



<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	129 no. Build to Rent apartments and associated site works. Redcourt, Seafield Road East, Clontarf, Dublin 3.		
<b>Case Type</b>	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
<b>Date:</b>	11 <sup>th</sup> November, 2020	<b>Start Time</b>	02:00 pm
<b>Location</b>	Via Microsoft Teams	<b>End Time</b>	04:00 pm
<b>Chairperson</b>	Tom Rabbette	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Hannah Cullen

**Representing An Bord Pleanála:**

Daire McDevitt, Planning Inspector

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning

Hannah Cullen, Executive Officer

**Representing Prospective Applicant:**

Ian McGrandles, Planning Consultant

Deborah Darcy, Ecologist

Stephen Diamond, Landscape Architect

Julian Keenan, Transport and Traffic Engineer

Ray Mason, Axis Engineering (Daylight & Sunlight)

Felim Sheridan, Arborist

Mark Curran, Project Architect

**Representing Planning Authority**

Diarmuid Murphy, Senior Executive Planner (Planning Department)

Roisin Ní Dhubhda, Executive Planner (Roads Planning)

Donal Kearney, Assistant Parks Superintendent

Maryann Harris, Biodiversity Officer

Kieran O'Neill, Senior Executive Landscape Architect, Parks Section

## **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 11<sup>th</sup> September, 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 17<sup>th</sup> August, 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. Compliance with Land Use Objective Z2**
- 2. Design Strategy (inter alia design, height, layout, interface with public realm, how the development addresses the public roads, communal open space and public open space)**
- 3. Residential Amenities**
- 4. Traffic & Transportation (inter alia Access & Car Parking Strategy)**
- 5. Issues raised by Parks & Landscape Services (addendum to the Planning Authority Opinion received on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2020) and the Biodiversity Officer Report (Addendum received on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2020).**
- 6. Childcare**
- 7. Any Other Business.**

## **1. Compliance with Land Use Objective Z2**

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

- Comments from the applicant in relation to the schemes compliance with the Z2 zoning.

### **PA Comments:**

- The land Use zoning is regarded as a legacy issue, none of the adjacent land is zoned Z2. Residential is permitted under Z2.

### **Prospective Applicant's comments:**

- Zoning has been attached to the land for a long period of time due Redcourt House and Gardens that used to occupy the site, this was destroyed by fire in 2007 and subsequently demolished. It is unsure why Z2 remains as the zoning since the house is now gone.

### **Further ABP comments:**

- Notwithstanding that Redcourt House is no longer there, the land use zoning remains, therefore, need to address this at application stage and clearly justify the proposed development compliance with the current zoning.

## **2. Design Strategy**

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

- The overall design strategy for the site.
- The interference with the public realm and how the proposal addresses the three roads that bound the site (Seafield Road East, Dollymount park and St. Gabriels Road)
- Interface with Redcourt Oaks scheme to the east
- Justification/rationale for the proposed height.
- Wind analysis and microclimate
- Clarify the nature of the proposed communal amenity space, is this a completely enclosed space? Examples of where this has been done for residential uses.
- Compliance of communal and open space requirements as set out in the guidelines for BTR scheme will need to be detailed further.
- Separation distances to the residences to the east.

### **PA Comments:**

- It is recognised the site is a standalone site.
- Sun/daylight issues raised in the report submitted are to be addressed in any application and any effects to the surrounding residents.
- Justification will be needed for the height as it exceeds the height parameters set out in the development plan for outer city areas.
- Special consideration to be given to flooding as the area is particularly flood prone.
- There are clear development standards in volume 2 which need to be addressed by the applicant.
- 500m from national special amenity area (Bull Island), which should be explored further in the application.

