



Case Reference / Description	354 no. residential units (122 no. houses, 232 no. apartments), childcare facility and associated site works. Kellystown, Clonsilla, Dublin 15.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	11 <sup>th</sup> June 2020	Start Time	09:37 a.m.
Location	Via Microsoft Teams	End Time	11:45 a.m.
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

# Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Ronan O' Connor, Senior Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

# **Representing Prospective Applicant:**

Joe Reilly, Castlethorn	
Barry Kelly, Castlethorn	
Hugh O' Neill, Castlethorn	
Eleanor MacPartlin, Stephen Little and Associates	
Stephen Little, Stephen Little and Associates	
Susan Dawson, OMP	
Mark Duignan, Waterman Moylan	
Daithi O'Troithigh, Doyle-O'Troithigh	

# **Representing Planning Authority**

Deirdre Fallon, Planning	
Patricia Cadogan, Planning	
Hugh O' Neill, Planning	
Linda Lally, Transportation	

Niamh O' Connor, Transportation

Germma Carr, Parks

Sinead Murphy, Water

## 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 15<sup>th</sup> May 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 18<sup>th</sup> March 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. Principle/Expected Kellystown LAP timeline
- 2. Transport
- 3. Design including density/height/layout/detailed design
- 4. Landscape/Trees/Ecology
- 5. Residential Standards
- 6. Site Services
- 7. Any Other Matters

# 1. Principle/Expected Kellystown LAP timeline

# ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Current status of the Kellystown LAP.
- > Expected timeline for implementation.

# Planning Authority's comments:

- > The Draft LAP is due to be published in the third quarter of this year.
- Key considerations of the LAP include the relocation of the football grounds and provision of the train station.
- The County Development Plan lays out key issues linked to the delivery of infrastructure and phasing.
- > Concerned that the pre-application does not address the County Development Plan.

### Prospective Applicant's response:

- > Lands have been zoned though previous Development Plans (2011, 2017).
- > The existing football grounds are in Fingal's ownership.
- Further consultation will take place with larnrod Eireann in relation to works proposed, including the prospective train station.
- > Approximately three landowners in the LAP area.
- > The applicant is the only developer
- The football club has a sporting lease and lands to the western site contain a protected structure – therefore available residential lands available at this location are small in extent.

# 2. Transport

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

- Status of the 'Kellystown Avenue' Road project/delivery mechanism for same.
- Entrances/Exits from the proposed development and the impact on the proposed cycleways.
- > Required road upgrades/potential closure of Porterstown Road.
- > Proposed shared cycle ways and pedestrian routes on Porterstown Road.
- > Footpath and cycle connections to surrounding areas.

#### Planning Authority's response:

- Porterstown Road closure is an Irish Rail led project/No timeline of when the works will start.
- The road alignment and design (Kellystown Avenue) are subject to a Part 8 procedure.
- > Cyclist and pedestrian access to and from the site is important.
- > The number of junctions onto Kellystown Avenue should be minimised.
- In relation to the TIA, the Porterstown road closure could impact on results/different scenarios should be modelled.
- > There is some capacity at certain junctions/Other junctions are over capacity.
- > More detail regarding cycle routes is needed/Width of the cycle lanes are important
- > The proposed Kellystown road route could change.
- > A footpath route south of the canal is being examined by the Planning Authority.

# Prospective Applicant's response:

- In relation to Kellystown road, there is already 280 metres of road and the applicant is adding 160 metres of new road.
- > There will be frontage onto 440 metres of road
- Footpath is 1.8 metres in width/The cycle lane is 1.5 metres in width/An increase to 1.75 metres in width is possible.
- > 7 metre road can be reduced to 6.5 metres.
- A separate pedestrian footpath and cycleway is being proposed on Porterstown Road/There are some shared spaces.
- Future connections are available for cycle lanes and pedestrian footpaths to the north east of the site.
- > Part of the LAP objective is to provide connections to adjacent lands.

# Further ABP comments:

- > Detail the entrances onto the cycle ways.
- > Show potential upgrades and have regard to the closure of Porterstown Road.
- Shared access for cycle ways, pedestrian routes and footpaths must be detailed/nature of proposed cycleways/footpath on Porterstown Road is not clear from the drawings submitted.
- > Talk to Irish Rail and the NTA.

