



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-308743-20

Case Reference / Description	1200 no. apartments, childcare facility and all other associated site works. GA3 Lands at Baldoyle (adjacent lands formerly known as the Coast), Dublin 13.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	4 th February 2021	Start Time	09:47 a.m.
Location	Via MS Teams	End Time	11:20 a.m.
Chairperson	Rachel Kenny	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Rachel Kenny, Director of Planning
Elaine Power, Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Hakeem Bader, Richmond Homes
Mark O' Donnell, Richmond Homes
Pauline Byrne, Brady Shipman Martin
Owen Sullivan, Cronin Sutton
Niall Barrett, Cronin Sutton
Bernard Seymour, BSLA
Arnaud Alatissiere, BSLA
Peter McGovern, HJL
Ronan Doyle, HJL
Sorcha Turnbull, Brady Shipman Martin

Representing Planning Authority

Sean Walsh, A/Senior Executive Officer
Kathy Tuck, Planner
Kevin Halpenny, Parks
Mark Finnegan, Parks
Hans Wisser, Bio Diversity Officer
Niall Thorton, Transportation
Damien Cox, water 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 17th 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 20th November 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. **Core Strategy and Phasing**
2. **Development Strategy – design, layout, height, density, materiality, housing mix**

3. **Open Space Strategy**
4. **Water Services – Flooding**
5. **Transportation – Bus and Car Parking**
6. **Social Infrastructure**
7. **Ecology**
8. **Any Other Matters.**

1. **Core Strategy and Phasing**

• **ABP Comments:**

- In combination with adjoining residential developments, both at construction and planning stage, the proposed number of units would exceed the envisioned number of units for the area as set out in the LAP. Any material contravention of the LAP should be fully addressed and justified.
- A clear phasing strategy is set out in the LAP. The applicant should clarify the proposed phasing strategy of lands within their ownership and current planning status of development located in Growth Area 1, which was subject to a pre-planning consultation with ABP – 307288-20. Any material contravention of the LAP should be fully addressed and justified.
- Be specific to every element that is being contravened and address the contraventions having regard to Section 37(2)(b).

• **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- The proposed number of units would exceed those set out in the LAP. This will be fully addressed in the material contravention statement.
- An application for Growth Area 1 lands will proceed before an application for GA3 lands is made.
- Growth Area 1 would provide the village centre and social infrastructure to support this development.
- The phasing of the proposed development would be in accordance with the LAP. Growth Area 2 lands are outside of the applicant's control.
- The applicant can discuss the phasing agreement with the Planning Authority.

• **Planning Authority's Comments:**

- The applicant could provide a new phasing agreement with the Planning Authority.

2. **Development Strategy – design, layout, height, density, materiality, housing mix**

• **ABP Comments:**

- The proposed density is a material contravention of the LAP. This should be addressed and fully justified.
- The applicant should clearly indicate which buildings would materially contravene the building height strategy as set out in the LAP. It is noted that the LAP does allow for additional height at the landmark building site.

- A clear design rationale for the layout proposed should be provided. In particular, having regard the open space strategy for the site and to the relationship with the railway line along the western boundary and the potential for anti-social behaviour.
- Having regard to the highly visible location any landmark buildings should be of exceptional architectural design quality and the building materials should be robust and high quality.
- Having regard to the coastal location of the external materials should be robust. Consideration of appropriateness of render at this location should be addressed in the Building Lifecycle report.
- Justify the proposed housing mix having regard to the number of 1-bed apartments.
- Having regard to the provisions of SPPR4 of the Apartment Guidelines the applicant should provide a clear justification for the number of dual aspect units proposed.
- A detailed daylight and sunlight assessment would be required as part of the development.

- **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- Any material contraventions will be fully addressed and justified.
- A clear design rationale has been provided in accordance with urban design principles.
- The open space strategy has been detailed and indicates clear linkages through the site towards the parklands to the north.
- The materials proposed are high quality and robust and complement each other and are reflective of surrounding urban area.
- The relationship with the western boundary / railway line will be addressed.
- The issue of dual aspect will be fully addressed.
- A daylight and sunlight analysis will be submitted with the application.

- **Planning Authority's Comments:**

- The open space land at the boundary with the railway could be incorporated into communal open space for future residents, as it would not enhance the park lands.
- The applicant has undertaken pre-planning discussions with the planning authority and the proposed development is welcomed. This is considered a good location for the proposed height and density.
- This is a highly visible site any landmark building needs of a high architectural standard.

