



Record of Meeting ABP-309698-21

Case Reference / Description	172 no. Build to Rent apartments and associated site works. Junction of Sallynoggin Road Lower and Glenageary Avenue, Glenageary, Co. Dublin.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	14 th May 2021	Start Time	10:09 a.m.
Location	Via MS Teams	End Time	11:16 a.m.
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning	
Daire McDevitt, Planning Inspector	
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer	

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Keith Craddock, Client	
Simon English, Client	
Muireann Coughlan, HPDC	
Kevin Hughes, HPDC	
Ger Harris, HPDC	
Chris Barrett, LEPD	
Jude O'Loughlin, NDBA	
Greg Zakrzewski, NDBA	
Dara Magee, Aecom	
Clodagh Holmes, Aecom	

Representing Planning Authority

Cait Ryan, Senior Executive Planner	
Dara Holohan, Executive Planner	
Tiago Bodini, Executive Engineer, Transport	
Sean Keane, Senior Executive Engineer	
Bernard Egan, Senior Executive Engineer, Drainage	

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 19th 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 15th 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 'NC'.
- 2. Development Strategy, including inter alia density, building height and scale, layout, architectural response to the site context and interface with adjoining uses.
- 3. Residential Amenities.
- 4. Childcare.
- 5. Part V.

- 6. Issues raised by Transportation Planning Section. With particular reference to SLO-160, parking provision and extent of works proposed outside site boundaries.
- 7. Issues raised by Drainage Division.
- 8. Any Other Business.

1. Compliance with local planning policy- Land Use Zoning 'NC'

ABP Comments:

- PA to clarify issue relating to proposed uses and NC zoning objective.
- Respond to the planning authorities' report regarding zoning compliance
- Documentation should address the NC land use objective.
- Private/civil legal covenants/agreements do not absolve a landowner of responsibilities arising from policies and objectives of statutory plans or other statutory planning policy documents.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Commercial units on the ground floor are 622 sq. metres
- Commercial uses will create active road frontage
- The proposed ground floor units complement the NC zoning
- Retail and shop uses are not allowed on this site due to a legal covenant

Planning Authority's Comments:

- The site is part of a broader neighbourhood centre
- Concerned that the objective in the land use zoning may not be achieved
- This is partly due to the quantum of commercial uses and the relationship of uses at the ground floor and public realm
- Residential uses are permitted in principle

2. Development Strategy, including inter alia density, building height and scale, layout, architectural response to the site context and interface with adjoining uses

ABP Comments:

- Justification/rationale for proposed height and density
- Rationale for scale and massing
- Architectural response to the site context
- Interface with public realm and adjoining units
- There should be a strong urban edge
- All documentation/drawings should correlate
- Address potential impact on adjoining lands, design should not prejudice any potential redevelopment opportunities.
- Justification/rationale for height strategy.
- Justification/rationale for density.
- Massing and scale need further consideration
- If material contravention arises, this needs to be addressed.
- If reliant on SPPR3, need to address requirements of documentation set out in section 3.2 of the Urban Development & Height Guidelines.
- Address concerns raised by the PA.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

• There is an opportunity for placemaking and creating a landmark site

- Blocks are located around a small courtyard with a small footprint
- Block B2 lines up with houses on Glenageary Avenue
- It also steps out to create an opening for the courtyard
- There is an urban plaza at blocks A1 and A2
- Central courtyards have been merged with external spaces
- Spaces are animated
- There is a transition between scales
- Public realm is enhanced
- There will be private roof gardens
- The tallest element is in the centre

Planning Authority's Comments:

- The overall scale and density are excessive
- The height and scale do not address the surrounding areas, concerns raised in relation to transition in height/scale from proposed development to lower existing context
- Internal separation distances should be examined and not just external

3. Residential Amenities

ABP Comments:

- Inconsistencies and discrepancies in the documentation needs to be addressed/clarified.
- Sunlight/daylight and shadow assessment
- Assessment should include units proposed within the scheme, communal and public spaces and adjoining lands/uses.
- Outline any potential impact on the sorting office site and adjoining units
- A microclimate analysis should include roof gardens and public areas
- Address any pinch points (overlooking)
- Clarify location, extent of and nature of uses and accessibility of communal facilities and amenities.
- Show accessibility and uses for communal amenities
- Include whole floor in assessment and work your way up.
- Assessments to have regard to scheme and impact on adjacent/adjoining lands/uses.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Any overlooking will be controlled
- 15 units require further examination
- All of the standards for sunlight and daylight can be met for living spaces
- The overshadowing cast is onto the large roundabout areas
- The taller elements do not cast shadows
- BTR amenity spaces are two types
- First is secondary storage for prams etc
- The second are linked bridges which allow more mixed spaces
- Breakout spaces will also be provided
- Sizes are generous

• There is 1050 sq. meters of internal BTR amenity space

Planning Authority's Comments:

- The documentation should show the amount of sunlight and daylight analysis for ground floor units
- There needs to be a shadow cast analysis
- The layout should show any shadow impact on future occupiers
- Provide the figure of communal open space
- Explain how the units at the rear facing Lidl will work
- Detail the use of community rooms
- Outline the exposure elements to upper floors and roof areas

4. Childcare

ABP Comments:

- Discrepancies in the information submitted noted.
- Clarify if a childcare facility is included in the proposal.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

• A childcare facility is being provided

Planning Authority's Comments:

• Welcome a childcare facility

5. Part V

ABP Comments:

- Lack of details/discrepancies noted.
- Clarify Part V proposals and ensure documentation is complete at application stage.
- Refer to DLR Housing Section report.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Part V units are proposed
- Locations have not yet been identified

Planning Authority's Comments:

- In relation to Part V, have regard to our report
- 6. Issues raised by Transportation Planning Section. With particular reference to SLO-160, parking provision and extent of works proposed outside site boundaries

ABP Comments:

• In relation to the SLO-160, clarify what is being proposed

- Clarify works outside application site boundaries and extent of works. Who is delivering these works?
- Justification/rationale for parking provision.
- Clarify residential/commercial parking
- Car parking Strategy and Management Plan.
- Liaise with DLR Transportation Section prior to lodging to address any outstanding technical issues.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- There is an objective with the planning authority to upgrade the roundabout. This includes a slip road which is shown within the site boundaries.
- The proposed development does not compromise the development of the slip road
- The applicant is not providing the slip road but can accommodate it
- This site is an intermediate urban location and therefore suitable for reduced car parking
- Spaces assigned for residential and commercial use will be outlined at application stage.
- No works outside the boundary are being proposed. This will be made clearer at application stage.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- Outline pedestrian links
- Check the proximity of the buildings to the roads
- Justify the proposed car parking figure
- The basement car park is angular and contains dead ends
- This will affect the position of cycle parking
- Address accessibility
- Clarify the red line boundary, what is in ownership and if any works outside of the boundary are being undertaken

7. Issues raised by Drainage Division

ABP Comments:

- Discrepancies highlight in the documentation submitted need to be addressed
- Liaise with Drainage Section to address outstanding technical issues.
- There is no further information sought at application stage

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

• Any outstanding issues will be addressed

Planning Authority's Comments:

- The documents contain inconsistencies and discrepancies
- Address the design issues

8. Any other matters

ABP Comments with regard to application:

- Address any outstanding technical issues, no recourse for FI under SHD.
- If Material Contravention arises, this need to be addressed in the documentation (MC Statement) and advertised.
- If Schedule 7A information is required, note requirements of article 299B
- Ensure all documentation /drawings correlate and are up to date.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

• No further comments

Planning Authority's Comments:

• No further comments

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 <u>cdsdesignqa@water.ie</u> 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 <u>spatialplanning@water.ie</u>

Tom Rabbette Assistant Director of Planning May, 2021