



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-306202-19

Description	303 no. Build to Rent apartments with a creche and all associated site works. (Parts of) St Laurence College, Wyattville Park/Road Loughlinstown, Glenageary, Co. Dublin.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	6 th February, 2020	Start Time	11:00am
Location	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	12:45pm
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	E.O.	Hannah Cullen

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Stephen Rhys Thomas, Senior Planning Inspector
Hannah Cullen, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Michael Hughes, BMCE
Peter O'Dwyer, BMCE
Peter Heffernan, Wilson Architecture
Marcus Reid, Wilson Architecture
Stephen M. Purcell, FAC
Kieran O'Neill (Promoter)
Robert Berkeley, (Promoter)
Dan Egan, The Big Space

Representing Planning Authority

Cáit Ryan, Senior Executive Planner
Fiona Cummins, Executive Planner
Claire Casey, Transportation Planning
Bernard Egan, Drainage Planning

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 **23rd January, 2020**, 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 **18th December 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. Zoning objective - School Masterplan and Landscape Design**
- 2. Site prominence and residential amenity – design, scale and massing**
- 3. Car Parking - Quantum and Design**
- 4. Site permeability**
- 5. Surface water management**
- 6. Any other matters**

1. Zoning objective - School Masterplan and Landscape Design

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Interaction of the proposed residential development with the residential and institutional zoning currently in place.
- Documentation supplied concentrates on the scheme, not on the surrounding context, school and residences. Transition from the development to the school facilities needs clarification/consideration.

PA Comments:

- Proximity of the proposed playing pitches and flood lighting overspill to surrounding area needs to be addressed.
- Clarity on the facilities associated with the school such as car parking and their management is unclear. Expansion plans of the school in the future.
- There may be scope to incorporate views from the Department of Education.

Prospective Applicants response:

- The proposed development is cognitive of the current land use zoning.
- Working alongside the school board and aligning with their institutional obligations.
- There is an ability to expand the school footprint if required.
- 292 students currently registered in the school.
- There are a set of character areas throughout the site and there is a wish to safeguard the open character of the overall lands.
- The proposal provides local permeability for the public.
- Landscape team will work with the school design team, use of stronger landscaping to amalgamate the two areas (school and proposed development)

Further PA comments:

- Breakdown of the development calculation needs to be further addressed, what informed the decision to develop the site area proposed.

Further Applicants comments:

- Will pursue advice from the Department of Education, in terms of school growth requirements.

2. Site prominence and residential amenity – design, scale and massing

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Site is slightly higher than the N11 carriageway. Section 28 Guidelines provide flexibility for height dependant of site context.
- Is the pedestrianised open 24/7?

PA Comments:

- County Development Plan details N11 has urban corridor potential.
- There are concerns with the proposed height, scale, design and the abrupt transition from existing buildings.
- The proposed development does not enhance or create a sense of place.
- Different appearance to development in the surrounding area.
- Surface car parking is lined up behind garden walls.

Prospective Applicants response:

- The bulk and scale of the higher elements are distributed so to face the open space area.
- Design report details how the buildings are broken down. Divided the length of the site by half then further broke down. Central plaza brings everyone into the public space. There is movement around all aspects of the site.
- Separation distance of 40m+ between blocks and existing residential units.
- The pedestrianised entrance will be accessible 24/7.
- The school will control an element of their lands, if the planning authority wants to limit access we can discuss and explore options.

Further ABP comments:

- Some proposed elevations may be considered of merit, others, such as that facing the N11, may benefit from further iterations.
- Include photomontages from different key viewpoints and positions from existing receptors/residents.
- Importance of inclusion of cross sections at application stage, particularly showing proposed development in context with existing adjacent residential and how such matters as potential overlooking and/or overbearing impacts are being addressed.

Further Applicants comments:

- Landscape visual impact and a series of more detailed assessments will be included at application stage.
- Operational plan can be created demonstrating how people will pass through the open spaces and buildings.

- More work can be done on the elevations at exposed locations.

3. Car Parking - Quantum and Design

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Notes the planning authority's concerns about lack of car parking.
- Surrounding demographic car ownership patterns and the documents submitted supporting this factor are noted.
- Reconfiguration of the school car parking should be included in the car parking strategy.

PA Comments:

- Accept the car parking ratio is lower the Development Plan standards because this is a BTR scheme, however the figures proposed are too low.
- The plans should clearly demonstrate access points to other areas.
- Car parking controls/management should be outlined.
- 1+ ratio of parking in nearby Cherrywood SDZ.

Prospective Applicants response:

- Preferred parking quantum discussed at 1st meeting was ratio of 1:1.
- BTR scheme residents will not rely solely on car parking and car use.
- Parking ratio at 0.68 in areas surrounding such as Roselawn, Cookstown, Swords Road.
- Car park is separate for the school.
- Cycle parking will be provided, further discussion with the PA will take place and include details at application stage.
- Operational controls of car parking will be looked into further.
- Brown Street student accommodation BTR scheme previously delivered, can include details of how the scheme was successful.
- Residential travel plan will be submitted at application stage, and has been requested by the planning authority.

4. Site permeability

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- The details submitted that show how to leave the site and gain access to the N11.
- Cherrywood will be an important destination for future occupants and a defined pedestrian/cyclist route will be necessary.

- Sections should be included at application stage to demonstrate the proposed ramp infrastructure.
- Relaxation of car parking requirements needs to be justified, existing public transportation infrastructure in the area needs to be part of that justification
- School entrance/walkway controls should be outlined.

PA comments:

- Route to the school is accessible. School entrance is controlled.
- Going through the school grounds along the frontage of the site is the most desirable.
- Access to the playing pitches requires clarity.

Prospective Applicants response:

- The existing pathway to the school grounds is within the school's property.
- Open linear landscape corridor provides a buffer to the slip road from the N11.
- Safety and accessibility standards can be met.
- The levels across the site are around 3 meters, lower at the main entrance and higher towards the N11.
- Proposed ramp to the N11, there is a possibility to move the ramp further east on the site.
- The local authority has ownership of the margin of land along the slip road from N11.
- Consent can be sought to incorporate landscaping of this area with the scheme, discussions with the planning authority will be necessary.
- Pitches are accessed from the school not the proposed site.
- Construction traffic, there is scope for left in left out access from N11, permissible by the planning authority.

Further PA comments:

- In terms of construction traffic, PA is unsure of scope for left in left out at site, advise further discussion with the traffic section of the Council.

5. Surface water management

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Technical issues raised in the planner's report.

PA comments:

- Clarity needed on linkage of the carpark and site attenuation proposed.
- Draft wayleave agreement/drawing to be provided at application stage.

Prospective Applicants response:

- Further information will be prepared in relation to all on site attenuation. At application stage it will be demonstrated how the two areas link, potential to use a single outfall, diversion of surface water.

6. Any other matters

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- In terms of future occupant amenity, apartments and dual aspect compliance, sections thorough the site should be submitted at application stage to demonstrate this.
- Given the scale of development schedule 7(A) EIA screening information should be submitted.

PA comments:

- Review the entrance to the school and access point proximity.

Further Applicants comments:

- We are compliant with dual aspect.

Conclusions:

The representatives of ABP emphasised the following:

- 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
February, 2020