



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-309371-21

Case Reference / Description	Demolition of existing buildings and southern boundary wall, construction of 311 no. Build to Rent apartments and associated site works. Cross Avenue, Blackrock, Co. Dublin.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	24 th March 2021	Start Time	10:00 am
Location	Via Microsoft Teams	End Time	11:55 am
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Hannah Cullen

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Daire McDevitt, Planning Inspector
Hannah Cullen, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Michael White, Lioncor
Noel Frisby, Lioncor
Maxime Laroussi, Urban-Agency Architects
Trevor Sadler, McGill Planning Ltd.
Brenda Butler, McGill Planning Ltd.
John Montgomery, NMP Architecture
Declan Alcock, Varming Consulting Engineers
Paul Casey, Punch Consulting
Ciaran Keating, CMK Horticulture & Arboriculture Ltd.
Maoliosa Molloy, Molloy & Associates Conservation Architects

Representing Planning Authority

Enda Duignan, Executive Planner

Stephen McDermott, Senior Executive Planner
Paul Conlon, Assistant Executive Parks Superintendent
Bernard Egan, Senior Executive Engineer
Elaine Carroll, Executive Engineer
Sean Keane, Senior Executive Engineer
Dermott Fennel, 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's on **2nd March, 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 **5th February, 2021** 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. Compliance with local planning policy- Institutional Lands.
2. Design Strategy, including inter alia building height and scale, layout, permeability and architectural response to the site context.
3. Architectural Heritage.
4. Services, facilities and amenity areas for future occupants.

5. Residential Amenities (impact on adjoining properties and within the proposed scheme)
6. Access and Car Parking Strategy.
7. Any Other Business.

1. Compliance with local planning policy- Institutional Lands

ABP Comments:

- Clarification from the PA regarding its concerns in relation to the institutional lands at this location.
- A strong rationale for the development of the land should be submitted at application stage, should any question of material contravention arise this will need to be addressed within the documentation.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Aware of the designation of the lands and that there is a much higher requirement for open space to be provided.
- The wording in the Masterplan seems to require a public access which is of concern to the college.
- There is significant capacity for expansion of the school into the future without it being prejudiced by the proposed housing scheme.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- It is recommended the applicant engages with the school in relation to creating a masterplan.
- The historical relationship between the development site and college should be further demonstrated in the application documentation.

2. Design Strategy, including inter alia building height and scale, layout, permeability and architectural response to the site context.

ABP Comments:

- The relationship/ interface with the school access road, Cross Avenue and boundary treatments.
- Connectivity and permeability throughout the site.
- Justification/rationale for height and density
- Details of elevations needs to be clear at application stage

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Cognisant of the location of the scheme and what it offers, it is a short walking distance to the railway and there are bus routes around the area.
- Blackrock is considered an employment zone.
- Cross Avenue is developing in a number of locations and has an opportunity to provide densification to the area.
- Mature trees presently on site have informed the design strategy, the goal is to retain the trees and densify with additional planting.

- The building responds directly to the site orientation with a separation of 22 meters between each block.
- The facades are a work in progress.
- The tree's around the boundaries will be preserved, the wall will be removed at Cross Avenue to open up the area.
- Point in relation to the ground floor elevations will be addressed at application stage.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- The site is a residual urban area typically consisting of 3-4 storey buildings.
- At the east portion of the site the height is less sensitive.
- PA refer to report previously submitted recommending the removal of floors
- Further clarification as to why the ground floor level is elevated is required.

3. Architectural Heritage

ABP Comments:

- Relationship with protected structures (school and opposite the site along Cross Avenue)
- The Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment should include details of the Church opposite the site.
- Status of structures to be demolished and removal of wall segment on Cross Avenue will need to be further addressed, a clear distinction needs to be made that the wall does not relate to any protected structure.
- Views need to be addressed and potential impact on protected structures to be considered.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Williamstown Castle and Castle Site House are the two protected structures around the site area however they are obscured to the rear, there are no protected structures on site.
- The urban presence from the church across from the site will be addressed at application stage.
- The segment of wall proposed to be demolished is not of architectural heritage importance.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- Additional photomontages should be supplied from Rock Road to the site to demonstrate any possible impacts.
- Scope to retain the segment of the wall proposed to be demolished and reincorporate it back into the site.

