



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Record of Meeting ABP-307097-20

<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	194 no. Build to Rent apartments and associated site works. Site to south of "Abingdon", Shanganagh Road, Shankill, Dublin 18.		
<b>Case Type</b>	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
<b>Date:</b>	9 <sup>th</sup> July 2020	<b>Start Time</b>	09:35 a.m.
<b>Location</b>	Via Microsoft Teams	<b>End Time</b>	10:59 a.m.
<b>Chairperson</b>	Rachel Kenny	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Ciaran Hand

### Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Rachel Kenny, Director of Planning
Rachel Gleave O'Connor, Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

### Representing Prospective Applicant:

James Naughton, Client
Shane McBride, Client
Alastair Hunter, Architect
Michael O'Carroll, Architect
Mark Richardson, PUNCH Engineers
Trevor Sadler, Planner
Brenda Butterly, Planner

### Representing Planning Authority

Cait Ryan, Senior Executive Planner
Fiona Cummins, Executive Planner
Thiago Bodini, Transportation
Mary Hegarty, Public Lighting
Bernard Egan, Drainage Planning.

## **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 27<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 24<sup>th</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. Height / design and associated potential impact upon the area;**
- 2. Visual relationship with Abingdon House;**
- 3. Residential amenity within the proposed development (particularly in relation to podium access, residential amenities, facilities, services);**
- 4. Landscaping and permeability / access routes;**
- 5. Car parking;**
- 6. Drainage;**
- 7. Creche demand and supply; and**
- 8. Any Other Matters**

## **1. Height / design and associated potential impact upon the area;**

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

- The height strategy for the proposed development on the site.
- The protection of adjoining residents amenity, specifically in relation to the separation distances to boundaries and neighbouring dwellings.
- The detail of tree protection where blocks are situated close to trees identified for retention.

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

- In light of the site characteristics, close to public transport etc. it is accepted that the site is appropriate for development higher than two storeys.
- However decisions around height should have regard to the DLRCC Building Height Strategy.
- Concerned that the proposed height of 5-8 storeys is excessive.
- Potential impact on neighbouring dwellings is a concern.
- This site is in close proximity to the designated Costal Zone Fringe area.

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

- It is intended that development of the site creates a distinct character for the area.
- It will appear as a series of attractive blocks set in a park land landscape.
- It is intended to retain a large number of trees on the boundaries for the site.
- Taller blocks are located to the centre of the site to reduce impact on neighbouring dwellings.
- The site is at a lower level to Clifton park.
- There is stepping to Rathsallagh Grove.
- The site is enclosed by mature trees.
- The design approach is to create a series of pavilions with different heights.
- The scale and mass is broken up and not overpowering.
- Slopes / changes in level are slight and gradual across the site.
- The slope creates a stepping effect to the proposed height.
- There is an extensive tree survey to accompany the application proposals.
- The configuration of the blocks was influenced by the desire to preserve trees.
- There is a large tree protection zone plan to ensure preservation.

### **Further ABP comments:**

- The gradual change in levels across the site is slight and will not impact how visible the development is.
- Clarify the exclusion and set back of the development from tree canopies.
- Detail the tree protection zone and how development close to these zones will ensure preservation of trees.
- Explain how the trees will co-exist with residents where windows / balconies are located close to tree canopies.
- Consider a reduction of the footprint of the building, to situate it further away from the north west boundary, protecting trees and the future development potential of sites to the north.
- Have regard to the Costal Zone Fringe and provisions of the DLRCC Building Height Strategy in the Design Statement Document.

## **2. Visual relationship with Abingdon House;**

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

- Potential impact on the Protected Structures, Abingdon House to the north of the site and Shanganagh Park House further to the south.

### **Planning Authority's response:**

- There is lack of detail regarding any impact on Abingdon House
- A robust assessment for the visual impact is needed

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

- There are no adverse impacts on either Shanganagh Park House or Abingdon House.
- Shanganagh Park House is located a significant distance away from the site.
- Abingdon House is not publicly accessible or visible from public areas.
- Abingdon House has a limited relationship with the wider area.
- Photomontages and a report will be submitted to demonstrate the relationship between the development and the Protected Structures.

### **Further ABP comments:**

- A Heritage Report is required to describe potential impacts upon the Protected Structures.
- Outline how the proposed development sits in conjunction with these Protected Structures with verified views, CGIs and wire lines.

## **3. Residential amenity within the proposed development (particularly in relation to podium access, residential amenities, facilities, services);**

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

- How will access to the podium levels via external stairs be controlled.
- Confirmation of the percentage of dual aspect units being provided.
- What determined the selection of units to test sunlight/daylight analysis.
- Confirmation of the location of residential facilities.
- How will the pavilion amenity space be managed and who will access it.

### **Planning Authority's response:**

- Explain how the pavilion amenity space will be accessed.
- Detail the future public realm surrounding the site.
- Blocks A, C and D have no residential amenities.
- A schedule is required for the communal and recreational amenity spaces.
- Dual aspect needs to be a minimum of 50%.
- The figure of 43.9% dual aspect is below the standards.

