



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Record of Meeting ABP-307421-20

<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	317 no. residential units (154 no. houses, 163 no. apartments), creche and associated site works. Woodtown, Ballycullen, Dublin 16.		
<b>Case Type</b>	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
<b>Date:</b>	22 <sup>nd</sup> September 2020	<b>Start Time</b>	14:20 p.m.
<b>Location</b>	Via Microsoft Teams	<b>End Time</b>	16:15 p.m.
<b>Chairperson</b>	Tom Rabbette	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Ciaran Hand

### Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Rachel Gleave O' Connor, Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

### Representing Prospective Applicant:

Trevor Sadler, MCG Planning
Christy Dowling, Arrow Asset Management
Stephen Manning, McCrossan O' Rourke Manning Architects
Ronan Mac Diarmada, Ronan MacDiarmada & Associates
Paul Moran, POGA Consulting Engineers

### Representing Planning Authority

Barry Henn, Executive Planner
Eoin Burke, A/Senior Planner
Brian Harkin, Senior Executive Engineer (Drainage)
Oisín Egan, Executive Parks Superintendent
John Hegarty, Senior Executive Engineer
William Purcell, Senior Engineer

## **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 23<sup>rd</sup> 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 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 25<sup>th</sup> 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. Timing and phasing of the development**
- 2. LAP site specific objectives**
- 3. Urban design response, layout (connectivity / permeability) and visual impact**
- 4. Density**
- 5. Public open space**
- 6. Unit mix**
- 7. Amenity (both for proposed residents and impact on existing)**
- 8. Ecology**
- 9. Drainage**
- 10. Creche**
- 11. Any Other Matters**

## **1. Timing and phasing of the development**

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

- > The intended timing and phasing of the development in light of Local Area Plan requirements
- > Any information on the delivery of the neighbourhood centre on a neighbouring site

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

- > The applicant should outline the phasing for the development
- > Show how construction of the neighbourhood centre fits in with the LAP

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

- > Planning permission for the neighbourhood centre was granted in 2019
- > Construction has commenced and should be completed within 12 months
- > The primary school is outside of the applicant's control
- > The application site includes a new public park and open space landscaping

### **Further ABP comments:**

- > Outline the future delivery of the neighbourhood centre as part of the submission
- > Consider if the proposal is a material contravention of the LAP in relation to phasing
- > Examine if a financial contribution is required in lieu of community infrastructure required under the LAP in relation to phasing

## **2. LAP site specific objectives**

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

- > Consideration of LAP objectives, particularly Objective BF8
- > What consideration has there been of site specific objectives under the LAP, for example the double ditches hedgerow

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

- > Explain how LAP objectives will be met

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

- > Height will be justified
- > A response to the double ditches hedgerow will be provided
- > There will be connections to the eastern and western side of the site
- > A gap will be made in the tree line running centrally through the site
- > A pedestrian connection is proposed to adjacent sites
- > There will be minimal impact on trees

### **Further ABP comments:**

- > Justify the height in relation to LAP objectives and consider if a material contravention arises
- > Have regard to the LAP site specific objectives and outline how the development responds to these objectives in the application submission

### **3. Urban design response, layout (connectivity / permeability) and visual impact**

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

- > The urban design strategy for the site and how the layout and height of blocks has been considered in light of the site topography
- > How permeability and visual impact has been considered

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

- > Apartment heights are a concern
- > This area is a transition area
- > The surrounding area would be considered rural in character
- > Detail the visual impact of the development
- > Provide sections
- > Show how open space areas are usable
- > It is important that the vehicular link to the east extends through to the adjacent site
- > Topography of the site is difficult and will amplify height
- > Ensure that during phasing there is management of finished phases and construction entrances
- > Development to the north of the site is in the process of being taken in charge

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

- > The topography of the site has influenced the height and design strategy
- > There is permeability into Stocking Wood
- > Pedestrian and cycle connections go through the site into adjacent areas
- > Pocket parks will allow for a visual break between blocks
- > Pedestrian connections link to the parks
- > There is no requirement in the adjoining development to bring the road up to the boundary
- > There is still a route to the adjacent area without extension of the road to the east
- > There is no impact on open space or ecology
- > CGI's with views from the housing estates will be provided

#### **Further ABP comments:**

- > Show the legal rights that evidence connections can be delivered
- > Connections to the neighbourhood centre to the north would be beneficial
- > Outline the gains/losses for providing connections to the east
- > Detail the ecological impact
- > Sections should be put in a A3 booklet
- > Provide sections showing the adjoining lands
- > Submit a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
- > Provide more CGI's
- > Redefine the material pallet across the site
- > Describe the materials and finishes
- > Show the different character areas and how they relate to each other

#### **4. Density**

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

- > Density rationale and calculations

**Planning Authority's response:**

- > Concerned with the density in the context of the LAP
- > Justify the density
- > Public transport in this area is limited
- > Address car use in the area

