



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-312149-21

Case Reference / Description	312149 - 224 no. apartments, creche and associated site works. Pinnock Hill, Fosterstown North, Swords, Co. Dublin.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	1 st April 2022	Start Time	10.00am
Location	Remotely via Microsoft teams.	End Time	11.30am
Chairperson	Stephen O'Sullivan	Executive Officer	David Behan

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Stephen O'Sullivan, Assistant Director of Planning
Conor McGrath, Senior Planning Inspector
David Behan, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Ronan Barrett, Applicant
John McKeown, Applicant
Raymond Martin, Applicant
Anneliese Charlesworth, Applicant
Shane Walsh, Architect
Immacolata Di Francesco, Architect
Jim Bloxam, Landscape Architect
Paul Mora, Civil Engineer
Seamus Nolan, Transport Engineer
John Spain, Planning Consultant
Stephen Blair, Planning Consultant

Representing Planning Authority

Malachy Bradley, Senior Planner
Eugenia Thompson, Senior Executive Planner
Linda Lally, Senior Executive Engineer - Transportation Section
Gemma Carr, Senior Executive Parks Super - Parks & Green Infrastructure Division
Daragh Sheedy, Executive Engineer - Water Services
David Devine, Senior Executive Engineer - Water Services
Fionnuala May – County Architect
Hugh O’Neill – Acting Senior Executive Planner
David T Ryan – Executive Planner

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, 14th January 2022, 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, 9th December 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. Design strategy – including height and massing of development, open space.**
- 2. Transportation and parking.**
- 3. Residential Amenity.**
- 4. Protected Structures**
- 5. AOB**

- 1. Design strategy – including height and massing of development, open space.**

ABP Comments:

- Confirmation sought with regard to the proposed Build to Sell nature of the tenure.
- The prospective applicant was invited to outline the development and design strategy, particularly in relation to the height and massing of development and to address the concerns raised by the planning authority in this regard.
- Clarity was sought with regard to the design of the pedestrian connection to the R132 and treatment of the difference in levels arising.
- The design and layout of public open space and potential conflict with proposed SUDS function.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- It was confirmed that the intention is that the proposed development is not proposed as Build to Rent.
- The design has regard to the Planning Authority Masterplan in respect of lands to the north. This is a significant junction and redevelopment of lands to the south is also anticipated.
- Lower density units are placed to the north, while heights step down to duplex units to the west.
- A sensitive boundary treatment will interface with existing residential development.
- An open aspect is allowed on the eastern side of the proposed development.
- The density provides for an appropriate urban design response and the proposed building heights are appropriate in this emerging context.
- The blocks provide a strong edge to the R132 and southern road frontage. The taller corner block, rising to 9-storey, acts as a gateway to development to the north.
- The break / slot between blocks 2 and 3 orders the massing and breaks up the frontage. Height tapers down toward existing residential units.
- The design anticipates and allows for the requirements of Bus Connect on the R132.
- Blocks 2 and 3 will be 3-4m from the edge of the footpath in the future context.
- There is an appropriate level of active frontage to the R132 with intervening planting and landscaping. There has been engagement with the NTA.
- Ground levels across the site will be increased somewhat to meet drainage requirements, which results in the proposed flight of steps to the R132.
- The design of this connection may be reviewed.
- More detail regarding the design of the public open space and SUDS measures will be provided.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- The concerns of the planning authority are set out in their submission.
- The proposed density is regarded as excessive.
- The proposed 9-storey block looks monolithic and there is limited context for blocks of this height. 9-storeys is not appropriate for this development.
- The prospective applicant should examine the height and massing of other SHD developments in the area. The height of proposed SHD development at Fosterstown was reduced by the Board.
- Blocks should present a more dynamic edge at the roadside rather than monolithic.
- The layout should provide for some flexibility in terms of the requirements of Bus Connects with regard to the building set-back / reserve.
- The prospective applicant should consider improvements to cycle and pedestrian infrastructure and connectivity across the site, including interface with car parking layout. Regard should be had to the requirements for universal access.
- Consideration must also be given to connections to proposed Metro Link stations.
- The conflicting objectives of residential amenity and SUDS arrangements in areas of public open space need to be resolved.
- Linkages to open space to the west of the site should be considered.
- Treatment of boundaries needs to be re-examined. There areas of communal open space backing onto private gardens.
- Tree surveys should inform the site layout and the choice and siting of street trees along the R132 will be important.
- Will work with the prospective applicants regarding the design of the proposed development.
- A financial contribution in lieu of public space may be required.

