

**An
Bord
Pleanála**

**Record of Meeting
ABP-307439-20**

Case Reference / Description	464 no. apartments, creche and associated site works. Former Blakes and Esmonde Motors Site Lower Kilmacud Road, Stillorgan Road (N11) and The Hill Stillorgan Co. Dublin.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	28 th September 2020	Start Time	14:10 p.m.
Location	Via Microsoft Teams	End Time	15:59 p.m.
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Lorraine Dockery, Senior Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Michael Hussey, Architect
Paul Sheeran, Architect
Joe Gibbons, Engineer
Kevin Fitzpatrick, Landscape Architect
Jane Doyle, Applicant
Aidan McLernon, Applicant
John Spain, Planning Consultant
Stephanie Byrne, Planning Consultant
Douglas Bell, Daylight / Sunlight Consultant

Representing Planning Authority

Ger Ryan, Senior Planner
Catherine Hanly, Assistant Planner
Gary Walsh, Executive Engineer

Sean McGrath, Senior Engineer
Dara O'Daly, Executive Parks Superintendent
Elaine Carroll, Executive 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 10th August 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 29th 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. Development strategy for the site to include height, density, massing and plot ratio in context of PA concerns; proposed uses in context of zoning objective; open space/permeability; childcare facility; materials/finishes**
- 2. Residential amenity**
- 3. Transportation matters**
- 4. Drainage matters**
- 5. Any other matters**

1. Development strategy for the site to include height, density, massing and plot ratio in context of PA concerns; proposed uses in context of zoning objective; open space/permeability; childcare facility; materials/finishes

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Height/massing//density/plot ratio of proposed development in the context of PA concerns; in the context of existing local and national policy; the existing/permitted pattern of development in the area; locational context
- Site Development Framework (Table 4.5.3.2) as contained in Stillorgan LAP
- Proposed uses in the context of the District Centre zoning
- Level differences across the site
- Open space and permeability/ accessibility
- Proposed crèche- location and size
- Proposed materials and finishes/elevational treatment

Planning Authority's comments:

- The LAP sets out a benchmark of five storeys; with landmark building no more than nine storeys- Site Development Framework
- Plot ratio on the extant permission was 1:2.2; LAP allows for a plot ratio of 2.5 while the proposed development is for a plot ratio of 3.1
- Massing is a concern
- Address possible impacts of overbearing on nearby properties
- Area is a zoned for district centre uses; concerned that this development is mostly residential in nature
- Orientation of the development has improved; need to show how levels work in the north and east side of the square
- Outline the management of the community hall
- Permeability has been improved; link from the N11 to The Hill should not be gated; would welcome 24hr access
- Open space calculations- need to be specific; differentiate between types of open space
- Detail boundary treatment plan; buffer planting should be shown
- Explain what is being kept open for both public and private spaces
- A taking in charge drawing would be beneficial
- Justify the crèche location; drop-off spaces
- Elevational treatment- brick could be used on the top two storeys that are set back

Prospective Applicant's response:

- In relation to height, the current LAP does not differ from previous LAP
- The LAP has not taken into account the new Building Height Guidelines
- This is a key site; a district centre that fronts onto the N11
- The proposed development responds to this context
- The fifteen-storey building on the corner has been pulled back from junction with N11
- Considers that the site can accommodate the plot ratio proposed
- More commercial frontage has been added from the previous extant permission
- Quality of the public realm has been improved; active ground floor uses
- Internal courtyards have been opened to the south and contain good sunlight

- Buildings are stepped up to eight floors
- The SLX scheme is eight storeys and the Part 8 scheme is nine storeys
- In relation to the district centre zoning and consistency with same – the non-residential space has been increased by one-third; a stronger mixed use than was previously permitted
- Mindful of potential vacancy
- The sports hall will have its own bespoke entrance
- The retail units will compliment Stillorgan shopping centre and not compete with it
- Communal spaces are landscaped and kept separate from the public spaces
- There is a desire to keep the link through site to N11 open, but this has to be balanced with security
- Looking to provide a set down area close to Lower Kilmacud Road; will be detailed
- The rationale for the crèche location is due to there being a south facing play area
- Crèche location will allow Kilmacud Road to be activated
- Brick is being used for the external buildings facing into the street; courtyards will have a render finish

