



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-304875-19

Case Reference / Description	126 no. dwellings (58 no. houses, 68 no. apartments and associated site works. Seamount Road via Seamount Abbey, Seamount Road, Malahide, Co. Dublin.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	16 th August, 2019	Start Time	11.30 am
Location	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	12.45 pm
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Cora Cunningham

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Ronan O'Connor, Planning Inspector
Cora Cunningham, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Kieran Rush, Applicant
Paul Carty, Applicant
Cathal Dalton, Applicant
Eleanor MacPartlin, Stephen Little & Associates Town Planners
John Carty, Stephen Little & Associates Town Planners
Kosta Kapetangiannis, Reddy Architecture + Urbanism Architects
Gabriel Vieyramacias, Reddy Architecture + Urbanism Architects
Ian Worrell, Waterman Moylan Engineers
Dan Egan, The Big Space Landscape Architects

Representing Planning Authority

Sean Walsh, A/Senior Executive Planner
Kathy Tuck, Assistant Planner
Niall Thornton, Executive Engineer – Transportation
Niall McKiernan, Senior Executive Engineer – Water Services

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 August, 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 9th July, 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. density/internal layout/public realm)**
2. **Transport (including cycle and pedestrian links/permeability/car parking provision/required infrastructure upgrades)**
3. **Residential and Visual Amenity/Visual Impact**
4. **Childcare Provision**
5. **Any other matter**

1. Design and Layout (e.g. density/internal layout/public realm)

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Justification of density for the proposed development having regard to the proximity of the Dart station.
- Existing and proposed pedestrian/cycle connections to/from the site including possible connection via Oak Hall.
- Concern over raised communal area and relationship to garden area of adjacent dwelling/aspect of ground floor apartment units and proximity to car parking spaces.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Proposed development had been envisaged as Phase 2 of Seamount
- Additional pedestrian connections via 3rd party lands at Oak Hall to the west not possible/ Differing levels with Oak Hall and no agreement reached in relation to links/may be possible to provide at a future date.
- Density has increased significantly since previous permissions.
- Difference in topography from south to north of proposed site is a constraint.
- Potential to add additional floors in apartment blocks, visual impacts would need to be then revisited.
- Adjacent site not taken in charge, unable to get agreement with 3rd party landowner.
- Apartments are setback to prevent overlooking, screening provided at ground floor level.
- Applicant has legal right to connections into proposed development from Seamount Abbey.
- Wayleave for Irish Water on site.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Proposed density is acceptable.
- Note that density has been increased significantly since previous permission.
- Seamount Abbey, Oak Hall and St. James' Orchard not taken in charge.
- Links to 2 sections of site not included in previous permission.
- Ensure consent from Seamount Abbey obtained in order to connect to services.
- Ensure scope left for future connections to Oak Hall.
- PA satisfied with proposed permeability.
- Seapark Hill at higher level looking over proposed development, have regard to public amenity and address in application.
- Link being provided from St. James' Orchard currently under construction.
- Houses on the access road via Seamount road should be single storey.
- Issues raised in section 247 meetings have been taken on board by prospective applicant.
- Need to provide more landscaping details.

Further ABP comments:

- Either look at ways to increase density or provide further justification for the density as propose/ at the lower end of what may be acceptable.

- Consider merging 2 parallel roads off Seamount Road to provide one entrance, show in application that consideration has been given to merging roads if retaining 2 separate parallel roads.
- Concern in relation to cars traversing entire site, consider relocation apartment car parking in order to reduce same.
- Wayleave to be shown in application.
- Address issues raised in PA Opinion in relation to concerns associated with shared surfaces.
- All existing and future pedestrian/cycle access through proposed site to future park and also to trains, buses, etc. should be shown at application stage.
- Ensure views to park give passive surveillance.
- Include additional CGI's in application. Very limited information provided.
- Address house design and impact on streetscape.

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

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Traffic Impacts having regard to comments in PA Opinion, including those relating to the Traffic & Transport Assessment.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Junction to be redesigned, traffic counts to be carried out in September when traffic returns to normal levels
- Visitor cycle parking to be located closer to park and provide passive surveillance.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Car parking provision at lower level of what is required.
- Entrance onto Seamount Road requires upgrading.
- Traffic and Transport Assessment should state quantity of traffic rather than formal assessment/have regard to queuing times at peak times
- Ensure provision of suitably located visitor bicycle parking, increase of bicycle parking required.

3. Residential and Visual Amenity/Visual Impact

ABP comments:

- Assessment of daylight/sunlight and overshadowing impacts required.
- Provide additional CGI's from more viewpoints in application.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Full studies will be included in application.

4. Childcare Provision

ABP comments:

- No crèche being provided, report states adjoining site Jameson Wood Childcare has sufficient spaces available/need to demonstrate robustly if a crèche is required or not.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- If a crèche is included as part of the development it may not be viable.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Adjoining site Jameson Wood Childcare not currently operating.
- Creche design in Jameson Wood does not meet PA design requirements,

5. Any other matters

ABP comments:

- Submit Flood Risk Assessment with application that addresses proximity to the reservoir.
- Have regard to landscaping proposals and in particular the smaller open space areas, they appear to be incidental to proposed development.
- CGI's should show how landscaping will enhance overall scheme.

Applicants Comments

- Smaller open space areas provide for attenuation, semi-private open space on podium level, permeability being provided across site.
- Open space complies with required provisions, SuDs included in proposals
- PA require hedgerow to be retained along Seamount Heights.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Ensure relevant consents are in place with 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
- 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

Rachel Kenny
Director of Planning
September 2019