



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-305127-19

Case Reference / Description	478 no. apartments (469 no. apartments, 9 no. live-work apartments) and associated site works. Ratoath Road, Dublin 11.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	2 nd October, 2019	Start Time	10.00 am
Location	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	10.50 am
Chairperson	Rachel Kenny	Executive Officer	Cora Cunningham

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Rachel Kenny, Director of Planning
Lorraine Dockery, Senior Planning Inspector
Cora Cunningham, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Kieran Rush, Ballymore
Paul Carty, Ballymore
Cathal Dalton, Ballymore
Michael Prenty, Ballymore
Alan Larkin, Reddy Architecture + Urbanism
Peter Carroll, Reddy Architecture + Urbanism
Rob Keane, Reddy Architecture + Urbanism
Garry Flood, JJB (J. B. Barry and Partners Limited)???
Jonathan Kirwan, JAK Consulting Engineers
Sean Whelan, JAK Consulting Engineers
Mark Johnston, Parkwood
Eleanor McPartlin, Stephen Little and Associates
John Carty, Stephen Little and Associates

Stephen Little, Stephen Little and Associates

Representing Planning Authority

Siobhan O'Connor, Senior Executive Planner
--

David Freeland, Assistant Planner

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 8th September, 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 August, 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 for the site to include proposal in context of zoning objective; height, scale and massing; density; layout; elevational treatments, connectivity, open space/public realm**
- 2. Residential amenity**
- 3. Transport and parking**
- 4. Drainage and flood risk**
- 5. Any other matters**

- 1. Development strategy for the site to include proposal in context of zoning objective; height, scale and massing; density; layout; elevational treatments, connectivity, open space/public realm**
- 2. Residential amenity**
Items 1 and 2 dealt with together

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Considered to be a strategic site close to good public transport links in an area where services and facilities exist and/or are emerging. Site could accommodate a quality development of appropriate height, density, scale and design. The provision of two landmark buildings on the site may work well at this location, subject to appropriate design/scale/massing
- ABP would have similar concerns to those expressed by the PA in their Opinion in relation to height, scale, massing and elevational treatment of proposal and impacts that same would have on overall quality of the proposed scheme, together with visual impacts on wider area. Density proposed is more akin to an inner urban area
- Have issue with extent/scale/design of Block D at southern end of site, rather than its overall height per se
- Proposal could be considered to be monolithic in nature, lacks variation in materiality/elevational treatment and may not provide optimum levels of amenity for future occupants. In terms of amenity, concerns in particular with regard to extent of daylight/sunlight into areas of open space; amenity of balconies/roof gardens at higher levels
- Justification required for development proposed in context of section 3.2 and SPPR3 of the Urban Development and Building Heights, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (December 2018)
- Residential amenity of the proposed development needs further examination

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Have looked at addressing PA concerns since receiving Opinion and have made some amendments on foot of this, for example increasing separation distances to reduce overshadowing; omission of floors to address concerns of massing; stepping down of blocks
- Block D looked at with regard to its relationship to adjoining road, will look in more detail at block
- Pedestrian comfort comments acknowledged and will be addressed in application
- Plaza designed to integrate with greenway, landscaping will address any changed to proposed layout
- Proposed development not a Build to Rent scheme, will be actively managed, submitted reports will be tailored accordingly

Planning Authority's comments:

- PA's preference would be for one landmark building on proposed site, however concern is more in relation to massing of Block D rather than its overall height
- Quality of scheme is paramount
- No qualitative cap but must ensure quality

Further ABP comments:

- PA Opinion gives good guidance on potential issues relating to proposed development
- Acknowledged the site's context in terms of roads and levels and therefore internal amenity spaces are an important element of proposed development- creating sense of place within development; inward looking
- Pedestrian comfort can be discussed further with PA
- Address issues of residential amenity, both internal and external
- Submit details on extent of dual aspect units; schedule of floor areas
- PA Opinion raises issue with percentage of uses (residential/non-residential), this balance may be altered redesign of scheme- be cognisant of caps on other uses under SHD
- Justification advised in relation to other uses proposed- want to avoid vacant units on site
- Address housing mix proposed in application and submit justification for same, if considered necessary

3. Transport and parking**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Level of car parking spaces proposed considered excessive, having regard to location of site and proximity to public transport

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Intend to reduce quantity of residential car parking in application
- Emphasis on car club/GoCar which will be made available on street together with disabled car parking

Planning Authority's comments:

- Issues can be discussed further with Transport Department

Further ABP comments:

- Clarification required with regards to assigning/management of spaces between various uses
- Have regard to ducting for electric cars, ABP now adding conditions to decisions with regards to this matter
- Address issues raised in transport report accompanying PA Opinion
- Liaise with PA prior to lodging application

4. Drainage and flood risk**ABP comments:**

- No departmental report received from PA
- Irish Water submission in relation to wastewater refers to capacity to connect 300 units initially; Project Work Services Agreement is required for remainder of units
- In relation to water supply, upgrade required to existing watermain
- Liaise with Irish Water and PA

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Ongoing discussions with Irish Water

5. Any other matters

ABP comments:

- Have regard to Schedule 7a in relation to EIAR
- Submit School Demand and Concentration Report; Building Lifecycle Report; additional CGI's and visualisations; phasing plan; details of universal access and waste management details
- Have regard to the interface between public/private areas together with area between proposed buildings and public realm
- No childcare facilities proposed – detail where local facilities are located, capacity/occupancy of same
- Submit details of floor areas, number of dual aspect units
- Letters of support, if available, should be submitted in relation to proposed primary care centre
- ABP will determine if longer permission timeline is required

Applicants Comments

- In discussions with private operator for primary care centre
- Discussions with Irish Rail and NTA in relation to new station, confirmation received that construction will begin shortly
- Can longer permission timeline be sought

Planning Authority's 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

Rachel Kenny
Director of Planning
October, 2019