**Prospective Applicant's comments:**

- A courtyard scheme is proposed.
- Scheme steps 3-6 storeys with the highest part along Dollymount Park and steps down to address Seafield Road East. The proposal addresses adjoining developments and has been designed to have regard to the amenities of surrounding properties.
- It is recognised that the site contains oak trees that have cultural significance, it is proposed to retain as many as possible and, to this end, have pulled the footpath away to create a landscape strip/buffer.
- Scheme sits comfortably on the site.
- Proposed internal/roofed amenity space provides a high-quality amenity space for residents.
- The Communal Area is not enclosed, the 'roof' resembles an umbrella function, its main function is to stop rainfall on the ground plane, increase the functionality of this communal space. There is a gap between the roof covering and the roof of the blocks. The communal space is thus not completely enclosed.
- To date there is no example of the roof/covering in Ireland but can provide examples from the UK and Europe where this has been successfully installed. A clear rationale and justification will be provided at application stage as to how it will work and be maintained, etc
- There is potential to reduce the height of the 'cover' that projects above the parapet heights (c.1.5m).
- There is no capacity to allow water to percolate through the grounds.
- Level of noise under the roof is attenuated.
- All requested documentation will be supplied at application stage.
- The Communal Amenity space is seen as passive open space. The nature of the space and other matters arising will be addressed at application stage.
- The ramp at the high end of the site at the northern section is unusual in configuration and will address this further at application stage.
- CGI's will be of benefit in illustrating the development and a full suite will accompany any application.

**Further ABP comments:**

- Further CGI's, cross sections and photomontages to be provided in the interest of clarity of the development.
- Provide examples as to where this type of communal sheltered open space has previously be implemented and how it functioned.
- Applicant should organise a meeting with the drainage department in the local authority to discuss technical details regarding runoff etc prior to lodging an application.
- An Architectural Design Statement should be prepared and include details of materials/finishes.
- Include a Building Lifecycle Report with an application. This should also address the roof/covering.
- Address potential visual impact from Bull Island.

### **3. Residential Amenities**

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

- Potential impacts arising from the proposed closed/ floating membrane feature in the scheme, such as access to sunlight/daylight, noise, temperature, odour etc need to be addressed further.
- All lower floor units should be included in the assessment for daylight/sunlight.
- Overlooking from decking and internal circulation areas to be addressed.
- Potential impacts on Redcourt Scheme to the east having regard to, inter alia, the setbacks proposed.

#### **PA Comments:**

- A fuller survey of the development would be welcomed.
- Scope to provide best- and worst-case scenarios.
- Full shadow study assessment before and after development, and with and without the current trees along the eastern boundary in particular.

#### **Prospective Applicant's comments:**

- Detailed reports will be prepared and lodged with the application.
- All aspects for daylight within each and every unit not just lower floor will be included in the assessment
- It is inevitable birds could get under the roofed area, this will be addressed at application stage.
- Impact on adjoining properties is not seen as an issue but will be demonstrated clearly at application stage.

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

- A report should be prepared that addresses the potential impacts on residential amenities of adjoining properties and residential amenities within the proposed scheme.
- Noise Impact Assessment, Temperature Impacts (communal amenity area), daylight/sunlight analysis.
- Liaise off line with the Drainage Section as no representative at the meeting.

### **4. Traffic & Transportation**

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

- Car parking strategy rationale/justification given the location of the development and proposal is for Build to Rent.
- Address how the proposal complies with the development plan in regard to parking standards
- Rationale for the closure of Seafield Road East entrance and opening of a vehicular entrance off Dollymount Park Road.
- The reconfiguration of the existing arrangement along Dollymount Park (parking and bring banks). Implications for redline boundary and relevant consents required.

**PA Comments:**

- Car sharing exclusivity unclear in the documents, further details required who can use this service.
- More parking provision on the northern side of site, rather than east, scope to relook at this.
- 33m long section of parking allocated on Seafield Road East.
- Parking is on the lower quantum for the area and there are concerns regarding potential overspill parking on adjoining roads.

