



Planning Report & Statement of Consistency

Strategic Housing Development, Knocknacarra District Centre, Gort na Bró, Rahoon, Galway





DOCUMENT DETAILS

\mathbf{O}		
	Client:	Glenvea
	Project Title:	Strategi Knockna Rahoon,
	Project Number:	180531
	Document Title:	Planning Consiste

Document File Name:

Prepared By:

igh Living

ic Housing Development, acarra District Centre, Gort na Bró,

g Report & Statement of

SOC F - 180531- 2019.11.13

MKO **Tuam Road** Galway Ireland H91 VW84



Author(s) Approved By Rev Status Date 01 Final 13/11/19 SMC CR



Table of Contents

1.	INTRO	DUCTION	4
	1.1 1.2 1.3	Preamble Brief Description of Proposed Development Structure of Report	4
2.	SITE L	OCATION AND CONTEXT	6
	2.1 2.2 2.3 2.3 2.3 2.3 2.3 2.3	 Designated Sites Tree Survey Biodiversity Management Plan 	
3.	PLAN	NING HISTORY	
	3.1	Subject Site	12
4.	PRE-P	LANNING CONSULTATION	14
	4.1	Section 247 Pre-Planning Discussions with Galway City Council 21st Nov 2018	14
	4.2	Section 247 Pre-Planning Discussions with Galway City Council 20 th Feb 2019	
	4.3	Part V Meeting with Galway City Council 12 th March 2019	
	4.4	Part V Meeting with Galway City Council 10 th September 2019	
_	4.5	Consultation with Other Bodies	
5.		OSED DEVELOPMENT	
	5.1 5.2	General Description Key Planning Statistics	
	5.3	Facilitation/Ancillary Works	
	5.4	Retail Content	20
	5.5	Compliance with Part V of the Planning and Development Act 2000	
6.	PLAN	NING POLICY CONTEXT	23
	6.1	National Planning Framework	
	6.2	Draft Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy for the Northern & Western Assembly	
	6.3	Galway City Development Plan 2017-2023	
7.	PLAN	NING ASSESSMENT	27
	7.1	Definition of Strategic Housing Development	27
	7.2	Principle of Development in Context of GCDP	27
	7.2. 7.2.		
	1.2.	7.2.2.1 Residential and Commercial Content	
		7.2.2.2 Public Plaza/Civic Open Space	
	7.2.	7.2.2.3 Community Space & Residential Amenity Space	
		7.2.3.1 Density & Site Coverage	32
	7.2. 7.3	4 Building Heights Public Open Space	
	1.0		



7.4 Sustainable Urban Housing – Design Standards for New Apartme	nts
7.4.1 Application Site Context	
7.4.2 Unit Typology	
7.4.2.1 Housing Need Assessment	
7.5 Communal Open Space	
7.5.1 Surrounding Public Amenity Space	
7.6 Access, Traffic & Parking	
7.6.1 Existing Roads	
7.6.2 Car Parking	
7.6.3 Proposed N6 Ring Road	
7.6.4 Cycling	
7.7 Design Statement	
7.7.1 Daylighting & Overshadowing	
7.7.2 CGI Visualisations	
7.8 Childcare Provision	44
7.9 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	
7.10 Other Matters	
7.10.1 Drainage & Construction Management Plan	
7.10.2 Mechanical and Electrical Services	
7.10.3 Taken in Charge	
7.10.4 Wind Microclimate Assessment	
7.10.5 Waste Management	
7.10.6 Fire Safety	
ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	47
8.1 Legislative Context	
8.2 Mandatory EIA	
CONCLUSION	

9.

8.

APPENDIX A: MEETING MINUTES
APPENDIX B: PART V CALCULATIONS
APPENDIX C: STATEMENT OF CONSISTENCY
APPENDIX D: TAKEN IN CHARGE
APPENDIX E: GALWAY COUNTY CHILDCARE COMMITTEE
APPENDIX F: EXISTING LINK ROAD

TABLE OF TABLES

Table 1: Key Development Statistics	15
Table 2: Part V Provision Unit Typology	16
Table 3: Part V Provision Unit Typology	16
Table 4: Planning Statistics	
Table 5: Dwelling Type Mix	
Table 6: Gross Floor Area of Proposed Scheme	
Table 7: Communal Residential Amenity	
Table 8: Residential Parking	
Table 9: Cycle Parking	
Table 10 - Part V Compliance	
Table 11: Floorspace Breakdown (Gateway Masterplan Site)	
Table 12: Building Heights Criteria	



Table 13: Public Open Space Areas	36
Table 14: Minimum Floor Areas for Community Open Space	

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 2-1: Site Masterplan	6
Figure 2-2: Proposed Development	7
Figure 2-3: Site Context	
Figure 2-4: Site Context (2)	8
Figure 2-5: Designated Sites	9
Figure 2-6: Flood Risk Mapping	
Figure 6-1: Galway MASP Strategic Locations	
Figure 7-1: Zoning Objective as per the GCDP – Application site outlined in Red (Indicative only)	
Figure 7-2: Proposed Civic Open Space	
Figure 7-3: Civic Open Space Uses	
Figure 7-4: Civic Open Space Uses (2)	
Figure 7-5: Residential Amenity Pavilion	
Figure 7-6: Proposed Courtyard	
Figure 7-7: Landscape Podium	
Figure 7-8: Site Context	
Figure 7-9: City Bus Routes	
Figure 7-10: Application Site & Galway City Green Network (Map Source: Galway City Development Plan Park – Blue Star)	



1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 **Preamble**

This preliminary Planning Report and Statement of Consistency has been prepared by MKO on behalf of Glenveagh Living in support of an application to An Bord Pleanála (ABP) under the *Planning and Development Act 2000* (as amended by the *Residential Tenancies Act 2016*) for a strategic housing scheme located at Gort na Bró, Rahoon, , Galway. This application is made under the Strategic Housing Provisions of the *Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act, 2016.*

This Planning Report and Statement of Consistency has been prepared to specifically address the requirements of the Regulations and the Guidelines issued by An Bord Pleanála. The proposed mixeduse development has been prepared in accordance with the Ministerial Guidelines and the requirements of the Galway City Development Plan 2017-2023. This Planning Report and Statement of Consistency also includes details in respect of the proposed development in relation to the site location and context, the development description and the relevant planning history and compliance with the development plan policies.

This report provides a comprehensive assessment of the proposed development's consistency with the relevant planning policy documents at national, regional and local levels. The following policy documents are considered in both the main body of the report and the appendices.:

- > Project Ireland 2040 National Planning Framework;
- Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas Guidelines 2009 and the associated Urban Design Manual;
- Sustainable Urban Housing Design Standards for New Apartments (2015);
- Childcare Facilities Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2001);
- Smarter Travel A New Transport Policy for Ireland (2009-2020);
- Draft Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy for the Northern & Western Regional Assembly
- Galway City Development Plan 2017-2023

Brief Description of Proposed Development

The proposed development will consist of the following:

- 1. Construction of 332 no. residential units:
 - o 93 no. 1 bed apartments
 - \circ 219 no. 2 bed apartments
 - \circ 20 no. 3 bed apartments
- 2. Provision of 2,667 sq.m of commercial floorspace
- 3. Provision of 93 sq.m of community use facilities
- 4. Provision of 470 sq.m of tenant amenity accommodation including shared workspaces, shared dining and lounge facilities
- 5. Provision of 174sq.m creche facility including an external secure play area.



- Provision of 85 no. car parking spaces and provision of realigned road between Gort na Bró and Gateway Retail Park Road.
- 7. Change of use of underground void to 181 bay underground car park.
- 8. Provision of shared communal and private open space, car parking, bicycle parking, bin storage, public lighting, site landscaping, services, signage, substation and all associated site development works.

1.3 Structure of Report

Following this Introduction section, the Planning Report and Statement of Consistency is set out as follows:

- Section 2 Provides a description of the site's context within the surrounding area.
- Section 3 Itemises the relevant planning history of the application site.
- Section 4 Details pre-application consultation discussions which have informed and shaped the proposed development.
- Section 5 Provides a description of the proposed scheme.
- Section 6 Provides an overview of the relevant national, regional and local planning policy framework:
 - > National Planning Framework
 - > Planning Policy Statement 2015
 - Regional Planning Guidelines for the West 2010-2022
 - Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy Issues Paper (Northern & Western Regional Assembly)
 - Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authority's 2018
 - Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas 2009
 - Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines for Planning Authorities Consultation Draft August 2018
 - > Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets
 - Childcare Facilities Guidelines for Planning Authorities
 - Salway City Development Plan 2017-2023
 - Salway Transportation Strategy
 - > Retail Planning Guidelines
 - Guidelines for Planning Authorities and An Bord Pleanála on carrying out Environmental Impact Assessment

The Habitats Directive

- Section 7 Provides a planning assessment of the proposed scheme.
- Section 8 Provides an insight into the legislative context surrounding environmental impacts of the proposed development.
- Section 9 Conclusion



2. SITE LOCATION AND CONTEXT

2.1 Site Location

The proposed site is located on Gort na Bró, Rahoon, Knocknacarra, Galway approximately 3.1km west of Galway City Centre. The surrounding area is characterised by the established residential suburb of Knocknacarra. The lands adjoining the site to the west are the location of the Gateway Retail Park which is the primary district retail centre serving the surrounding area. A number of well-known retailers have premises at this location including Dunnes Stores and B&Q. The existing Retail Park is Phase 1 of the overall development strategy for the 'Gateway Site'. Figure 2.1 below illustrates the wider context of the site and how the proposed development (Phase 3) fits into the overall 'Gateway' Masterplan.

