



Case Reference / Description	Demolition of existing dwellings, construction of 105 no. apartments and associate site works. 52, 54, 56 and 58 Station Road, Raheny, Dublin 5.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	15 th July 2020	Start Time	12.30 pm
Location	Via Microsoft Teams	End Time	1.10 pm
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Senior Executive Officer	Cora Cunningham

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Una O'Neill, Senior Planning Inspector
Cora Cunningham, Senior Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

John Gannon, TPA
Frank Gunning, Applicant
Matt Gallagher, Applicant
Larry Pierce, PMCA Architects
Ronan MacDiarmada, Ronan MacDiarmada Landscape Architect
Robert Fitzmaurice, CSC Consulting Engineers
Niall Barrett, CSC Consulting Engineers

Representing Planning Authority

Diarmuid Murphy, Senior Executive Planner
Nicola Conlon, Senior Executive Planner

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 24th June, 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 21st May, 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. Residential Amenity - sunlight/daylight analysis; northern elevation and opes; private amenity areas.**
- 3. Landscape Strategy – Issues raised by PA; internal courtyard; positioning of ESB substation adjoining Station Road; DCC plans for northern area of open space.**
- 4. Pedestrian Movement around the Site.**
- 5. Interface with Open Space to the North and East.**
- 6. Surface Water Management Issues Raised by PA.**
- 7. Traffic and Transportation Issues Raised by PA.**
- 8. Any Other Matters.**

1. Height and Design

ABP Comments:

- Previous permission on proposed site from 2016.
- PA Opinion raises issues in relation to mass, bulk and vertical emphasis, address in application.
- Photomontages should be submitted showing when trees are not in leaf for clarity.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Rationale to build permitted development using identical footprint.
- Adjustments between permitted and proposed schemes.
- Permitted development under previous Development Plan.
- Planning context has changed with adoption of new Development Plan which allowed for increased height and mix permitted on proposed site.
- Height achieved without any negative impact on existing environment.
- Mix of units and increased height proposed at centre of development.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- PA has no objection to proposed height, materials proposed, and omission of 3 bed units.
- Bulk, mass and scale of elevation broken up on northern side, provide more detail and illustrations.

2. Residential Amenity - sunlight/daylight analysis; northern elevation and opes; private amenity areas

ABP Comments:

- PA has raised issues in relation to Daylight/Sunlight analysis submitted, standards applied in relation to BRE guidance.
- Northern elevation falls short of BRE standards.
- Consider internal amenity and outlook to park with alternative provision such as a projecting angled window, which would benefit passive surveillance of the open space.
- Quality residential development and amenities required.
- Planted buffer zone around ground floor units to be further considered.
- Apartment 6 and above has a limited side elevation, consider additional high level window.
- Balconies are proposed directly over the basement car park, revision of previously permitted scheme, consider further the amenity issues with this arrangement.
- Address issues raised in PA Opinion in relation to visual softening of the entrance to the car park.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Satisfied PA issues can be addressed in application.
- Will revise and recheck standards.
- Can look at revisions and consider.
- Looked at variation regarding Daylight/Sunlight.
- PA might clarify issues raised in PA Opinion in relation to overlooking viewing cones.
- Will address defensive space in application.

- Pergola to be provided.
- Will revisit and address in application issues relating to car park entrance.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- Prospective applicant should address in application what level of privacy 3rd parties might expect from the proposed elevational treatments

3. Landscape Strategy – Issues raised by PA; internal courtyard; positioning of ESB substation adjoining Station Road; DCC plans for northern area of open space

ABP Comments:

- Address plans and proposals in relation to boundary treatment onto Station Road.
- Northern area to be ceded to PA, clarify what is planned for this area with PA Parks Department, show how the development can improve on the interface with this area.
- Submit boundary treatment plans.
- Location of ESB substation - consider if there is scope for relocating.
- Submit cross sections of central courtyard showing level changes.
- Question re requirement for lift from courtyard to basement.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Need to discuss proposed open space further with PA to reach agreement.
- Will consider further inclusion of railings along boundary.
- ESB substation considered in other area, this location only opportunity for obtaining level access as per ESB requirement but will discuss further with ESB.
- Lift in courtyard is dedicated for bike and bin access, may change location if not acceptable.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- PA require permeability and connections through.

4. Pedestrian Movement around the Site

ABP Comments:

- Consider additional entrance points to park on northern boundary.
- Address function of paved area along northern boundary, areas should be fully utilised where possible.
- Consider ground level terraces and open space along eastern boundary and location of pedestrian only entrance.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Entrances will be controlled for residents but will discuss further with PA Parks Department.

5. Interface with Open Space to the North and East.

ABP Comments:

- Pedestrian paved area to north does not connect to east of proposed development, no access at ground level.

- Opportunity to improve on overlooking and interaction with existing open space to north and east, consider maximising amenity for future occupants.
- Consider and address in application providing additional light and supervision to the northern element of proposed site.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Paved area proposed to be for private use of residents located in this area, will consider further and address in application.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- Prospective applicant should engage in further discussions with Parks Department.
- Differential heights would give privacy to ground floor units.

6. Surface Water Management Issues Raised by PA

ABP Comments:

- Address issues raised by the Drainage Division in PA Opinion.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Issues can be addressed in application.

7. Traffic and Transportation Issues Raised by PA

ABP Comments:

- Address issues raised in PA Opinion.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Issues raised can be addressed.

8. Any Other Matters

ABP Comments:

- PA refer to conditioning a financial condition, prospective applicant should see proposed financial condition prior to lodging application, no opportunity for FI request in SHD applications

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- PA raised issue in relation to space being provided for playground, will discuss further with Parks Department.

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 **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
August, 2020