

Bord Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-306989-20

| Case Reference / Description | Alterations to Phase 1 permission of 45 no. apartments of previous permitted Reg.Ref:D17A/0950 and ABP-300745-19 to provide a total of 105 no. apartments and associated site works. Frascati Centre, Frascati Road, Blackrock, Co. Dublin. | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| Case Type | Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request | | |
| Date: | 5 th June 2020 | Start Time | 09:30 a.m. |
| Location | Via Microsoft Teams | End Time | 11:30 a.m. |
| Chairperson | Tom Rabbette | Executive Officer | Ciaran Hand |

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

| Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning |
|----------------------------------------------|
| Rachel Gleave O'Connor, Planning Inspector |
| Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer |

Representing Prospective Applicant:

| Niall Kavanagh, Applicant | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Gavin Arnold, Architecture | |
| John Kelly, Visual Impact | |
| Stephen Diamond, Landscape | |
| Seamus Nolan, Transport | |
| John Spain, Planning | |
| Paul Turley, Planning | |
| Scott Paterson, Project Manager | |

Representing Planning Authority

Enda Duignan, Executive Planner

Stephen McDermott, Senior Executive Planner

Elaine Carrol, Drainage

Marc Campbell, Parks and Landscape Services

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 7th 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 24th 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. Height and design
- 2. Impact upon existing residential amenity (daylight / sunlight / overlooking)
- 3. Landscaping
- 4. Residential amenity within the proposed development (including private amenity space)
- 5. Car parking
- 6. Cycle parking
- 7. Creche demand and supply
- 8. Any Other Matters

1. Height and Design

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Proposed height
- Design approach

Planning Authority's comments:

- > The site is suitable for height subject to mitigation measures
- The Blackrock LAP indicates there should be transition in scale to existing dwellings surrounding the site
- > There could be a higher form onto Frascati Road

Prospective Applicant's response:

- > The site is in a district centre and close to a Dart station
- Recognised that height is in excess of the Blackrock LAP
- There is an integrated approach to design with apartments arranged around the courtyard in phase 2
- Contemporary approach to materials and finishes
- > This is carried on from the extant permission for phase 1
- In relation to phase 2, the height is 3 storeys to the west over the approved podium car park
- The height increases to 5 storeys over the podium car park towards the south east of the site
- > There is graduation in height with the retail building
- > There is stepping down to the retail building
- Scale and character will be managed
- > There will be an extension of larger tree planting to wrap the site edges
- Layers of landscaping will be outlined, formed of boundary treatment, green wall and courtyard planting

Further ABP comments:

- Submit a rationale regarding the proposed height which should include consideration of height on Frascati Road
- Show elevations with and without the green wall
- > Detail the built form without planting/landscaping treatment

2. Impact upon existing residential amenity (daylight / sunlight / overlooking)

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

Potential impact on adjacent apartment block Lisalea

Planning Authority's comments:

- > There is a lack of transition in height to adjacent residential dwellings
- Outline the visual impact of the development upon the rear gardens for existing dwellings
- There are significant daylight and sunlight impacts on the south facing balconies in Lisalea

- > The development should be designed to mitigate impacts
- Vegetation outside of the site and within the rear gardens of adjacent dwellings cannot be relied upon to screen

Prospective Applicant's response:

- > Analysis has been undertaken regarding separation distances
- Intense planting will act as screening in addition to separation distance to Frascati Park
- > At ground level there will not be a dependence on outside vegetation to screen
- Winter gardens are being provided to phase 1 in place of balconies and balconies are proposed for units in phase 2

Further ABP comments:

- > Explanation around BRE values used should include reference to the Lisalea block
- Clarify the floor plans for Lisalea
- Refer to the BRE guidelines concerning existing development constructed close to a boundary

3. Landscaping

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Screening mechanisms
- Landscaping and the podium

Planning Authority's response:

- Outline the proposed vegetation and planting
- Show the extent of the spaces
- > Concern that the height of screen planting shown will not be achievable in practise
- Highlighted the importance that the landscape plans ensure a successful screening strategy

Prospective Applicant's response:

