



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-307475-20

Case Reference / Description	Demolition of existing warehouses and dwelling, retention of Hendrons' Building and construction of 296 no. shared living residential units and associated site works. Hendrons' Building (a protected structure) and wider site, 36-40 Dominick Street Upper, Dublin 7.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	16 th September 2020	Start Time	09:35 a.m.
Location	Via Microsoft Teams	End Time	11:25 a.m.
Chairperson	Rachel Kenny	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Rachel Kenny, Director of Planning
Conor McGrath, Senior Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Denis Boland, Client
Alan O' Brien, Client
John Spain, Managing Director
Meadhbh Nolan, Associate Director
John Fleming, Managing Director
Claudia Fialho, Architect
Carol Pollard, Conservation Architect
Rob Goodbody, Historic Building Consultant
Miriam Porter, Landscape Architect
Stephen Dent, Engineer
Eoin O'Shea, Senior Project Manager

Representing Planning Authority

Mary Conway, Deputy Dublin Planning Officer
Peter Nelson, Executive Planner, Planning Dept
Ruth Johnson, Archaeology
Mary McDonald, Senior Executive Architectural Conservation Officer
Roisin Ni Dhubhda, Executive Planner, Roads

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 30th 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 3rd 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. Development Plan Policy - Zoning & Building Heights.
2. Design Strategy – Heights, Elevation treatment and materials.
3. Relationship with Protected Structures
4. Relationship with Palmerston Place and Right of way.
5. Internal residential amenity.
6. Bicycle and motorcycle parking.
7. AOB

1. Development Plan Policy - Zoning & Building Heights

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Zoning objective and Z3 zoning
- Building heights

Planning Authority's comments:

- There needs to be a balance
- The zoning objectives need to be met
- Amenities need to be protected
- The wall is a protected structure
- Facilities should not be excessive and need to be viable
- Demonstrate how facilities are sufficient and how public access will be facilitated.
- Explain how the gym will be viable.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The primary use of this site is residential use
- The scheme has a range of facilities that will be open to the public
- There is a net gain for the area with the enhancement of facilities
- Proposed height is slightly over the development plan provision
- The area is central and in close proximity to the Luas line
- A material contravention statement will be submitted

Further ABP comments:

- Show compliance with the zoning objective
- Ensure that the scale of the public provision meets the zoning objective
- Outline accessibility of neighbour facilities to the public and management of same.
- Submit a rationale for neighbourhood facilities
- The building heights have some conflicts in the submitted documentation
- Proposed building height is 26.8 metres while the development plan provision is 24 metres

2. Design Strategy – Heights, Elevation treatment and materials

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Design approach
- Elevation at Western Way
- Relationship of block C with Hendron's building
- Strategy for the 9-storey corner
- Material use

Planning Authority's response:

- Satisfied in principle with the height and blocks
- There is a lack of detail regarding the materials and façade
- Show articulation of the blocks

Prospective Applicant's response:

- There is a modest extension at the top
- Density is suitable
- The taller block C at the Western Way sweeps away around the corner.
- There are a series of dropping forms
- The building is not visible in a long elevation
- Ground level units have views over / overlook the wall
- Step back occurs on the top floor
- Materials are restrained to sit in the background to Hendrons.
- White brick is to be used, which is suitable for the climate
- The window frames are black and signage will be red

Further ABP comments:

- Detail elevational treatment
- The elevations on Western Way are important
- Submit CGI's for Western Way travelling from the park
- Show if there could be better articulation between blocks at the junction
- Examine the relationship of the southern elevation of block C with Hendrons

3. Relationship with Protected Structures

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Relationship with the two protected structures

Planning Authority's response:

- Detail the relationship with the protected structures

Prospective Applicant's response:

- A rational regarding conservation will be submitted

Further ABP comments:

- In relation to the top floor to Hendron's building, submit a rationale for the design approach
- An Architectural Heritage Assessment could address outstanding issues
- Show the relationship of this proposed scheme with the protected structures

4. Relationship with Palmerston Place and Right of way

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Corner of Dominick street and Palmerstown Place
- Relationship with the terrace to the north and right of way
- Boundary on Western Way

Planning Authority's response:

- In relation to the corner the colour and quality of the roof elements need consideration
- The proportion of windows are competing with Hendron's building

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Ownership of the right of way is unknown. It is not in the prospective applicants ownership
- There are structures on the right of way
- In relation to a fire tender, there is enough space for turning within the site but the right of way could provide emergency access to the site.
- NO. 1 Palmerstown Place has a side gate to the laneway but there is no access to the rear of other houses from the right of way.
- The corner of Dominick street and Palmerstown Place is active
- Larger windows are located on the ground floor of the proposed building , with public / community uses on the ground floor
- The location of the ESB substation is due to ESB requirements on access and was chosen through a process of elimination
- There will be a minimum opening in the wall and the finishes will be two doors with stone cladding on the outside
- The switch room door will be accessed from within the site

Further ABP comments:

- Detail the relationship with Palmerstown Place
- Outline the right of way and explain ownership
- Explain why the ESB sub station is located on the Western Way
- Submit a rationale for why there will be an opening in the boundary wall

5. Internal residential amenity

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Communal and recreational spaces
- Breakdown of uses
- The extent of communal spaces, particularly shared Kitchen / Living / Dining spaces.

Planning Authority's response:

- Detail the internal residential amenities
- There needs to be a justification for the size of the open space

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Public and shared communal uses will be shown
- All rooms exceed minimum floor area requirements and each room has a kitchenette
- Residents in blocks C, D and E have two options for communal use on each floor
- Access for maintenance of lightwells will be reviewed
- Landscaping is designed to give privacy

Further ABP comments:

- The communal and recreational spaces overlap with public neighbourhood spaces
- Examine communal uses
- There is a need to differentiate between public and private space
- Exceeding the room size requirements does not compensate for reduced areas of communal space. The proposal is for a shared living model.
- Daylight analysis needs to include all of the ground floor and lower ground floor units
- Daylight and sunlight analysis of the courtyards need to be detailed
- The central space does not achieve a high standard due to its orientation and configuration
- Need to demonstrate how the courtyard space works as a quality area. Reference to other similar examples.
- Outline the how lightwells will be maintained

6. Bicycle and motorcycle parking**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Proposed bicycle parking
- Use of bike racks

Planning Authority's response:

- Show future proofing in terms of accommodating increased demand over time
- Submit a rationale for the proposed bicycle numbers
- This scheme will have employees with parking requirements
- Submit a mobility management plan

Prospective Applicant's response:

- There are 144 bicycle spaces and 3 motorcycle parking spaces
- Double racks are being used for bicycle storage
- Bicycle parking is reduced as this is a central location in close proximity to the Luas and the Dublin bike scheme

Further ABP comments:

- Justify the rate of proposed bicycle parking

7. AOB

Planning Authority's comments:

- Refer to the points raised in the Conservation Report particularly regarding the detail the protected structures, glass blocks and ventilation
- Provide detail of rooftop elements, including roof gardens and consider measures to alleviate areas of blank elevations
- Note that houses on Palmerstown Place are listed on the NIAH as being of Regional Importance.

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 **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

Rachel Kenny
Director of Planning
October, 2020