Phase 2 of the Gateway Retail Park was granted planning permission on the 5th September 2017 (Pl. Ref No: 17/158) and is currently under construction on lands to the north of the existing retail park and comprises approximately 10,000 sq.m of retail floorspace. The application site is bounded by Gort na Bró to the east and the retail park link road to the west. The Western Distributor Road, an arterial route serving the city, is located to the south. The route of the proposed Galway N6 ring road, which is currently with An Bord Pleanála for consideration, passes approximately 1.3km to the north. However, junction upgrades associated with this proposed development are proposed in the vicinity of the site as well as the realignment of the link road between Gort na Bró and the Gateway Retail Park which traverses the site. Further detail in respect of this matter is set out in Section 7.5.3.



Figure 2-1: Site Masterplan

2.2 Site Description

The application site has an area of approximately 2.43 ha (excluding Phase 02 basement) and is traversed by the road which links Gort na Bró and the Gateway Retail Park. The southern portion of the site is

formed primarily by waste ground and is surrounded by advertising hoarding. The northern portion of the site is formed mainly by scrub and some small trees. The site context is outlined in Figure 2.2 below.



Figure 2-2: Proposed Development

The overall topography of the application site is relatively flat. As set out earlier the surrounding area is primarily residential in character with the Gateway Retail Park located immediately to the west. The site is bordered to the north by Gaelscoil Mhic Amhlaigh, a newly built primary school. To the south the application site will be bounded by a future District Centre Use which will be the subject of a future planning application. The site context is further illustrated in Figure 2.3 & 2.4 below.





Figure 2-3: Site Context



Figure 2-4: Site Context (2)



2.3 Site Constraints

2.3.1 **Cultural Heritage**

A review of National Monuments Service mapping indicates that there are no archaeological records or protected structures located on the subject site. Given the location of the subject site in a heavily developed area it is considered that the archaeological potential of the subject site is low to negligible.

The National Monuments Service mapping indicates that there is an archaeological record located on the playing pitches approximately 100 metres to the east of the subject site (Ref: GA094-056). This record is identified as a 'designed landscape feature'. A review of aerial photography and a site visit indicate that this may be a mapping error as no designed landscape feature can be identified at this location.

This submission is accompanied by an Archaeological Impact Assessment prepared by Tobar Archaeological Services Ltd. This report concludes that no recorded monuments, protected structures or NIAH structures are located on the proposed development site. The southern portion of the site has been developed and subject to ground works, therefore this area has no potential for the presence of subsurface archaeology. The report recommends that archaeological monitoring of topsoil removal on the northern portion of the application site is undertaken. The applicant fully intends to facilitate archaeological monitoring as required.

2.3.2 **Designated Sites**

A review of National Parks and Wildlife Service mapping indicates that the nearest designated sites to the subject site are the Moycullen Bogs NHA (Site Code: 002364), the Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code: 000297), the Galway Bay Complex SAC (Site Code: 000268) and the Inner Galway Bay SPA (Site Code: 004031). The location of these sites in the context of the subject site are identified in Figure 2.5 below.



Figure 2-5: Designated Sites

This submission is accompanied by a Natura Impact Statement. The Natura Impact Statement has been prepared in accordance with the European Commission guidance document Assessment of Plans and



Projects Significantly Affecting Natura 2000 Sites: Methodological Guidance on the provisions of Article 6(3) and 6(4) of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC (EC, 2001) and the Department of the Environment's Guidance on the Appropriate Assessment of Plans and Projects in Ireland (December 2009, amended February 2010).

In addition to the guidelines referenced above, the following relevant guidance was considered in preparation of the report:

- 1. DoEHLG (2010) Appropriate Assessment of Plans and Projects in Ireland Guidance for Planning Authorities. Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government,
- 2. European Communities (2000) Managing Natura 2000 Sites: the provisions of Article 6 of the 'Habitats' Directive 92/43/EEC, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg. European Commission,
- 3. European Communities (2018) Managing Natura 2000 Sites: the provisions of Article 6 of the 'Habitats' Directive 92/43/EEC, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg. European Commission,
- 4. Directive 92/43/EEC, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg. European Commission,
- 5. EC (2007) Guidance document on Article 6(4) of the 'Habitats Directive' 92/43/EEC Clarification of the concepts of: alternative solutions, imperative reasons of overriding public interest, compensatory measures, overall coherence, opinion of the commission. European Commission,
- 6. EC (2013) Interpretation Manual of European Union Habitats. Version EUR 28. European Commission,
- 7. NRA (2009) Guidelines for Assessment of Ecological Impacts of National Roads Schemes, National Roads Authority, Dublin.

The NIS provides an assessment of all potential direct or indirect pathways for adverse effects on the QI/SCI habitats and species of Galway Bay Complex SAC and Inner Galway Bay SPA.All identified potential pathways for impact are robustly blocked through the use of avoidance, appropriate design and mitigation measures as set out within this report. The measures ensure that the construction and operation of the proposed development does not adversely affect the integrity of European sites.

Therefore, it can be objectively concluded that the proposed development, individually or in combination with other plans or projects, will not adversely affect the integrity of any European Site.

2.3.3 Tree Survey

Following consultation with Galway City Council the applicant was advised that it may be beneficial to undertake a Tree Survey. This survey has been undertaken and is enclosed with this submission. It concludes that no trees of high-quality, Category A status were recorded within the study area. Semimature ash, beech, maple and birch trees were identified but are not of particular quality or value. The remaining trees within the study area were immature, small and easily replaced. It should be noted that the proposed development includes for comprehensive landscaping arrangements including for the planting of trees. Please see enclosed Landscape package prepared by Ait Landscaping.

2.3.4 **Biodiversity Management Plan**

Given the extent of landscaping incorporated into the proposed development the decision was taken to prepare a Biodiversity Management Plan (BMP) for the project. This BMP was prepared in conjunction with the project Landscape Architect. The purpose of the BMP is to ensure that the landscaping proposed is of a type and scale that reduces the requirement to utilise herbicides and pesticides for their ongoing management. Furthermore, the BMP recommends that where possible native planting is utilised, and these recommendations have been incorporated into the proposed planting scheme for the proposed development. Ultimately the intention of the BMP is to ensure that the development facilitates and contributes to biodiversity within the development and in the surrounding area.



2.3.5 Flood Risk

A review of the most recent Office of Public Works Flood Risk mapping indicates that the subject site is bordered to the east by an area which is subject to the 0.1% AEP and 1% AEP Fluvial Flood Extents. This flood mapping is illustrated in the context of the application site in Figure 2.6 below. The subject site is not affected by the modelled area of flood risk.



Figure 2-6: Flood Risk Mapping

Notwithstanding the above this submission is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment prepared by DBFL Consulting Engineers. The report concludes that the subject site is located within Flood Risk Zone C and that residential development is appropriate in the context of this flood zone categorisation.



3. **PLANNING HISTORY**

3.1 Subject Site

A review of the online planning register of Galway City Council indicates that 1 no. planning application has been made in respect of the subject site details of which are as follows:

<u>Pl. Ref. No</u>: 07/440

Applicant: Rumbold Ltd.

<u>Development Description:</u> Permission for a temporary single storey structure (78.14sq.m) to accommodate a show apartment/marketing suite and associated parking, landscaping and site development works

Decision: Grant subject to conditions (03/09/2007)

Notable previous planning applications in the vicinity are summarised below:

Pl. Ref. No: 04/141

Applicant: Rumbold Builders Limited

<u>Development Description</u>: Permission for development on lands (4.573ha) at Galway West Business Park, Western Distributor Road, Rahoon, Galway. The proposed development is Phase 1 of a District Centre mixed-use development and comprises the following: Main Anchor Store (7124sq.m gross floor area) incorporating supermarket (2224sq.m net retail selling space and non-food goods totalling 2273 sq.m net retail selling space); 4 no. retail/ retail services units (1813sq.m gross floor area); DIY/Hardware Retail Warehouse (4819.5sq.m gross floor area) and associated Garden Centre (1180.5sq.m); health and fitness unit (1953.5sq.m gross floor area); restaurant (256sq.m gross floor area); 650 car parking spaces at surface and basement levels and incorporating 162 cycle spaces. Permission is also sought for associated service and access roads, service yards, hard and soft landscaping , ESB substation , and other ancillary uses and site development works.

Decision: Grant subject to conditions (03/09/2007) Appealed to An Bord Pleanála (Ref: 61.210888) (Granted 26/08/05)

Pl. Ref. No: 13/341

Applicant: Aldi Stores (Ireland) Ltd.

<u>Development Description</u>: Permission for development. The site is bounded to the south by the Western Distributor Road and to the north by a link road (unnamed) linking with Bothár Stiofán and the entrance to Galway West Retail Park. The proposed development comprises of the construction of a single storey discount foodstore (to include off licence use) with a gross floor area of 1,542sq.m (net retail area 1,140sq.m). The development includes the erection of 3 no. free standing double sided internally illuminated pole signs, 1 no. internally illuminated gable sign and 1 no. entrance glass sign. The proposed development will be served by 96 no. car parking spaces. Vehicular access to the site will be provided via the link road (unnamed) to the north of the application site. Pedestrian access is provided to the site from the link road and the Western Distributor Road. The proposed development includes the construction of a ground mounted ESB transformer, all landscaping, boundary treatments and site development works, on the 0.65 hectare site.