**Prospective Applicant's comments:**

- Used the Redcourt Oaks data to assist in the calculation for a parking ratio.
- 81 spaces will satisfy the demand of the proposed scheme.
- A full car parking management assessment report will be submitted as a part of the application.
- Spaces will be allocated to the apartments.
- Proposal for two car sharing spaces in the basement area which will be exclusive for the residents of the scheme, scope to include one other space at Seafield East to serve the wider area.
- Point noted regarding relocating spaces from the east to the north.
- SHD in Eastwall has exclusive car sharing spaces for the residents, can include this as an example.
- It is proposed to remove the perpendicular on street parking (Dollymount Park) which is not heavily used. It is proposed to then mirror parallel parking to reflect the arrangement on the opposite side of the road.

**Further ABP comments:**

- Recommend looking at the documentation provided with other SHD applications to see what was included in relation to car sharing
- Board will need to be clear on who will carry out certain works to facilitate the development
- Ensure correlation of all documentation submitted as part of an application.

**Further Planning Authority comments:**

- May need to seek some sort of letter of commitment from the car sharing service.
- Consideration for visitor parking and its management, further details needed.
- In support of any other ideas that could enhance sustainable modes of transport.
- Possibility to relook at enhancing a pedestrian route to the commercial areas in proximity to the scheme.
- Confirmation will need to be provided on the current car spaces that are to be retained and removed as result of the proposed development.

**5. Issues raised by Parks & Landscape Services****ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on**

- Tree removal and presence of badgers, pygmy shrew and hedgehogs on site.
- Landscape buffer appears to be included in open space provision.
- Are there any other protected species associated/on the lands of the proposed development?

**PA Comments:**

- 64%-65% tree loss on site, quite a considerable amount.
- Development footprint too large to best conserve the trees, would not consider tree loss appropriate, should seek to maximise the retention of the trees.
- The trees seem only to be looked at from a single perspective, value needs to be relooked at from all angles as mentioned in our report (e.g. visual and ecological).
- Ongoing systematic surveys in relation to the badgers, PA would not be confident relocating the species to the public park (St Annes Park) would be acceptable/successful.

**Prospective Applicant's comments:**

- At eastern boundary 20 trees are being kept, removing 36 along the southern boundary.
- Further detail to be provided on tree protection and construction management.
- Landscape buffer not included in the open space calculation.
- Good mix of tree species, value is more collective in grouping rather than individually.
- The NRA guidelines are often applied/considered, due to the lack of other guides, standard protocol determine other sets the badgers can relocate to within their territory.
- May not be viable option to include artificial sets on the site.

**Further ABP comments:**

- Further meetings with planning authority may be required to discuss this matter further.
- Other protected species associated/on the lands of the proposed development?

**Further Planning Authority comments:**

- Discussion have taken place with the NPWS and there are some concerns regarding badgers relocating to another sett successfully.
- Will liaise further with the applicant in relation to breeding viability of the badgers.

**Further Applicants comments:**

- Other species include pygmy shrew, bats and hedgehogs.
- Aiming to find the most satisfactory biodiverse friendly solution, currently exploring options.

**6. Childcare****ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on**

- Further information needs to be provided regarding childcare demand analysis, justification/rationale for no provision on childcare within the scheme.

**PA Comments:**

- Take any issues/concerns raised in report submitted as read.

**Prospective Applicant's comments:**

- Will engage with childcare committee as requested in the planning authority report.
- Requirement for about 24 spaces for the development which is well served by childcare provision in the surrounding area.
- More detail and an updated childcare demand analysis will be provided.

## 7. Any other business

### ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on

- Liaise with DCC Drainage regarding runoff and issues raised in the Drainage Report.
- Liaise with DCC Biodiversity Parks and Landscape Services regarding issues raised in their reports.
- If Material Contravention arises, this need to be addressed in the documentation submitted with the application in the form of a Material Contravention Statement and referred to in the Public Notices.
- Technical issues highlighted need to be fully addressed at application stage as there is no provision for further information under SHD,
- Ensure all documentation is submitted and correlates as no provision for further information under SHD.

### PA Comments:

- In relation to the trees located on the west side, in the event they are to be removed PA will work with the applicant on this matter/ further discuss.

### Prospective Applicant's comments:

- Nothing further to add.

### 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](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  
December, 2020