



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-304560-19

Case Reference / Description	234 no. residential units in a mix of apartments and duplexes. Former Doyles Nursery and Garden Centre and 'Benoni', Brennanstown Road, Cabinteely, Co. Dublin.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	11 th July 2019	Start Time	11:30 a.m.
Location	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	12:55 p.m.
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Ronan O'Connor, Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Pat Crean, Atlas GP Ltd. (Applicant)
Niall O'Byrne, Marlet
Shaun Thorpe, Marlet
Des Twomey, PLUS Architects
Suzanne McClure, Brock McClure Planning and Development Consultants
Matthew McRedmond, Brock McClure Planning and Development Consultants
Shaun Grima, AECOM (Traffic and Transport)
Michael Dunne, AECOM (Civils)
Magnus Hay, AECOM (Civils)
Cass Roche, PC Roche Landscape Architects
Emma McKendrick, AECOM

Representing Planning Authority

Stephen McDermott, A/Senior Planner
Michelle Breslin, Senior Executive Planner
Bernard Egan, Senior Executive Engineer
Elaine Carroll, Executive Engineer)
Donal Kearney, Assistant Parks Superintendent)
Claire Casey, Senior 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 25th 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 29th 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. Design and Layout (e.g. height, scale, massing, density)**
- 2. Transport (including cycle and pedestrian links, car parking provision, required infrastructure upgrades)**
- 3. Residential and Visual Amenity**
- 4. Surface Water Management and Flood Risk**
- 5. Any other matters**

1. Design and Layout (e.g. height, scale, massing, density)

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Proposed height, scale and massing of Block C/Scale of Blocks A and B
- Density of the proposed development
- Layout in regard to overshadowing and open spaces

Planning Authority's comments:

- The 8 storeys proposed for Block C is excessive
- Heights need to be justified in accordance with the guidelines
- The scale and massing of Block C are a concern/could be broken up more
- Acceptability of density is dependent on the quality of the design
- Open space could be improved – potential overshadowing of courtyard spaces.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The height of Block C is in accordance with the new height guidelines
- Taller blocks are located on the lower areas of the site
- Less tall structures are located on top of the hill
- There has been a clear out of central space to allow for more open space - This will allow for tree planting/There is more non-podium landscape
- Open space is higher per resident unit than previous permission
- A pedestrian friendly environment has been created
- Permeability allows for bicycle access

Further ABP comments:

- Justify the proposed height
- Demonstrate the quality of open space/Detail if there is overshadowing
- Address the concerns raised by the P.A

2. Transport (including cycle and pedestrian links, car parking provision, required infrastructure upgrades)

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Brennanstown Road upgrade works.
- Traffic Management
- Cycle and pedestrian links through the site and from Cabinteely Park to the proposed linear park to the north of the site.
- Car parking provision
- Location of the proposed Car Club spaces

Planning Authority's comments:

- Part 8 needs approval
- SLO130 proposal is not in place
- Works proposed are to be welcomed
- Car parking provision is a concern
- Seek 1 car parking space per unit
- Basement parking is fine
- An explanation is required as to how the lowest level will be accessed
- A quality audit should be submitted
- Clarify the swept path analysis

Prospective Applicant's response:

- A future connection to Cabinteely park has been allowed for
- Cyclists come down an independent road
- There are separate car access routes/Car parking basement levels are independent, and this will be explained/clarified.
- A quality audit can be submitted
- Car club spaces will be at surface level

Further ABP comments:

- Highlight pedestrian links and future connections, especially future connections to Luas
- Justify the car parking provision

3. Residential and Visual Amenity**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Proposed use of Block A
- Location of residential amenity space for residential unit in Block A
- Impacts of Blocks A and B on residential amenity of properties on Brennanstown Road
- Proposed multi-use play area and any potential noise issues
- Visual amenity in relation to massing
- Overlooking

Planning Authority's comments:

- Clarify plans for Block A
- Addition Sections Required
- A creche is not proposed and this needs to be addressed

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Use of Block A is being examined
- Scale and design of Block A is considered appropriate for the entrance to the development
- Block B has identical set back from the boundary as the development permitted.
- There are 2 storeys facing boundary.
- Setback top level has a blank elevation with no overlooking

- Upper levels are the bedroom and lower levels are the living spaces
- Any noise issues will be addressed
- The play area is away from residents and attenuation buffers it from noise
- Further discussion will take place with PA in relation to crèche provision

Further ABP comments:

- Submit CGI's showing the visual impact in a winter scenario/no leaf scenario
- Detail the interface of Blocks A and B and surrounding residents
- Justify design approach to Block A

4. Surface Water Management and Flood Risk

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Flood risk

Planning Authority's comments:

- Development lies within Flood Zones A and B pre-mitigation works.
- Satisfied with mitigation measures proposed.
- Justification tests are required however and concern raised in relation to this issue.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- There is no CFRAM mapping for the site
- Entire development is within Flood zone C after mitigation measures.
- A legal opinion will be sought in relation to the acceptability of approach to flooding issues.

Further ABP comments:

- Address flood risk
- Ensure compliance with guidelines
- There is no provision for further information to be sought at application stage

5. Any other business

ABP comments:

- Submit an ecological survey which includes a bat survey

Planning Authority's comments:

- Outline wind impact, taken in charge and building maintenance

Applicants Comments:

- No further comments

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

Tom Rabbette
Assistant Director of Planning
July 2019