



<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	Demolition of 'Carmond', construction of 500 no. apartments, childcare facility and associated site works. Lands at 'St. Teresa's House/Centre', 'St. Teresa's Lodge', 'Alzheimer's Society of Ireland', 'Carmond' and 'St. Vincent's' Park, Temple Hill, Monkstown, Blackrock, Co. Dublin.		
<b>Case Type</b>	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
<b>Date:</b>	30 <sup>th</sup> April 2021	<b>Start Time</b>	09:10 a.m.
<b>Location</b>	Via MS Teams	<b>End Time</b>	10:55 a.m.
<b>Chairperson</b>	Rachel Kenny	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Ciaran Hand

**Representing An Bord Pleanála:**

Rachel Kenny, Director of Planning
Daire McDevitt, Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

**Representing Prospective Applicant:**

Lisa Rocca, Applicant
Derek Murphy, O' Mahony Pike Architects
Suzanne McClure, Brock McClure
Eoin Reynolds, NRB (Traffic & Transport)
Marcus Wallace, JJ Campbell, Design Engineers
Garrett O'Neill, CONA, Conservation Architects
Sean Cassidy, Mitchell Associates, Design Landscape Architect
Bill Hastings, ARC, Visual Impact
Douglas Bell, IES, Daylight & Sunlight

**Representing Planning Authority**

Enda Duignan, Executive Planner
---------------------------------

Stephen McDermott, Senior Executive Planner
Bernard Egan, Drainage
Tom Kilbride, Transportation
Paul Conlon, Parks and Landscape 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 9<sup>th</sup> April 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 15<sup>th</sup> March 2021 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. **Compliance with local planning policy- Land Use Zoning 'F', Institutional Lands, Tree Objective, Blackrock Local Area Plan (Site Framework Strategy).**
2. **Design Strategy, including inter alia building height and scale, permeability and architectural response to the site context.**
3. **Architectural Heritage.**
4. **Residential Amenities (impact on adjoining properties and within the proposed scheme)**
5. **Issues raised by Transportation Planning Section.**
6. **Issues raised by Drainage Division**
7. **Any Other Business.**

## **1. Compliance with local planning policy- Land Use Zoning 'F', Institutional Lands, Tree Objective, Blackrock Local Area Plan (Site Framework Strategy).**

### **ABP Comments:**

- The proposal which is the subject of this consultation is regarded for this purpose as a stand alone application, Therefore need to address compliance with local planning objectives relating inter alia to Land Use Zoning Objective 'F', Institutional Lands objective, Tree objective and objectives set out in the Blackrock LAP, including but not limited to the Ste framework Strategy for St. Teresa's.
- Need to address any potential material contraventions that arise in the documentation.

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

- There is a small overlap of 10.37 metres squared at E2 which encroaches on lands Zoned 'F'
- A modification to the design will avoid encroachment
- Overall the proposal builds on the extant permission, additional units, heights and amendments to design. But the Masterplan and the design principle of the extant permission are being retained
- Public open space is 30%
- Permeability to Rockfield park is being retained
- Views from St Teresa's House (protected structure) is being retained
- The tree objective will be addressed
- Tree belts are being retained
- There will be no gains/losses of trees
- It is considered that the proposed development maintains the key design principles set out in the site framework strategy
- There will be passive surveillance of the woodland park
- Blocks B2 and B3 will have access opened
- Proposed buildings address the street
- Height is located in the middle and stepping down to the east
- Temple Hill is being opened up
- There will be permeability for cyclists and pedestrians

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

- Modification can address the encroachment
- In accordance with section 8.2.2 of the county development plan the calculation of open space is 1200 sq. metres short
- Calculation is done on population-based provision. There could be a potential material contravention
- Satisfied with tree proposals on Temple Hill road.
- Examine the modification of block D on the south eastern boundary
- The proposed blocks must respect the protected structure.
- Concerned with the modification of block B4
- The built form is in line with that for the N11 corridor not suited to this site.
- There are no visual breaks
- Height could be a potential material contravention

- Detail the visual impact from within the site
- Proposed density needs a justification

**Further ABP Comments:**

- Address all incidences of material contravention.