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

- Podium access is for all residents in all blocks via the external stairs from public areas.
- Stairs to the podium are not currently shown as gated.
- The public can access the podium levels in theory, but this is not the intention.

- The pavilion amenity space is in a central and accessible location for the wider community.
- The Dart is in close proximity, therefore consider a minimum target of 33% dual aspect to be appropriate.
- The 42% of dual aspect is for corner locations.
- A figure of 50% dual aspect is being aimed for.
- Orientation is east – west for all units, there are no north facing units.
- There is a community space located between blocks B & C - the pavilion amenity space.
- The two raised podium areas are primarily accessed by the core for residents use.
- Public gardens are to the north at surface level.
- Laundries are located in each apartment.

**Further ABP comments:**

- Examine the justification for a 33% minimum for dual aspect units, the apartment guidelines indicate this is appropriate where a site is located close to public transport AND employment areas.
- The figure of 50% for dual aspect units relates to all other sites.
- Any areas that are publicly accessible cannot be described as being a residential amenity space.
- If podium gardens are to be publicly accessible an explanation is required of how this will be managed.
- Detail the daylight and sunlight analysis on each floor until it can be shown that all units meet BRE target values, at which point floors above may not require testing.

**4. Landscaping and permeability / access routes;**

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

- Description of what spaces are public and what spaces are private in the development.
- The proposed landscaping treatment of the podium edge.
- Tree protection approach.
- Potential for access to the north in future.

**Planning Authority's response:**

- The submitted tree survey does not detail those trees to the south of the site. While outside the boundary, there may still be need for protection measures.
- These trees are important for screening and should be included in the arboricultural report.
- Clarity is needed regarding the retention of trees during the construction phase.
- Outline the use of materials to be used.
- Clarify the management of tree houses.
- Clarify what is private/public and how it is being managed.
- The proposed railing for the boundary to the south should be omitted.
- Accommodate desire lines in the landscape through the trees.
- Demonstrate future connections with lands to the north, this is important for permeability.
- Lands to the south have two connections.

- Show linkages into the lands zoned F.

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- It is not expected that there will be an impact on trees to the south.
- The tree houses are communal and accessed via the podium.
- The tree houses will be managed.
- The proposed railing to the south of the site is due to a fall in the land and for providing security.
- A softer edge can be examined.
- The applicant does not have access or own a right of way at the northern boundary.
- A footpath can be provided to the boundary and the future provision of it to be extended.

**Further ABP comments:**

- A plan is required with associated commentary to explain the distinction between public and private.
- Outline where and how access is controlled in the landscape.
- Detail the treatment of the podium edge and how this will appear after completion, 1 year, 2 year etc.
- Cross reference the tree protection plan with the construction management plan.
- Show access to the north.

## **5. Car parking**

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

- Levels of proposed car parking.
- Visual appearance and quantum of surface parking.

**Planning Authority's response:**

- The proposed car parking rate is 0.64 spaces per unit this should be 1 space per unit.
- The proposed site is not close to employment areas.
- Concerned that there could be parking overspill.

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- The proposed development is close to a Dart and is build to rent.
- It is 1 km from the employment zone of Cherrywood.
- Majority of parking is under the podium.
- Proposed car parking rate is reasonable given the characteristics of the development.
- Cycle parking is in excess of DLRCC standards.
- The census breakdown will provide clarity of how people commute in the area.
- Car clubs is also an option.

**Further ABP comments:**

- Justify the proposed car parking rate with reference to the characteristics of intended occupiers.
- Detail the travel distance to surrounding employment areas.

- A rationale is required for the quantum and visual impact of the proposed surface car parking spaces.
- The EV rate of 10% is low.

## **6. Drainage**

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

- Outstanding issues regarding drainage.

### **Planning Authority's response:**

- Have regard to what is contained in the Drainage Division report from DLRCC.
- There are no significant outstanding drainage issues.

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

- Further discussions can take place with DLRCC's Drainage Division.

### **Further ABP comments:**

- Drainage details should be submitted at application stage.

## **7. Creche demand and supply**

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

- Rationale for no creche provision.

### **Planning Authority's response:**

- Submit a robust justification for why there is no creche being provided.

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

- There are 14 creches in the local area.
- In a worse case scenario 3-9 childcare spaces will be required.
- A new creche is not viable as part of the development.
- Wider area can facilitate space.
- A creche assessment will be submitted.

### **Further ABP comments:**

- Submit a creche assessment and justification.

## **8. Any Other Matters**

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

- Refer to DLRCC cycle parking standards in relation to the type of storage proposed.
- Examine the access route to cycle parking under the podium.
- An easier route could be provided.

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

- There will be managed stacked cycle parking.

**Further ABP comments:**

- Investigate potential for incorporating a number of Sheffield stands alongside stacked storage.
- Accommodate different bicycle sizes.

**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)

---

Rachel Kenny  
Director of Planning  
July, 2020