



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-304426-19

Case Reference / Description	100 no. residential units and associated site works. Dalguise House, Monks town Road, Monkstown, Co. Dublin.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
1st/2nd/3rd Meeting	1 st Meeting		
Date:	21 st June 2019	Start Time	11:40 a.m.
Location	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	12:55 pm
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Lorraine Dockery, Senior Planning Inspector
Una O' Neill, Senior Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

John Spain, John Spain Associates
Justin Power, Horan Rainsford Architects
John O' Neill, Benchmark Engineers
Paul Singleton, McCloy Consulting
Bill Hastings, Arc Info
Mary Mac Mahon, John Spain Associates
Bernard Doyle, Lulani Dalguise Ltd.
Simon Canz, Dermot Foley Architects
Michael Moran, Transport Planning Services
Paddy Hoare, Benchmark Engineering

Representing Planning Authority

Dara Holohan, Executive Planner
Stephen McDermott, A/ Senior Planner
Bernard Egan, Senior Executive Engineer
Thiago Bodini, Executive Engineer

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 7th 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 13th 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 to include height, length, bulk and massing; open space provision; permeability; childcare provision**
- 2. Residential Amenity**
- 3. Biodiversity**
- 4. Transport and Parking**
- 5. Drainage Matters**
- 6. Any other matters**

1. Development Strategy to include height, length, bulk and massing; open space provision; permeability; childcare provision

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Development strategy for this proposed development within the context of wider Dalguise House lands and the justification/rationale for development of this portion of the overall landholding at this time
- Possible issue that development, as proposed, may be considered ad hoc, piecemeal development in the absence of the overall design strategy for the entire landholding
- Capacity of site, as outlined in red, to accommodate a development of the scale proposed
- Level differences across the overall lands; relationship of proposed development with any possible future development on wider lands
- Concerns expressed by PA in relation to proposed height, length, bulk and massing
- Architectural heritage and impacts, if any, on Protected structure and its associated grounds
- Open space provision in the context of site levels; usability and access for all
- Discussion re non-provision of childcare facility
- Materials/finishes and need to ensure quality finish

Planning Authority's comments:

- There are two phases of development with this being the initial phase
- There should be a masterplan of the overall site
- No issue in principle if entire landholding was developed as a SHD application
- Ensure that there is further integration between phases
- Open space is challenging due to topography of the site; need to show how open space is to be accessed
- Should be childcare provision in phase 1

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Site levels are 3 meters below Monkstown Road and this level difference influenced height strategy
- Ridge height of Dalguise House is the same height as that proposed for apartments; separation distance of 135 meters
- Mature trees along the north will provide screening
- Buildings will be slightly visible in wider area
- This is considered to be first phase of a two phase development
- A masterplan diagram of the wider area will be submitted
- Topography is distinctive, and the geography is difficult
- This area, as outlined in red, is more readily developable due to levels
- Phase 2 is compatible with, but not reliant on Phase 1
- Protected Structure is a key part of overall design strategy
- Within the wider redevelopment, will propose that the road at Richmond cottage will stay along with original avenue
- The historic routes are to be retained and the building is to be restored
- The communal open space is centred at the trees

- Open space exceeds the minimum standards of guidelines
- Spaces along the stream will create a riparian corridor
- Childcare spaces are calculated for 11 children; hence non-provision within this initial phase
- Childcare facilities will be identified within the wider area

Further ABP comments:

- If continuing with this strategy, advise submitting a rationale as to why the entire landholding is not being comprehensively redeveloped in one phase
- Advised submitting rationale to outline why, as proposed, the development could not be construed as ad hoc, piecemeal development
- A comprehensive redevelopment of the overall landholding with the protected structure suitably integrated into proposals, would be welcomed- reference made to Temple Hill application
- Ensure protection of trees
- Examine the height, length, bulk and massing, as per PA concerns
- Detail the proximity of the blocks to the entrance road
- Submit a arboricultural impact report
- Quality of open space is important; permeability and accessibility to be considered
- Submit an open space rationale detailing active and passive areas
- Provide a childcare justification
- No provision for further information in SHD process

2. Residential Amenity

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Potential impacts on nearby residential properties development in terms of overlooking, overshadowing, overbearing and noise
- Amenity of future occupiers to include internal daylight/sunlight and outlook, in particular to single aspect units to south

Planning Authority's comments:

- Concerns regarding units facing the embankment and this needs to be addressed

Prospective Applicant's response:

- All potential overlooking will be addressed
- Will re-examine landscape embankment
- 100% of the units are south west facing

Further ABP comments:

- Address overlooking, overshadowing, noise and traffic
- Submit a schedule of floor areas

3. Biodiversity

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Report of Biodiversity Officer of planning authority dated 30th May 2019, as contained in Appendix B of Chief Executive Opinion
- Tree removal; root protection for trees proposed for retention
- Bat survey and possible impacts of lighting

Planning Authority's comments:

- Recommended submission of NIS

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Work is being carried out on a bat survey
- A NIS could be screened out

Further ABP comments:

- Submit a bat survey, lighting and ecology reports
- Address issues of any impacts on the stream including any impacts of proposed bridge- reference made to Golf Lane and Doyle's Nursery SHD applications re: provision of bridge over streams

4. Transport and Parking

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Parking provision
- Report of Transportation Division of planning authority dated 31st May 2019, as contained in Appendix B of Chief Executive Opinion
- Details relating to excavation/haulage routes/ construction traffic management

Planning Authority's comments:

- Recommended that applicant justify the parking numbers
- Cycle parking should be included
- Submit details in relation to one-way system proposed between phase 1 and 2
- Wayfinding
- Cycle routes should be detailed

Prospective Applicant's response:

- There will be a signage strategy
- Interface will be examined between two phases
- Construction traffic will be addressed; construction management plan will be submitted
- Public transport in close proximity and will be set out

Further ABP comments:

- Justify the proposed car parking provision
- Outline the availability of public transport
- Submit a traffic assessment
- Provide details on construction traffic

5. Drainage Matters

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Report of Surface Water Drainage Planning Division of planning authority dated 29th May 2019, as contained in Appendix B of Chief Executive Opinion
- Report of Irish Water to An Bord Pleanála dated 07th June 2019

Planning Authority's comments:

- No surface water issues
- Flood risk – in principle is fine but should be detailed
- Detail flood protection and excavation measures
- Take account of flood risk in relation to the walkways

Prospective Applicant's response:

- No outstanding issues
- Satisfied with sewerage disposal
- Works are being carried out by the applicant subject to Irish Water specification

Further ABP comments:

- Detail drainage and any possible impact on trees

6. Any other matters

ABP comments:

- Should be no discrepancy between drawings
- Procedural issue relating to description of development in public notices
- Address any archaeology issues
- Submit the following details/reports- a building lifecycle report (include internal communal areas); materials/finishes report; CGI's/visualisations/cross sections of proposal which include views from wider area; landscaping/boundary treatments; schedule of floor areas

Planning Authority's comments:

- Phasing
- Length of Block B is a concern
- Examine coastal fringe policy on operative CDP

Applicants Comments:

- Part V units will be located in Block A
- Part V units in Phase 2 have been offset into Phase 1

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 Direct of Planning
July, 2019