



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-305128-19

Case Reference / Description	438 no. Build to Rent apartments (408 no. apartments, 28 no. shared living units) and associated site works. 26 Parkgate Street, Dublin 8.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	18 th September, 2019	Start Time	11.30 am
Location	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	1.15 pm
Chairperson	Rachel Kenny	Executive Officer	Cora Cunningham

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

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

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Joe O'Reilly, Chartered Land
Eoin Wilcox, Chartered Land
Stephen Little, Stephen Little and Associates
Eleanor MacPartlin, Stephen Little and Associates
Niall Connolly, Stephen Little and Associates
Rory Murphy, Reddy Architecture and Urbanism
Rob Keane, Reddy Architecture and Urbanism
Fergus Monaghan, Arup Engineering
Tony Lynch, Arup Engineering
Bill Hastings, Arc Consulting
Feargus McGarvey, Mitchell & Associates Landscape Architects
David Walshe, IN2 Consulting Engineers

Brian Kehoe, Lafferty Project Management
--

Representing Planning Authority

Mary Conway, Deputy Dublin Planning Officer

Rhona Naughton, Senior Planner

Niamh Kiernan, Assistant Conservation Officer

Edel Kelly, Senior Transportation Officer

Heidi Thorsdalen, Senior Executive Planner
--

Mary McDonald, Assistant Conservation Officer

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 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 12th 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. **Principle of Development: City centre mixed use zoning objective (Z5)**
2. **Development Strategy for the site including urban design considerations such as building height and the bulk, scale and mass of blocks; architectural treatment; and interface with public streets**
3. **Housing Format: Combination of BTR and Shared Living Accommodation**
4. **Support Facilities and Services including communal facilities and amenities, support services and management**
5. **Residential Amenity: open space, aspect of units, access to daylight and sunlight, wind impacts and impact on existing dwellings**
6. **Architectural heritage, archaeology and impact on protected views**
7. **Transportation**
8. **Site Services**
9. **Childcare**
10. **Any other matters**

1. Principle of Development: City centre mixed use zoning objective (Z5)

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Overall mix of uses in the context of the Z5 zoning objective.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Proposed uses are permissible within the zoning
- Extensive pre-planning carried out with PA, some matters still to be resolved.
- Had regard to SDRA for area
- Focus is to provide a residential scheme providing public and private realm
- 29% active uses at ground level including active frontages, ground floor active space are employment spaces
- Z9 open space zoning to rear of the site
- Significant amount of employment floorspace coming on stream in the City Biggest constraint is lack of residential accommodation
- Only site in the city that is adjacent to the river, all other sites are cut off from the river by roads
- Prime location for residential development given the river frontage and proximity to Phoenix Park

Planning Authority's comments:

- The site is within the city centre mixed use zoning
- SDRA principles envisages that the Heuston area will provide a counter balance to the Docklands
- PA question percentage of employment/commercial uses and would expect a greater mix of uses throughout floors and not just at ground level
- Satisfied that the mix of uses would not contravene zoning objective. The mix may contravene the guiding principles for the SDRA in the Development Plan

Further ABP comments:

- Need to address the PA's aspirations for area under SDRA, and the zoning vision which envisages a mix of uses

- Need to outline the two land-use zonings on a layout plan so that ABP can be confident no conflict arises

2. Development Strategy for the site including urban design considerations such as building height and the bulk, scale and mass of blocks; architectural treatment; and interface with public streets

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Height of the 29-storey tower. Visual/skyline impacts, particularly from sensitive views
- Scale, massing and proportions of the blocks and the interface to Parkgate Street, to the apartments to the west and to the River Liffey to the south
- Placemaking and legibility considerations
- Architectural expression, detailing and material finishes
- Discrepancies in the drawings submitted

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Scheme evolved on foot of prior discussions with PA as detailed in the pre-application records
- Scale of co-ordinating across the design team difficult and acknowledge discrepancies in the submitted documents
- The site is prominent, and the need for a design of exceptional quality is acknowledged
- High quality materials proposed – detail in the architectural statement
- Design team of the view that they have got to a stage where the proportions between the tower and the other blocks works. Continue to work on architectural and material detailing
- Further studies are being undertaken in relation to the top of the tower and how this will meet skyline
- Elevational drawings need more detail
- Position of height on corner of site most appropriate
- Public realm and access provided to river from the base of the tower
- Cognisant of adjoining buildings, daylight/sunlight analysis carried out
- Additional work is required in order to provide a good quality finished development

Planning Authority's comments:

- Extensive consultation with applicant, and the nature and scale of the development is accepted in principle
- Scope for high building on proposed site, but the PA has not seen the level of detail needed in relation to massing, architectural expression and materiality.
- Detailed discussion regarding layout, positioning of public/private open space and access to river
- Exceptional architectural character and quality needed for this site
- Development plan requires a slenderness ratio of 3:1. Tower should be no wider than 30 metres on any view

Further ABP comments:

