- Asks questions about splitting the project into two applications to address network constrains, would another pre-application meeting be necessary?
- If application included the junction as part of the boundary, would this result in a new pre-application meeting?

Planning Authority’s (PA) comments:

- Notes that the Part V requirements need to be finalised,
- Advises that the applicant need to consider that current residents at Applewood.

ABP further comments:

- If the application were to be split in two, then yes, new pre-application meetings would be required,
- If the application were to include the adjacent junction, then no, a new pre-application meeting would not be required but need to ensure letters of consent are submitted

Conclusions:

- Issues raised need to be dealt with when submitting the application,
- The applicant and PA should liaise with regard the aforementioned issues.

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
2019