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- > Density is 44.9 units per hectare on developable land
- > Density is sustainable
- > Over 50% of the development contains apartments
- > There is a balance of housing type proposed

**Further ABP comments:**

- > National guidelines should be addressed in the submission
- > Apartment guidelines need to be addressed in relation to density
- > Detail the density calculations

#### **5. Public open space**

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

- > The design strategy for public open space areas
- > Outline if there will be an impact on trees and hedgerows
- > Detail the tree protection and hedgerow plan, and where tree removal is proposed, this should be evident on proposed plans

**Planning Authority's response:**

- > The double ditches should be retained
- > Show green infrastructure links
- > More amenities in the park area could be provided
- > The linear park to the south needs more detail
- > Show footpaths, tree planting and landscaping
- > Outline the visual impact
- > There is lack of a formal kick about area

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- > There are as many pocket parks as possible
- > Open space is to the east
- > There is a little kick about area
- > The linear park has been widened
- > A link is being provided over to the other end of the site

- > There are step down areas into home zones
- > Communal space is located at the apartments
- > A bigger kick about area is being introduced

**Further ABP comments:**

- > Detail the public open space areas

**6. Unit mix**

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

- > Proposed unit mix

**Planning Authority's response:**

- > Set out a rationale for the proposed unit mix

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- > The unit mix is as broad as possible
- > There are 18% - 1 beds, 35% - 2 beds, 29% - 3 beds, 17% - 4 beds and 1% - 5 beds

**Further ABP comments:**

- > Have regard to the national policy
- > Justify the unit mix if this departs from Local Planning Policy

**7. Amenity (both for proposed residents and impact on existing)**

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

- > Single aspect units facing block D
- > Sunlight access to living rooms
- > Overlooking of neighbouring balconies
- > Condition of the podium

**Planning Authority's response:**

- > Show the relationship with neighbouring sites
- > Outline the daylight and sunlight analysis
- > Consider a shadow analysis around the site

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- > Dual aspect will be examined
- > Block C on the ground floor will be checked

**Further ABP comments:**

- > The labelling of floor plans needs to be clear
- > Check block C on the ground floor and the quality of aspect for units
- > Outline the stacked arrangement for the duplexes and how this ensures good quality accommodation

- > Show the ventilation and landscaping for the podium areas and how this relates to landscaping
- > Provide daylight, sunlight and overshadowing analysis for both the proposed development and in relation to potential impact on adjacent sites/properties

## **8. Ecology**

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

- > Ecology and the submitted bat survey
- > Mitigation measures

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

- > No further comments

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

- > The linear park has been broadened to keep the hedgerow
- > Road layout to avoid trees
- > Agree that mitigation measures are needed
- > Plants and trees will be pollinators
- > More mature trees, wild flower and meadow mixes will be introduced
- > This will add to existing habitats

### **Further ABP comments:**

- > Issues raised in relation to bat survey
- > Any necessary mitigation in relation to bats should be followed through into a construction management plan with mitigation clearly outlined
- > Trees on the east tree belt are important and any required mitigation for tree losses in relation to the central tree line should be explained
- > Show biodiversity improvement and mitigation measures

## **9. Drainage**

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

- > SUD's
- > Flood risk
- > Irish water submission

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

- > Attenuation is 40%-50% undersized
- > Detail the surface area types e.g. if there are green roofs and permeable paving
- > The runoff co-efficient is 5%
- > It should be 60%
- > Show which areas are served with each attenuation system
- > Outline the volumes for the attenuation from the green roofs
- > Explain who owns the existing 375 mm surface water sewer
- > More SUD's measures could be implemented

- > Show surface water attenuation on the surface
- > Side slopes should be shallow to help with maintenance
- > The SAAR value is 300 mm one part of the site and 800mm the other part of the site
- > This needs clarification
- > A drawing should be submitted outlining surface water outfalls

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- > Attenuation is 32%
- > A breakdown will be provided
- > The infiltration rate at 5% will be examined
- > Permeable paving is being designed
- > Green roofs have been identified
- > Can connect to the surface water sewer
- > Underground attenuation will be examined
- > The SAAR figure difference is due to a typo
- > In relation to the Irish water submission – the scheme is part of the Irish Water funding plan
- > It will be completed in quarter four of 2021
- > Occupancy on this site will not take place until 2022

**Further ABP comments:**

- > Look to providing more information on SUD's, work with Planning Authority in relation to this
- > Detail what is being provided
- > Outline any flood risk
- > Address the Irish water submission

## **10. Creche**

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

- > Proposed creche size

**Planning Authority's response:**

- > Submit an analysis of the surrounding area
- > Show if the creche size meets the demand

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- > Creche size and demand will be examined
- > A community audit will be submitted

**Further ABP comments:**

- > Submit a rationale and justification for the creche

## **11. Any Other Matters**

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- > No further comments



**Prospective Applicant's response:**

> No further comments

**Further ABP comments:**

> No further comments

**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)

---

Tom Rabbette  
Assistant Director of Planning  
October 2020