- > Planting will also be included on the podium car park elevation
- > Planting will take place along the boundary with the bungalow
- > Planting will take place along the bungalow
- > There will be screening and a layered landscape at Frascati Park
- > The podium to the car park will be detailed
- > Planting will act as a buffer at the podium
- Windbreakers will be included
- Some planting will be 3-5m high
- > The intention is for impacts and views to be softened rather than entirely screened
- Long-term maintenance will be addressed

Further ABP comments:

- > Further detail of the proposed green walls required
- > Outline what the proposed development will look like with/without the green walls
- Explain what the green walls will look like after completion and after 1 year, 2 years' time etc

- > Define the podium gardens
- > Examine how there can be more use of spaces
- Detail the usability

4. Residential amenity within the proposed development (including private amenity space)

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

> Location of private amenity space for studio apartments

Planning Authority's response:

- Ensure a high-quality open space
- Outline the usability and functionality
- > Sunlight/daylight analysis for studio apartments needs to be detailed
- Winter gardens can have wind issues

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Winter gardens are located on phase 1 in place of balconies
- > The second block over the podium has balconies in phase 2
- The north east of the development will be checked for potential to include balconies to studios
- > Winter gardens/balconies can be added to the studio apartments in phase 2
- > There is private amenity space for each apartment
- Planting is located adjacent to the entrances on the first floor of studios in phase 2 with voids on levels above this
- Recognised that the private amenity space for the studios is not directly beside the living area

Further ABP comments:

Consider the location of the private amenity space for studio apartments

5. Car parking

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Residential car parking
- Levels of proposed parking
- > Parking in relation to the shopping centre

Planning Authority's response:

- There should be one space per unit
- > No minimum standard for retail parking
- > Maintain segregation with the residential and retail parking
- Explain how segregation works
- > Outline accessibility for waste management

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Car parking is in alignment with apartment guidelines
- > This location is close to the Dart and bus routes

- > The car parking proposed is 0.57 per unit
- There will be 3 Go car spaces, 10 electric charge points and disabled parking close to the lift core
- Visitor parking will be in the retail area
- > There will be two barriers
- > One barrier will only be accessible for residents
- > Waste will be managed by a company and bins brought out for collection
- > The refuse truck will use the existing route serving the retail
- > Car parking spaces are already existing

Further ABP comments:

- Submit a rationale for car parking
- > Outline the segregation of residential and retail parking

6. Cycle parking

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

The types of bicycle storage

Planning Authority's response:

- Too much of a reliance on stacked storage which does not accommodate all styles of bicycle
- Examine providing more Sheffield type storage which can accommodate a range of bicycle types
- Increase the quality and quantity

Prospective Applicant's comments:

- The stacker storage is designed so that the top stack can be pulled down for loading/unloading of bicycle
- > There are 130 bicycle spaces in total
- > A stacker type system is being used to maximise the number of spaces for residents
- Of the total spaces, there are 22 bicycle spaces for visitors at lower ground level that are of the Sheffield type

Further ABP comments:

- > Detail the types of bicycle storage suitable for different types of bike
- Ensure quality and quantity

7. Creche demand and supply

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

Rationale for no proposed crèche

Planning Authority's response:

> A full evaluation will be needed

Prospective Applicant's response:

No crèche is being proposed

- > A small crèche is unviable
- > There is capacity in the wider area
- A rationale will be submitted

Further ABP comments:

Submit a rationale for no crèche

8. Any Other Matters

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

> Entrance arrangements to apartments

Planning Authority's comments:

- Green roofs do not include the section over the 45 apartments for the whole of the development
- In relation to entrance arrangements, confirmed that there is a core containing lifts and stairs to all levels
- > Main entrance to all apartments is via the lobby in phase 1 which is controlled
- > Front doors to apartments are via external walkways
- Green roofs requirement is 60%
- > There is no requirement for green roofs over phase 1 in the previous permission
- > Communal garden areas will have a attenuation element
- Green roofs over the retail area will be retained

Further ABP comments:

- > Detail the entrances at the lobby areas and routes to apartments
- > Show how there is segregation between accessing the apartments and retail
- Respond to ecology comments from the Planning Authority
- > Provide cross sections to the rear gardens on Frascati Park

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 June, 2020