



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-307464-20

Case Reference / Description	221 no. Build to Rent apartments, creche and associated site works. Old Schoolhouse Site (former Clonsilla School a protected structure), Porterstown Road, Clonsilla, Dublin 15.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	6 th October 2020	Start Time	14:35 p.m.
Location	Via Microsoft Teams	End Time	15:56 p.m.
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	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:

Ellen Ballard, C+W O'Brien Architects
Brian Bolger, C+W O'Brien Architects
Terry Kelly, OSH Ventures Limited
Cathal Kelly, DFK
John Mitchell, OSH Ventures Limited
Kevin Hughes, Planning Consultant
Muireann Coughlan, Planning Consultant
Hanna Loughnane, Conservation Architect
Bryan Deegan, Altemar
John McGrath, Landowner

Representing Planning Authority

Deirdre Fallon, Senior Executive Planner
Linda Lally, Senior Executive Engineer

Helena Bergin, Conservation Officer
Phillip Grobler, Executive Engineer
Gemma Carr, Senior Executive Parks Superintendent
Paul Keane, Senior Executive Engineer
Cian O Ceilleachair, Senior Executive Engineer
Anna-Marie Meagher, Parks and Green Infrastructure

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 29th 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 2nd July 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 Strategy, Design, Scale and Mass (Including Impact Upon Protected Structures)**
- 2. Access and Connectivity**
- 3. Residents Amenity Areas and Community Use**
- 4. Cycle Storage and Car Parking**
- 5. Creche Design and Drop-Off / Parking**
- 6. Ecology, Grasslands / Trees (Including Impact Upon Royal Canal)**
- 7. Technical Assessments (Flood Risk; Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing; Transport Assessment; DMURS Compliance)**
- 8. Any Other Matters**

- 1. Height Strategy, Design, Scale and Mass (Including Impact Upon Protected Structures)**

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Masterplan requirements for the site as indicated in planning policy
- Proposed heights and design strategy
- What has informed the strategy in relation to the scale and mass of proposed blocks
- What consideration has been given to the potential impact upon protected structures

Planning Authority's comments:

- Masterplan is not on the programme yet
- It is not evident that site characteristics have influenced the approach taken by the applicant
- There are two protected structures, the old schoolhouse and the royal canal
- There is too much of the landscape given over to car parking
- Design approach needs to respond to the royal canal
- Consider the positioning of blocks adjacent to the embankment

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The protected structure of the old schoolhouse is prominent
- The proposed development is 56 metres behind the schoolhouse
- The height is not dominant
- Proposed site has a linear nature
- The blocks have visual permeability to and from the royal canal
- Future provision has been made for the two developments to the north to link into this site
- The adjacent sites do not have permissions
- This will open up the canal
- The highest density blocks overlook the open space
- The future core of the Clonsilla spine road is being facilitated
- There could be a potential footbridge
- Greenway can connect to the Irish Rail proposal
- Site can be viewed from north, south, east and west
- There is a rise from 4 to 7 storeys
- The highest is at the centre

- Heritage report will outline both protected structures
- The old school house has to be repaired and restored
- Proposed block is 12 meters from the canal
- Boundary on top of the bank has been set back
- Waterways Ireland will be consulted regarding the top embankment to the canal

Further ABP comments:

- Take into consideration the height in the surrounding area
- Show the level differences of the canal and the proposed site
- Drawings should show the actual and perceived distances
- Demonstrate what the blocks on the boundary will look like
- Have regard to both protected structures and show the relationship
- Include the topography of the site
- Outline the length of the frontage
- Explain the evolution of the design
- Show the layout of the open spaces around the blocks
- Detail elevational treatment and material finishes
- Include photomontages that demonstrate the quality of finish proposed

2. Access and Connectivity

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Transport assessment
- Upgrade works required
- Pedestrian and cyclist connections that appear outside of red line boundary for the site
- How the potential impact of Irish Rail upgrade works may impact access to the site

Planning Authority's response:

- This is an infill site
- Footpaths and roads do not link to the north
- The impact of Porterstown Road narrowing should be outlined
- Have regard to the electrification of the Dart and the closing of the rail crossing adjacent the site
- Provide a traffic impact assessment
- Traffic counts from previous years could be submitted
- Show how the greenway site ties in with the royal canal greenway

