



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-307307-20

Case Reference / Description	359 no. Build to Rent residential units (3 no. houses, 356 no. apartments) and associated site works. Lands North of Stocking Avenue, Stocking Avenue, Woodstown, Dublin 16.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	9 th September 2020	Start Time	2:00 pm
Location	Via Microsoft Teams	End Time	4:10 pm
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Hannah Cullen

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Ronan O'Connor, Senior Planning Inspector
Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Hannah Cullen, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Steve Cassidy, Ardstone Homes
Gavin Lawlor, Tom Philips & Associates
John Fleming, John Fleming Architects
Brendan Keogh, DBFL Engineers
William Burke, Mitchell + Associates
Maryrose O'Donnell, Virtus Project Management
Oscar Carbella, John Fleming Architects
Dave Lee, Tom Philips & Associates

Representing Planning Authority

Jim Johnston, Senior Executive Planner
Barry Henn, Executive Planner
Eoin Burke, A/Senior Planner
Brian Harkin, Senior Executive Engineer (Drainage)

Ronan Toft, Assistant Engineer (Drainage)
Oisín Egan, Executive Parks 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 7th July, 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 9th June, 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. Compliance with LAP/Height/Density**
- 2. Residential Standards including dual aspect provision, private/communal/public open space provision, supporting amenities/noise impacts.**
- 3. Design including layout/interface with Stocking Avenue/site topography**
- 4. Impact on Surrounding Residential Amenity/Adjoining Sites (daylight/sunlight/overshadowing/overlooking/visual impact/noise/development potential)**
- 5. Transport including required infrastructure upgrades/roads proposals/permeability/parking**
- 6. Site Services**
- 7. Trees/Environmental Screening**
- 8. Any other matters**

1. Compliance with LAP/Height/Density

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Accessibility of the site
- Progression of dialogue regarding the community center between the planning authority and the applicant.
- Details in relation to other amenities in the area including the recently granted neighborhood centre.
- Management of the development.

Planning Authority comments:

- Is a deviation from LAP.
- No public transport system such as LUAS or Dart at this location.
- Community centre is welcomed but size should be considered.

Prospective Applicants comments:

- Not reluctant to amending the size of the community centre/will engage further with the planning authority on the details before lodging an application.
- The proposed development is not to be looked at as an isolated site, applicant is developing residential and other land uses in the immediate wider area.
- Currently in discussions with a supermarket retailer to occupy retail unit in the neighbourhood centre/further details to be agreed upon and supplied at application stage.
- The apartments on this site will work well with the surrounding area.
- Site is located in a suburban setting suitable for high density development.
- Visual Impact Assessment concludes there is not any significant impact.
- The location is in close proximity to employment opportunities.
- Confident of ability let the units/applicant has set up their own operating entity for letting and management.

Further ABP comments:

- Views from the linear walkway looking to the apartment block would be useful at application stage.
- Justification to be provided for the housing mix, height and density at this location.

Further Planning Authority comments:

- PA will follow up with the applicant on details in relation to community centre.
- Provide more CGI's for clarity and views to and from contiguous sites and the M50.

2. Residential Standards including dual aspect provision, private/communal/public open space provision, supporting amenities/noise impacts.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Dual aspect provision
- Screening of noise from the M50

Planning Authority comments:

- At application stage can a drawing be provided identifying dual/single aspect units.

Prospective Applicant comments:

- Applicant has prepared a dual aspect/views drawing which will be provided at application stage.
- 36% are fully dual aspect, 40% are single aspect and 24% are made up of projecting bay windows.
- All the apartments are ventilated with noise dampers/no issue with noise from the M50/noise impacts set out in the EIA.
- Prospective applicant sought clarity as to what ABP would consider dual aspect stating that there appeared to be inconsistency in that regard.

Further ABP comments:

- Justification to be provided at application stage in relation to the dual aspect and projecting bay windows, demonstrate why they are appropriate and how they will work effectively. Seek to justify why certain unit typologies can/should be considered dual aspect, give reference to previously permitted similar units if applicable.

3. Design including layout/interface with Stocking Avenue/site topography

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Appearance of the proposed units to the west of the site.

Planning Authority comments:

- It is a sloped site/retaining walls can be problematic.
- Categorization of areas of open space.
- Play provision and wildflower areas are noted.

Prospective Applicants comments:

- Each apartment has 32sqm of open space.
- Internal amenity space of 6,000sq. feet
- 38% public open space.
- Kickabout spaces are flat for usability.
- Play equipment are made from naturally sourced materials, any other materials on site can be reused for other purposes.

Further ABP comments:

- A plan showing quantum of open space would be useful at application stage.

Further Planning Authority comments:

- Details of the proposed uses and age groups that would be using the open space.
- Units to the west need to be addressed further in the documentation.

**4. Impact on Surrounding Residential Amenity/Adjoining Sites
(daylight/sunlight/overshadowing/overlooking/visual impact/noise/development potential)**

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Distances between the blocks, in particular B and C.

Planning Authority comments:

- PA state they have addressed these issues in their report submitted.

Prospective Applicant comments:

- 98.5% achieving the guideline figures for day/sunlight.

Further ABP comments:

- Outline the distances between opposing windows at application stage.

Further Applicant comments:

- Proximity issue will be addressed in the application.

5. Transport including required infrastructure upgrades/roads proposals/permeability/parking.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Car parking ratio guidelines in relation to BTR developments.
- Frequency of the bus route serving the site.
- Compliance with DMURS guidelines.

Planning Authority comments:

- Concerns have been raised in report submitted.

Prospective Applicant comments:

- 15B is a high frequency bus service serving the site with an 8-15 minute frequency, improvements are proposed as well due to Bus Connects scheme.
- Scheme is compliant with DMURS
- Planning authority have mentioned in their report they are satisfied with the ratio of car parking.
- Provision for 'Go-Car' service and charging stations/spaces on site.
- Further work to be done to the site entrance, details will be provided at application stage.
- Cyclist safety at the junction can be further looked into.

6. Site Services

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Comments on the letter submitted by Irish Water.

Planning Authority comments:

- Nothing further to add, ensure drawings requested in PA report are submitted at application stage.

Prospective Applicants comments:

- Applicant has been in contact with Irish Water, background information will be provided when submitting application.
- Technical issues can be discussed further with the planning authority.
- The network is tendered and contracted to go ahead.

7. Trees/Environmental Screening

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Applicant proposal to submit EIAR and AA screening at application stage.

Planning Authority comments:

- Loss of central hedgerow and trees onsite, protection of the boundary trees and existing green infrastructure.
- Sections of planting can act as a noise barrier.
- Tree protection fencing and relevant signage for the trees to be included before construction.

Prospective Applicant comments:

- Applicant is going to provide these reports at application stage, EIA Report is being proposed, it is intended to submit another development adjoining this one in excess of 500 units/AA screening is being prepared.
- Any trees of high quality/value are being retained.
- Tree protection drawing is being prepared.

8. Any other matters

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- LAP provision of a school

Planning Authority comments:

- Itemize compliance with the phasing of the LAP at application stage.
- Pre-connection enquiry with Irish Water to be included.
- Ensure comments/ a statement is given in relation to flooding even if there are no issues.

Prospective Applicant comments:

- A 'school needs assessment' has been carried out along with a childcare assessment demonstrating there is already adequate provision of spaces.
- Received letter of pre-connection from Irish Water.
- Applicant states that they can include a conclusion/statement to address flooding.
- All documentation to address concerns raised will be submitted 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 **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
October, 2020