Decision: Grant subject to conditions (15/05/2014) Appealed to An Bord Pleanála (Ref: 61.243481) (Granted 31/10/14)

<u>Pl. Ref. No: 15/11</u>

Applicant: The Minister for Education and Skills

Development Description: Permission for development which will consist of the construction of a new 2 storey Primary School building with a section of the building rising to 3 storey and comprising of 24 no. general classrooms, General Purpose Hall with servery area, staff room, Library and Resource Room, Special Educate Tuition Rooms, offices, staff areas, sanitary and ancillary accommodation with a total floor area of C. 3982m.sq. Proposed site works to include provision for 36no. surface car parking spaces



including accessible parking via new internal vehicular and pedestrian access from Distributor Road, new internal access road to include bus turning circle, drop-off and pick-up facilities. A new pedestrian access route to the south of the site. External works to include bicycle parking, formation of 3 no. basketball courts, junior play areas, external bin store, ESB sub-station and associated site engineering works. Decision: Grant subject to conditions (12/08/2015)

Pl. Ref. No: 17/158

Applicant: Targeted Investment Opportunities ICAV

Development Description: Permission for development which will consist of: Phase 2 of Knocknacarra District Centre comprising a mixed-use 2 storey development (with plant areas at roof level) of c. 11,969.3 sq. m as follows: 6 no. retail units (units 12-17, c. 9,688.6 sq. m GFA); crèche (unit 11, c. 444.4 sq. m) with an external play area; café/restaurant (unit 9, c. 197 sq. m); first floor gym (unit 18, c. 678.1 sq. m) as well as offices (units 7, 8 & 10, c. 786.5 sq. m); provision of new east/west pedestrian link; signage zones c. 143.68 sq. m, canopies on southern elevation; 129 no. basement and 22 no. surface car parking spaces; 116 no. cycle spaces (at surface level); all located to the north of existing Dunnes Stores and surface car park. Permission is also sought for associated ancillary development comprising service yards, refuse areas, hard and soft landscaping, single storey ESB substation (58.2 sq. m), basement entrance, vents, revised surface circulation in south east corner of site; basement level plant, attenuation areas (& foul pump), works and build out of basement area (to also tie in with existing basement), and all associated site development & drainage works. Primary vehicular access to the proposal will be from new entrance (at northern boundary) from internal access road, all on a site of c. 1.56 hectares Decision: Grant subject to conditions (05/09/2017)

erant subject to contractions (00/00/2017)



PRE-PLANNING CONSULTATION 4.

To date, 2 no. statutory consultation meetings have taken place with Galway City Council under Section 247 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and minutes of these meetings are provided in Appendix A of this report. In addition to this, under the provisions of Section 5 of the Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 2016 a tripartite meeting took place on 18th July 2019 between the applicant, Galway City Council and An Bord Pleanála. A summary of the main issues discussed at these meetings is set out below. In addition to these meetings a meeting was held with Galway City Council Housing in relation to Part V provision. Information is also set out below in relation to consultations with other bodies namely the TII, NTA, the Galway County Childcare Committee and representatives of Gaelscoil Mhic Amhlaigh.

Section 247 Pre-Planning Discussions with 4.1 **Galway City Council 21st November 2018**

A relatively detailed submission was made to the Planning Authority prior to this meeting including an Architectural Package, a Traffic Report and a Planning Report. An overview of the project was presented to the Planning Authority at this meeting. The key points of discussion that arose at the meeting can be summarised as follows:

- Private Rented Sector Model versus Build to Sell Model.
- Scale, massing, height and overshadowing.
- Impact of future N6 Galway City Ring Road on proposal.
- Linkages between proposed Phase 3 and existing Phases 1 & 2.
- Ownership and Taken in Charge.
- Nature, extent and location of car parking provision.
- Nature, extent and location of open space provision.
- > Unit typology and mix.

Following this meeting the project team considered the comments of the Planning Authority and made amendments to the scheme where necessary. The evolution of the proposal in terms of its makeup, from the first pre-planning consultation to the present is set out in Table 1 below.

Section 247 Pre-Planning Discussions with Galway City Council 20th February 2019

A detailed submission was made to the Planning Authority prior to this meeting including an Architectural Package, a Traffic Report, Planning Report/Statement of Consistency, Landscape Plan and an Engineering Package. The feedback received from the Planning Authority, in respect of the amendments to the proposal in the interim, was positive. The matters discussed at this meeting can be summarised as follows.

- > Layout and use of proposed civic open space.
- Scale, massing and height of the proposed development.
- Materials, finishes and colours.
- Size, location and type of balconies.
- Impact of wind on the proposed development.
- Traffic flows and parking provision.
- Linkages between proposed and existing phases.
- Unit typology and mix.
- > Childcare and community space provision.



Planning Statistic	Amended Scheme	Previously Proposed Development
Site Area	2.43 Ha	2.2 Ha
No. of Units	335	300
Break down of	96 no. 1 beds	108 no. 1 beds
Residential units	218 no. 2 beds	169 no. 2 beds
	21 no. 3 beds	23 no. 3 beds
Mix of Units	96 no. 1 beds (28%)	108 no. 1 Beds (36%)
	218 no. 2 beds (65%)	169 no. 2 Beds (56%)
	21 no. 3 beds (7%)	23 no. 3 Beds (8%)
Breakdown of other units	2,571 of Commercial Floorspace	3,209 sq.m of Commercial Floorspace
Total Floor Area	35,236	32,500
Plot ratio	1:45	1.75:1
Density	138	158
(units per ha)		
Open Space	3,085 sq.m	2,250 sq.m
Parking	268	252
	(85 spaces on-site & 183 spaces in underground Phase 2)	(80 spaces on-site & 172 spaces underground in Phase 2)

Table 1: Key Development Statistics¹

4.3 Part V Meeting with Galway City Council 12th March 2019

A meeting was held with the Galway City Council Housing Section in relation to the proposed development on the 12th March 2019. At that meeting the applicant proposed to provide Block B in its entirety to an Approved Housing Body. The Housing Section had no issue in principle with this arrangement but requested that the unit typology in this Block was amended to better fit the characteristics of the housing list.

¹ The 'Amended Scheme' referred to was presented to GCC at the second Section 247 Meeting. The makeup of the proposed development has since evolved further to what is the subject of this planning application.



Following this meeting a revised design for Block B was submitted to the Housing Section comprising the following:

Unit Type	Unit Numbers	Unit Breakdown
1-Bed	6	14%
2-Bed	29	69%
3-Bed	7	17%

Table 2: Part V Provision Unit Typology

The Housing Section have confirmed that they are satisfied with this quantum and type of social housing provision.

4.4

Part V Meeting with Galway City Council 10th September 2019

Following amendments to the design of the scheme a further meeting was held with the Galway City Council Housing Section in relation to the proposed development on the 10th September 2019. At that meeting the applicant proposed to provide a re-designed Block B in its entirety to an Approved Housing Body. The Housing Section had no issue in principle with this arrangement.

Table 3: Part V Provision Unit Typology

Unit Type	Unit Numbers	Unit Breakdown
1-Bed	5	12.5%
2-Bed	30	75%
3-Bed	5	12.5%

The Housing Section have confirmed that they are satisfied with this quantum and type of social housing provision. Please see enclosed in Appendix B correspondence from Galway City Council Housing Section in respect of this matter.

4.5

Consultation with Other Bodies

Consultations have been undertaken with a number of statutory bodies in respect of the proposed development. The applicant has consulted with TII and Irish Water. Consultation with Irish Water was undertaken in writing. Consultation with TII has taken place in writing but also by way of a meeting which took place on 21st March 2019. Consultation has taken place also with the NTA via email correspondence. More detail in relation to consultation with TII is set out in the Traffic and Transport assessment which accompanies this planning application.

Given the presence of a childcare facility within the proposed development a meeting took place between the applicant and Galway County Childcare Committee on 26th July 2019. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the nature of childcare demand in the locality and the requirement for a childcare facility given that a facility is currently under construction in Phase 2 of the Gateway Retail Park. This was a productive meeting where the scale and design of a potential facility was discussed. Correspondence received from Galway County Childcare Committee after this meeting is enclosed in Appendix D of this report.

The applicant and members of the project team met with representatives of Gaelscoil Mhic Amhlaigh on 5th June 2019. The Gaelscoil is located immediately to the north of the application site. The purpose of this meeting was to present the proposed development to the representatives and to address any



comments, queries or concerns that they may have in relation to any element of the proposal. This was a positive meeting and resulted in some design alterations to the northern elevation of the proposed development (Blocks E & F)



5.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

5.1 General Description

Planning permission is sought by Glenveagh Living for development on a site which extends to 2.43 Ha (excluding underground car park) at Gort na Bró, Rahoon, Knocknacarra, Galway.

- Construction of 332 no. residential units:
 - 93 no. 1 bed apartments
 - 219 no. 2 bed apartments
 - 20 no. 3 bed apartments
- Provision of 2,667 sq.m of commercial floorspace
- Provision of 93 sq.m of community use facilities
- Provision of 470 sq.m of tenant amenity accommodation including shared workspaces, shared dining and lounge facilities
- Provision of 174sq.m creche facility including an external secure play area.
- Provision of 85 no. car parking spaces and provision of realigned road between Gort na Bró and Gateway Retail Park Road.
- Change of use of underground void to 181 bay underground car park.
- Provision of shared communal and private open space, car parking, bicycle parking, bin storage, public lighting, site landscaping, services, signage, substation and all associated site development works.

5.2 Key Planning Statistics

An overview of the key planning statistics associated with the development are set out below:

Table	4: Planning Statistics	
-------	------------------------	--

Quantum	Dimension
2.43	Ha
7,296 sq.m (30%)	%
1.45:1	
138	Units per Ha
	2.43 7,296 sq.m (30%) 1.45:1

Table 5: Dwelling Type Mix

Apartment Type Mix	Quantum	% Mix
1-bedroom	93	28

² Please note that density calculation is based on a site area which excludes the area of the underground car park. This is considered a reasonable approach in respect of the calculation of an accurate density.