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Access and connectivity will be shown
- Cycle and pedestrian connections can be facilitated
- Traffic assessment was not lodged due to the coronavirus which has resulted in less movements, so a survey would have given an inaccurate assessment
- Traffic to the south of the site is at low speed
- A survey regarding the level crossing will be undertaken
- There is potential to connect Lambourn estate to the village

Further ABP comments:

- Outline access and connectivity
- Show any potential impact from the Irish Rail electrification
- Detail access to the towpath and explain if it is deliverable

3. Residents Amenity Areas and Community Use

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- The facilities intended as part of the residents' amenity
- Community use in the protected structure

Planning Authority's response:

- No further comments

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The proposed development is a build to rent and will be managed
- Operational uses will be shown
- Community use in the protected structure is an attempt to bring the structure back into use
- Facility will be managed and available for the community

Further ABP comments:

- More information is needed regarding residential use in block A and community use in the protected structure
- It is not appropriate to rely on publicly accessible uses to form residential amenities
- Have regard to the apartment guidelines and the SPPR7 requirements in relation to resident facilities and resident amenities as part of BTR development
- Submit a schedule of areas

4. Cycle Storage and Car Parking

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Proposed cycle numbers and storage
- Car parking at surface level

Planning Authority's response:

- There needs to be quality bicycle parking for each unit
- Anything below the figure of 0.5 car spaces per unit would be a concern
- Impact of car parking on the surface is excessive
- The under-croft car parking is not successful
- This site will be visible from the north greenway

Prospective Applicant's response:

- This development is 400 metres to the train station
- Car parking is 0.5 car spaces per unit
- 111 car parking spaces is sufficient
- Underground parking has been examined and shown to be invasive

- This can be outlined
- There was a typo in the documents regarding bicycle figures
- There will be 84 in built and 137 outdoor bicycle spaces
- Bicycle provision will be shown

Further ABP comments:

- Cycle storage could compensate for reduced car parking
- Car clubs could be examined
- Outline if there is an alternative to surface parking and demonstrate compatibility with provision of green spaces
- Show distance to surrounding employment hubs and pedestrian/cycle routes to these

5. Creche Design and Drop-Off / Parking

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Creche size and justification
- Proposed balcony on the first floor attached to the creche
- If the outdoor amenity space for the creche is open to the public
- Creche car parking and drop off

Planning Authority's response:

- 8-10 creche car spaces and drop off areas are needed
- A dedicated set down area is needed

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Creche spaces have been calculated on the basis of the apartments proposed
- Calculation came to 2.94
- This is for 59 children
- Majority of children are in walking distance of the creche
- There are 10 childcare facilities within a 2-kilometre range
- Staff parking will be allocated
- There is no proposed balcony (error in drawings)
- Creche outdoor space will not be public open space

Further ABP comments:

- Provide a creche size justification
- Detail creche drop off and the set down area

6. Ecology, Grasslands / Trees (Including Impact Upon Royal Canal)

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Biodiversity
- Ecological impact
- Tree removal
- If a derogation licence is needed

Planning Authority's response:

- More information regarding the potential impact on the grassland is needed

- Explain how it will be protected
- Clarify if tree removal is happening outside of the red line boundary
- Outline the usability of public open space
- Pedestrian access to Lambourn estate would be useful

Prospective Applicant's response:

- There is no impact on the main hedgerow along the canal
- Trees outside the red line boundary are not being removed
- Any tree removal will be subject to agreement
- There is no resting or breeding places along the canal for the otters
- There is no need for a derogation licence
- Grassland encroaches on both sides
- Elevated metal walkways on the grassland can protect species

Further ABP comments:

- Explain in the submission that a derogation licence is not needed, if so held
- Clarify tree removal
- Ensure the consistency of all documentation
- A visualisation of the proposed grassland would be useful

7. Technical Assessments (Flood Risk; Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing; Transport Assessment; DMURS Compliance)

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Flood risk
- Daylight/sunlight analysis
- Transport and DMURS

Planning Authority's response:

- Ensure that the daylight/sunlight ties in with the open space

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Apartments are dual aspect
- One facade in each block is south facing
- There are significant distances to ensure no overshadowing
- There is a no impact on private amenity spaces

Further ABP comments:

- The submission should explain why there is no flood risk
- Outline sunlight/daylight analysis
- Detail transport and DMURS

8. Any Other Matters

Planning Authority's comments:

- No further comments

Prospective Applicant's response:

- No further comments

Further ABP comments:

- There is no further information sought at application stage

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