



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Record of Meeting ABP-306682-20

<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	Provision of 67 no. apartments on the previously permitted Greenacres residential development of 253 no. apartments as permitted under ABP Reg. Ref 304469 and associated site work. Greenacres, Longacre and Drumahill House, Upper Kilmacud Road, Dundrum, Dublin 14.		
<b>Case Type</b>	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
<b>Date:</b>	8th May 2020	<b>Start Time</b>	14:30 p.m.
<b>Location</b>	Via Microsoft Teams	<b>End Time</b>	16:00 p.m.
<b>Chairperson</b>	Tom Rabbette	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Ciaran Hand

### Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Daire McDevitt, Planning Inspector
Rachel Gleave O'Connor, Planning Inspector (Observing)
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

### Representing Prospective Applicant:

Pauline Byrne, Brady Shipman Martin
Richard Doorly, HJ Lyons
Sara Madigan, HJ Lyons
Anthony Horan, OCSC
Neil Furber, Pleydell Smithyman
Niall O'Byrne, Marlet

### Representing Planning Authority

Ger Ryan, Senior Planner
Shane Sheehy, Executive Planner
Catherine Hanly, Assistant Planner
Bernard Egan, Drainage

## Introduction

The representatives of An Bord Pleanála (ABP) welcomed the prospective applicant, the Local Authority (LA) 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 P.A on 12<sup>th</sup> March 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 LA 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 14<sup>th</sup> February 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. **Development Strategy with particular regard to overall density, design, including heights, scale, massing and materials, connections and permeability.**
2. **Residential Amenities (potential for overlooking, overshadowing, overbearance).**
3. **Visual Impact Assessment.**
4. **Carparking**
5. **Issues raised in the Irish Water Submission.**
6. **Childcare.**
7. **Any Other Matters**

## **1. Development Strategy with particular regard to overall density, design, including heights, scale, massing and materials, connections and permeability.**

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

- Proposed changes from the previously permitted application in relation to density, height (in particular Block B), scale and massing.
- Extent of the cycle track and links to the existing infrastructure along Kilmacud Road Upper and the implications for tree removal.

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

- Density is high but not a concern
- Height, and in particular Block B, is a concern
- There is a transition zone with Airfield and needs to be treated accordingly.
- Does not comply with the DLR Building Height Strategy.
- It is acknowledged that the implementation of a cycle track will require some trees to be removed
- The cycle track and links to the existing infrastructure along Kilmacud Road Upper need to be delivered

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

- Density is 182 units per hectare
- This is an amendment application for an extant permission
- There will be an increase by 67 apartments and an overall height increase of 2 storeys on each block.
- The overall site strategy remains unchanged from the permitted SHD development in 2019.
- Changes are to extend the development vertically. No other changes are proposed
- There is an increase in the number of units and reduction in car parking
- Design and approach are not much different from the previously permitted application
- The lower building facing east is 6 storeys. This also faces open space
- 1 additional floor on the east side adjoining Drumahill is now 5 storeys and not 4 storeys but will read like a 4 storey.
- The extant SHD permission included the cycle track as shown.
- There will be some loss of trees, but tree retention will be maximised where feasible.
- The cycle lane is tapered at the end of the red line in order to retain a mature tree.

### **Further ABP comments:**

- Need to include a justification/rationale at application stage for the proposed density, height, scale and massing
- Clarify what trees are to be retained or replaced and seek to justify where trees are to be removed. Submit supporting documentation.
- If the proposal constitutes a material contravention this needs to be clearly addressed in the documentation submitted with an application.

## **2. Residential Amenities (potential for overlooking, overshadowing, overbearance).**

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

- Potential impact on residential amenities
- Impact on Drumahill houses and Eden Farm (bungalow).

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

- The separation distance is 22 metres from the rear of the building
- Separation distance should be measured from the 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> floor
- Trees being used as a mitigation measure is not enough
- This development should stand on its own merits
- The potential for overlooking, overshadowing and overbearance on Eden Farm needs to be shown
- Eden Farm has the appearance of a dwelling. It should be clarified at application stage if this structure is in residential use.

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

- Refers to Block B and potential impact on adjoining houses in Drumahill.
- There is a 22-metre distance to the back of properties
- At the highest point of the block there is a 43-metre separation distance
- A stepped profile results in no overbearing impact on adjacent properties.
- There is an obliqueness of view
- Trees act as a mitigation measure and will screen the development.
- Distances and separation for Eden Farm are the same as the previous application
- Eden Park is not used as a dwelling/residence.

### **Further ABP comments:**

- Detail and address, if applicable, any potential for overlooking, overshadowing and overbearance
- Consider if there is an impact on Eden Farm and address.
- Cross sections and contiguous elevations should form part of the application documentation.

## **3. Visual Impact Assessment.**

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

- Potential visual impact from adjoining properties in particular Drumahill houses and Eden Farm.

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

- Any impacts must be addressed

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

- Information will be provided

### **Further ABP comments:**

- Detail any potential impacts on adjoining properties
- Cross sections from Eden Farm would be required

- CGIs and VIA to be submitted.

#### **4. Car parking**

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

- Rationale/justification for the proposed parking provision.
- Car parking management/Strategy.

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

- No representative from the Transportation Division available.
- Car parking being proposed is 0.6 per unit
- The site is not well linked to public transport
- Buses are not high capacity
- 1 space per unit is needed

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

- The traffic impact assessment outlines there are two Luas stops within a 10-minute walk
- This is a central location
- Car ownership is diverse
- Need to encourage model shift
- There is generous cycle parking and Go Car proposed
- The parking mix will be reviewed
- The role of the management company will be set out.
- Works on excavation of permitted car park commenced.

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

- Car parking was previously 0.8 and now 0.6 is being proposed. Need to justify/rationale for the proposed parking provision.
- Set out a car parking strategy and management at application stage.

#### **5. Issues raised in the Irish Water Submission.**

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

- Outstanding issues in the Irish Water submission

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

- The 225mm diameter sewer upgrade is a requirement
- A upgrade of 450mm diameter pipe is needed from Goatstown to near Roebuck Road
- This is all on public land
- Clarify with Irish water the extent of the works being carried out

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

- Works need to be done outside of the site
- No change from the previous application
- Goatstown Road network is part of the capital works programme
- Work is due to be completed in the last quarter of 2020

- Will liaise with Irish Water.

**Further ABP comments:**

- Clarify who is carrying out any works required and if 3<sup>rd</sup> party consents are required.

**6. Childcare**

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

- Justification/rationale for the scale of the childcare facility.

**Planning Authority's response:**

- As there are additional units being proposed in this development more childcare spaces are needed to comply with the Guidelines.

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- 41 spaces provided on the permitted application which resulted in an overprovision by 5 spaces
- It is acknowledged that there is a shortfall of c.4 spaces in the current proposal which will be addressed at application stage.

**Further ABP comments:**

- Include a justification/rationale for the scale of the childcare facility at application stage.
- Outline the set down area and associated car parking

**7. Any Other Matters**

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- No further comments

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- No further comments

**Further ABP comments:**

- Ensure that all reports correlate.

## 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)

---

Tom Rabbette  
Assistant Director of Planning  
May, 2020