



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Record of Meeting ABP-308916-20

<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	Demolition of existing buildings, construction of 109 no. Build to Rent apartments and associated site works. The Former Mall Shopping Centre, Quay Street and High Street, Balbriggan, Co. Dublin.		
<b>Case Type</b>	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
<b>Date:</b>	7 <sup>th</sup> May 2021	<b>Start Time</b>	10:00 am
<b>Location</b>	Via Microsoft Teams	<b>End Time</b>	11:10 am
<b>Chairperson</b>	Tom Rabbette	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Hannah Cullen

### Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Una O'Neill, Senior Planning Inspector
Hannah Cullen, Executive Officer

### Representing Prospective Applicant:

Robert McCauley, MDO Architects
Sylwia Allen, MDO Architects
John Brennan, ORS Engineers
Cormac Geoghegan, ORS Engineers
Adam Price, ORS Engineers
Declan O'Leary, CSR Landscape Architects
Shelley O'Donovan, Molloy & Associates Conservation Architects
Maoliosa Molloy, Molloy & Associates Conservation Architects
David Casey, JBA Flood Consultants
AJ Noonan, Applicant
Trevor Sadler, McGill Planning

### Representing Planning Authority

Niall Thornton, Executive Engineer
------------------------------------

Chris Garde, Executive Planner
Gemma Carr, Senior Executive Parks Superintendent
Darragh Sheedy, Executive Engineer
Colin Gallagher, Senior Engineer
David Murray, Assistant 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 on **27<sup>th</sup> 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 **16<sup>th</sup> 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. Development Strategy – Height/Scale/Mass/Interaction with Streetscape
2. Residential Amenity
3. Transportation Issues
4. Water Services and Flood Risk
5. Any Other Matters

## **1. Development Strategy – Height/Scale/Mass/Interaction with Streetscape**

### **ABP Comments:**

- Further consideration in terms of the design, scale and massing of the buildings, in terms of their impact when viewed from the street, particularly relating to Block A, and the visual impact from both Blocks when viewed from the wider area.
- A greater rationale to be set out in terms of the height strategy proposed, having regard in particular to the bulk and massing, when considered against the existing context of the town centre and ACA.
- Further regard should be given to Objective DMS158 and table 12.11 of the development plan.
- Consideration in relation to the contribution of the buildings to the urban neighbourhood and streetscape. Documentation should clearly indicate public realm improvements proposed to Quay Street, including consideration of footpath widths at this location and PA plans in this regard, as well as to High Street.
- Consideration of proposed staggered building line at street level of Block A in terms of contribution to the public realm.
- Consider further the maximisation of opportunities for activity at street level.

### **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- The site lands are complex due to the varying change in site level.
- The existing scale present on site and other building heights within the surrounding area have been considered within the development proposals.
- Cognisant of the ACA designation and any possible wider area impacts.
- The main material proposed to be used at the lower level is brick which has a long-term quality to it, the tone and type of brick is being discussed. Higher level proposals include metal and glazing.
- The proposed scheme will attempt to establish a regenerated building line.
- The building design proposals are sensitive of the streetscape.
- The PA's comments in relation to inclusion of more animated uses at ground level onto Quay Street are noted.

### **Planning Authority's Comments:**

- Quay Street is an important linkage to the main street and Harbour.
- Overly muscular approach has been taken in relation to the ACA, the width of Quay Street is quite narrow, it should be a high quality pedestrianised and cycle zone.
- It is noted the proposals include a bike shop, however further uses should be submitted in relation to the lower level on to Quay Street.
- Colour of the brick proposed should be further considered, scope to mix colours.
- The proposed development's interface with Quay Street is crucial.

## **2. Residential Amenity**

### **ABP Comments:**

- Sunlight-daylight analysis – note FCC objective DMS30 relates to the two docs referenced in the Apartment Guidelines. The latter document referenced in DMS30 has been updated.

- Relationship with single storey dwellings on High Street, as well as two storey dwellings opposite, needs to be more explicitly examined and potential impacts explored further in terms of sunlight analysis, daylight analysis, overshadowing etc. Consideration of these issues also in relation to buildings proximate to Quay Street block.
- With regard to VSC calculation, consider further baseline assumptions being made and ensure all necessary information is submitted.
- Query whether lowest level of accommodation relating to Block B is included in ADF assessment and extent of rooms being considered.
- Documentation and assessment in relation to sunlight, daylight, and overshadowing needs to be robust.
- Documentation and plans should clearly indicate compliance with SPPR7 and 8. Justification and analysis in relation to what Resident Support Facilities and Resident Services and Amenities are being provided and consideration as to whether the uses and scale of uses being provided is adequate for the number of units proposed.
- Justification and analysis of communal amenity space calculations required –Explore further the usability and functionality of the open space proposed, including area to rear of Block B identified as a maintenance strip.
- Plans should be clear in relation to what units are being classified as dual aspect units and north facing units.
- Vibration and noise should be addressed within a construction management plan.

**Prospective Applicant’s Comments:**

- All points made by the PA and the Board have been noted.

**Planning Authority’s Comments:**

- The report submitted to the Board should be taken as read and all points raised should be addressed by the applicant within an application to the Board.

**3. Transportation Issues**

**ABP Comments:**

- Documentation should elaborate on public transport availability and walking/cycling distance to existing amenities and national policy context in this regard.
- Consideration of overspill parking issues.
- Consideration of cycle parking location and facilities.

**Prospective Applicant’s Comments:**

- All quality audits will be carried out along with a justification of the proposed parking ratio.
- A car sharing option is also proposed which is to be controlled by a management company.

**Planning Authority’s Comments:**

- A lower standard ratio for parking has previously been accepted however the level of parking reduction needs to be fine-tuned.
- On-street parking in this area is already of concern, there is not much scope to further accommodate more cars as a result of any overspill from this development.

- The strength of the cycling provision is to be demonstrated as an attractive alternative option for residents.

#### **4. Water Services and Flood Risk**

##### **ABP Comments:**

- Further exploration of SUDS measures to be adopted, having regard to amenity and biodiversity as well as water quantity and water quality.
- Address Issues raised in relation to adequacy of SSFRA and FFL.

##### **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- There is continued dialogue with the PA in relation to flooding.
- Specialists introduced to the team after the stage 2 consultation was submitted for expertise on the matter.
- A flood model has been prepared, the proposed floor levels are sufficient to protect the site from fluvial flooding.
- Further SuDS measures can be looked at, green roofs are proposed, continue to work alongside the water/drainage department in the PA.

##### **Planning Authority's Comments:**

- The site is located 15 metres from River Bracken and 100 metres from the Coast which the applicant should remain cognisant of.

#### **5. Any Other Matters**

##### **ABP Comments:**

- 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.
- Ensure compliance with updated Apartment Guidelines and SPPRs in relation to BTR developments.
- Photomontages should also be submitted with trees not in leaf so that the buildings can be fully considered.
- Scope of inclusion of a Bat Survey relating to the derelict buildings.
- Clarification of areas to be retained in relation to the two rights of way to the south of Block A.

##### **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- A Bat Survey will be undertaken for the stage 3 application.
- No childcare is proposed within the development, a justification will be provided along with surveys.
- Details of the balance of passive surveillance will be further added.

##### **Planning Authority's Comments:**

- Regeneration of the site is important along with the site's interaction with Quay street, the grain, and its materiality.
- The grain is set in the historic setting present within the area, this needs to be considered.

**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](mailto: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](mailto:spatialplanning@water.ie)

---

Tom Rabbette  
Assistant Director of Planning  
May, 2021