



<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	Amendments to previously permitted development Reg.Ref:3665/15 (PL29N.246124) as amended by Reg. Refs: 4267/17, 2133/18 and 4306/18. Construction of 233 no. apartments, crèche and associated site works. Daneswell Place, Former Printworks/Smurfit Site, Botanic Road, Glasnevin, Dublin 9.		
<b>Case Type</b>	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
<b>Date:</b>	19 <sup>th</sup> March, 2020	<b>Start Time</b>	11:30am
<b>Location</b>	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	<b>End Time</b>	12:10pm
<b>Chairperson</b>	Rachel Kenny	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Hannah Cullen

**Representing An Bord Pleanála:**

Rachel Kenny, Director of Planning
Erika Casey, Senior Planning Inspector
Hannah Cullen, Executive Officer

**Representing Prospective Applicant:**

Sadhbh O'Connor, Thornton O'Connor Town Planning
Riette Gora, Senior Architect, Scanron

**Representing Planning Authority**

Barry O'Connell, Executive Planner
Mary McDonald, 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 **26<sup>th</sup> February, 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 **30<sup>th</sup> January, 2020** 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. Design strategy with particular regard to measures to overcome previous reasons for refusal; height, scale and massing of blocks particularly Block A; finishes and materials and open space/landscaping strategy.**
- 2. Residential amenity**
- 3. Any other matters**

**1. Design strategy with particular regard to measures to overcome previous reasons for refusal; height, scale and massing of blocks particularly Block A; finishes and materials and open space/landscaping strategy.**

**ABP Comments:**

- Proposed application is on foot of a previous application refusal.
- It is noted a number of changes to the blocks and height strategy have been introduced which is welcomed.
- Design approach in relation to block A is a principal concern.
- Treatment of the upper floors requires further consideration. Block appears prominent, as indicated in the CGI's provided.
- Further liaison between the applicant's conservation team and DCC's conservation officer is advisable.
- Not a merit based assessment, respond to the critiques given and ensure to robustly defend the chosen approach and why it is considered the optimal strategy.
- Starkness/harshness between the materials used on the upper and lower floors.
- There is scope to further and improve the elevational design and improve the variation in materials.
- Internal blocks height has reduced significantly.
- In relation to the open space strategy, note that the wind report highlights some areas of concern. Inclusion of landscaping details may alleviate this. This should be considered and re-tested prior to application stage.
- Proliferation of the substations, opportunity to disperse should be considered as they appear dominant on streetscape.
- Connections to the boundary at the north of the site, ensure no ransom strips.
- Works to Botanic Road public realm to be included in the red line boundary.

**Planning Authority's Comments:**

- Comparison of Block A in both schemes and round ends previously proposed gave a softer addition rather than the harsh right angles currently proposed.
- Proximity of blocks D and E to boundary will have a significant impact on the Former Players Factory.
- Bulkiness of Block A and roofscape is a concern.
- Acknowledge the internal buildings are set back from surrounding historic streetscapes, photomontages demonstrate this.
- It is noted the proposed location is a brownfield site with opportunity for development, however, the views from the surrounding houses/units will be impacted from the massing and bulkiness currently proposed.
- Landscaping will be an important element.
- Scope for a mixture of windows. Treatment is currently monotonous and repetitive.
- Concern regarding the suspended elements of the design and in particular, that at the south end of Block B and its impact on the public realm.
- Indicative layout of the sunlight/daylight assessment has some inaccuracies. Ensure all documents are consistent.

- Public realm along the Botanic Road – clarity required as to how it will be managed if not taken in charge, further details needed on this.

#### **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- Design and height of Block A was considered favourable in previous decision by the Board.
- Was previously more commercial have amended design to appear more domestic in this application.
- Alignment of the apartment blocks should assist in minimising visual impact on the surrounding streetscape. Additional photomontages have been prepared.
- Feel the scale and density is appropriate however, will take all comments on board and re-look at design.
- Comments made in relation to block B by the Planning Authority in their report have been noted and adjustments are being made.
- Wind test can be re-taken with mitigation measures in place for application stage.
- Integration of the substations is preferred rather than stand alone. ESB doors will be high quality. Need to have access for ESB staff.
- The proposed development is an amendment to the previous application. No difficulty in extending red line boundary to include public realm works to Botanic Road.

## **2. Residential amenity**

#### **ABP Comments:**

- Daylight/sunlight concerns.
- Error in housing quality assessment document.

#### **Planning Authority's Comments:**

- Further assessment desired on daylight/sunlight best and worst-case scenarios.

#### **Prospective Applicant's Comments**

- Daylight results of figures for blocks C and D have been received and amendments made to design to ensure compliance with the standards. This will be demonstrated at application stage.
- Consistency between all documentation will be ensured.

## **3. Any other matters**

#### **ABP Comments:**

- Reiterated that consistency is crucial in all documentation.
- Further details needed regarding the general communal facilities and how they will be managed.
- Provide further details regarding quality of materials at application stage.

### **Planning Authority's Comments:**

- In relation to the community and social infrastructure audit, more investigative approach to be taken. Need to understand the impact of the development locally.
  - Treatment of the roofscape needs to be looked at in more detail.
- Reconsider materials and fenestration design.

### **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- Will go into further depth in the community and social infrastructure audit in particular, the proposed crèche and the demand for spaces.
- All further details requested can be supplied at application stage.

### **Conclusion**

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  
March, 2020