



<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	Demolition of existing buildings, construction of 225 no. Build to Rent apartments and associated site works. Former Steelworks Site, 32A, 32B, 33,34 and 35 James Street, Dublin 8.		
<b>Case Type</b>	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
<b>Date:</b>	15 <sup>th</sup> September 2020	<b>Start Time</b>	15.30 pm
<b>Location</b>	Via Microsoft Teams	<b>End Time</b>	16:50 pm
<b>Chairperson</b>	Rachel Kenny	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Hannah Cullen

**Representing An Bord Pleanála:**

Una O'Neill, Senior Planning Inspector
Rachel Kenny, Director of Planning
Hannah Cullen, Executive Officer

**Representing Prospective Applicant:**

Kevin Hughes, Hughes Planning and Development Consultants
Tiernan McCarthy, EML Architects
John Wallace, EML Architects
Ronan Barrett, Prospective Applicant
Rachel Mc Kenna, Consulting Engineer

**Representing Planning Authority**

Suzanne White, Planner
Kiaran Sweney, 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 24<sup>th</sup> 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 21<sup>st</sup> 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. Development Strategy – layout; height; design; visual impact; unit mix.**
- 2. Residential Amenity - sunlight/daylight analysis; open space; aspect; resident support facilities/services and amenities.**
- 3. Interface with neighbouring properties and impact on adjoining residential amenity.**
- 4. Any Other Matters.**

## **1. Development Strategy – layout; height; design; visual impact; unit mix**

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

- Concerns in relation to layout, height, scale and massing.
- Layout - Interaction/response of the development to adjoining buildings. Block C and proximity to boundary; sunlight/daylight/overshadowing analysis to consider developments to the west and southwest of Blocks C and B; proximity of Block B to existing apartments to east, overbearance and visual impact; animation at ground level within the scheme and onto Basin View.
- Open Space Layout - Permeability across the scheme to open space areas (for Block C; for three storey apartments in Block B fronting Basin View). Main open spaces to the east do not meet BRE sunlight guidance.
- Density driven scheme rather than design.
- Greater rationale in relation to height strategy required and detailed assessment against section 3.2 of the height guidelines.
- 75% appear to be 1-bedroom units, consideration of unit mix in the wider area.

### **PA Comments:**

- Comments given in the opinion submitted, focus to be put on the visual impact, also amenity impact on Oakley, considering the individual units within.

### **Prospective Applicants comments:**

- This scheme has been worked on for 18-20 months we have examined and designed it in various different forms.
- Linear landscaped courtyard space on arrival area into the scheme, private and public space is easily distinguishable.
- In discussions with the planning authority in relation to the direct interface with Oaklee and sun/daylight to the surrounding properties.
- Design and overhanging balconies appear to affect the sun/daylight on the units - the necessary corrective action to amend the scheme will be taken.
- Pedestrian gate located at block A and B is proposed to be removed, allowing access from block C.
- Have considered appropriate location of services.
- Propose to increase quantum of open space through additional roof gardens.
- Propose to maximise east, west and south facing apartments.
- Propose to change balcony design in block B.
- Increased quantity of brick finishes up to 2 more stories.
- Due to proximity to 2 hospitals it was found there is a strong demand for 1 bed apartments, we will put forward a rationale for this.
- Established Public Rental Scheme (PRS) - intend to own operate the scheme.

### **Further ABP comments:**

- Concerns over rationale and submitted documentation in relation to scale of block A and B and interaction of block B with the public realm.
- Issues of bulk, massing and visual clutter, as raised by PA, to be addressed in documentation.

- Heights proposed will be examined against and have regard to section 3.2 of the BHG.
- Justification to be supplied for the level of 1 bed units, contribution to the dwelling typology in the area.

## **2. Residential Amenity - sunlight/daylight analysis; open space; aspect; resident support facilities/services and amenities.**

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

- Sun/daylight analysis on neighboring properties and impact on amenity spaces.
- Hedging that is proposed on the site plan appears to separate large areas of communal open space for ground floor units only, limiting the area of communal space accessible to all. Documentation to clarify rationale for design approach taken.
- Highlight which units are dual aspect and which are single aspect.
- Clarify what resident support and amenity spaces are proposed and rationale for overall quantum proposed.

### **PA Comments:**

- Nothing further to add to the report submitted.

### **Prospective Applicant comments:**

- Residential amenity spaces made up of clusters of seated areas, working desks, laundrette and a yoga space.
- Majority of the residents will approach the development at James Street, proposed to place the concierge desk and management office here.
- Gym not desired by the end user as there are many gyms currently around the area.
- Layout of the gardens - to be located in the east for maximum sunlight resulting in higher usability for the residents. Pedestrian gate to be removed.

### **Further ABP comments:**

- Clarity to be provided at application stage in relation to which units are dual and single aspect.
- Rationale to be included in relation to the quantum of spaces proposed and landscaped gardens at application stage.

## **3. Interface with neighbouring properties and impact on adjoining residential amenity.**

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

- Consideration of scale and massing in relation to existing block.
- Visual impacts from the scheme from surrounding buildings and surrounding area. Note additional photomontages requested by PA.

### **PA Comments:**

- Nothing further to add to the report submitted.

### **Prospective Applicant comments:**

- With regard to the site layout studies have been done from the James Street houses and the Oakley buildings to the proposed development, acknowledge there is an impact, but it will be worked on.

**Further ABP comments:**

- Visual impacts overall from the scheme and the area in its entirety to be regarded not solely focused on the Oakley and James Street residences.

**4. Any other matters**

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

- Work alongside the concerns raised by the Board and the Chief Executive's Opinion ensuring all items addressed fully at application stage.
- Discuss further with DCC Transportation and Water Services sections concerns raised.

**PA Comments:**

- Address concerns raised in our report at application stage.

**Prospective Applicant comments:**

- Will address any concerns the Board and the planning authority may have, all rationale, reports, justification and documentation will be included at application stage.

**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)

---

Rachel Kenny  
Director of Planning  
October, 2020