



<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	101 no. residential units (41 no. houses, 60 no. apartments) and associated site works. Ringfort View, Balrothery, Balbriggan, Co. Dublin.		
<b>Case Type</b>	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
<b>Date:</b>	3 <sup>rd</sup> November, 2021	<b>Start Time</b>	10:00 am
<b>Location</b>	Via Microsoft Teams	<b>End Time</b>	10:50 am
<b>Chairperson</b>	Tom Rabbette	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Hannah Cullen

**Representing An Bord Pleanála:**

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Karen Hamilton, Senior Planning Inspector
Hannah Cullen, Executive Officer

**Representing Prospective Applicant:**

Killian Harrington, Downey Planning and Architecture
Sandy Williams, Downey Planning and Architecture
Kevin Dodd, Downey Planning and Architecture
Joe McCallion, Downey Planning and Architecture
Garret Murphy, Transport Insights
Ciaran McKeon, Transport Insights

**Representing Planning Authority**

Malachy Bradley, Senior Planner
Bernadette Quinn, Senior Executive Planner
Phillip Grobler, Senior Executive Engineer
Linda Lally, Senior Executive Engineer
Gemma Carr, Senior Executive Parks Superintendent

## **Introduction**

The representatives of An Bord Pleanála (ABP) welcomed the prospective applicant, Planning Authority (PA) and introductions were made via Microsoft Teams having regard to the COVID-19 restrictions.

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 **23<sup>rd</sup> September, 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 **30<sup>th</sup> August, 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, as amended, 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 the Fingal County Development Plan, inter alia, provision of the school and master planning of the site.**
- 2. Development Strategy, *inter alia*, density, communal amenity areas, design and layout, open space**
- 3. Traffic & Transport**
- 4. Impact on Visual Impact**
- 5. Impact on Residential Amenity**
- 6. Any Other Business.**

**1. Compliance with the Fingal County Development Plan, inter alia, provision of the school and master planning of the site.**

**ABP Comments:**

- Clarity required in relation to noncompliance with the masterplan, in particular exclusion of a school and the density proposed.
- The applicant should be cognisant of the roads and other items as ancillary features.

**Planning Authority's Comments:**

- There is an objective for a masterplan on this site, it is the opinion one is required at application stage.
- Scope for the applicant to provide documentation from the Department of Education in relation to the school provision.
- The absence of the school is not justified.
- Noted the location of the proposed access roads is over greenbelt zoned lands.

**Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- It is noted a masterplan is required, open to preparing one for application stage if required.
- A school would not be viable at this location, a full school demand assessment will be submitted to support this.
- The site has potential to support higher density than as stated in the development plan.
- Note the access road is not permitted, the access road is deemed as infrastructure and will conflict with the greenfield zone

**2. Development Strategy, inter alia, density, communal amenity areas, design and layout, open space.**

**ABP Comments:**

- Designation of different amenity areas needs to be clarified at application stage.
- Flag potential issues of external staircases for duplex unit including security concerns and appropriate architectural finish.
- Sense of place/placemaking has not been demonstrated within the Architectural Design Statement further clarity is required.
- The design and layout of the residential units along the internal road
- Functionality of the public open space required.

**Planning Authority's Comments:**

- The open space proposed should be usable and make the most of the existing green infrastructure in the area such as the Riparian Corridor.
- Class two open space does not seem fully developed, passive surveillance in this area is not strong.
- Larger open space to be developed as parkland.

**Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- Looking at re-designing the area at the Riparian Corridor to ensure there is no dumping or antisocial behaviour here.
- The class two open space was deliberately left unfinished as it is open for discussion and design suggestions.

**3. Traffic & Transport**

**ABP Comments:**

- Scope to explore redesign of car parking.
- The necessary upgrades to the Old Coach Road

**Planning Authority's Comments:**

- The site appears to be dominant by surface car parking, the 6m wide carriageway is not required to be this wide.
- Ensure the pedestrian and cycle facilities and links are prioritised.
- Concern in relation to the pedestrian and cycle provision.
- Overall layout of the internal access.
- The main access over greenbelt zoned lands.

**Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- Old Coach Road and School Lane are very narrow so to accommodate traffic from the site wouldn't be suitable in this area, the Ringfort Road access seems most fit.
- Alternative design options are being explored to accommodate surface car parking.
- The cycle lane connections will be further detailed at application stage.
- Footpaths on both sides of the internal road from Ringfort are proposed.

**4. Impact on Visual Impact**

**ABP Comments:**

- The submitted visuals need to demonstrate at the possible impact from a closer range.

**Planning Authority's Comments:**

- A sensitive design approach needs to be taken given the typography of the site.
- Depth of the blocks seems to add to the visual impacts of the proposed development.

**Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- A fully detailed Visual Impact Assessment will be submitted at application stage.

## **5. Impact on Residential Amenity**

### **ABP Comments:**

- A childcare audit should be submitted at application stage, provide justification as to why school provision is not required at this location.
- The daylight/sunlight figures are below the standard percentage in the kitchens, requires further justification.

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

- Lack of bicycle parking and bin stores, further information will need to be provided in relation to this item as it is not clearly evident from the documentation submitted.

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

- A childcare audit will be submitted at application stage.
- Further details will be provided in relation to bin stores and cycle parking as flagged by the PA.

## **6. Any Other Business**

### **ABP Comments:**

- Any issues in relation to third party consents should be resolved and if required consent documentation submitted as part of an application to the Board.
- Part V evidence for 20% required at application stage.
- There appears to be no reference in the current documentation to Article 299B of the Regs which are specifically required for SHD.

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

- Removal of low value trees at the western boundary, further information is required in relation to new/additional planting to create a stronger boundary treatment.
- Further details required in relation to SuD'S features in the open space area.

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

- Documentation requested by the PA and ABP will be submitted at application stage.
- In relation to tree planting the proposals are to retain and strengthen the existing trees on the western boundary.

## 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.
- A Schedule of Documents and Drawings should be submitted with the Application.
- 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  
December, 2021