



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Record of Meeting ABP-307086-20

<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	224 no. apartments and associated site works. Garters Lane, Saggart, Co. Dublin.		
<b>Case Type</b>	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
<b>Date:</b>	26 <sup>th</sup> June 2020	<b>Start Time</b>	10:05 a.m.
<b>Location</b>	Via Microsoft Teams	<b>End Time</b>	11:15 a.m.
<b>Chairperson</b>	Stephen O' Sullivan	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Ciaran Hand

### Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Stephen O' Sullivan, Assistant Director of Planning
Stephen Rhys Thomas, Senior Planning Inspector
Conor McGrath, Senior Planning Inspector (Observing)
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

### Representing Prospective Applicant:

Stephen Barrett, Planning
Tom Sheridan, Client
Tim Darmody, Architect
Alanagh Gannon, Landscape Architect
Eoin Reynolds, Traffic
Gary Lindsay, Engineer

### Representing Planning Authority

Eoin Burke, A/Senior Planner
Colm Maguire, Assistant Planner
John Hegarty, Senior Executive Engineer (Roads)
Brian Harkin, Senior Executive Engineer (Water and Drainage)
Ronan Toft, Assistant Engineer (Water and 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 29<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 21<sup>st</sup> April 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. Public realm improvements – Garters Lane and Luas Line**
- 2. Design strategy – ground floor interface eastern elevation and placemaking**
- 3. Car parking and Transportation**
- 4. Residential amenity – meeting guideline standards and dual aspect ratios**
- 5. Surface Water Management – Flood Risk**
- 6. Any other matters.**

## **1. Public realm improvements – Garters Lane and Luas Line**

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

- Public realm in relation to the Luas line
- Interface at Garters lane road and to the west access point
- Interface with the Luas line

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

- Junctions are welcome
- Examine a right turning lane into the proposed development
- The signalling of Fortunestown lane and Garters lane was conditioned in a previous application
- Detail the interface, boundary treatment and communal open space

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

- The cycle ways and footpath at Garters lane will be continued
- Ensuring permeability
- There is permeability to the park lands and link road
- There will be a new corner block of eight storeys
- This will act as a landmark
- Garter lane bookends the proposed site
- There are six storeys at the plaza
- The urban blocks are rising in height
- The hedge way is being retained
- Proposing to remove the western hedge and replace it with new native species
- The junction that links to Garters lane allows for permeability
- Junctions are spaced adequately
- There will be an upgrade for the junction at Fortunestown lane and Garters lane
- Provision has been made for this upgrade
- Landscaping has been set back
- Site lines are in accordance with DMURS
- No plans for right turning into the proposed development

### **Further ABP comments:**

- Outline the public realm in relation to the Luas line
- Detail the interface at Garters lane and the Luas line
- CGI's showing the interfaces would be useful
- Extra space at junctions is not in line with DMURS

## **2. Design strategy – ground floor interface eastern elevation and placemaking**

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

- Ground floor interface
- Blocks B & C to the east
- Ramp works and connections to the link street
- Place making in relation to block A
- Gateway treatment

**Planning Authority's response:**

- Ramps are a concern
- There is a lack of urban edge
- Show examples of ramps in other developments
- The interface of the east facing units for block B needs more detail
- Show ramp coverings and the levels of shrouding
- Gateway treatment needs to be distinctive

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- The apartments at the ground floor contain green decks
- They are shielded from the link street
- Set back is 24 meters between blocks B & C
- Block D is a robust urban block
- It is four storeys with set back
- Bicycle parking is adjacent
- Ramps are shrouded where possible
- There are different height levels
- Worked with the different levels to design the ramp
- The width allows for pedestrian comfort and safety
- In relation to interface with the street
- A section of the ramp needs to be flat for approaching the street
- A corner block for Block A has been created to the south due to the Luas line
- The elevational treatment for the landmark building will be outlined

**Further ABP comments:**

- Detail the ground floor interface
- Examine blocks B & C to the east
- Outline the proposed ramp
- Submit CGI's and cross sections

**3. Car parking and Transportation****ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Parking rationale
- Park and ride
- Luas capacity

**Planning Authority's response:**

- The car parking ratio should be reduced to 0.6 spaces per unit
- There is no park and ride

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Possible to have 0.8 car parking spaces per unit
- This is similar to the adjoining scheme
- Luas capacity will be addressed
- Future commuting patterns will be outlined

**Further ABP comments:**

- Submit a car parking rationale
- Detail future Luas capacity

**4. Residential amenity – meeting guideline standards and dual aspect ratios**

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

- Proposed dual aspect ratio
- Community infrastructure

**Planning Authority's response:**

- Seeking a contribution in lieu for development of the community centre in Fortunestown

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Dual aspect is 49.1 %
- Six units are being examined
- This will bring the dual aspect ratio to 52%
- The community centre is being provided in the adjoining development
- Discussions regarding contributions can take place
- There is currently a creche in the area

**Further ABP comments:**

- Submit daylight and sunlight analysis
- Examine and detail community infrastructure and residential amenities
- Clarify the dual aspect ratio
- Outline what are the dual aspect units
- The standards for floor areas are just being met
- Submit a rationale for floor areas

**5. Surface Water Management - Flood Risk**

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

- Surface water and flood risk
- Proposed SUD's

**Planning Authority's response:**

- Attenuation is an issue
- Drainage is currently 5 litres per second
- This should be 3.57 litres per second
- Detail the catchment areas for each attenuation
- Explain the attenuation volume for permeable paving
- Clarify the discharge rate
- Cross sections should be submitted for SUD's, green roofs and the podium
- Explain the proposed green podium
- Outline if additional water will be retained by SUD's
- Examine bioretention
- There is no flood risk issue

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- In relation to the discharge rate
- Due to basements the proposed development had to be split into two
- This is why there is a higher discharge rate
- A blue roof system is being used for attenuation
- Natural fall is from north to south
- Private drainage will connect to the public
- Southern end is connected
- Its not possible to provide public to private connections and then private to public connections on seperate systems

**Further ABP comments:**

- Outline surface water and SUD's
- Address any outstanding issues
- There is no further information sought at application stage

**6. Any Other Matters**

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Outline bin storage and collections
- In relation to the parking standards a rate of 0.7- 0.8 is acceptable
- Show fire tender access and auto-track analysis

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Roof plants in each unit stand alone
- Bin storage will be in the under-croft basement and brought up for collection
- The landing zone will be shown
- An operational waste management plan will be submitted

**Further ABP comments:**

- Detail roof plants and vents
- Refer to the national cycle manual for pedestrian and cyclist surfaces

## 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)

---

Stephen O' Sullivan  
Assistant Director of Planning  
July, 2020