2. Transportation and parking

ABP Comments:

- Clarification sought regarding the Bus Connects reservation along the southern boundary of the site.
- Potential for conflict with current development plan objectives relating to the protection of the legacy Metro North route should be considered.
- The prospective applicant was requested to outline the car parking strategy and whether consideration was given to basement level parking on the site.
- The shortfall in bicycle parking provision relative to guidelines standards was highlighted.
- Clarification was sought on the interaction of right turning movements on the L2300 with the operation of the R132 junction, particularly at peak hour.
- Clarity sought regarding cycle / pedestrian connectivity to employment areas at the airport.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- The site is well served by public transport. 153 number parking spaces are provided, which reflects permitted development at Fosterstown to the north.
- The proposed disabled parking space will be relocated to a more appropriate area as part of improvements to pedestrian access to the Bus Connect route.

- Undercroft parking is appropriate for this site based on buildability, viability and drainage issues. It has a reduced land take compared to basement parking.
- Traffic modelling shows no significant impact at existing junctions.
- Will revisit bicycle parking to meet guidelines standards.
- Analysis indicates that there are no difficulties for right turning traffic along the L2300. Overall traffic impacts are low.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- Concerned at the siting of the special needs parking space. Relocation to a more appropriate location should be considered.
- Concern was expressed regarding creche parking and set down movements, and possible overspill of parking.
- Perpendicular parking resulting in reversing movements adjoining a creche is not appropriate. A set-down area and staff parking should be provided.
- Parking provision is below the required standard. Family sized dwelling units need adequate parking provision.
- The layout of parking adjoining the public open space could encourage use by external users, particularly given proximity to future public transport infrastructure.
- Clarity regarding taking in charge and the car parking layout is required.
- Access to the bicycle parking area should be addressed and ancillary facilities including storage should be considered.
- There are proposed improvements to cycle facilities along the R132 to the airport.
- A robust traffic report is required, including full modelling of junctions given their current levels of congestion.
- The Boirimhe entrance onto the L2300 can be blocked at peak hour by traffic queuing back from the R132 junction.
- Consideration should be given to the relationship of parking and adjoining footpaths to provide adequate levels of amenity and safety.

3. Residential Amenity

ABP Comments:

- Prospective applicant should examine potential noise impacts and identify any mitigation measures in submitted documents.
- The design and treatment of the interface with the R132 should address the interim period pending Bus Connects and longer-term solution.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- 892-sq.m. of play area is allowed for with passive supervision.
- Access to play areas will be via tree lines path and enclosed by native trees. A tree survey for the site will be provided.
- Communal open space is 11% of site area.
- Will continue to discuss in further meetings with PA

Planning Authority's Comments:

- Bin storage along the northern site boundary should be reviewed.
- Surveillance to pedestrian routes should be provided.

- The prospective applicant should undertake a tree survey which should inform the design proposals. The use of native trees is welcome
- Careful design of open spaces and amenity infrastructure will be required given the level of development proposed on this site.

4. Protected Structures

ABP Comments:

- Clarification sought as to whether the proposed development, or Bus Connects, would impact on the milestone structure and if the existing boundary wall will be removed

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- The site of the milestone will be dealt with by Bus Connect
- The existing boundary wall will be replaced by a landscape buffer area.
- Will continue further discussions with PA

Planning Authority's Comments:

- The milestone should remain in its current location.
- Landscaping proposals and measures to protect the structure during construction will be discussed in further meetings with prospective applicant.

5. AOB

ABP Comments:

- No further comments

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- No Further comments

Planning Authority's Comments:

- The prospective applicants use of SUDS elements was commended.

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 **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.

Stephen O'Sullivan,
Assistant Director of Planning
April 2022