Further ABP comments:

- Height of proposal in context of Site Development Framework as set out in Stillorgan LAP; landmark building of 9 storeys envisaged in LAP for this site with benchmark height of 5 storeys for remainder of site- need to address this matter in application documentation given heights proposed
- Relatively recently adopted Stillorgan LAP took into consideration extant permission on site ABP-300520-18, which had maximum height of 9 storeys
- Also referred to pattern of permissions within wider area; none extend to a height of 15 storeys
- Also need to address density, massing and plot ratio
- Landmark building of fifteen-storeys needs strong justification; give rationale for this height
- Additional CGI's and visualisations to be submitted
- Explain how this may not be considered as overdevelopment of the site
- Address any possible overbearing issues on existing and permitted development in vicinity
- Transition between the landmark element and the lower elements of the proposal; need to ensure that excessive massing or bulk in the overall design does not detract from the proposed landmark element
- Queried positioning of landmark element on the site, why it wasn't located closer to the junction
- Address the matter of possible material contravention
- Address how the proposed uses are consistent with the district centre zoning, given quantum of uses proposed
- Outline the level of vacancy in the area; show the uptake of units in the area
- Detail the locations of the public/communal open spaces
- Show permeability and the pedestrian entrances (Stillorgan Village Area Movement Plan)
- If access is to be gated- will need to submit rationale/justification for same given that gating of this access would severely impede links to N11 through the site.
- Submit a taking in charge drawing

- Submit a rationale for crèche size and location
- Address matter of elevational treatment and need for high quality finish given locational context of this prominent site
- Detail materials and finishes; detailing; submit a building lifecycle report
- Questioned extensive use of render and the weathering impact; emphasised need for high quality development

2. Residential amenity

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Existing and future residential amenities
- Sunlight/daylight analysis; microclimate

Planning Authority's response:

- Outline existing and future residential amenities

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Average daylight factors will be over 90%
- There can be mitigation measures for the east facing single aspect units on the N11
- Over 50% of units are dual aspect

Further ABP comments:

- Address existing and future residential amenities
- Show how the proposed development will not have a negative impact on existing residents
- Ensure that level of amenity is not reduced from that previously permitted on the site; queried whether scale of development proposed was resulting in loss of amenity for future occupiers
- Detail sunlight and daylight analysis; noise analysis
- There are a number of east facing single aspect units
- Detail locations of single and dual aspect units
- Show separation distances and if there is any impact from the permitted development on Leisureplex site opposite
- Outline the quality of the development and living spaces
- Detail noise and microclimate

3. Transportation matters

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Car parking provision

Planning Authority's response:

- Proposed parking of 0.38 per units is too low
- Raised some concerns in relation to Lower Kilmacud Road interface
- Two stacking lanes are important

- Protected cycle lanes are needed
- Proposed public realm should go beyond the minimum requirements
- Detail the footpath being provided

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Satisfied with the level of parking being provided
- Go car is being provided
- There are upgrade works proposed on the Lower Kilmacud Road
- A set down area and loading bay will be provided
- Four lanes can be accommodated

Further ABP comments:

- Address the matter of proposed parking provision
- Have regard to the national guidelines and previous parking provision permitted under SHD in wider area
- Outline details in relation to public lighting
- Cross sections would be beneficial
- Liaise with PA in this matter, prior to lodging application, if possible

4. Drainage matters

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Outstanding drainage matters, as outlined in Appendix B of PA Opinion

Planning Authority's response:

- Provide full details of all drainage matters

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Drainage issues will be provided

Further ABP comments:

- Detail outstanding drainage matters
- There is no further information sought at application stage; liaise with PA prior to lodging application, if possible

5. AOB

Planning Authority's comments:

- No further comments

Prospective Applicant's response:

- An EIAR will be submitted

Further ABP comments:

- Interface with the public realm works

- Outline level differences across site
- Submit justification/rationale for matters raised; CGIs and Visualisations will be helpful

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 **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