2-bedroom	219	66
3-bedroom	20	6
Total	332	100%

Table 6: Gross Floor Area of Proposed Scheme

Description of Area	Quantum of Gross Floor Area (m ²)
Residential GFA	24,066
Retail GFA	2,667
Community/Amenity	563
Creche	174
Total	27,467

Table 7: Communal Residential Amenity

Description of Area	Quantum of Gross Floor Area (m ²)
District Plaza	2,166
Residential Courtyard	1,456
Landscaped Podium	1054
Block B Landscaping	200
Total	4,876

Tahle	8.	Resid	ential	Parking	
1 and	0.	rusiu	unun	1 arning	

Residential Parking	No. of Spaces
Block F	82
Off-Street	3
Phase 02 Basement	181
Total	266

Table 9: Cycle Parking

Cycle Parking	No. of Spaces
Block A	64
Block B	70
Block F	252
Surface Stand Spaces	291
Total	677

5.3

Facilitation/Ancillary Works

It should be noted that there are 2 no. elements of the proposed development described above which require further explanation. These are:

> the realignment of the link road between Gort na Bró and the Gateway Retail Park;



>

the upgrading of the new junction between the application site and Gort na Bró and associated upgrade works.

The planning application for the proposed N6 Ring Road is currently with An Bord Pleanála for assessment (Ref: PL07.302848). As part of the scope of works required to facilitate the new road it is proposed to realign the existing road between the Gort na Bró/ Western Distributor Road roundabout and the Gateway Retail Park Road. This realignment will comprise a new link directly between Gort na Bró and the Gateway Retail Park Road. The indicative location and alignment of this proposed link is illustrated in Figure 6.4 of the enclosed Traffic and Transport Assessment prepared by Atkins Ltd.

The proposed development includes for the realignment of this road in line with the proposals published by Galway City Council and Transport Infrastructure Ireland. The provision of this realigned link road will facilitate the beneficial development of the application site and the proposed layout is based around this realignment. There is no definitive timeline surrounding the delivery of the N6 Ring Road. In this regard the applicant, in conjunction with agreement with TII, intends to construct this realigned link road ahead of the delivery of the wider N6 Ring Road Scheme. The project team met with TII's representatives in relation to this matter on 21st March 2019 where the proposed development was presented and the overlap between the proposed development and the proposed N6 scheme was identified. Following a period of review and a number of clarifications Arup (GCC/TII's design consultant) responded on 18th April 2019 as follows:

'Arup have reviewed the proposed planning application by Atkins in the context of the interaction with the proposed N6 Galway City Ring Road (GCRR) scheme which is currently before An Bord Pleanála. The Gateway Urban Village, Knocknacarra development and the N6 GCRR scheme overlap in the area of the proposed realigned entrance to the Galway Retail Park. Both schemes propose the realignment of the existing entrance to Galway Retail Park from its current location as a fifth arm of the Gort na Bró Roundabout on the Western Distributor Road to a new location to the north onto Gort na Bró Road. Galway County Council do not object to the proposed Gateway Urban Village, Knocknacarra development subject to it including for the provision of the plan layout and vertical layout of the proposed realigned entrance to Galway Retail Park as currently shown in the N6 GCRR planning application.'

It should be noted that the proposed development will include provision for the layout and vertical alignment of the proposed (N6 Scheme) and the realigned entrance to the Gateway Retail Park and it is therefore considered that there is no conflict between the proposed development and the proposed N6 Galway City Ring Road Scheme.

In addition to the above there is also a requirement to upgrade the junction between the application site, Gort na Bró and and the Gort na Bró residential housing estate. The nature and extent of this work is illustrated in Section 6.3 of the enclosed Traffic and Transport Assessment prepared by Atkins. Some of these works will take place on lands which have been taken in charge by Galway City Council. The project team met with Uinsinn Finn (Senior Roads Engineer, Galway City Council) in relation to this matter on Thursday 4th April 2019 and the nature of these works were described and discussed. Galway City Council have given consent to the applicant to include this area in the red line boundary of the planning application and this letter of consent is included in the application submission.

5.4 **Retail Content**

The retail content of the proposed development comprises 2,667 sq.m of floorspace which is incorporated into 11 no. units ranging in size from 103 sq.m to 249 sq.m. The purpose of these units is to provide food and beverage outlets, local services (i.e. butcher, baker, hair salon) and convenience retail offering which serves local needs. There will be no comparison retail provision and no retail provision of a type and scale which would have any impact on any retail centres or the city centre itself. The applicant was



advised by An Bord Pleanála at the tripartite meeting that the nature and scale of retail/F&B uses proposed would not require the preparation of a Retail Impact Assessment.

5.5

Compliance with Part V of the Planning and Development Act 2000

This section of the report details the Part V proposal on the proposed site. The relevant legislation regarding Part V Social Housing is contained within the *Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended)* and the *Planning & Development Regulations, 2001 (as amended).*

Under Section 96 of the Act the options for compliance with Part V are as follows:

- i. The transfer, to the Planning Authority of the ownership of part(s) of the land (10%) subject of the application, to be reserved for the provision of social housing.
- ii. the building and transfer, on completion, to the ownership of the Planning Authority, or to the ownership of persons nominated by the, of houses on the land which is subject to the application for permission of such number and description as may be specified in the agreement.
- iii. the transfer to the ownership of the Planning Authority, or to the ownership of persons nominated by the Authority, of houses on any other land within the functional area of the Planning Authority of such number and description as may be specified in the agreement.
- iv. the grant to the Planning Authority of a lease under the Housing Acts 1966 to 2014 of houses on the land which is subject to the application for permission, or on any other land within the functional area of the Planning Authority, of such number and description as may be specified in the agreement.
- v. a combination of a transfer of land and one or more of the options listed above, or a combination of 2 or more of any of the others.

The proposed development includes for 332 no. residential units. The application proposes to provide 41 no. units to fulfil the schemes obligation as set out below. The number of Part V units proposed exceeds the minimum 10% requirement as outlined under Section 96 of the Act. The applicant has engaged with Galway City Housing Department in order to establish an agreed quantum, type and location of the proposed Part V provision.

Table 10 - Part V Compliance

Part V Information Required	Part V Proposal
(i) details of such part or parts of the land for the proposed development or is or are specified by the Part V agreement, or houses situated on such aforementioned land or elsewhere in the planning authority's functional area proposed to be transferred to the planning authority, or details of houses situated on such aforementioned land or elsewhere in the planning authority's functional area proposed to be leased to the planning authority, or details of any combination of the foregoing, and	41. no units (See Appendix B)
 (ii) details of the calculations and methodology for calculating values of land, site costs, normal construction and development costs and profit on those costs and other related costs such as an appropriate share of any common development works as required to comply with the provisions in Part V of the Act, and 	See Appendix B
(iii) a layout plan showing the location of proposed Part V units in the development?	All Social Housing provision will be in Block B of the



proposed development. (See Appendix B)



6. PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

Set out below is a planning assessment of the proposed development in the context of the relevant planning policy. Please note that a detailed Statement of Consistency is also enclosed in Appendix C.

6.1 National Planning Framework

The Department of Housing, Planning, Community and Local Government recently published the National Planning Framework (NPF) entitled 'Ireland 2040'' to succeed the National Spatial Strategy. The NPF comprises the Government's proposed long-term strategic planning framework to guide national, regional and local planning and investment decisions over the next 25 years. The NPF is a high-level document which provides a framework for future development and investment in Ireland, providing a long-term and place-based aspect to public policy and investment, and aiming to coordinate sectoral areas such as housing, jobs, transport, education, health, environment, energy and communications, into an overall coherent strategy.

There are a number of objectives set out in this document which are relevant in the context of the proposed development. Some of these are set out below:

National Policy Objective 1b states in the context of population growth to 2040:

'Northern & Western Region - population growth of 180,000 additional people.'

There is a very significant population growth allocated to the Northern & Western Region in which Galway is the main urban centre. In order to facilitate this population growth there will be a requirement to develop large numbers of new houses and apartments, approx. 20,000 units based on a standard household size of 2.7 people. Given that Galway is currently acutely affected by the housing crisis there is a considerable divide to be bridged in order to bring housing provision from its current under-supply to the level required to accommodate the population growth forecasts. However, it is important that more sustainable urban development patterns are established in order to facilitate targeted services and infrastructure investment. The purpose of this type of approach would be to achieve more compact urban growth. The proposed development will deliver 332 no. residential homes and these homes would be developed in accordance with the aspirations described above.

It is considered that the proposed development would assist in delivering the growth identified in National Policy Objective 1b and it is therefore considered that the proposed development accords with this Objective.

National Policy Objective 2a states:

'A target of half (50%) of future population and employment growth will be focused in the existing five cities and their suburbs'

Based on the growth figures set out in NPO 1b above this will result in a population increase of 90,000 people in the city of Galway and its suburbs in the period to 2040. This equates to approximately 20,000 new homes in total or approximately 1,000 homes per annum. Section 2.6 of the NPF sets out the principles of Securing Compact and Sustainable Growth. The importance of achieving compact growth is set out in above in relation to Objective 1b. Section 2.6 of the NPF refers to the constant challenges associated with our urban settlements expanding outwards onto greenfield lands in a process commonly referred to as urban sprawl. Taking the principles of compact urban development, it is considered that the density of new residential development within the existing urban footprint of Galway should be maximised. It is necessary to maximise densities in these areas in order to satisfy the requirement for 1,600 new homes per annum to 2040. The proposed development represents an efficient use of land in



the context of residential density and it is considered that it accords with the requirements to deliver new residential development in a sustainable manner within the existing urban footprint of the City.

National Policy Objective 4 states:

'Ensure the creation of attractive, liveable, well designed, high quality urban places that are home to diverse and integrated communities that enjoy a high quality of life and well-being.'

