



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-307978-20

Case Reference / Description	438 no. Build to Rent apartments, childcare facility and associated site works. Former Avid Technology, Carmanhall Road, Sandyford Industrial Estate, Dublin 18.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	23 rd November 2020	Start Time	14:05 p.m.
Location	Via Microsoft Teams	End Time	15:35 p.m.
Chairperson	Rachel Kenny	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Rachel Kenny, Director of Planning
Karen Hamilton, Senior Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Kevin Hughes, Director of Hughes Planning and Development Consultants
Paul Quinn, Director of Burke-Kennedy Doyle Architects / BKD Architects
Paola Garcia, Architect of Burke-Kennedy Doyle Architects / BKD Architects
Clodagh Holmes, Principal Engineer of AECOM
Simon Ronan, Landscape Director of Niall Montgomery + Partners Landscape Architects
Niall O'Byrne, Senior Planner of Marlet
Pat Crean, CEO of Marlet

Representing Planning Authority

Ger Ryan, Senior Planner
Gormla O'Corrain, Senior Executive Planner
Eoin Kelliher, Executive Planner
Claire Casey, Senior Executive Engineer – Transportation Planning

Bernard Egan, Senior Executive Engineer – Drainage Planning
Donal Kearney, Assistant Parks Superintendent – Parks and Landscape Services

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 15th 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 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 19th 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. Development Strategy, inter alia, height, design and layout and open space provision.**
- 2. Impact on Residential Amenity**
- 3. Site Specific Objective SLO 113**
- 4. Traffic and Transport**
- 5. Drainage Matters**
- 6. Any Other Business.**

1. Development Strategy, inter alia, height, design and layout and open space provision.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Height and design
- Dual aspect
- Open space provision

Planning Authority's comments:

- The proposal represents overdevelopment
- The proposed development goes too far beyond the Sandyford Urban Framework Plan (SFUP)
- This site and the Tack site would account for two-thirds of the demand of housing and in the SUFP area
- Explain how the proposed development relates to adjoining buildings
- Look to integrate features of the design into the streetscape
- An 8-storey limit in the SUFP is correct
- More contextual information is needed
- There is not enough private and communal space
- One third of the podium courtyard reaches the sunlight requirements which is below the BRE standard
- Explain the usability of open space
- Roof gardens are not considered useable open space
- Concerned that plants will act as a wind defence
- Plant selection needs to be more specific
- Outline the maintenance of the pocket gardens

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Height is similar to developments to the west
- It allows for bookending along the road
- Site is at a junction and allows for a prominent vista closure
- Opportunity for a marker type building at this location
- Massing is being broken down
- Material elements include simple pallet, stone and brick
- Ground floor contains amenity space with mixed commercial use
- Dual aspect is 38.8%
- There is no north facing single aspect units
- Balconies provide private amenity space
- There is excess communal open space to compensate for apartments without balconies
- Daylight is reaching the standard at 98.8%
- There is set back of 6.5 meters for buildings to the south
- 5-6 metre setback for the Tack site
- 9-10 metre separation distance to the Chill insurance site
- Daylight for open space at the courtyard received 73% daylight
- The ground and first floor received 50% daylight

- The pocket park is an interface for the upper and lower levels
- Frontage is achieved
- Roof gardens are accessible

Further ABP comments:

- The need to address any potential material contravention of the plan, including inter alia, height and density
- Section 3.2 of the height guidance includes development management criteria for taller buildings.
- Justification of the proposed height and density
- Submit a rationale for the quantum proposed for dual aspect
- Care should be given to actual dual aspect rather than only projecting elements
- Outline the quality and quantum of open space
- Explain if there is any impact on adjoining buildings
- Detail all daylight/sunlight analysis for open space
- Show functionality for different age groups
- Courtyards and pocket parks have circulation space which is not considered useable space or compliance with standards.

2. Impact on Residential Amenity

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Sunlight/daylight standards
- Communal residential support facilities

Planning Authority's response:

- Overlooking to the Chill Insurance building is a concern
- Separation distance is not 22 metres
- Dual aspect should be 50% for this location

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Residential amenities will be outlined
- 15 apartments do not have amenity space

Further ABP comments:

- Detail all areas which relate to a relaxation of standards including storage and private amenity space.
- Show the extent of the facilities being provided as compensatory measures

3. Site Specific Objective SLO 113

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Social and community infrastructure requirement on the site.
- The proposal includes facilities for the development only and not the wider community

Planning Authority's response:

- Previous permission contained community uses
- There is no detail of community uses in this proposed development

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Social and community infrastructure will be outlined

Further ABP comments:

- Examine the previously granted permission
- Detail if compliance with the site-specific objective will be achieved.

4. Traffic and Transport

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Quantum of parking
- Proposed cycle parking

Planning Authority's response:

- This is not a city centre site
- Outline the number of car trips
- Have regard to the development plan
- The rate of 0.3 is not acceptable at this location

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Traffic and transport will be further detailed

Further ABP comments:

- Outline GoCar and car sharing
- Examine other SHD applications in the vicinity.
- Explain management / mobility/ car sharing etc.

5. Drainage Matters

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Irish water feasibility
- Surface water

Planning Authority's response:

- Any design issues are resolvable

Prospective Applicant's response:

- No outstanding issues with feasibility or surface water

Further ABP comments:

- Address any outstanding issues

6. Any other business

Planning Authority's comments:

- Letters on consent may be needed if there is a reliance on the public realm to provide access

Prospective Applicant's response:

- No further comments

Further ABP comments:

- EIA scoping is not addressed under section 5 this is a stand-alone process and details are available on the Boards web site or available on request.

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

December, 2020