

## **APPENDIX (B)**

### **Summary**

**South Central Area Committee Meeting**

**Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> May 2022**

**ABP – 313278 – 22**

**(DCC Ref: SHD009/22)**

**White Heather Industrial Estate, South Circular  
Road, & 307/307a South Circular Road and 12a St  
James's Terrace, Dublin 8.**



**South Central Area Committee Meeting, Wednesday, 11<sup>th</sup> May 2022 at 4.00 pm (via Zoom).**

**Presentation by Liam Currie, Executive Planner, on planning application SHD0009/22 (ABP-313278-21) for the demolition of all existing buildings on site and construction of a build-to-rent mixed residential and commercial development consisting of 7 no. townhouses, 328 no. apartments, café, childcare facility, residential amenities and associated site works, at 43-50 White Heather Industrial Estate, South Circular Road, & 307/307a South Circular Road and 12a St James's Terrace, Dublin 8.**

Due to COVID-19 restrictions no members were physically present at the meeting but were given remote access to meeting via Zoom.

**Members Participating in Meeting;-**

Cllr Vincent Jackson – Chairperson

Cllr Darragh Moriarty

Cllr Hazel de Nortúin

Cllr Máire Devine

Cllr Michael Pidgeon

Cllr Michael Watters

Cllr Sophie Nicoullaud

Cllr Daithí Doolan

While the development of the site was welcomed in principle the members were particularly concerned about the impact on the residential amenity of adjoining residents with regard to overlooking and loss of daylight and it was stated that the proposed height needs to be stepped back and further realigned to alleviate same. Members were again very critical of build-to-rent model and argued that there needs to be a greater mix of tenure types in the area. Concerns were also expressed in relation to impact on traffic management at the junction to the site and the relatively high provision of car parking spaces for a site which is well connected and close to city. There was dissatisfaction at the mix of bedroom no's per unit which was not family oriented. Members were also concerned about access to Grand Canal, impact on water pressure in the area and the safe disposal of asbestos which may be present on site.

The following is a summary of the concerns/observations which were expressed by members.

### **Height, Density, Layout and Design and Development Plan.**

- Members welcomed the development of the site which is well located for a residential development and no longer appropriated for industrial use. However it was stated that the height proposed was excessive and in contravention of the city development plan.
- Concerns were expressed about the negative impact of proposed development on the residential amenities of nearby residents with regard to shadowing and overlooking. Need to take rear extensions into account and their proximity to proposed development.
- It was stated that some of the concerns with regard to overlooking at St. James's Terrace end have been addressed by having town houses at that end and locating the higher blocks to the centre of the site. However, Block 1 which has 5 stories is too close to some of the residential dwellings on St. James's Terrace and the height needs to be lowered at this point.
- It was stated that there will be a 40% loss of daylight in 13 St. James's Terrace which is unacceptable and there is a need to step back the height of the blocks at this point.
- One of the members stated that he would prefer to see increased massing in the centre of the site to compensate for lower heights on either side.
- The CGIs submitted do not give an accurate visualisation of the impact of proposed development on adjoining houses and CGIs should have been submitted showing views from St. James's Terrace, Priestfield Cottages and Dolphins Barn.
- It was questioned how many of the units will have universal design and have mobility access.

### **Mix of Bedrooms per unit**

- It was stated that there are too few three-bed units and too many one-bed units being provided.
- Not suitable accommodation for families who are in need of housing in this area and this is another opportunity missed in providing good quality family type accommodation in this part of the city.
- Concern was expressed that it is not proposed to provide any 3 bed Part V units.

### **Build-to-Rent Model and Tenure Mix.**

- Members expressed their dissatisfaction that a build-to-rent scheme was proposed.
- Disappointment was expressed that the applicants are going for 90% private rental and it was stated that we need a greater tenure mix.
- Concern was expressed about the high cost of renting accommodation in built-to-rent schemes such as this.

### **Traffic Management**

- Concern was expressed about the negative impact of proposed development on traffic which is already very heavy at the junction near proposed access to site.
- The City Council and local residents have raised concerns in relation to the proposed access point onto South Circular Road and its impact on Bus Connect proposals and Traffic at that junction. These concerns were somewhat dismissed by the Board and don't appear to have been fully addressed in this application.

- There will be a cluster of turning points near that junction including access to the planned Bailey Gibson Site and this could prove problematic from a traffic management viewpoint.
- It was stated that there was an over provision of car parking spaces as the site was well connected by public transport which will be further improved with Bus Connect and it is also within walking distance to city centre.
- The overuse of space in this part of city for car parking and particularly surface car parking is wasteful.
- Another member disagreed that too many car parking spaces were being provided and stated that the parking provision was adequate and should not be downsized.
- It was questioned if there was any provision for EV charging points.

### **Parks, Open Space and Amenities**

- It was stated that access should be provided to the Grand Canal and we need to make permeability a condition of any planning granted in this instance.
- The planning enforcement case involving Grand Canal Court near Herberton Bridge was mentioned where the developer failed to provide public access to canal as promised.
- Concern was also expressed in relation to shadowing of green open space along Grand Canal.
- Members welcomed the inclusion of a childcare facility in the proposed development.

### **Other Matters**

- Concern was expressed that there may be asbestos in some of the older warehouse buildings and if so this should be flagged with regard to the safe disposal of same.
- It was stated that local residents have complained of low water pressure in the area at present and were concerned about the impact of the proposed development on water pressure in the area.