



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-308642-20

Case Reference / Description	Construction of 137 no. residential units (29 no. houses and 108 no. apartments), and all other associated site works. Lands North of Stocking Avenue, Stocking Avenue, Woodstown, Dublin 16.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	8 th February 2021	Start Time	02:30 pm
Location	Via Microsoft Teams	End Time	04:15 pm
Chairperson	Rachel Kenny	Executive Officer	Hannah Cullen

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Rachel Kenny, Director of Planning
Rachel Gleave O'Connor, Planning Inspector
Hannah Cullen, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Steve Cassidy, Ardstone Homes
Mark Forrest, Ardstone Homes
Gary Talbot, Ardstone Homes
Gavin Lawlor, Tom Philips + Associates
David Lee, Tom Philips + Associates
Alan Larkin, Reddy Architecture
William Burke, Mitchell + Associates
Brendan Keogh, DBFL Consulting Engineers
Dan Reilly, DBFL Consulting Engineers
Carl Rushe, Virtus Project Management

Representing Planning Authority

Jim Johnston, Senior Executive Planner
--

Barry Henn, Executive Planner
John Hegarty, Senior Executive Engineer
Oisin Egan, Executive Parks Superintendent
Ronan Toft, Assistant Engineer
Graham Murphy, Senior Executive Engineer

Introduction

The representatives of An Bord Pleanála (ABP) welcomed the prospective applicant, Planning Authority (PA) via Microsoft Teams having regard to the Covid-19 restrictions 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 **9th December, 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 **12th November, 2020** formally requesting pre-application consultations with ABP. The prospective applicant advised of the need to comply with definition of SHD as set out in the (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 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. Density and tenure;

2. Design

- building height rationale, site layout / landscape design and use of retaining walls;

3. Access and surface car parking;

4. Phasing;

- 5. **Childcare demand;**
- 6. **Drainage and water supply;**
- 7. **Any other business**

1. Density and tenure

ABP Comments:

- Confirmation required that the address of the site is actually lands to the south of Stocking Avenue and not to the north as stated in application form.
- Clarification required in relation to the tenure of the scheme build to rent or build to sell, this will need to be clear in the application documents.
- The PA has the opportunity to expand on any issues raised in their report submitted to the Board.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- The site is located to the south of Stocking Avenue and the application form references lands to the north in error.
- Reference to the provision of houses in the application form is in error, the proposed development concerns apartment / duplex units only.
- The site is not peripheral or less accessible it falls into an intermediate urban location category due to the transport made available.
- There are proposals for the bus connects scheme to be put in place which would make a route to Tallaght in 10 minutes.
- The density that has been proposed is appropriate, there are amenity's provided that can support the surrounding area.
- In response to the PA's Local Area Plan (LAP) concerns raised the proposed scheme and in relation to White Pines will be able to accommodate other lands to the east, north and south.
- The scale of the landmark building can be relooked at however of the opinion it is appropriate for the location.
- The landmark building will provide wayfinding and an introduction to the scheme through high quality materials and design.
- An established principal for height can be shown at Hunters Hall and Stocking Well Row.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- Further clarification is required in relation to tenure given rise to the LAP.
- The landmark building proposed appears out of place and there is also concerns in relation to its height.

2. Design

ABP Comments:

- Detail required on the proposed use of retaining walls throughout the site.
- Additional consideration to be given to the landscape arrangements through the site.
- Breakdown of single aspect north facing units and dual aspect required.

- The day/sunlight report submitted as part of the pre-application documentation only contained testing for worst case scenario windows, comprehensive testing and results should be included at application stage.
- Consideration required of the proposed layout and how this addresses the street.
- Details of the relationship between units in Block A and retaining walls needed.
- Query whether the PA to take areas in charge or is a management company proposed. If there are to be areas taken in charge this will need to be fully detailed at application stage.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- There are completed residential developments to the north and south of the proposed site, a neighbourhood centre will be located off the roundabout which is still in construction.
- There is a 19-20m fall across the site, the contours are critical which run northeast to southwest which have driven a lot of the decisions made for the development.
- Block A has been selected as a worst case scenario however there is still a generous distance to the north and south.
- Blocks A, B and C are stepped down to address the site level change.
- An emergency/second access at Stocking Avenue has been suggested by the PA.
- The communal open space is proposed to run north and south through the blocks.
- An overhead powerline through the centre of the site is creating a sterile zone.
- The shortfall in the sun/daylight report will be fully addressed at application stage.
- The use of retaining walls have assisted in flattening the scheme.
- A management company is proposed there should be no need for taken in charge by the PA.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- A previous design rendition was parallel/perpendicular aspect to the streetscape.
- Further consideration to be given to the universal accessibility due to the sloping nature of the site, alternatives should be considered and detailed at application stage.
- These lands will be exposed to areas of ice and snow which the applicant will need to consider.
- Further setback to be considered from the adjacent site to the east, in consideration of the future development potential of those lands.
- If the applicant proposes any areas to be taken in charge by the PA a drawing will need to be submitted prior to the application detailing the areas.
- Flag potential maintenance issues in relation to the sloping lands, any details of the management company should be provided at application stage.

3. Access and surface car parking

ABP Comments:

- Further consideration needed in relation to the PA comments on the secondary road, as well as whether any matters under the application comprise a material contravention.
- Consideration should be given to any alternative to the surface car parking proposed.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Do not believe the access is an objective of the LAP.
- The idea of basement parking was previously explored however it is not economically viable.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- There are concerns with the emergency/second access due to the alignment.
- The material and width for vehicular access is not satisfactory.
- From an analysis of the area the surface car parking is peripheral due to the distance from retail and employment areas.
- Scope for the applicant to minimize the use of retaining wall structures within the site.

4. Phasing**ABP Comments:**

- There are detailed requirements of the LAP in relation to delivery of facilities and phasing which will need to be taken into full consideration.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- The phasing of the development will be fully addressed at application stage.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- The applicant should respond to the phasing issues which have been flagged in the PA report at application stage.

5. Childcare Demand**ABP Comments:**

- Data to support conclusions around existing childcare provision in the area should be recent and up to date.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Concerns from the PA and the Board are noted, the scheme will be independent of the requirement in the wider area, at application stage this will be clarified, there will also be additional spaces provided by the neighbourhood centre.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- Nothing further to add to the concerns flagged in the report submitted to the Board.

6. Drainage and water supply**ABP Comments:**

- Technical details should be discussed further with the PA prior to lodgement of an application.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Further engagement will be sought with the PA, Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) comments are noted along with the provision of rain gardens.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- Inclusion of SuDS features and further cross sections to be provided.
- Concern there is no further capacity of the underground system attenuation tank to serve the site.

7. Any other business**ABP Comments:**

- There is an error in the application form in relation to the site address and the unit typology, ensure at application stage consistency and accuracy within all documentation submitted, including the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) non-technical summary.
- Cumulative impacts require comprehensive consideration, particularly during construction phase.
- The applicant should respond in full to the concerns raised by the PA in their report submitted.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- In relation to errors, particularly the unit typology and the stie address which should be land south of Stocking Avenue, in the application form, all errors will be corrected.

Planning Authority'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 **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
February, 2021