



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-308853-20

Case Reference / Description	177 no. apartments, creche and associated site works. Canterbury Gate, Old Navan Road, Mulhuddart, Co. Dublin.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	29 th April 2021	Start Time	02:30 pm
Location	Via Microsoft Teams	End Time	03:30 pm
Chairperson	Rachel Kenny	Executive Officer	Hannah Cullen

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Rachel Kenny, Director of Planning
Una O'Neill, Senior Planning Inspector
Hannah Cullen, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Margaret Commane, Hughes Planning and Developments Consultants
Christopher Browne, Hughes Planning and Development Consultants
Dermot O'Hagan, JNP Architects
Dan Reilly, DBFL Consulting Engineers
John Paul Casey, Casey Landscape Design/ Consultant Landscape Architect
Paul Singleton, McCloy Consulting
Barry Harte, Investor
Eric Smith, Investor

Representing Planning Authority

Deirdre Fallon, Senior Executive Planner
Jennifer Casserly, Executive Planner
Gemma Carr, Senior Executive Parks Superintendent
Daragh Sheedy, Senior Executive Engineer

Niamh O'Connor, Executive Engineer
Linda Lally, Senior Executive Engineer
Colin Gallagher, Acting Senior Planner

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's on **26th January, 2021** 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 **9th December, 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. R121/Old Navan Road Upgrade.
2. N3 M50 to Clonee Upgrade.
3. Water Services Issues - Flood Risk Assessment; SUDS Strategy.
4. Development Strategy – overlay of zoning map and site layout; ground level interface with Old Navan Road; movement around/between blocks and podium OS; access to Tolka Valley Park.
5. Environmental Issues – Noise; Air Quality; Seveso Sites; Trees; Bat Survey.
6. Transportation Issues.

7. Any other matters.

1. R121/Old Navan Road Upgrade

ABP Comments:

- Note recent application for R121/Old Navan Road Upgrade and decision to refuse permission, which has implications for site layout as proposed.
- While pre-application submission was made prior to that decision, only the documentation before us will be considered.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Since the refusal of the road upgrade application a lot of work and revisions are in progress in absence of permittance of the road upgrade, confident the existing road can be worked with in proposed development.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- Nothing further to add to the report submitted to the Board.

2. N3 M50 to Clonee Upgrade.

ABP Comments:

- Objective of the development plan to upgrade the N3 from Littlepace to the M50.
- Further clarity and certainty in relation to the potential implications of your development on this road scheme is required.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- At the southern boundary of the site there will be no encroachment therefore there will be no requirement to set back.
- Possibility of attenuation from the new roads scheme within the site - continuing to work on receiving further information on this.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- There is no detailed design at the moment for the road scheme, this should become clearer in the coming months along with attenuation details.

3. Water Services Issues - Flood Risk Assessment; SUDS Strategy.

ABP Comments:

- Site is predominantly within Flood Zone B, with a small portion within Flood Zone A, with flood zone A on a portion of the existing alignment of the Old Navan Road.
- Further consideration of all flood risk management issues required. Any application should demonstrate compliance with FCC development plan policy and objectives and the Flood Risk Management guidelines.

- Surface water management details including Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) measures and use of tanks to be elaborated upon.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- There is a section of the existing Navan Road in flood zone A, the rest of the site is predominantly in flood zone B.
- The scheme has been designed so that the residential areas will be above flood zone level.
- A specialist has been introduced to prepare hydraulic modelling for the application.
- The application documentation will expand on items such as green roofs, green podium areas and SUDS.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- Concern with the overall appropriateness of the development given the sites proximity to the Tolka River and possible undue impacts it may have.
- Additional details of flood risk measures are requested to be submitted.
- Further clarity is sought on the use and capacity of the water tank onsite.

4. Development Strategy – overlay of zoning map and site layout; ground level interface with Old Navan Road; movement around/between blocks and podium OS; access to Tolka Valley Park.

ABP Comments:

- The application site is zoned RS and the eastern portion of the site is zoned OS. Documentation should be clear in relation to what development is proposed on this OS space and whether that development is in compliance with the Zoning Objective for the lands.
- With regard to the design and layout, further consideration is required in relation to site context and the ground level interface with R121/Old Navan Road, design and legibility of pedestrian entrances from Old Navan Road, pedestrian movement between and around the blocks, accessibility of communal open space and play area, and connection from within blocks to the communal open space and residential amenity facilities.
- Elaboration on Open Space Strategy, including access to immediately adjoining amenity of Tolka Valley Park and delivery of any planned entrance/infrastructure relating to the park to be considered in consultation with FCC.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- A layout plan with zoning overlays will be included at application stage.
- Scope to include communal amenity spaces within each of the blocks.
- Further meeting will be sought with the PA to pursue options in creating an access point to the adjacent park.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- The proposals are to be examined against the underlying zoning.
- Any improved access to the amenity spaces and units to the front of the development is welcomed to enliven the area.

- There are no short/medium term plans for an access to the adjacent park, there is not much usage in this area of the park currently however further engagement can be sought with the applicant on this.

5. Environmental Issues – Noise; Air Quality; Seveso Sites; Trees; Bat Survey.

ABP Comments:

- Further consideration of noise impact, air quality, and compliance with Fingal Development Plan.
- Submitted tree and bat survey is not site specific. Further consideration to be given to extent of survey and boundary of the site, along with the extent and timing of ecological surveys is required.
- Consultation with HSA in relation to relevant SEVESO sites is required.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- The full application will have all reports/surveys covered.
- More up to date bat surveys are proposed to be submitted at application stage.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- The issue of noise is to be addressed comprehensively.
- Any further discussion can be sought within the environmental/ecological department within the PA.

6. Transportation Issues

ABP Comments:

- Further consideration of adjoining pedestrian network, particularly referencing section of missing footpath and any crossings of R121.
- There is an objective to improve the cycle network along the R121, this should be addressed as part of any application.
- Detail in relation to connectivity to public transport and pedestrian routes.
- Justification should be provided of the appropriateness of the parking rationale proposed.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- All further clarification requested can be provided at application stage.
- In relation to the quantum of parking proposed the site given its relation to transportation links is deemed intermediate not periphery. Through use of census data and being a BTR scheme the proposed ratio was chosen.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- It is set out in the report submitted to the Board concern with the parking at the creche and the number of visitor parking proposed.
- Of the opinion the development is not in an intermediate location due to the lack of high frequency transport.
- The cycle parking proposals are also below the standard number sought along with design standards and proposed location.

- Can engage with the applicant in further conversation offline in relation to this topic.

7. Any other matters

ABP Comments:

- Ensure compliance with updated Apartment Guidelines and SPPRs in relation to BTR developments; Building Height Guidelines, specifically section 3.2 and any microclimate issues; building lifecycle report.
- Advised that there is no provision for further information at application stage, all details to be submitted at application stage; ensure consistency between documentation submitted by various consultants.
- Clarify any issues in relation to site ownership.
- It is noted that there appears to be construction waste onsite, this should be addressed in the construction management plan.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Will liaise further with the PA in relation the relevant items raised.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- Nothing further to add to report submitted to the Board, taken as read.

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
June, 2021