



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Record of Meeting ABP-304985-19

<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	Demolition of 3 no. houses and construction of 165 no. apartments with all associated site works. "Dunluce", "Drumkeen" & "Mulberry", Glenamuck Road, Carrickmines, Dublin 18		
<b>Case Type</b>	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
<b>Date:</b>	11 <sup>th</sup> September, 2019	<b>Start Time</b>	14:30 pm
<b>Location</b>	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	<b>End Time</b>	15:40 pm
<b>Chairperson</b>	Rachel Kenny	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Maeve Williams

### Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Rachel Kenny, Director of Planning
Ronan O'Connor, Planning Inspector
Maeve Williams, Executive Officer

### Representing Prospective Applicant:

Gerard Long, Victoria Homes
Paul Corrigan, Corrigan Hodnett
Celia Harris, Mitchell Associates
Igmar Ferreira, Ferreira Architects
Patrycja Kochaniuk, Ferreira Architects
Brenda Butterly, McGill Planning
Trevor Sadler, McGill Planning

### Representing Planning Authority

Michelle Breslin, Senior Executive Planner
Rebecca Greene, Executive Planner
Elaine Carrol, Executive Engineer (Drainage)
Claire Casey, Senior Executive Engineer (Transportation)

Mark Freeman, Senior Executive Engineer (Transportation)
Dermot O'Connor, Executive Engineer (Environment & Climate Change)
Donal Kearney, Assistant Parks Superintendent
Ruairi O'Dulaing, Parks Superintendent

## 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 21<sup>st</sup> 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 25<sup>th</sup> July 2019 formally requesting pre-application consultations with ABP. Prospective applicant was 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. Residential Density**
- 2. Design, Layout and Landscaping (including height, boundary treatment, relationship to street, internal layout and public realm, impact on existing mature trees).**
- 3. Transport (including car parking provision, cycle and pedestrian links, required infrastructure upgrades).**
- 4. Residential and Visual Amenity**
- 5. Surface Water Management and Flood Risk**
- 6. Childcare Provision**
- 7. Any other matters**

### **1. Residential Density**

#### **ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Justification of the proposed of 111 units/ha required, having regard to the distance between the development and the closest LUAS stop.

#### **Planning Authority's comments:**

- Are cognitive of the National Planning Framework and of the County Development Plan 2013 which still applies.
- LAP seeks 45- 50 units per ha which is an appropriate amount for this site.
- The PA are bound by the Local Area Plan (LAP).
- This site will be more car dependent than other sites within its vicinity.
- No QBC proposed along the front of this site – to their knowledge – bus connect route not extending to this proposed development.

#### **Prospective Applicant's response:**

- The proposed development is within 10-15 minutes' walk to the LUAS; will provide robust justification in relation to the density at application stage.

#### **Further ABP comments:**

- Ensure all the information is submitted at application stage as ABP cannot request further information once the application has been made.

- 2. Design, Layout and Landscaping (including height, boundary treatment, relationship to street, internal layout and public realm, impact on existing mature trees).**

#### **ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Site layout, in particular the relationship to the street frontage. Justification for the design approach taken would be required.
- Site ownership, in particular the portion to the western end of Springfield Lane.
- Impact on the existing trees on the site, having particular regard to the impact of the basement construction.

#### **Planning Authority's response:**

- The LAP outlines a height of 2-4 storeys on this site. However are cognitive of the building height guidelines.

- The removal of trees is excessive. To keep the trees would protect the character of the road.
- The north/eastern corner of the site will have all the trees removed.
- It would be beneficial to visit the site with the applicant and discuss the biodiversity of the area with particular attention to the trees.
- The maturity of trees is of value to the area.
- A detailed ecological assessment should include details of tree and detail what trees/hedgerows are to be removed.

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Five storeys is appropriate for the local area. The proposed development will have an urban feel to it.
- A portion of Springfield lane is controlled by NAMA, the prospective applicant is in discussions to reach an agreement to improve the visual aesthetic of the laneway.
- It is intended to upgrade the area of the Springfield lane that they have ownership of.
- A tree survey was conducted on the proposed site. There was evidence of trees under category 'U' (dead/diseased) and category 'C' (shorter time expectancy).
- Reintroduce native trees and nursery trees into the proposed development, to keep the character of the green area. The public open space will be expanded upon, with the aim of having a river walkway at application stage.
- There are no other trees on other nearby sites.
- Will meet with PA to walk the area regarding their plans for culling trees and planting 200 new trees.