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

**ABP Comments:**

- Rationale/justification for height strategy proposed.
- Rationale/justification for scale proposed.
- Architectural response to the site and interface with adjoining lands and uses

**Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- The Carmond lands are integrated into the overall site area
- There is an octagonal arrangement of buildings
- In relation to the previously permitted scheme the footprint at the corner is larger
- Blocks A1, B1, B2 and B3 have the same separation distances
- Height has been increased
- The corner at B4 is wider and softer
- Blocks E1 and E2 have 6 storeys
- This is one storey more than the previous scheme
- A curve element addresses the junction
- B4 has four storeys and A1 is one more storey than previously permitted
- There is bookending and a symmetrical arrangement
- The tallest building is 10 storeys
- There is no immediate impact on residents or St Vincent's
- This is within the BRE guidelines
- The masterplan layout is being retained
- Any shadow cast is over the road and is minimal

**Planning Authority's Comments:**

- Detail the architectural outlook
- There could be potential overshadowing of the central communal open space
- There is an objective to have a low boundary railing at the interface of Rockfield park
- Space at that location should be retained and made part of Rockfield Park

**Further ABP Comments:**

- Rationale/justification for height strategy proposed.
- The objective in the development plan of a low boundary railing needs to be addressed
- Detail the proposed materials and finishes
- Visual impact assessment
- Address any potential material contraventions

### **3. Architectural Heritage.**

#### **ABP Comments:**

- Justification/rationale for the dismantling of gate lodge, its relocation and extension
- Justification/rationale for a building at the location of C3, how it address/overcomes the reason for its omission by condition under extant permission.
- Address potential impact of a building at this location (block C3) on St Teresa's house
- Impact on Newtown villas ACA to the north of the site and protected views.
- The visual impact should have regard to protected and listed views
- Address material contravention, if they arise.

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

- Gate lodge location will be justified
- A vista is being created at blocks B2 and B3 with stepped lawns
- The proposed 2 storey glass pavilion is appropriate in scale
- Separation distances are suitable
- The house can take plugged in extensions

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

- The alternative chosen location for gate lodge is appropriate
- Proposed use of Gate lodge is acceptable.
- Not satisfied with the proposed glass pavilion (C3) in its current form. The proposal does not comply with PS2 and safeguarding architectural heritage
- The Europa site has two protected views
- There needs to be a detailed evaluation of any building at this location.

### **4. Residential Amenities (impact on adjoining properties and within the proposed scheme).**

#### **ABP Comments:**

- Sunlight/daylight and overshadowing assessment should include (existing, LAP heights and criteria, extant permission and proposed)
- Any assessments should include full floor levels and address worse case.
- Potential/perceived overlooking of the Alzheimer Society, adjoining residential properties and within the proposed scheme
- Cross sections should show the relationship with existing residential properties

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

- In relation to Barkley court and overshadowing, there are high VSE values
- Two properties to the north are just outside the recommendations
- Sunlight and daylight analysis has been positive
- Blocks C1 and C2 have separation distances
- Privacy has been enhanced
- The interface at block E has no impact on sunlight and daylight
- There is a separation distance of 33 meters to the wall

- There is no shadow cast on residents
- A no leaf scenario would be difficult
- A rationale will be provided

**Planning Authority's Comments:**

- Blocks E1 and E2 are a concern and need to be addressed
- Detail the visual impact of block A1
- Blocks C1 and C2 have increased footprint due to the penthouse levels
- Examine any pinch points
- Photomontages should show a no leaf scenario
- There should be views from Rockfield park and St Vincent's

**5. Issues raised by Transportation Planning Section.**

**ABP Comments:**

- Justification/rationale for car parking strategy and management.

**Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- Proposed car parking rate is 0.51 per unit
- The proposed development is ideally located close to public transport
- There is significant cycle parking provision

**Planning Authority's Comments:**

- Have regard to the county development plan in relation to parking
- Justify the proposed car parking rate
- The cycle parking provision is very welcome
- Ensure the quality of cycle parking
- Sheffield stands should be used where possible

**6. Issues raised by Drainage Division**

**ABP Comments:**

- Address issues raised by Drainage Planning

**Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- Any outstanding issues will be addressed

**Planning Authority's Comments:**

- Address discrepancies
- There needs to be a revised flood risk assessment

## 7. Any other matters

### **ABP Comments with regard to application:**

- Reminded Prospective applicant of the need to ensure that all documentation correlates and dovetails.
- No provision of FI under SHD so need to ensure all technical matters are addressed.
- Address material contraventions if they arise and advertise.

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

- No further comment

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

- No further comment

- **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)

---

Rachel Kenny  
Director of Planning  
June, 2021