It is considered that the proposed development represents an attractive, liveable, well designed and highquality urban space. The proposed development and the developer's vision are set out in detail in the enclosed Urban Design Report prepared by Reddy Architecture. This description can be summarised as follows:

'The new village centre will interconnect with and support the existing wider community, it will provide an appropriate balance between high quality residential uses and other mixed uses to create and active, dynamic, inviting streetscape. The new centre will develop a vibrant commercial quarter/mixed use development model designed around a high-quality public environment with distinct civic character, which will include a new public plaza, attractive and well-maintained landscaping, and active street frontage.'

For more detail in relation to the high-quality design of the proposed development please see enclosed Urban Design Report prepared by Reddy Architects.

National Policy Objective 13 states:

In urban areas, planning and related standards, including in particular building height and car parking will be based on performance criteria that seek to achieve well-designed highquality outcomes in order to achieve targeted growth. These standards will be subject to a range of tolerance that enables alternative solutions to be proposed to achieve stated outcomes, provided public safety is not compromised and the environment is suitably protected.'

All relevant guidance as it relates to development management standards i.e. density, parking etc. have been considered carefully in the design of the proposed development. It is considered that the development management standards adopted by the proposed development fall within appropriate thresholds as identified in the respective guidance documents.

6.2

Draft Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy for the Northern & Western Regional Assembly

The Draft Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy for the Northern & Western Regional Assembly (RSES) was published in November 2018. The principal purpose of the (RSES) is to support the implementation of the National Planning Framework and the economic policies and objectives of the Government by providing a long-term strategic planning and economic framework for the development of the regions. Section 3.6 of the RSES sets out the Galway Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan (MASP). The Vision of this MASP is that Galway will be a leading global city, renowned as a successful, sustainable, competitive, compact and accessible city of scale that supports a high quality of life, maintains its distinctive identity and supports its rich heritage, language and cultural experience.

The MASP reiterates the significant population growth targets which are set out in the National Planning Framework. It is estimated that by 2040 the population of the Galway MASP will be 145,816 people which is an increase of 51,741 people. Based on an average household size of 2.7 people this results in a requirement for nearly 20,000 new homes. The proposed development will contribute to the overall unit requirement for the projected population growth. The MASP identifies strategic locations within its plan boundary which:



'present the opportunity and capacity to deliver the quantum of housing on the appropriate sites, subject to the adequate provision of services'

These locations are identified in Figure 6.1 and include the suburbs of Galway City including Knocknacarra. The primary strategy of the MASP is to consolidate these areas. In order to consolidate these areas, it is considered necessary to facilitate higher density development on brownfield sites and on zoned lands. This will serve a dual purpose -1) The delivery of an appropriate quantum of units in line with the future growth projections set out in previous sections and 2) A shift toward a more compact urban form i.e. preventing the continued sprawl of the suburbs by delivering high density schemes at appropriate locations.



Figure 6-1: Galway MASP Strategic Locations

6.3 Galway City Development Plan 2017-2023

Section 2.1 of the Galway City Development Plan (GCDP) sets out the Council's key aims and strategy as it relates to the delivery of housing and the creation of sustainable neighbourhoods. A central aim is as follows:

'To provide for good quality housing for all sectors of the community in sustainable neighbourhoods that are attractive places to live and are within easy access to a range of local services, amenities, community facilities and public transport networks. To ensure that these neighbourhoods have a sense of identity and foster sustainable living and movement patterns. To enhance the quality and to protect the character of Galway's older neighbourhoods and regenerate the city centre's neighbourhoods.'

A selection of the key strategy goals set out in the GCDP are listed below:

- > Implement the recommended settlement strategy for the city ensuring that sufficient land is zoned to meet future demand, in the interests of sustainability and to achieve optimal integration of land use and transportation.
- > Accommodate through land use zoning the requirements of the Housing Strategy
- > Encourage sustainable neighbourhoods of high-quality residential development, with a mix of house types and tenures with a strong identity and sense of place.



> Promote sustainable neighbourhoods where community facilities and services of an appropriate nature are easily accessible.

The criteria set out above are detailed in policy terms, through the objectives in the plan as well as through the various other policy/guidance documents at local and national level. Having reviewed these documents in the context of the proposed development, we consider that the key issues relating to the proposed development are:

- > Principle of the Development
- > Access, Traffic and Transportation
- > Design Standards
 - Density/Plot Ratio
 - Site Coverage
 - Parking
- > Design Statement
- > Childcare Provision
- > Drainage

Each of the above matters are dealt with individually in the following Section.



7. PLANNING ASSESSMENT

7.1 **Definition of Strategic Housing Development**

It is considered that the proposed development meets the criteria to be considered a Strategic Housing Development as per the provisions of the Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 2016.

7.2 **Principle of Development in Context of GCDP**

7.2.1 Compliance with Core Strategy

The application site is located in the suburb of Knocknacarra which is identified in the Galway City Development Plan (GCDP) as an 'Outer Suburb' of the City. The Core Strategy included in the GCDP sets out an estimated housing yield capacity in the City of 9,093 units over the duration of the plan period (2017-2023). This estimate is based on all residentially zoned lands within the city plan boundary. However, not all of these lands will be brought forward for development during the plan period for a variety of reasons such as absence of services and other development constraints. Table 1.3 of the GCDP states that there is sufficient land zoned on the west side of the City to deliver 3,325 units during the plan period. It should be noted that the Core Strategy in the City Development Plan was prepared prior to the publication of the National Planning Framework and the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Northern & Western Regions. These publications have introduced growth targets which exceed those used to formulate land use zoning requirements in the Galway City Development Plan. It also important to reiterate that fact that only a percentage of the zoned lands within the City Development Plan area will ultimately be developed due to a variety of factors and constraints. For this reason, it is important to ensure that development proposals which do come forward are of an appropriate density.

The proposed development will provide 332 no. residential units at the District Centre of Knocknacarra where the GCDP requires the delivery of a minimum of 20% residential development in the context of all likely future floor space requirements. In the context of the limited number of housing completions within the city plan boundary the proposed development will make an important contribution to the delivery of required residential units. The Core Strategy also makes reference to the requirement to ensure that there are sufficient lands zoned to facilitate Employment Growth. The proposed residential and commercial development will complement the existing and proposed employment activities in Phase 1 and Phase 2 respectively. It is therefore considered that the proposed development is consistent with the requirements of the Core Strategy of the Galway City Development Plan 2017-2023.

7.2.2 Compliance with Zoning Objectives

The application site is located in an area zoned 'CI-Commercial/Industrial' within the Galway City Development Plan 2017-2023 (GCDP). The GCDP lists uses which may contribute to the zoning objectives, dependant on the CI location and scale of development and one such use is residential. The application site is part of a parcel of lands identified as being the '*Northern Portion of CI lands at Rahoon*'. The zoning of the application site is illustrated in Figure 7.1 below.





Figure 7-1: Zoning Objective as per the GCDP – Application site outlined in Red (Indicative only) pment of

a scale equivalent to 20% of the proportion of all likely future floor proposals. This residential development shall be integrated into the overall scheme.

- > Development of these lands will only be considered where it can be shown to be linked in with the existing development and shall show how it relates to an overall layout for the area which will include for landscaping, boundary treatment and linkages with the adjoining residential development and transport services.
- The provision of a civic open space will be a requirement on this site and lands shall be reserved for this purpose.
- Any additional phase of development shall include for the front-loaded delivery of a public/community facility which can be in the form of a community facility, a community health facility, a transport facility, a park and play area over and above normal open space requirements.
- Any future development shall include for a number of small retail/service units which can be demonstrated to deliver a broad range of District Centre uses.

7.2.2.1 Residential and Commercial Content

The application site forms part of the Knocknacarra District Centre which is a Level 3 designation on the Galway City Retail Strategy. The City Development Plan states the following in respect of District Centres-

'In general, district centres function to provide a range of services characterised by large multiple anchors with a mix of convenience and comparison goods. In addition, there is generally a range of smaller local services including local offices, restaurants, recreational and community facilities. The district centre is generally of a scale and nature to serve the local catchment and ties in with settlement and other objectives in the core strategy.'

The type and size of the retail units proposed as part of the proposed development are small retail/service units in which it is intended to provide a range of retail types including food and beverage. As described in Section 5.4, these units will serve a local function only in line with the district centre designation. It is considered that the content and scale of retail floorspace proposed accords with the specific development objective that is associated with the application site.

The proposed development includes for the provision of 24,066³ sq.m of residential floorspace and 2,667 sq.m of commercial floorspace. Phases 1 and 2 of the Gateway Retail Park include 34,929.6 sq.m of

³ Including amenity and community areas as well as bike stores, bin stores and service areas. Excluding circulation areas.



commercial floor space. Table 11 below sets out the quantum of each type of floorspace on the wider site (existing and proposed).

Use Type	Floor Area (Sq.m)	Percentage
Residential	24,066	40%
Commercial	37,996	60%
Total	62,062	100%

Table 11: Floorspace Breakdown (Gateway Masterplan Site)

The proposed residential content will comprise 40% of the overall floor area (existing and proposed) on the '*Northern Portion of CI lands at Rahoon*'which exceeds the minimum provision of 20%. It is therefore considered that the proposed development accords with this development objective.

7.2.2.2 Public Plaza/Civic Open Space

The provision of a high quality civic open space in the form of a Public Plaza has been a key design consideration for the project team from the outset. Its size, shape and location have been carefully considered to ensure that it becomes a vibrant space which is a central feature of the district centre as a whole. Its location and size have been a fundamental driver of the entire development layout. The proposed civic space has been sized and positioned to ensure functionality in its own right but also to act as a gathering point for the surrounding residential population and for future employment uses to the north of Gaelscoil Mhic Amhlaigh.