3. Open Space Strategy

- **ABP Comments:**

- Details are required regarding the timeframe for the transfer of amenity lands to the north of the site to the Local Authority.
- Detail the quality and quantity of open space within the proposed development. having regard to wayleaves on the site.

- **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- The timeframe for handing over the lands can be agreed with the planning authority.

- The proposed layout includes a generous quantity of open space, including an urban park in the centre of the site.
- The scheme would be landscaped to a high standard and some routes will contain wildlife activity.
- **Planning Authority's Comments:**
- Concern regarding the timeframe for the transfer of amenity lands to the north of the site to the Local Authority. Historically these lands were to be transferred to the Local Authority by the previous landowner. It is noted that this is a requirement in the LAP.
- The park lands should be transferred prior to the units being occupied. This amenity space is required to support the future population of the area. In addition, they would reduce pressure on designated sites in the immediate vicinity of the site.
- Clarify the quantity and quality of communal and public open spaces.
- Concerns regarding the visual impact of bicycle parking on open space areas.

4. Water Services – Flooding

- **ABP Comments:**
- Clarify the impact that surface water drainage would have on the wetlands to the north. Any drainage to the wetlands should not negatively impact on the existing floodplain.
- A robust Flood Risk Assessment is required, and all concerns raised by the Planning Authority should be fully addressed.
- **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**
- The floodplain has been extensively modelled. Flood levels are in line with the LAP and details discussions have been undertaken with the planning authority to ensure the proposed development would not have a negative impact.
- Additional compensatory storage would be provided to offset the proposed mounding / infill of parklands.
- SUD's will be incorporated into the proposed development.
- **Planning Authority's Comments:**
- The planning authority note that there are on-going discussions with the applicant and that all concerns raised are being fully addressed by the applicant.

5. Transportation – Bus and Car Parking

- **ABP Comments:**
- Car parking spaces need to be of sufficient size to accommodate a standard car.
- Clearly indicate how the proposed road layout can accommodate the public transport route proposed through Growth Area 1.

- The proposed development in combination with adjoining sites would result in a significant population increase in the area. The Traffic Impact Assessment needs to be robust and address concerns of the planning authority.
- **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**
 - The layout would be designed in accordance with appropriate standards.
 - Discussions have taken place with Dublin City Council regarding the hole in the wall roundabout (which is outside of the Planning Authority's administrative boundary).
 - In accordance with TII guidance, it is not proposed to include the Hole in the Road roundabout in the Traffic Impact Assessment.
 - The applicant has engaged with Dublin City Council regarding the potential traffic impact within their administrative area. DCC have indicated that they have no objection not the proposed development.
- **Planning Authority's Comments:**
 - The proposed bus route needs to be constructed to taken in charge standards. The applicant should engage with Irish Rail to ascertain their requirements. The underpass may need to be closed during construction works.
 - The location of the proposed bus stops should be clearly indicated and agreed with Dublin Bus.
 - Consideration of additional pedestrian crossings between the site and the GA1 along the public transport route.
 - The size of car parking spaces needs to be reconsidered, to ensure they can accommodate a standard modern car.
 - The level of car parking proposed should be justified.
 - The planning authority recommended that the Hole in the Wall roundabout be assessed as part of the Traffic Impact Assessment.

6. Social Infrastructure

- **ABP Comments:**
 - Having regard to the proposed number of residential units, sufficient social infrastructure should be available to support the additional population.
- **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**
 - The village centre will be developed as part of Growth Area 1 and would provide sufficient social infrastructure to accommodate the proposed future population prior to the development of the subject site (Growth Area 3).
- **Planning Authority's Comments:**
 - Social infrastructure provision should be detailed in the submission.

7. Ecology

- **ABP Comments:**
 - Having regard to the sites hydrological link to designated sites it is noted that an NIS would be submitted with any application.

- The applicant should ensure that any mitigation measures outlined in the NIS can be implemented by the applicant and do not require any additional consents.
- **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**
- The NIS will be robust and will fully assess the impact of the development.
- **Planning Authority's Comments:**
- Notes that if the drainage concerns are fully addressed the proposed development would not negatively impact on the designated sites.

8. Any other matters

- **ABP Comments with regard to application:**
 - No further comments
 - **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**
 - Clarification of bicycle parking standards to be provided on site.
 - **Planning Authority's Comments:**
 - Ensure that national standards to bicycle parking are applied.
 - **Further Comments from ABP**
 - A justification should be provided for any deviation from national standards.
 - **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
 March, 2021