



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Record of Meeting ABP-306951-20

<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	258 no. apartments, crèche and associated site works. Lands at Murphystown Way, Dublin 18.		
<b>Case Type</b>	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
<b>Date:</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> June 2020	<b>Start Time</b>	14:30 p.m.
<b>Location</b>	Via Microsoft Teams	<b>End Time</b>	16:15 p.m.
<b>Chairperson</b>	Tom Rabbette	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Ciaran Hand

### Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Karen Kenny, Senior Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

### Representing Prospective Applicant:

Dick Cuddihy, Applicant
John Duggan, Applicant
Michael Hussey, OMP Architects
Sarah Curran, DBFL
Thomas Jennings, DBFL
Thomas Burns, BSM
Paul Turley, John Spain Associates

### Representing Planning Authority

Clare Casey, Roads and Transport
Donal Kearney, Parks
Elaine Carroll, Drainage
Marguerite Cahill, Case Planner
Ger Ryan, Senior Planner
Naomh Fleming, Senior Executive Planner

## **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 26<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 20<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. Development Strategy – height and massing of the blocks, architectural detailing, and open space strategy.**
- 2. Residential Amenity – dual aspect ratio, daylight and sunlight, wind impacts and inward noise.**
- 3. Surface Water Drainage.**
- 4. Transportation – proposed link road; access / circulation / drop off, car parking and cycle parking.**
- 5. Archaeology and Built Heritage.**
- 6. Any Other Matters.**

## **1. Development Strategy – height and massing of the blocks, architectural detailing, and open space strategy.**

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

- The height, scale and massing of blocks and feature elements.
- Interface with streets and open spaces.
- Open space strategy.

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

- The site has potential to take height and to provide frontage along the M50.
- Development will be a landmark along the M50.
- Overall massing involves a series of layered facades, stepping up to a prominent corner element. Refinement of fenestration and detailing ongoing. Taller buildings will be set back.
- The landscaping strategy builds on the approach used on the adjoining Glencairn site. The north of the site is a wooded valley with open space. Open space to the south of the stream would be more active.
- Proposed to create two breaks in the historic stone walls to allow for pedestrian connections into the open space.

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

- The LAP allows for height.
- Concern in relation to overall bulk and massing of Blocks 1 & Block 2 (length of elevations) when viewed from Murphystown Way. The corner elements read as heavy and awkward and may need to be refined.
- Submitted details need to address transition in levels.

### **Further ABP comments:**

- Further detail needed in relation to scale, massing and proportions of blocks and feature elements and in relation to how these various elements come together to form a coherent character for the scheme overall. Further justification or refinement may be needed – including additional photomontages, cross sections, axonometric views and CGIs. Scheme may benefit from greater differentiation between the height of the various elements.
- Further detail needed in relation to architectural detailing and materiality.
- There is a need for additional photomontages to illustrate key views along the M50, from overbridges, along the Luas Line and along Murphystown Way. The views should include the contiguous Glencairn scheme (under construction).
- Need to clarify transitions in ground levels to the north of the housing blocks and how this will be addressed within the final scheme.
- Need to provide detail in relation to potential ecological impacts.

## **2. Residential Amenity – dual aspect ratio, daylight and sunlight, wind impacts and inward noise.**

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

- Dual aspect ratio.
- Daylight and sunlight analysis.
- Potential wind and noise impact.

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

- Dual aspect is 42%. The site is a central and accessible site as defined by the apartment guidelines. The Luas is within 70 metres and Sandyford is within 500 metres.

- Further sunlight/daylight and wind analysis will be done.

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Considered that dual aspect standard of 50% should be met at this location. The adjoining site was characterised as a suburban location.

**Further ABP comments:**

- Further clarification / justification needed in relation to the proportion of dual aspect units (33%) having regard to the locational context of the site.
- Further detail needed in relation to sunlight/daylight analysis.
- Further detail needed in relation to wind and microclimate impacts.

**3. Surface water drainage**

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

- Surface water drainage
- Irish water submission
- Fire flow requirements

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- SUD's strategy includes 60% green roofs and permeable paving.
- The access road to the north west is drained separately and will be taken in charge.
- Under croft car parking is being drained to an attenuation tank.
- Run off from the car park will drain and then discharge to the foul system.
- The Irish Water connections are feasible and connections via third party lands / infrastructure can be addressed.

**Planning Authority's response:**

- The detail design matters in relation to surface water drainage and in relation to outfall during flood conditions detailed in the report of the Water Services Division to be addressed. A hydrologic assessment would be beneficial for assessment of surface water drainage capacity.

**Further ABP comments:**

- Prospective applicant should liaise with Irish Water and the PA and resolve any outstanding issues in relation to water supply and drainage prior to lodging an application.
- Should IW raise issues in relation to the capacity of the water supply or wastewater networks at application stage, ABP would have to be guided by this advice and may need to refuse permission on grounds of prematurity.

**4. Transportation – proposed link road; access / circulation / drop off, car parking and cycle parking.**

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

- Link road
- Access and circulation
- Drop off point
- Car parking and cycle parking

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Proposed to deliver a 70m section of the proposed link road. This will be a cul-de-sac pending completion of future phases.
- The junction at Murphystown Way will include right turn lanes into the site.

- A drop off area is proposed at the south west corner of the site close to the pedestrian access between blocks 1 and 2. A dropped kerb at this location will facilitate fire access.
- In relation to the link bridge, levels of previously designed scheme will be matched and there will be no compromise on design.
- Under-croft basement will include an area for public and creche parking and an area dedicated to residential parking.
- Car parking ratio (space per res. unit) is 0.76

**Planning Authority's response:**

- Need to examine drop off at Murphystown Way.
- Ensure pedestrian and cycle access to the link road.
- The link road will remain a cul-de-sac until full road and overbridge completed. Need to detail how the cul-de-sac will work in the short to medium term. Also need to show details of proposed embankments and levels.
- Concern in relation to rate of car parking provision. This is a suburban location and car storage is needed. A rate of 1 space per unit is recommended.
- Cycle parking should be nearer to the units.

**Further ABP comments:**

- The proposed link road would form part of a larger road project between the Leopardstown Road Roundabout to the north and Murphystown Way that includes a bridge connection over the M50. Need to address overall design of the link road and overbridge, any relevant issues arising from previous refusal for Phases 2 and 3 of the road (ABP 06D.HA0040).
- Further clarification needed in relation to how the cul-de-sac would work pending the completion of the overall link road.
- Need to clarify rate of cycle parking provision, accessibility to units and the design of cycle stands / secure parking areas.
- Need to justify the proposed car parking figure having regard to site location and other SHD decisions.

**5. Archaeology and Built Heritage**

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

- Archaeological strategy.
- Interventions to existing stone boundary wall.

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- An archaeological assessment has been carried out.
- Historic boundary wall is to be retained with some intervention.

**Planning Authority's response:**

- Ensure that spaces around the boundary wall works and that the wall is afforded adequate protection. A geotechnical report needed in respect of the condition of the wall.

**Further ABP comments:**

- The comments of DAU in relation to the archaeological assessment are noted.
- There is a need for clarity in relation to the historic significance of stone walls and in relation to the treatment and protection of the walls.

## 6. Any Other Matters

### Planning Authority's comments:

- No further comments

### Prospective Applicant's response:

- No further comments

### Further ABP comments:

- ABP advised that all works should be included within the red line boundary and letters of consent submitted from third party landowners as appropriate.

## 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  
June, 2020