Effectively this public plaza will act as a civic catalyst for the existing uses in the vicinity, the proposed development and future developments in the area. The plaza is adequately sized at 2,166 sqm. (67 m x 30.5 m) and is similar in size to the quadrangle in NUI Galway and is much larger than equivalent civic squares such as in Temple Bar, Meeting House Square and the plaza at the Central Bank, Dublin. It is envisioned that musical or cultural events could be held in the plaza in collaboration with Galway City Council or other groups and the applicants would welcome the opportunity to develop the cultural value of the plaza. The suitability of the plaza to facilitate events, in terms of its size and layout, is illustrated in Figures 7.2, 7.3 & 7.4 below.

The relationship between the proposed development and Phases 1 and 2 has been a key consideration from the very outset of the design phase of the proposed development. The importance of the relationship between Phase 1 and Phase 3 and the physical interface between the two is highlighted in the design decision to locate and orientate the proposed Public Plaza at a strategically important location between the two.





Figure 7-2: Proposed Civic Open Space

Furthermore, it is intended to facilitate priority pedestrian movements between Phases 1 and 3 in order to facilitate interconnectivity and linkages. Figure 7.2 above illustrates the proposed layout of the plaza and the linkages to the Phase 1 development to the north. The primary pedestrian movements between the two Phases are illustrated in the enclosed Architectural Design Statement. Landscaping measures, surface finishes and boundary treatments have all been selected in order to promote and facilitate pedestrian priority at the interface between Phase 1 and Phase 3. Similarly, it is intended to provide formal pedestrian linkages between Phase 3 and Phase 2 which is currently under construction. Please see Figure 2.1 for more information in relation to the location of the respective Phases.



Figure 7-3: Civic Open Space Uses





Figure 7-4: Civic Open Space Uses (2)

The shared surface proposals on the internal roadway (between Phases 1 and 3) are intended to maximise the amenity and vibrancy of this area. The use typology of the proposed development has also been shaped by the desire to ensure that this public plaza has high levels of footfall and pedestrian activity. It will be fronted at ground level on two sides by retail/food and beverage uses and by a cinema on the third side (the proposed cinema will be the subject of a separate planning application).

It is considered that the proposed civic open space accords with Galway City Council's vision for the district centre and therefore accords with the relevant development objective. More detail in respect of the proposed civic open space can be found in the enclosed architectural design statement.

It is proposed to provide two formal pedestrian crossings between the proposed development and the Phase 1 site. These crossing points are strategically located at the northern and southern extents of the civic open space. The crossing points will facilitate pedestrian connectivity but will also act as traffic calming measures which will significantly reduce traffic speed immediately adjacent to the proposed civic open space.

7.2.2.3 Community Space & Residential Amenity Space

The proposed civic open space will be an important community asset in its own right but the applicant has also included for a community space within the footprint of the development itself. In order to ensure that this space can be utilised by as wide a spectrum of the local community as possible it is intended that this area will not have a prescriptive use but will be available for the community to use how they wish. Multi-configuration furnishings will be provided in this space to facilitate a range of uses from office type activities, meetings, exercise and recreation and arts and cultural activities. This area will be managed on site by the appointed property manager. The proposed community space is located immediately adjacent to the civic open space on the ground floor of Block C where it will be centrally located and visible to the community. It has a gross floor area of 94 sq.m. It is considered that the provision of this area accords with the specific development objective set out in the Galway City Development Plan.

In addition to the above the proposed development includes for an enclosed residential amenity area adjacent to the landscaped courtyard between Blocks A & D. This amenity space will be a stand-alone pavilion which will serve the entire development. This space will provide shared recreational areas for tenants and will act as a social hub. Figure 7.5 below provides an illustration of the proposed amenity space.





Figure 7-5: Residential Amenity Pavilion

7.2.3 **Density Standards**

7.2.3.1 Density & Site Coverage

This submission is accompanied by an Urban Design Report prepared by Reddy Architecture & Urbanism and this Statement of Consistency should be read in conjunction with the Design Report. The Galway City Development Plan (GCDP) states that a plot ratio of 0.46:1 for new residential development should not normally be exceeded. However, the subject site is zoned 'CI- Commercial/Industrial and the maximum permitted density on lands with this zoning objective is 1.25:1. The maximum permitted site coverage on lands with this zoning designation is 100%. The plot ratio of the proposed development is 1.46:1 and the site coverage of the proposed development is 0.30:1 (30%). It is considered that the proposed development materially contravenes the Galway City Development Plan in respect of the proposed density and the prescribed density for new development on 'CI-Commercial/Industrial' lands in the Plan. A Statement of Material Contravention is enclosed with the planning application submission.

Plot ratio is typically an indicator of the density of commercial or industrial development while the density of residential development is more typically calculated on a units per hectare basis. In this regard it is considered that the standards set out in the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2009) are the most pertinent for the purposes of setting out the relevant density standard. These Guidelines set out appropriate levels of density depending on the location of a site. Development sites which are identified for increased levels of density, among others, are those located on public transport corridors. The guidelines state the following in respect of such sites-

'In general, minimum net densities of 50 dwellings per hectare, subject to appropriate design and amenity standards, should be applied within public transport corridors, with the highest densities being located at rail stations/bus stops, and decreasing with distance away from such nodes.'

The application site is located immediately adjacent to the 412 and 414 bus routes which are major arterial public transport routes linking the western suburbs with Galway City Centre. There are bus stops serving both of these routes located in the immediate vicinity of the application site. The location of the subject



site in the context of the City bus routes is illustrated in Figure 7.8 below. Given the location of the site in the context of this public transport corridor and its strategic importance as the Knocknacarra District Centre it is considered that a significantly higher density than the minimum 50 per hectare is appropriate at this location.

7.2.4 Building Heights

The Department of Housing, Planning and Local Government published the Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines for Planning Authorities in December 2018. The purpose of these guidelines is to outline wider and strategic policy considerations and a more performance criteria driven approach that planning authorities should apply when considering building heights. The Guidelines are designed to move planning authorities away from generic maximum height restrictions in urban areas.

A key point set out in Section 2.0 of the Guidelines is as follows:

'While achieving higher density does not automatically and constantly imply taller buildings alone, increased building height is a significant component in making optimal use of the capacity of sites in urban areas where transport, employment, services or retail development can achieve a requisite level of intensity for sustainability.'

The Guidelines set out a number of criteria against which the Planning Authority and An Bord Pleanála must assess a planning application and against which an application must demonstrate compliance. These are set out below and responses included to demonstrate compliance:

<u>Criteria: At the Scale of the relevant City/Town -</u>	
Criteria	Response
'The site is well served by public transport with high capacity, frequent service and good links to other modes of public transport.'	Please see Section 7.3.1 of this Report – the application site is serviced by high quality bus routes.
'Development proposals incorporating increased building height, including proposals within architecturally sensitive areas, should successfully integrate into/ enhance the character and public realm of the area, having regard to topography, its cultural context, setting of key landmarks, protection of key views. Such development proposals shall undertake a landscape and visual assessment, by a suitably qualified practitioner such as a chartered landscape architect.'	It is considered that the proposed development will successfully integrate into the area. The application site forms part of the District Centre for Knocknacarra and the character of the surrounding area is primarily dictated by Phase 1 of the Gateway Retail Park to the west, the retail outlet to the south, and the school to the north. Although the district centre is surrounded by suburban residential development it has a different character as evidenced in the photomontages which accompany this submission. The Western Distributor Road and Gort na Bró/Millar's Lane provide a clear buffer between suburban Knocknacarra and the District Centre. The proposed development comprises a high- quality addition to the public realm of the District Centre by including a public plaza and quality pedestrian linkages throughout and to adjoining lands.

Table 12: Building Heights Criteria

It is considered that the topography of the application site versus the surrounding area will not result in any overshadowing or overbearing. This is demonstrated in the daylight studies which are appended to the architectural design statement. It is considered that the Western Distributor and Gort na Bró provide a suitable buffer from residences so as to prevent any overbearing.

The proposed development will not have any adverse impact on existing landmarks in the locality or on any protected views.

While not a redevelopment site it is considered that the proposed development will play an important place making role in the suburb of Knocknacarra. It will do this in two ways – firstly, the development includes for a large, high quality civic open space which will benefit the residents of the development but also the residents of the wider community by delivering a public space for recreation, amenity and cultural activities. This space will contribute to the health, happiness and well-being of the all residents of the community.

Secondly, the proposed development includes for food and beverage retail units of a type and scale which do not currently exist in Knocknacarra and which in this type of development should create a vibrant retail area benefitting the wider community.

The proposed development incorporates high quality urban design and layout and materials which contribute to the creation of an attractive streetscape.

At the scale of district/neighbourhood/street -	
Criteria	Response
	The proposed development will accommodate a high-quality residential development designed to apartment guidelines. This project will exploit the potential of the location, its close proximity to shopping and leisure and to other amenity such
'The proposal responds to its overall natural and built environment and makes a positive contribution to the urban neighbourhood and streetscape'	as the sea, parklands and the adjoining hinterland. This project will promote sustainable neighbourhoods and the creation of balanced sustainable communities

'On larger urban redevelopment sites, proposed

contribution to place-making, incorporating new streets and public spaces, using massing and

height to achieve the required densities but with

sufficient variety in scale and form to respond to

the scale of adjoining developments and create

developments should make a positive

visual interest in the streetscape.'


