



Case Reference / Description	436 no. apartments, creche and associated site works. Sector 3, Aiken's Village, Stepside, Dublin 18.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	4 th November, 2020	Start Time	09:30 am
Location	Via Microsoft Teams	End Time	11:05 am
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Hannah Cullen

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Irené Mc'Cormack, Planning Inspector
Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Hannah Cullen, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Rick Larkin, Twinlite
Cian Burke, Twinlite
Graham Tyler, Tristan Capital
Kristin Smyth, Tristan Capital
Diarmuid Phelan, Ferreira Architects
Eoin Reddington, Ferreira Architects
Ulick Burke, Kavanagh Burke Consulting Engineers
Declan O'Sullivan, Kavanagh Burke Consulting Engineers
Ross Bryant, JBA (Flood Risk)
Ceila Harris, Mitchell & Associates Landscape Architects
Chris Shackleton, CS Consulting (Daylight/sunlight)
Cormac O'Brien, Aecom (Transportation)
Stephen Little, Stephen Little & Associates (Planning)
Michael O'Sullivan, Stephen Little & Associates (Planning)
Fiona Redmond, Stephen Little & Associates (Planning)

Representing Planning Authority

Ger Ryan, Senior Planner (Planning)
Elaine B. Carroll, Executive Engineer (Drainage)
Donal Kearney, Assistant Parks Superintendent
Julieanne Prendiville,
Dermott Fennell,

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 **28th 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 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 **24th 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 Strategy including layout/design/Block E/separation distances
(Response to Refusal Reason no. 2 - ABP 306471-20)**
- 2. Residential Amenity- Dual aspect design and calculations, Sunlight/Daylight
Assessment**

3. Drainage Issues - PA & Irish Water Submission (Response to Refusal Reason No. 1 - ABP 306471-20)

4. Any Other Matters

1. Development Strategy including layout/design/Block E/separation distances (Response to Refusal Reason no. 2 - ABP 306471-20)

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on

- Design rationale amendments to the scheme, particularly in regard to block E.
- Do the planning authority accept there is greater permeability in the current proposed scheme?
- Separation distances between public routes to the facades of the units.
- Site boundaries and design details regarding ground level defensible private amenity areas bounding the central open space.

PA Comments:

- Red line to include open space lands to the southeast
- Drawings of the boundary treatment seem to seal site off, preferable it remains open. Is the site accessible 24 hours?
- PA accept permeability has increased and improved, it's a matter of has it been improved enough.
- Scope of providing a link to the east of the site to avoid currently going west to go east to get to the Luas.

Prospective Applicant's comments:

- Changes have been made to the scheme, many discussions have been held with the planning authority and the separation distances have been adjusted.
- Internal units have been amended to reflect amenity.
- Public Plaza provided to the north of the site, draws people in.
- South of the site paved walkway provided allowing permeability.
- Footprint and height of block E has decreased/scaled back.
- Photomontages demonstrate the space between block D and E showing the creation of more open space.
- Blocks B & C, G & H, and F & J separation distances of 15 meters+ which the Board found previously acceptable.

- Boundary to the southern linear park is open, only boundary treatment is 1.2-meter-high railing for security for the lower ground units.
- North-south link will be potentially managed.
- 24 hour access through the site is proposed
- A 'taken in charge' drawing can be supplied at application stage.
- Comments made by the planning authority in relation to the link to the east have been noted, it may be possible to provide such a link.

Further Planning Authority comments:

- PA would like to organise a meeting with the applicant to discuss the taking in charge area of landscaping

2. Residential Amenity- Dual aspect design and calculations, Sunlight/Daylight Assessment

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on

- Importance of relooking at podium level.
- Typology of dual aspect in the proposed development, note previous Board concerns, a justification should be provided at application stage.
- Block A/B and block G/F and the relationship between the ground floor and undercroft parking and treatment along Thornbury Road.
- Area to the south to be included in the red line boundary?
- Requirement to address Sunlight/Daylight

PA Comments:

- Clarify why the 2nd floor is being analysed as opposed to 1st floor units.
- Analysis should also be provided for the lower floor units.
- PA referred to standards/policies from London, maybe of some interest/relevance regarding dual aspect (London Housing Standards Report 09)
- The PA is of the opinion where there is a unit that would be otherwise a single aspect unit, a bay window does not suffice.

Prospective Applicant's comments:

- The proposal is providing 51% dual aspect, identified as red by colour coding.
- Unit sizes are bigger than average.
- A full Sun/daylight assessment will be submitted at application stage.

- No impacts shown on properties on Village Road and Glencarraig.
- Entire 2nd floor is 100% compliance sun/daylight.
- Private amenity balconies achieving 92% lighting.
- The lower floors will also be analysed.
- 2.5 metre projection is to a pop-out/bay window , it reflects quality layout, the applicant is confident the rooms will get more than adequate space and daylight.
- Sought letter of consent from planning authority which was received to enable the red line to be extended.

3. Drainage Issues - PA & Irish Water Submission (Response to Refusal Reason No. 1 - ABP 306471-20)

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on

- The location of the proposed overflow storage tank on lands in the control of DLRCC to the south east and associated zoning.
- The treatment of surface water on the site having regard to the recently constructed housing development around the site and the necessity to compliment the surrounding systems.
- Revisions to Flood Risk Assessment to address the location of the foul overflow storage tank in close proximity to detention basing serving adjacent development.
- Certain appendices appear to be missing from the documentation submitted.
- Irish Water require additional assessment survey.

PA Comments:

- Concern regarding the location of the overflow storage tanks on lands zoned F- Open Space and Amenity.
- Concern raised regarding foul overflow and potential pollution.
- The PA is happy to facilitate a further meeting with the applicant to discuss the more technical details.
- No proposals on file to support application on attenuation.

Prospective Applicant's comments:

- Have been engaging with the planning authority and Irish Water.

- Letter of consent received from the DLRCC regarding the location of the overflow storage tank on lands in the control of DLRCC to the southeast of the site.
- Received an updated letter from Irish Water after they submitted their response to the Board,
- Applicant to engage further with Irish Water
- There will be further discussions with the Drainage Department.
- Applicant and Irish Water working together to ensure there will be as much clarity as possible provided to the Board in regards to the available capacity.
- The full set of drawings and calculations sought by the planning authority will be provided.
- Request to look at the residual risk of flooding, volume of the pond can accommodate storm water catchment.

4. Any other matters

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on

- School audit and social infrastructure audit to be supplied at application stage.
- Clarification required in relation to Taking in Charge proposals.
- Quantum of car parking to be addressed
- Ensure Material Contravention Statement has regard to any of the issues raised/anything contravening the development plan (if applicable)

PA Comments:

- Proposals for community facilities such as yoga room or cinema, will these be available to the wider public?
- Status of the park to the west, spilt ownership infrastructure, now under control of Irish Water.
- Planning Authority are in the process of trying to take this park area in charge.
- Issue with car parking ratio, very car dependant area, visitor parking to be given further consideration
- Cycle parking area, the majority are stacked racks which are not as user friendly
- Arborist report to be provided on the existing trees on the boundary line.

Prospective Applicant's comments:

- Aware of all the compliance points that must be addressed in a material contravention statement.

- As it is a BTR scheme there may not be a community room for the wider public however there is a public open space in the scheme.
- Initially started a 1:1 ratio for parking, reduced slightly due to 43% car drivers, 10% passengers, the remaining not clear cut that they are travelling by car.

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
November, 2020