# 3. Design including density/height/layout/detailed design

# ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Proposed density.
- > Walking routes from the canal to the train stations.
- > Treatment of Block A/Ground floor frontages.
- Location of Block E.
- > Treatment of the rear gardens.
- Open space strategy.
- > DMURS compliance.

# Planning Authority's response:

- The centre of the site is 4.2 hectares and contains 122 units and the net density is for this part of the site is approximately 29 units per hectare.
- > In relation to Block A, it is acknowledged there is capacity for height.
- > The proximity of Block A to other residential developments is a concern.
- > There is a dominance of 2 storey housing within the development.
- > Explain the urban design function and relationship to roads.

# **Prospective Applicant's response:**

- > Overall density is 63 units per hectare.
- > Two thirds of the units are apartments.
- > There is a gradual increase in height towards Coolmine train station.
- > Walking time to the train station is 18 minutes.
- > There are cycle and pedestrian connections to the schools.
- Blocks contain active edges.
- > Massing of Block A will be reviewed.

# An Bord Pleanála

- > There will be more active uses on the southern end.
- Houses on Porterstown road have front doors onto the road and there are no blank gables.
- > Open space usability and interlinkages will be shown.

### **Further ABP comments:**

- > Submit a rationale for density proposed.
- > Show walking distances to train stations.
- Detail the treatment for block A.
- > More detailed drawings required including detailed elevations.
- > CGI'S and photomontages would be useful.

### 4. Landscape/Trees/Ecology

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

- > Tree retention.
- > Landscape Impacts.
- ➤ Ecology.

#### Planning Authority's response:

- Landscape is designated as Highly Sensitive.
- > Hedgerows need protection.
- > SUDS proposals need to be shown.
- Show open space layout and strategy.
- Location of the pumping station is a concern.
- Clarify tree impacts and retention.
- > Show interaction between green and blue corridors.
- Detail the open space use at block A.

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

- > The pumping station will be relocated to the edge of the open space
- Swales, permeable paving and bio retention are being proposed.
- > There are 889 linear metres of hedgerows on site.
- Some hedgerows will be cut back and not removed.
- > 74% of hedgerows will be retained.

### Further ABP comments:

- > Outline the impacts on trees/hedgerows.
- Detail the impacts on ecology including wider impacts such as canal based habitats/species.

### 5. Residential Standards

# ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Quality of open space including courtyards.
- Landscaping.
- > Balconies on the ground floor and at podium level.

### Planning Authority's response:

- > Address any outstanding issues in the PA opinion.
- > Ensure relevant standards are addressed.

### Prospective Applicant's response:

Issues will be addressed

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

- > Outline overshadowing impacts on communal spaces.
- Show landscaping at the podium level.
- > Detail balconies at the ground floor level and defensible space relating to same.
- Submit CGI's and a Housing Quality Assessment.

#### 6. Site services

### ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- > The proposed pumping station including location and sizing of same.
- > If the upgrades to the existing pumping station are required.

### Planning Authority's response:

- > Proposed pumping station serves 80% of the LAP lands.
- > The station is pumping to the east/Irish water submission wants pumping to the west
- > Clarify pumping station drainage, ownership and maintenance
- > More green roofs should be provided.

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

- > Pumping station will be relocated to the edge of the public park.
- It can be sunk down by 1.8 metres, if needed, thereby allowing all of the LAP lands to be serviced.
- > The rising main at Porterstown will be pumped west
- > Apartment blocks do contain SUD's and onsite attenuation.
- > The size of the pond could be increased to allow for additional attenuation.
- > An upgrade to the existing pumping station is not needed.

#### Further ABP comments:

- Address any outstanding issues.
- > There is no further information sought at application stage.

#### 7. Any Other Matter

#### Planning Authority's comments:

> Outline phasing and the delivery of infrastructure.

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

> A crèche and retail is being delivered.

# Further ABP comments:

Submit a social infrastructure capacity survey.

# 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 <u>cdsdesignqa@water.ie</u> 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 <u>spatialplanning@water.ie</u>

Tom Rabbette Assistant Director of Planning July, 2020