'The proposal is not monolithic and avoids long, uninterrupted walls of building in the form of slab blocks with materials / building fabric well considered.' 'The proposal enhances the urban design context	The proposed development incorporates a range of building heights types, finishes and materials to ensure that it achieves a high quality of overall design and integrates with the wider area.
for public spaces and key thoroughfares and inland waterway/marine frontage, thereby enabling additional height in development form to be favourably considered in terms of enhancing a sense of scale and enclosure while being in line with the requirements of "The Planning System and Flood Risk Management – Guidelines for Planning Authorities " (2009).'	This project will exploit the potential of the location, its close proximity to shopping and leisure and to other amenities such as the sea, parklands and the adjoining hinterland.
'The proposal makes a positive contribution to the improvement of legibility through the site or wider urban area within which the development is situated and integrates in a cohesive manner.'	This new village centre will interconnect with and support the existing wider community and will provide an appropriate balance between high quality residential uses and other mixed uses to create an active, dynamic, and inviting streetscape. The new centre will develop a vibrant commercial quarter/ mixed use development model designed around a high- quality public environment with distinct civic character which will include a new public plaza, attractive and well-maintained landscaping and active street frontage.
'The proposal positively contributes to the mix of uses and/ or building/ dwelling typologies available in the neighbourhood.'	As set out in Section 7.3.2.1 the proposed development will introduce a unit typology which there is currently underprovided in Knocknacarra.
At the scale of the site/building	
Criteria	Response
'The form, massing and height of proposed developments should be carefully modulated so as to maximise access to natural daylight, ventilation and views and minimise	The form and massing of the proposed development have been carefully considered in the context of day lighting and overshadowing. Please see shadow analysis and daylighting
overshadowing and loss of light.' 'Appropriate and reasonable regard should be taken of quantitative performance approaches to daylight provision outlined in guides like the Building Research Establishment's ' Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight' (2nd edition) or BS 8206-2: 2008 –	analysis enclosed with this planning submission. The form and massing of the proposed development have been carefully considered in the context of day lighting and overshadowing. Please see shadow analysis and daylighting analysis enclosed with this planning submission.
overshadowing and loss of light.' 'Appropriate and reasonable regard should be taken of quantitative performance approaches to daylight provision outlined in guides like the Building Research Establishment's ' Site Layout Planning for Daylight and	analysis enclosed with this planning submission. The form and massing of the proposed development have been carefully considered in the context of day lighting and overshadowing. Please see shadow analysis and daylighting



The Guidelines go on to provide guidance in respect of building heights in suburban/edge locations (City & Town) i.e. developments outside city and town centres and inner suburbs. The application site forms part of a district centre so does not adhere to this exact typology but nonetheless the guidance is applicable. It states that:

'Development should include an effective mix of 2, 3 and 4-storey development which integrates well into existing and historical neighbourhoods and 4 storeys or more can be accommodated alongside existing larger buildings, trees and parkland, river/sea frontage or along wider streets.'

The proposed development comprises a mixture of 4-7 storey buildings. However, it is considered that the nature of the application site and the buffer between it and surrounding residential and commercial development make it a suitable location where 4 or more storeys can be accommodated.

For more detail in respect of the scale and massing of the proposed development please see enclosed the Design Report prepared by Reddy's Architecture & Urbanism.

7.3 **Public Open Space**

The proposed development incorporates 4 no. distinct areas of public open space as follows:

Description	Quantum
Public Plaza	2,166 sq.m
Residential Courtyard	1,350 sq.m
Landscaped Podium	1,054 sq.m
Block B	475 sq.m
Total	5,045 sq.m

The Public Plaza is described in the 7.1.2.2 above and illustrated in Figure 7.2 above. There is an overall provision of 5,045sq.m of public open space within the proposed development. The quantum of open space required for new apartment developments is set out in the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines (2018) and these are set out below.

Table 14: Minimum Floor Areas for Community Open Space

Description	Quantum Required	Proposed Development	Quantum Required
1 Bedroom	4 sq.m	93 units	372 sq.m
2 Bedroom	7 sq.m	219 units	1,533 sq.m
3 Bedroom	9 sq.m	20 units	180 sq.m

2,085 sq.m



Total

The proposed residential courtyard is 1,350 sq.m in size and is located between Block's A and D. Please see Figure 7.6 below for more detail in relation to it.

332



Figure 7-6: Proposed Courtyard

The proposed courtyard will be gated. These gates will be open during the day but will be closed at night for security purposes. Residents will have access to the courtyard at all times. For more detail in relation to the specification of this area please see enclosed Landscape Report prepared by Ait Landscaping.



Figure 7-7: Landscape Podium

The landscaped podium area will be located between Blocks E and F. It has an area of approximately 1,054 sq.m and will be accessible from the first-floor level of Blocks E and F. For more information in relation to this area please see enclosed Landscape Report prepared by Ait Landscaping.



7.4 Sustainable Urban Housing – Design Standards for New Apartments

The Design Standards for New Apartments were published in March 2018 and recognise the importance of ensuring that apartment living is an increasingly attractive and desirable housing option while also ensuring that quality outcomes are achieved on the ground.

7.4.1 **Application Site Context**

>

The Apartment Guidelines set out criteria in terms of the location of new apartment developments. While the application site is not central in the context of Galway City Centre it is considered reasonable to describe it as an Urban Location. This type of location is described in the Apartment Guidelines as follows:

Central and/or Accessible Urban Locations Such locations are generally suitable for small-to-large scale and higher density development that may wholly comprise apartments including:

- Sites within walking distance or principal city centres, or significant employment locations, that may include hospitals and third-level institutions (i.e. up to 15 minutes or 1,000-1,500 metres).
- Sites within reasonable walking distance to/from high capacity urban public transport stops.
- Sites within easy walking distance (up to 5 minutes or 400-500m to/from high frequency urban bus services.



Figure 7-8: Site Context



It should be noted that while the UCHG and NUIG Campuses are located just outside the 1.5km buffer specified in the Apartment Guidelines they are both still within a 20-minute walk of the application site or a 10-minute cycle. These locations are significant employment locations on the western side of the City. In addition, there are significant employment opportunities at the Westside Shopping Centre and the surrounding area i.e. Rahoon Road and Seamus Quirke Road. There are also employment opportunities at the Gateway Retail Park immediately adjoining the application site and in Salthill to the south east of the application site.

In the context of the proximity to employment centres it should be noted that there are approximately 30 hectares of lands zoned 'Industrial' to the north of the application site. At present, only a small proportion of these lands have been developed but this landbank has the potential to deliver a quantum of industrial/light industrial development which could support levels of employment to rival the Ballybrit or Parkmore Business Parks on the eastern side of the city. As these lands are developed, they will offer employment opportunities to the residents in the proposed scheme. There are also existing employment locations in the immediate vicinity i.e. Aviva & Abbott.

In addition to the above the application site is located immediately adjacent to the 411 and 412 bus routes which are major arterial public transport routes linking the western suburbs with Galway City Centre. These routes combined operate 4 times per hour (every 15 minutes) between the application site and the City Centre. There are bus stops serving both of these routes located in the immediate vicinity of the application site. The location of the subject site in the context of these routes is illustrated in Figure 7.8 below. It is also intended to provide a bus stop within the proposed development.

In addition to the above it should be noted that the application site is the designated district/town centre for Knocknacarra which is the largest residential suburb in the city.



Figure 7-9: City Bus Routes

It is considered that the proposed development meets the criteria to be classified as an *Accessible Urban Location* as per the provisions of the Apartment Guidelines. This designation sits at the top of the hierarchy in terms of the number of units that may be delivered and the density that may be achieved. The apartment guidelines do not specify an upper density threshold for accessible urban locations. However, they do specify a density guideline for application sites located at *Intermediate Urban Locations* which are locations on the second rung of the hierarchy. The Guidelines state that at these locations it may be possible to achieve in excess of 45 units per hectare. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that a higher density may be achievable at an accessible urban location.

Unit Typology 7.4.2

The unit type breakdown of the proposed development is as follows:

- > 93 no. 1 bed apartments
- > 219 no. 2 bed apartments
- 20 no. 3 bed apartments

The Apartment Guidelines set out some demographic trends which inform what type of units the Department of Housing Planning and Local Government consider to be required in the coming years. Indeed, the unit typology of the proposed development has been developed on the basis of such trends. Since 1996 two-thirds of households added to Ireland comprise 1-2 people yet only 21% of dwellings completed in Ireland since then comprise apartments of any type. Furthermore, the 2016 Census indicates there are approximately two and a half times as many 1-2-person households as there are 1-2 person homes. The 2016 Census also found that 1-2 person households now comprise a majority of households and that this trend is set to continue. On the basis of the above the guidelines recognize the importance of accommodating this growing demographic. Based on the above the Guidelines include the flowing policy:

Specific Planning Policy Requirement 1

'Apartment developments may include up to 50% one-bedroom or studio type units (with no more than 20-25% of the total proposed development as studios) and there shall be no minimum requirement for apartments with 3 or more bedrooms.'

The implication of this policy is that there is no requirement to provide a certain percentage of 3 or 4 bed units within an apartment development. The proposed development has been designed with the prevailing demographics as a guide. Furthermore, the application site is located in the centre of the suburb of Knocknacarra which is largely made up of 3, 4 and 5 bed semi-detached and detached houses in traditional suburban housing estates.

Housing Need Assessment 7.4.2.1

In addition to the above, and in order to assist in the identification of an appropriate and commercially feasible unit typology, the applicant commissioned Future Analytics Ltd to prepare a Housing Need Assessment. This Assessment is included with this Stage 3 submission. Some of the key conclusions are set out below for information purposes.

- Galway City is set to grow significantly over the period to 2026 and beyond.
- > > > > > Galway City has an upward trend towards 1-2 person households.
- Galway City has a strong preference towards apartment living (twice the national rate).
- Galway City's person-household composition is changing. By 2026, 60% of households will be 1-2 person households.

The implication of the findings of this assessment is that, aside from the requirement to facilitate significant levels of growth and density the nature of demand is changing in line with changing demographics. It is important that the housing market reacts to these changing demands. The proposed development has been designed in such a way as to provide a type and size of accommodation which will be able to respond to changing patterns of demand.



