



Case Reference / Description	233 no. apartments, creche and associated site works. Junction of Ravens Rock Road and Carmanhall Road, Sandyford, Dublin 18.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	17 th December 2020	Start Time	10:10 a.m.
Location	Via Microsoft Teams	End Time	11:55 a.m.
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Una O' Neill, Senior Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Robert McCauley, MDO Architects
Sylwia Allen, MDO Architects
Carlota Alvarez, OCSC
Eoin Munn, Transport Insights
John O' Donovan, NJ O' Gorman Engineers
Jerry Barnes, MacCabe Durney Barnes
Joe O' Connell, UI Group
Shelley Hargadon, UI Group

Representing Planning Authority

Ger Ryan, Senior Planner
Gormla O'Corrain, Senior Executive Planner
Bernard Egan, Senior Executive Engineer, Drainage

Claire Casey, Senior Executive Engineer, Transportation
Donal Kearney, Assistant Parks Superintendent, Parks and Landscape Services

Introduction

The representatives of An Bord Pleanála (ABP) welcomed the prospective applicant, Planning Authority (PA) 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 once the Opinion has issued,
- ABP received a submission from the PA on 14th October 2020 providing the records of consultations held pursuant to section 247 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 as amended 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 16th September 2020 formally requesting pre-application consultations with ABP. The prospective applicant advised of the need to comply with the definition of SHD as set out in the (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act of 2016, in relation to thresholds of development. The representatives of ABP advised that the Inspector dealing with the pre-application consultation request would be different to the Inspector who would deal with the application when it was submitted. Recording of the meeting is prohibited.

Agenda

- 1. Planning Policy Context – SUFP**
- 2. Development Strategy – layout and public realm, scale and design of blocks, open space**
- 3. Residential Amenity – sunlight/daylight, dual aspect apartments, residential support facilities and amenities, communal open space**
- 4. Transportation**
- 5. Water Services**
- 6. Any Other Matters**

1. Planning Policy Context – SUIP

• **ABP Comments:**

- Further consideration/justification of the documents as they relate to the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Development Plan 2016-2022 and the Sandyford Urban Framework Plan
- Submit a rationale regarding the proposed density and height strategy
- Set out what amenities/community/social infrastructure are available in the area
- In relation to open space, outline what exists and what is proposed for the area
- Material Contravention Statement should address all aspects which are being potentially materially contravened

• **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- The density in the surrounding area is high
- A park and community facilities (creche and community room) are being provided
- In relation to height, there is justification for the height at this location
- Buildings are set back and 15-20 metres deep
- The character of the buildings follows the SUIP
- There are internal streets and courtyards

• **Planning Authority's Comments:**

- Concerned that the proposed high density will affect open space in the wider area
- Potential deficit of public open space in the wider area
- Delivery of open space could be through a contribution

2. Development Strategy – layout and public realm, scale and design of blocks, open space

• **ABP Comments:**

- Pedestrian movement around and between the blocks needs to be more clearly indicated and permeability issues highlighted
- More detail is needed in relation to the interaction of the buildings with the public realm
- Consider a privacy strip for units facing Ravens Rock Road and to the units at the corner of Block C with Ravens Rock Road
- Further detail and consideration of public realm works is required
- Clarity is needed in relation to whether Block C residents can access the communal open space at podium level from that level
- Further consideration of the impact of the bulk, scale and massing of the proposed development on the adjoining sites and vice versa
- Show the calculation of open space areas, what is included and what is excluded
- The childcare facility play space is not indicated on the plan and should not be included in the communal area calculation
- The quantum and quality of the communal open space, including detailed designs, required for communal open space at podium level and above on the 7th, 8th and 9th

floors - demonstrate amenity value of upper level spaces, functionality, wind impact, etc.

- A more detailed arboricultural assessment is required

- **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- Access to the podium level is via the concierge
- There is controlled access to the central courtyard
- Steps are proposed from the green street
- The eastern street connects to the southern street
- There is a fall of 3 metres
- A ramp will link both streets

- **Planning Authority's Comments:**

- Show impacts on the courtyards
- Layout is good
- Retention of the landscape to the north is positive
- The gabling onto the adjoining site is good
- Concerned with the green street and wrap around
- Detail the treatment of the Mercury building
- Proposed basement ramp is a concern
- Consider moving the vehicular entrance to Mercury House
- Look to integrate the loading bays
- Quality of open space is a concern

3. Residential Amenity – sunlight/daylight, dual aspect apartments, residential support facilities and amenities, communal open space

- **ABP Comments:**

- Outline the sunlight/daylight impact on the apartments, courtyards and roof terraces
- Clarify the number of dual aspect apartments
- Detail the quantum of residential support facilities and amenities
- Justify the amenity value for apartments
- Show the movement between shared amenity spaces
- Clarify the design rationale for the mezzanine level to the childcare facility
- Show bin storage areas
- Identify play area for the childcare facility and how it interfaces with the proposed podium level open space and playground.

- **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- The lighting for courtyards follows BRE standards
- North facing units have a good standard of daylight
- 5% of rooms don't comply
- This will be addressed

- **Planning Authority's Comments:**

- The centre of the courtyard falls below BRE standards
- Detail amenities being provided
- Explain how trees are being protected

4. Transportation

- **ABP Comments:**

- Outline the quantum of car parking
- Show the accessibility of cycle parking spaces
- Explain the provision for cycle parking in the public realm
- Re-examine the loading bay on Ravens Rock Road

- **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- This site is a central site and is self sufficient
- Satisfied with the level of parking
- Loading bays can be examined

- **Planning Authority's Comments:**

- Car parking is low at 0.53 spaces per unit
- The green street needs good permeability
- Outline the levels
- Try to preserve the existing pedestrian routes
- Ensure easy access to the basement for the short stay bicycle parking
- Proposal for the cycle path at Carmanhall Road will be published in January
- Satisfied with the public realm at Carmanhall Road
- The loading bays at Ravenstock are a concern

5. Water Services

- **ABP Comments:**

- Detail surface water
- Outline the flood risk assessment in relation to blockages and the potential for surcharging
- Provide more information for the blue roof proposals

- **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- Satisfied that any potential issues can be overcome

- **Planning Authority's Comments:**

- Ensure that there are no inconsistencies in any proposals or documentation

6. Any other matters

- **ABP Comments with regard to application:**

- There is no further information sought at application stage

- A robust assessment is required in relation to SUFP and Development Plan
- Requirement to gain consent from the Council for works within the public realm and inclusion within the red line boundary

- **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**
- No further comments

- **Planning Authority's Comments:**
- No further comments

- **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
, 2020