**Further ABP comments:**

- Further work is necessary in relation to the proposed elevations, as the visual appearance does not tally with the CGIs.
- If the applicant considers any aspect of the proposal would constitute a Material contravention under Section 37(2), the prospective applicant must advertise this fact.
- Prospective applicant encouraged to meet with the PA ecologist for further discussion on the ecological corridor to discuss the value of grouping of trees and the knock-on effects to the surrounding areas and to ensure that the proposed development has a realistic biodiversity plan when submitting the proposed development.
- Ensure all details of legal entitlements to make application be stated in the application public notices.

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

**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Permeability, connectivity, identify possible pedestrian links to other sites and services, as well as proposed upgrades to footpaths and roads in the vicinity of the site.
- Amount of car parking proposed. Some documents suggest that the site is highly accessible, but this may not tally with levels of car parking proposed.
- The timescale of the approved Part 8 Scheme.

**Planning Authority's response:**

- Recommend a condition restricting occupancy prior to the completion of the Part 8 Scheme/Estimated timeline is 2020/2021.
- GDDR has an impact regarding timing.
- Welcomes permeability if the application delivers what is outlined.
- Upgrade of road infrastructure welcomed as it will make Springfield Lane safer.

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Welcomes surrounding road infrastructure improvements.
- Seeks to provide permeability through the site.
- A reduction in car parking may negate the need to provide two separate basements/will look into this issue further.
- Links between the northern and southern half the site curtailed due to ownership issues (Springfield Lane).
- Note existing footpath between this site and the Luas station.

**Further ABP comments:**

- Ensure links to the other surrounding developments are detailed at application stage. May benefit from a Masterplan showing linkages to other sites.
- There are no footpaths or concrete proposals for provision on the opposite side of the Glenamuck road. Potential provision for upgrades/development contributions as part of the proposed development.

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

- Detailed assessments required in relation to impacts on surrounding residential amenity to include issues such as loss of daylight/sunlight/overshadowing, loss of privacy/overlooking, visual impact.

**Planning Authority's response:**

- Welcomes a contemporary vision of the proposed development.
- Concerns in relation to the visual impact of the development and the proximity to the boundary.

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- A five storey apartment blocks, with 200/300 trees and a stream running through the development, with a car free development would not be out of touch of the LAP guidelines.
- The proposed development is a good distance away from other developments north and south of the proposed development so it will not impact on these residents.

**Further ABP comments:**

- Ensure impacts on all windows are considered, including those ground floor units to the east of the site.
- Outline the window to window distance on the drawings.
- Include CGIs with a no leaf scenario (winter scenario).

## **5. Surface Water Management and Flood Risk**

### **ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- The stream running through the site and its potential to flood.
- Ensure technical requirements of the PA are met, as relates to surface water proposals.

### **Planning Authority's response:**

- Require a ground water analysis source/characteristic of the waterflow/impacts of the development. The analysis should consider nearby houses which have septic tanks and wells.
- Springfield Lane is an area where there are a lot of water springs and that the proposed development should be cognitive of this when submitting the proposed application, as there is no mention of it in the pre-application documents.

### **Prospective Applicant's response:**

- The submitted reports will be reviewed and figures/technical details clarified.
- The soil excavation information presented will be reviewed to ensure the information is accurate and in line with the current figures.
- Springfield Lane is not for them to manage.

### **Further ABP comments:**

- Ensure other issues relating to surface water are dealt with including the variation in levels between Springfield Lane and the development site.
- If any reports are amended at various stages, ensure that it is reflected in all other reports which will be submitted.

## **6. Childcare Provision**

### **ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- The non-provision of childcare facilities on the site.
- Reliance on permitted developments not yet operating. The Board would require certainty in relation to the need or otherwise for childcare facilities.
- Noted the calculation of a demand of 10 childcare spaces is based on Dublin wide data. May need data that is more specific to the area/socio-economic and demographic data.

### **Planning Authority's response:**

- Expect that there will be demand resulting from this development.

### **Prospective Applicant's comments:**

- Approximately 25% of residents expected to avail of childcare, based on figures from the census.
- There are crèches in other areas which are accessible via public transport.
- It will prove difficult for small developments to employ a management company.
- Will review this issue.

**Further ABP comments:**

- If the proposed development will not have child care facilities, it must be justified at application stage.

**7. Any other matters**

**Planning Authority:**

- Would like to see designated zones for rubbish collection. There are guidelines on the LA website for the prospective applicant to consult for their information.

**Prospective Applicant:**

- Will meet with the PA regarding some of the issues raised at this meeting.

**ABP comments:**

- Ensure that all information that can be included at application stage be included as there is no provision for further information once the application has been submitted.

**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](mailto: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](mailto:spatialplanning@water.ie)

---

Rachel Kenny  
Director of Planning  
September, 2019