



<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	489 no. apartments, creche and associated site works. Golf Lane, Carrickmines, Dublin 18.		
<b>Case Type</b>	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
<b>Date:</b>	22 <sup>nd</sup> July 2020	<b>Start Time</b>	09.30 am
<b>Location</b>	Via Microsoft Teams	<b>End Time</b>	10.45 am
<b>Chairperson</b>	Tom Rabbette	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Hannah Cullen

**Representing An Bord Pleanála:**

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Lorraine Dockerry, Senior Planning Inspector
Hannah Cullen, Executive Officer

**Representing Prospective Applicant:**

Liam McGroary, Applicant
Graham O'Sullivan, HJL Architects
Henry J Lyons, HJL Architects
Nick Fenner, DBFL Consulting Engineers
Mike Martyn, Cameo Landscape Architects
Aebhin Cawley, Scott Cawley
John Spain, JSA
Luke Wymer, JSA
Thomas Jennings
Aidan Gallagher

**Representing Planning Authority**

Michelle Breslin, Senior Executive Planner
Bernard Egan, Senior Executive Engineer
Donal Kearney, Assistant Park Superintendent

## **Introduction**

The representatives of An Bord Pleanála (ABP) welcomed the prospective applicant, Planning Authority (PA) via Microsoft Teams having regard to the Covid-19 virus.

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 PA on 22<sup>nd</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 PA 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 27<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. Proposal in context of previous refusal on site under ABP-302336-18**
- 2. Concerns raised by PA in relation to height, density, core strategy, tree loss, open space**
- 3. Residential Amenity**
- 4. Biodiversity**
- 5. Transport and Accessibility**
- 6. Drainage Matters**
- 7. Any other matters**

## **1. Proposal in context of previous refusal on site under ABP-302336-18**

### **ABP Comments:**

- Previous application on site and reason for refusal
- Noted change in site area from previous application

### **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- It is intended to seek letter of consent for the lands excluded and include in application

### **Planning Authority's Comments:**

- No comments to make

## **2. Concerns raised by PA in relation to height, density, core strategy, tree loss, open space**

### **ABP Comments:**

- Height/scale/density of proposal in context of PA concerns, in particular concern with 12 storey 'non-landmark' element
- Proposal in context of national and local policy and with Cherrywood SDZ.
- Quality of development, materials/finishes/detailing will be paramount
- Justification for height/setbacks proposed; include cross sections and visualisations in application with both near and distant views
- Tree removal- should try and achieve a balance between development and retaining trees; consider additional planting; balance between tree loss and compensatory measures.
- Open space provision must be useable and accessible; daylight/sunlight analysis to be submitted in this regard; microclimate analysis of open spaces on upper floors
- Discussion regarding linear park along stream; details required as to who is providing, timescale and exact proposal
- Connectivity through site and to wider area is pertinent in this case, in particular across Glenamuck Road and to LUAS; how is this going to be addressed

### **Planning Authority's Comments:**

- Concerns with the 12 storey non-landmark in particular.
- Architectural quality has been noted.
- Address suitability of proposed development given its locational context
- Connection to linear park and retail park is fundamental.
- Development should not be an isolated piece of land; links to Cherrywood welcomed
- Arborist report to be provided at application stage to demonstrate tree retention.

### **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- Site can provide gateway to the city
- Design approach responds directly to previous guidance from the refusal.
- Site is close to LUAS line/station.
- Height is suitable for this location; logic for a landmark building.
- As one approaches the city centre there will be a gradual increase in building heights, no abrupt changes.
- This scheme helps to deliver and be consistent with the core strategy.
- Cherrywood SDZ can compliment the proposed development; not in competition with it. Can include a plan at application stage of how they could work alongside each other.

- Arboricultural assessment has been prepared.
- Within red line boundary, there are 207 trees, plan to retain 60 of those and proposing to plant an additional 230 trees; will have improved ecological impact.
- Local biodiversity will be enhanced and improved.
- 39% open communal space to be provided.
- Micro-climate of roof terraces currently being examined

**Further ABP Comments:**

- Submit a rationale/justification for the heights chosen for this development; a strong argument will need to be made.
- CGI's, visualizations, photomontages should be included at application stage including perspectives from the M50, Cherrywood SDZ; existing residents' views
- Address the core strategy issues raised by Planning Authority at application stage.
- Liaise further with the Planning Authority to discuss linear park along the stream regarding redline boundary, management and all technical details.

**Further Planning Authority Comments:**

- Willing to engage in further meetings with the prospective applicant.

**3. Residential Amenity**

**ABP Comments:**

- Address how new residential scheme will impact on existing residents in the area
- Address possible 3<sup>rd</sup> party concerns that may be submitted
- Ensure future residential amenities are consistent with apartment guidelines; address SPFRs; daylight/sunlight; aspect of units
- Quality of residential units between retail and gym, in particular single aspect units

**Planning Authority's Comments:**

- Noted in particular blocks A-A3 concern with day/sunlight.
- More detail is essential at application stage, outlines dual aspect units.

**Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- Will look at any concerns raised, the scheme is designed to respect future and current residents.
- The orientation of the site itself reduces any impacts on the adjoining lands.
- Units that have been mentioned can be looked at in more detail.
- Mindful of dual aspect and want to keep it at the highest level possible.

**Further ABP Comments:**

- Submit HQA and clearly demarcate aspect of units

**4. Biodiversity**

**ABP Comments:**

- Address landscape and ecology issues including those raised in PA Opinion
- Have regard to bat protection and derogation measures if applicable
- There are two water courses traversing the site.
- Ensure consistency between all the documentation.

**Planning Authority's Comments:**

- SHD not referred to PA Biodiversity Officer as ABP is competent authority

**Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- Completed all site surveys, noted the high number of non-native trees on the site.
- Site has some biodiversity value.
- Likely to screen out the development at Stage 1 for AA

**5. Transport and Accessibility****ABP Comments:**

- Planning authority's report raises some issues; need to address these at application stage
- Further discussions/collaboration with PA in relation to the upgrade of Golf Lane.
- Map/cycle diagram detailing the pedestrian/cycle movements and connectivity across Glenamuck Road to wider area useful at application stage.

**Planning Authority's Comments:**

- Stressed further the concerns raised in report submitted including shortfall of parking and bicycle parking management.
- Sustainable linkages to be provided so the scheme is not entirely car reliant.
- Fundamental that red line boundary is extended to ensure clarity.

**Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- Will address concerns raised by PA
- Justification of the car parking will be included at application stage.
- Re-examining basement layout which should allow for +200 cycle parking spaces.

**6. Drainage Matters****ABP Comments:**

- Irish Water states no upgrades required

**Planning Authority's Comments:**

- No significant issues raised; can facilitate further meetings with the applicant in relation to drainage, if required

**Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- Comments are noted.

**7. Any Other Matters****ABP Comments:**

- Zone of archaeological potential, address at application stage.
- Details of interface with public realm onto Golf Lane.
- Building lifecycle report, construction and traffic management plans, CGIs/visualisations/cross sections to be submitted with application.
- Strong argument will need to be put forward in relation to the landmark building.

### **Planning Authority's Comments:**

- Nothing further to add.

### **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- All comments have been noted and will be taken on board before lodging an application.

### **Conclusion**

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  
July, 2020