4. Services, facilities and amenity areas for future occupants.

ABP Comments:

- Further details are required in relation to management of the residential facilities, location and usage.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- The advice given was to consolidate any communal spaces/facilities into 1-2 blocks (A and C) rather than spread out throughout the scheme, they will contain a controlled access, this is best practice for Build to Rent (BTR) schemes.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- There are no fundamental issues in relation to this item, a more robust operations management report should be submitted, it should be clarified if these facilities are for residents only.

5. Residential Amenities (impact on adjoining properties and within the proposed scheme)

ABP Comments:

- A further focus needs to be put on St Margaret's to the west to identify any possible impacts.
- If the recommended guidelines are not being complied with and should there be any undue impacts this should be addressed fully at application stage along with any mitigation measures proposed.
- More detailed studies should be provided in relation to items such as overlooking, access to sunlight & daylight, overshadowing, overbearance, light pollution and noise.
- Inclusion of a non-technical summary to assist anyone wishing to view the proposals.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- There is a vast number of trees to provide screening along with the blocks being stepped away from the west.
- The vertical sky component is more likely to be of a lesser figure than presented, will be relooked at.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- Verified photomontages should be included to show any visual impacts to the properties of St. Margaret's west.
- The labelling of the units included in the daylight study is unclear.
- Scope to relook at a greater transition in height in particular to the north of the site.
- Additional figures should be provided of levels of light for the 2nd and 3rd floor of the blocks.

6. Access and Car Parking Strategy

ABP Comments:

- Clarification required around the car parking strategy and rationale for the approach.
- The applicant should liaise with the PA to discuss any technical details.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Due to the scheme being BTR the lower figure of about 0.4 has been proposed, the scheme is also very accessible being well served by public transport.

- This development will encourage sustainable modes of transport, pedestrians and cyclists are being prioritised.
- Car sharing facilities are proposed to be used which assists in boosting the parking ratio.
- The site had been designed to be as permeable as possible, there is no reliance on going through the college, the most direct route to public transport is by using Cross Avenue.
- There is potential to link to the north west of the site for any future developments.
- Auto tracking has been provided and will be submitted at application stage.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- Level of parking is considerably low, this could result in pressure on the on-street parking facilities, a parking ratio more close to 1 is sought.
- Further details required in relation to delivery, refuse and emergency vehicles movements throughout the site.
- Scope for the applicant to provide upgrades to the non-signalised junction.
- The pathways surrounding the site should be universal access compliant, there are no levels currently shown in the documentation submitted.

7. Any Other Business

ABP Comments:

- Issues/concerns raised by the Parks Department of the PA should be fully addressed/responded to at application stage.
- Consideration for the PA's comments in relation to the removal of the trees and any possible material contravention arising from this.
- A strong rationale should be provided as to why the original access point is not being used within the proposed development.
- Ensure there is correlation between all documentation with no contradictory figures/information at application stage.
- Requirement to address/respond to all technical issues prior to lodging an application as no recourse to further information under SHD.
- Address any material contraventions if they arise.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- With the proper management on site the trees can be maintained.
- There is decay at the base and at the trunk of the tree in question, can confirm it is therefore a category B tree, a desktop study can be prepared to see if it could be retained however it is not probable.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- Issues surrounding drainage will be discussed with the applicant at another date.
- Concerns in relation to this development's effects on tree root protection area.
- Flag scope to retain the Austrian Pine tree as in the proposals it details it is to be removed, clarification is also required in relation to the category of the tree and it is labelled both A and B in reports submitted.

- It is for the applicant to decide if the removal of trees is materially contravening the local statutory plan, the applicant should be cognisant it is an objective of the plan to retain trees and wood life.

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
April, 2021