- Development Plan allows for tall buildings of 50m+ in Heuston SDRA
- Strong urban design argument and a definitive design needed in support of the development. Evolution of the scheme from original plan to application should be detailed
- Further detail needed in relation to massing, architectural expression and materials
- In addition to the city-wide views, there is a need to address the local context along Parkgate Street/River/Heuston Station. A significant step up in scale from existing contiguous development. More detail needed to show the scale, massing and proportions and how this will interface with existing development
- Provide CGI/Photomontage of views from Parkgate Street/Heuston Station
- Consider flythrough as part of application

3. Housing Format: Combination of BTR and Shared Living Accommodation**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Residential and shared living within one scheme
- Apartment guidelines envisage a shared/community environment.
- Shared living to date has been stand-alone development with a critical mass of bed-spaces to create a sense of community and to sustain the critical ancillary amenities, activities, services and facilities associated with co-living

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Have reviewed the proposed development and on reflection having regard to the management of the scheme all the units will be 'Build to Rent'

4. Support Facilities and Services including communal facilities and amenities, support services and management**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Communal facilities and amenity areas

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Community facilities proposed
- Envisaged that the tower block would have its own character and amenity areas
- EIAR will address provision
- Will provide more clarity in the application

Planning Authority's comments:

- Clarity required

Further ABP comments:

- Management agreement/covenant required for BTA under SPPR 7 of the Apartment Guidelines
- Need to address internal and external communal areas and support facilities, quantum, quality, distribution and function of spaces and how spaces will be managed
- Need to address the amenity and usability of open spaces at higher levels

- PA raises issue with regard to social and community infrastructure for the wider area and need for an audit

5. Residential Amenity: open space, aspect of units, access to daylight and sunlight, wind impacts and impact on existing dwellings

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Residential amenity – private open space provision, number of dual aspect units and single aspect north facing units, access to daylight and sunlight and impact on adjacent properties

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Slight reduction in daylight due to tower height
- Roof gardens have two aspects, active enjoyment during good weather and provide some visual amenity during bad weather
- Will submit views of different aspects
- May be able to provide more balconies, will address in application

Planning Authority's comments:

- Question housing mix and high percentage of smaller units
- Need to demonstrate amenity and that shared facilities are of high quality to offset lack of private amenity space

Further ABP comments:

- SPPR 8 of the Apartment Guidelines, in relation to Build to Rent, allows for a relaxation of standards on the basis of alternative, compensatory communal support facilities, but puts an onus on applicant to demonstrate the overall quality of the scheme
- Further detail is required in relation to private/communal open space provision and compensatory measures for reduced private open space; percentage of dual aspect units and number of north facing single aspect units; daylight/sunlight analysis and shadow analysis is needed for all blocks; and the impact on existing residential development should be addressed in the application
- Quality and 'all-weather' amenity and usability of upper level roof gardens should be addressed

6. Architectural heritage, archaeology and impact on protected views

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Impact on architectural heritage and historic views, including protected structures on the site, the local context along Parkgate Street and around Heuston Station, and other key views such as those along the Quays and from the Phoenix Park

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Protected structures are to be retained.
- Level of intervention to the protected wall along the river/southern boundary seeks to balance conservation requirements and bring sunlight into the site

- Incorporating larger outbuilding into the scheme. Looking at the possibility of retaining some of the smaller out building
- Will take on board PA comments

Planning Authority's comments:

- There is some divergence of views between the Planning and Conservation Sections in relation to the scheme
- Conservation officer accepts the principle of the development, however, concerned in relation to building height, impact on views of Wellington Monument as you move along river, and impact on historic buildings on Parkgate Street. Noted that the locations identified by the Development Plan for taller buildings in this SDRA are set back from the river
- Concern at removal of part of turret and a request for more meaningful engagement with regard to archaeology
- Further discussions required in relation to the riverside wall. Planning section support the interventions to allow sunlight in but note the need to strike a balance

Further ABP comments:

- Need to address issues raised by the PA / Conservation Officer in the application
- Have regard to archaeology and treatment of same

7. Transportation

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Matters raised in PA report in relation to access and servicing of the site (waste collection, drop offs etc)

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Applicant will look at the design issues. Design ongoing.
- Ongoing discussions with GoCar in relation to car sharing and long-term management of a car club

Planning Authority's comments:

- Proposed development in good location – close to city and public transport
- Details required in relation to interaction with public street in terms of access and servicing
- PA will facilitate meeting with TII in relation to Luas
- Anticipate challenges during construction – need to consider access arrangements at design stage
- Liffey Cycle Route recently published and will run to front of the site
- Need to provide full details of travel plan and car club

Further ABP comments:

- Transportation issues should be resolved prior to making an application

8. Site Services

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- The wastewater connection and upgrades that may be required

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Applicant has engaged with Irish Water and principles of connection agreement are agreed

Further ABP comments:

- Any works requiring consent will be included within the red line boundary

9. Childcare

ABP comments:

- Consider childcare provision based on the needs of residential units and the employment uses and taking account of the sites accessibly to a significant public transport interchange

Perspective Applicants Comments:

- Will submit a childcare audit with application

10. Any other matters

- No other matters discussed

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