



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-304965-19

Case Reference / Description	575 Build to Rent apartments and associated site works. Former Aldi Site, Carmanhall Road, Sandyford Industrial Estate, Dublin 18.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	11 th September, 2019	Start Time	11.30 am
Location	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	1.10 pm
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Cora Cunningham

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Karen Kenny, Senior Planning Inspector
Cora Cunningham, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Amy Lee, Richmond Homes
Kenneth Beirne, Richmond Homes
Derek Byrne, Henry J Lyons Architects
Roldan Jacoby, Henry J Lyons Architects
Patrick Raggett, O'Connor Sutton Cronin Consulting Engineers
Anthony Horan, O'Connor Sutton Cronin Consulting Engineers
Patrice McVeigh, O'Connor Sutton Cronin Consulting Engineers
Bernard Seymour, Bernard Seymour Landscape Architects
Sadhbh O'Connor, Thornton O'Connor Town Planning
Ciara Cosgrave, Thornton O'Connor Town Planning

Representing Planning Authority

Ger Ryan, Senior Planner
Naoimh Fleming, A/Senior Executive Planner
Marguerite Cahill, Executive Planner
Johanne Codd, Drainage
Clare Casey, Transportation
Donal Kearney, Parks and Landscape

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 16th 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 27th 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. Building Height**
- 2. Quantum of development – residential cap under objective MC4 of the Sandyford Urban Framework Plan**
- 3. Development Strategy – housing mix, amenity, residential support facilities / services / amenities, childcare and car parking**
- 4. Part V**
- 5. Drainage and Flooding Matters**
- 6. Any other matters**

1. Building Height

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Building height. Increase from what was previously approved on site and exceedance of the 14-storey cap under the Sandford Urban Framework Plan.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Framework Plan outdated, superseded by national policy.
- Scheme is design led. Height for visual interest / wayfinding at the entrance to Sandyford and close to the Luas stop.
- Height does not impact on amenities. Floor to ceiling heights differ from what was permitted resulting in a 5.5 metre difference between proposed and permitted development.
- Function room proposed on top floor of building.
- Proposed development will not be visible from opposite side of site. Designers looked holistically at the area.
- Shift in massing has helped with vista, daylight and sunlight.
- Ongoing discussions with owners of adjacent site in relation to boundary treatment, landscaping and tie-ins.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Sandyford Urban Framework Plan provides for building height based on an analysis of the area. The 17-storey tower is not supported. Height should be appropriate to area.
- Need to ensure conditions are attached to a grant of permission in order to ensure that the entire area reads as one and to ensure tie-ins with adjacent site.

Further ABP comments:

- Material Contravention statement relies on change of national policy. Onus on applicant to demonstrate quality of the scheme. Further justification required in relation to the urban design and architectural considerations that underpin the proposed building heights.
- Need to have regard to connections through urban block into adjacent sites.

2. Quantum of development – residential cap under objective MC4 of the Sandyford Urban Framework Plan

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Exceedance of residential cap under Objective MC4 of the SUFFP.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Proposed development if permitted would exceed the cap by c. 67 units. Figure given in PA opinion overstates the exceedance. The exceedance is 5% and is not considered material. The applicant will provide further detail at application stage.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Cap of 1300 units introduced in 2016 Development Plan.
- The stated figure in relation to existing / permitted development in the opinion is an error. The total number of existing / permitted units would be 1367, 67 over the cap permitted.
- The cap is related to mix of uses in this area, rather than a core strategy issue.

Further ABP comments:

- The clarification in relation to the extent of the exceedance is noted. The applicant is advised to justify the number of units proposed in the context of MC4 and to consider any potential conflict with the core strategy.

3. Development Strategy – housing mix, amenity, residential support facilities / services / amenities, childcare and car parking.**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Mix of units having regard to lower number of 3 bed units being provided in proposed development.
- The standard of amenity having regard to the quantity and quality of amenity spaces, communal areas and services / facilities.
- Reduced rate of car parking.
- Level of childcare provision.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Housing mix demand different in Build to Rent developments, no demand for 3 bed units. Demographic profile will be addressed in EIAR to be submitted with application.
- Prospective applicant in discussion with PA in relation to amenity space / landscaping. High quality landscaping proposed.
- Two amenity areas to be provided on proposed site together with two gym zones and possibility to provide further areas. Management plan to be submitted with application.
- In terms of reduced car parking, half a floor of permitted basement car parking is omitted under the revised scheme. Looked at other SHD approvals, levels of car ownership in the area and level of management. Car club to be provided and a higher level of managed parking proposed.
- Will demonstrate in application how accessible proposed development is compared to other SHD applications with lower rates of car parking provision.
- Childcare assessment submitted. Rockbrook permitted on adjacent site as a build to sell development, large creche proposed as part of that scheme. Will take on board comments and look at proposed creche size.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Obligation to provide housing mix and to create sustainable communities.
- Critical mass of housing in Sandyford Business District with primarily 1-2 beds. When amount of 3 bed units in Sandyford is considered the mix then comes into focus.
- Lower number of car parking spaces proposed than permitted. PA looking for higher provision of car parking and concerned that the proposed development would set an undesirable precedent. PA would have concerns in relation to stacked car parking
- Smaller creche than that previously permitted under condition of the extant permission. PA have similar view to ABP.
- PA satisfied with landscaping proposals, further details required in application.
- PA require further sun analysis, include tree specification in details.

Further ABP comments:

- Justification required in relation to unit mix.
- Need clarity in relation to the quantum and quality of active spaces and communal areas and services / facilities and details for the management of same.
- Clarify quantum and quality of amenity, documentation unclear in relation to private and public open space, ensure good quality internal and external amenity space.
- Further consideration required in relation to size of the creche.
- Apartment guidelines allow for some relaxations of standards for BTR schemes, however, onus on applicant to demonstrate overall quality of the development.

4. Part V**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Part V and transfer of units.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Submitted documentation refers to sale of units to PA in error. Part V to be leased, ongoing discussions with PA.

5. Drainage and Flooding Matters**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Drainage and Flooding.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Prospective applicant to discuss further with PA.

PA comments:

- PA need for further detail on drainage calculations.
- Flood issues in area.

Further ABP comments:

- Ensure clarity in application in relation to drainage and servicing.

- Noted that flood risk issues on subject site and adjacent site were successfully addressed under previous applications.

6. Any other matters

ABP comments:

- Address wind analysis in application.
- Be mindful of separation distances and address.
- Submit Taking in Charge details.
- Submit details relating to management of public areas during day and night time.

Applicants Comments

- PA raised concern in relation to separation distances.
- Ongoing discussions with PA in relation to taking in charge.
- Lift access to block D (addressing level difference) remains the same, will provide more details in application.
- Passive surveillance / active uses provided to Carmanhall Road.
- Management Plan in relation to amenities will be submitted.
- Issues raised in PA Opinion in relation to Blackthorn Drive parking bays noted, however, details are as previously approved.

Planning Authority's comments:

- PA looking for application to have regard to Rockbrook development.
- PA do not intend to take in charge.
- PA concern relating to access to Block D and management of same.
- Active frontage to be provided across width of site on Carmanhall Road.
- Address how communal room in Block D will be managed.
- Condition in previous permission in relation to continuation of cycle lane.

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
September, 2019