



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-307008-20

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------|
| Case Reference / Description | 417 no. apartments and associated site works. Cooldown Commons, Fortunestown Lane, Citywest, Dublin 24. | | |
| Case Type | Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request | | |
| Date: | 18 th June 2020 | Start Time | 09:40 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 |
| Ronan O' Connor, Senior Planning Inspector |
| Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer |

Representing Prospective Applicant:

| |
|---|
| Aidan McLernon, Cairn Homes |
| James Dolan, Cairn Homes |
| Daibhi Mac Donhaill, Cairn Homes |
| Alan Larkin, Reddy Architecture |
| Deirdre Walsh, DBFL |
| Thomas Jennings, DBFL |
| Linda Maher, TBS Studios Landscape Architecture |
| Trevor Sadler, MCG Planning |
| Brenda Butterly, MCG Planning |

Representing Planning Authority

| |
|--|
| Jim Johnston, Senior Executive Planner |
| Colm Maguire, Assistant Planner |
| John Hegarty, Senior Executive Engineer (Roads) |
| Brian Harkin, Senior Executive Engineer (Water & 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 18th 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 26th 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 of Development**
- 2. Design (inc density/height/layout/unit types etc)**
- 3. Residential Standards**
- 4. Transport including parking provision/infrastructure requirements**
- 5. Social Infrastructure including childcare facilities**
- 6. Ecology/Ecological Screening**
- 7. Site services**
- 8. Any Other Matters**

1. Principle of Development

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Procedural issues in relation to amending the SHD development on the adjacent site.
- Compliance or otherwise with the Fortunestown LAP including the phasing set out therein.
- Viability of the proposed retail unit/end use of same.

Planning Authority's comments:

- The density parameters of the LAP are being exceeded.
- Total units permitted for Fortunestown makes phasing redundant.
- Welcome the retail unit in principle/A viability study should be submitted
- If there is lack of demand for retail, explore if the larger unit could be separated into two smaller units.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- A previous scheme is being amended through this application.
- There is currently no end user for retail.
- Size is similar to a SPAR and will be for daily convenience shopping.
- This will avoid crossing over the Luas line to the Citywest Shopping Centre.
- A flexibility study of retail units and their use can be submitted.

Further ABP comments:

- The prospective applicant should have regard to the LAP and highlight any contraventions of same.
- In relation to retail – outline the likely/expected end user.

2. Design (inc density/height/layout/unit types etc)

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Proposed height, particularly in light of the LAP stating reduction in height to the north.
- Layout in relation to the location of blocks, defined urban space, own door units/duplex units, landscaping and surface parking.

Planning Authority's response:

- The height steps down to the adjoining developments.
- Retains the character of the LAP.
- More own door units are needed
- Ensure that the urban spaces are well defined.
- The two separate spaces are a concern.
- Landscaping details required.
- Examine overlooking of the permitted development to the north-east from the proposed duplexes.
- Boundary treatment for communal spaces to the rear of duplexes
- Surface parking is relying on perpendicular parking.
- Examine the rear boundary of block F1.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Duplex apartments have own door access.
- This will create an active street frontage.
- There is a central pedestrian area with movement from the Luas.
- Open spaces are part of the centralised masterplan.
- It is 56 metres to the south west of the site
- Surface parking has been broken up.
- Parking to the south-east serves apartments, the Luas and retail unit.
- There is visitor parking and pick up/drop off points.
- Road is constructed to the boundary to facilitate a possible future crossing for the Luas.
- Adjoining land is outside of the applicant's ownership.
- A boundary treatment plan will be submitted.
- Communal space is an amenity to the duplex units.
- The main road contains an urban edge of 3 storey units.
- The ground floor of the duplexes contains a private patio at the rear.
- First floor contains a terrace to private amenity space at the front.
- Overlooking to the rear of other blocks and adjacent developments is being avoided.

Further ABP comments:

- Submit a height rationale.
- Justify the level of surface parking.
- Clarify the nature of the amenity space being provided for the ground floor units/Detail the first floor level terraces.
- Potential overlooking is a concern.

3. Residential Standards**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Residential design standards including floor areas, number of dual aspect units and quality of courtyard spaces.

Planning Authority's response:

- There needs to be a strong justification for any north facing single aspect units.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Floor areas will be checked to ensure compliance with national standards.
- North facing single aspect units are predominantly in block E/Will review plans to minimise the number of these units.
- A shadow analysis will be submitted in relation to the proposed courtyards.

Further ABP comments:

- Submit a detailed schedule of accommodation.
- Examine and seek to minimise the number of north facing single aspect units.
- Submit an overshadowing/daylight and sunlight analysis report.

4. Transport including parking provision/infrastructure requirements

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Overall parking provision including level of surface car parking and nature/end users of same.
- Access points to the basement car park.
- Links to the east and neighbouring park

Planning Authority's response:

- No traffic issues.
- Internal layout complies with DMURS
- There are good pedestrian links.
- Proposed cycle provision and storage is good
- Parking provision is 0.77 per unit/This should be reduced to 0.6 per unit.
- There should be two entrances to the basement car park.
- Clarify the management of bin storage areas.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Car parking provision is 0.7 per unit.
- This is a build to sell development.
- There is high levels of car ownership.
- The catchment area of public transport is east-west and this does not serve the major employment zones including Citywest.
- Car clubs could be examined.
- Basement parking will be managed/Is considered one access point is viable and can be managed.
- The east and neighbouring park is owned by a different developer.

Further ABP comments:

- Justify the car parking provision.
- Examine the use of car clubs.
- Submit a taking in charge plan.

5. Social Infrastructure including childcare facilities

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Proposed social infrastructure.
- School and childcare infrastructure.

Planning Authority's response:

- There is delivery of school infrastructure.
- A contribution in lieu of community infrastructure will be applied.
- Satisfied with childcare facilities.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Childcare assessment is sufficient.
- There is a crèche in phase two at the bottom of block B.

Further ABP comments:

- Detail the school infrastructure.
- Submit a childcare assessment.

6. Ecology/Ecological Screening

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Ecology/Impact on stream.

Planning Authority's response:

- Additional detail regarding trees to the south of the site is needed.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Ecology will be examined.
- Consultations with Inland Fisheries Ireland will take place.
- An EIAR is to be submitted.

Further ABP comments:

- Consultation with Inland Fisheries Ireland will be required

7. Site Services

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Surface Water Attenuation
- Irish Water submission

Planning Authority's response:

- Attenuation needs to be increased by 9%.
- Look to increase SUD's.
- More swales, rain guards and tree pits would be welcome.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Quantum of attenuation can be checked.
- Green roofs are on all the buildings.
- There is permeable paving, swales and bio-retention.
- Details of SUD's will be provided.
- Site sections will be submitted.
- Legal agreements have to be obtained to carry out works.

Further ABP comments:

- More detailed required in relation to the flood event to the south west of the site.
- Explain if works are being carried out on 3rd party lands.
- Consents may be required.
- There is no further information sought at application stage

8. Any Other Matters

Planning Authority's comments:

- A landmark building would be welcome.
- Ensure a high quality design.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- 40 out of 377 units have own door access.
- 11 storeys is being proposed.
- This will be a landmark building.

Further ABP comments:

- Have regard to the proximity of the Casement Aerodrome

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 **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

Tom Rabbette
Assistant Director of Planning
July, 2020