7.5 **Communal Open Space**

The Design Standards for New Apartments 2018 set out guidance in relation to the type and size of communal open space which is suitable for new apartment developments. The provision and proper future maintenance of well-designed communal amenity space will contribute to meeting the amenity needs of residents. In particular, accessible, secure and usable outdoor space is a high priority for families with young children and for less mobile or older people.

The Guidelines go on to state that communal space may be provided as a garden within the courtyard of a perimeter block or adjoining a linear apartment block. The open space provision associated with the proposed development has been carefully considered. The design of the landscaping will create a unique sense of place to encourage the community to come together. Public spaces will be overlooked by the residences and will be robust and well designed to ensure that they will remain fit for purpose over their life time. Seating will be placed in sunny locations. Biodiversity shall be enhanced throughout, and landscaping will be provided for all ages. In the courtyard's community planters shall be provided to encourage the community benefits. The emphasis will be on communal facilities such as community meeting rooms. a shared garden, a children's play area and recycling facilities including a communal waste composter. More detail in respect of the proposed open space and landscaping solutions for the application site can be found in the enclosed report and drawings prepared by Áit Landscape Architects. It should be noted that aside from the on-site amenity provision the application site is surrounded by a network of green spaces. More detail in respect of this matter is set out below.

7.5.1 Surrounding Public Amenity Space

The location of the application in the context of Galway City Council's 'Green Network' is illustrated below. Figure 7.9 illustrates the proximity of the application site to large public amenity areas.



Figure 7-10: Application Site & Galway City Green Network (Map Source: Galway City Development Plan) (New Park – Blue Star)

In addition to the above there is a new neighbourhood park planned for Knocknacarra which will include playing pitches, playground, community centre and outdoor exercise equipment. The new park will be located adjacent to St John the Apostle National School and this location is identified in Figure 7.11 above with a blue star. It is considered that there is substantial public amenity space available to residents of the proposed development in the immediate vicinity of the application site. Some of these amenity spaces are listed below:

- 2 no. soccer pitches located immediately adjacent to application site.
- Galway Golf Club located 2km from the application site.
- Westside Playing Fields located 1km from the application site.
- McGrath's Field and Knocknacarra Playground located less than 1km from the site.
- Salthill Knocknacarra GAA Club located 2km from the site.
- Knocknacarra Community Centre, Cappagh Park and Barna Woods located 2.5km from the application site.

Access, Traffic & Parking 7.6

The Gateway Development can be accessed from the Western Distributor Road to the south and the Rahoon Road to the north. From the Western Distributor Road there are two access points. The main access point is at the Roundabout with Gort Na Bró, which is a 5-arm roundabout, of which one arm leads directly to a mini roundabout that provides access to the existing Gateway Development. The second access point is from the roundabout with Bóthair Stiofáin, via an uncontrolled T Junction that leads onto an internal road that links to the mini roundabout at the access to the existing Gateway Development.

Access from the north is via an uncontrolled T Junction with the Rahoon Road and Millers Lane (local name), which leads to another uncontrolled T junction which links to the mini roundabout at the access to the existing Gateway Development. For more information in respect of the access, traffic and transportation arrangements associated with the proposed development please see the preliminary Traffic and Transport Assessment prepared by Atkins Ltd. enclosed with this submission.

Existing Roads 7.6.1

As set out in this report the proposed development includes for the realignment of the existing link road between Gort na Bró and the Gateway Retail Park. This road will be closed once the realigned road is put in place. Please note that the existing road is not in the charge of Galway City Council nor has it been designated as a public right of way. A letter from the landowner's solicitor is enclosed in Appendix E of this report and sets out the position in respect of this matter.

Car Parking 7.6.2

The proposed development incorporates 332 no. residential units and 2,667 sq.m of commercial floorspace. It should be noted that the Design Standards for New Apartments (March 2018) supersede the Galway City Development Plan in relation to appropriate levels of car parking provision. These Standards state the following in respect of development proposals at Intermediate Urban Locations -

'In suburban/urban locations served by public transport or close to town centres or employment areas and particularly for housing schemes with more than 45 units per hectare net, planning authorities must consider a reduced overall car parking standard and apply and appropriate maximum car parking standard'.

The proposed development is located on a public transport corridor and comprises a net density in excess of 45 units per hectare and therefore qualifies for a reduced overall car parking standard. In this regard it should be noted that there is a distinction between the residential and commercial car parking allocation associated with the proposed development. In terms of strictly residential use approximately 266 no. car parking spaces are proposed as part of the proposed development. In terms of the commercial retail activities a limited number of spaces will be provided within the application site while the c.900 no. car



parking spaces serving the Gateway development as a whole will also be utilised. At this stage of the design process it is estimated that a parking provision of 0.81 space per apartment will be sufficient. Detailed use analysis of the current and proposed Phase 2 parking, including an assessment of different usage times, has been undertaken and is included in the enclosed Traffic and Transport Assessment prepared by Atkins.

In light of the location of the application site in immediate proximity to a strategic public transport corridor, and the significant provision of bicycle storage being proposed, it is considered that there is adequate car parking to serve the proposed development and the Gateway development as a whole.

It should be noted that National Policy Objective 13 of the National Planning Framework seeks levels of parking provision which facilitate well designed, high quality outcomes to achieve targeted growth. It is considered, in the context of this objective, that a reduced car parking standard should be applied to the application site. For more detail in respect of this matter please see the enclosed preliminary Traffic and Transport Assessment prepared by Atkins Ltd. enclosed with this submission.

Proposed N6 Ring Road 7.6.3

The planning application for the proposed N6 Ring Road is currently with An Bord Pleanála for assessment. As part of the scope of works required to facilitate the new road it is proposed to realign the existing road between the Gort na Bró/ Western Distributor Road roundabout and the Gateway Retail Park Road. This realignment will comprise a new link directly between Gort na Bró and the Gateway Retail Park Road. The indicative location and alignment of this proposed link is illustrated in Figure 2.1 of the enclosed Traffic and Transport Assessment prepared by Atkins Ltd.

The proposed development includes for the realignment of this road in line with the proposals published by Galway City Council and Transport Infrastructure Ireland. The provision of this realigned link road will facilitate the beneficial development of the application site and the proposed layout is based around this realignment. There is no definitive timeline surrounding the delivery of the N6 Ring Road. In this regard the applicant, in conjunction with agreement with Galway City Council Roads Department, intends to construct this realigned link road ahead of the delivery of the wider N6 Ring Road Scheme.

Cycling 7.6.4

Secure sheltered cycle parking will be provided for the residents within the development as well as visitors. There will be a total of 677 bicycle no. spaces provided within the proposed development. It is considered that this level of provision accords with the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments 2018. This level of provision significantly exceeds the standard set out in the Galway City Development Plan.

Design Statement 7.7

This submission is accompanied by an Urban Design Report prepared by Reddy Architecture & Urbanism and this Planning Report & Statement of Consistency should be read in conjunction with the Design Report. It sets out the considerations and rationale which have informed the design of the proposed development to date.

It should be noted that the scale, quantum and typology of residential content proposed have been developed in a manner which employs best practice in terms of urban design, and which has regard to the following documents:

- > Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities 2007
- Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas 2009
- Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for new Apartments 2015
- Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities
- Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets
- Urban Design Manual A Best Practice Guide May 2009



Galway City Development Plan 2017-2023

Compliance with the 'Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities' is demonstrated in the Housing Quality Assessment enclosed with this planning application.

7.7.1 Daylighting & Overshadowing

This submission is accompanied by a Daylight and Overshadowing Study prepared by Integrated Environmental Solutions Ltd. This assessment concludes that the proposed development performance is in line with BRE recommendations in the BRE 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight' Guide.

7.7.2 CGI Visualisations

>

A Photomontage Report has been prepared by Unique Advanced Technologies Ltd. The report represents an accurate visualisation of the proposed development which presents the effects of the development from various viewpoints and sensitive locations. Please see enclosed Photomontage Report for more detail.

7.8 Childcare Provision

The scheme that was presented at the tripartite meeting at Stage 2 did not incorporate a childcare facility. It was intended, at that time, to utilise the creche facility that forms part of the Gateway Retail Park Phase 2 development which is currently under construction (Pl. Ref. No: 17/158). That creche has been designed to accommodate 72 no. children.

In order to estimate the childcare requirements for the proposed development it is necessary to calculate a resident population figure. Based on an average household size of 2.7 people the proposed development will have a population of 895 people. Census data for the western suburbs of the City indicate that the typical creche going cohort make up approximately 15% of the overall population which equates to the requirement of 135 no. creche spaces to serve the proposed development. However, some account must be taken of the type of accommodation that is being provided and the predicted demographic makeup of future residents.

For example, it is considered reasonable to omit the 1 bed units and a proportion of the 2 bed units from childcare requirement calculations as these units are likely to be occupied by single people and/or young couples. Apartment living is not always attractive to couples with children and young families. Furthermore, future residents may place their children in childcare near their places of work or at existing facilities in the local area.

Following the tripartite meeting and a meeting between the applicant's representatives and the Galway City Childcare Committee the proposed development was amended to incorporate a creche. This facility is located on the ground floor of Block A and has a gross floor area of 174 sq.m. It has been designed to accommodate 40 no. children.

It is important to note the extension of existing childcare provision in Knocknacarra was discussed with the Galway City Childcare Committee (GCCC) as was the extent of childcare demand generated by the proposed development. GCCC advised the following, in an email dated 30th July 2019:

'Given the floor space and the outdoor play area in the plan attached for the proposed creche, it would likely be adequate to cater for the needs of families in your client's proposed apartment development close by.'

The proposed creche they are referring to in this instance is the one which is currently under construction in Phase 2 of the Gateway Retail Park which is currently under construction (Pl. Ref. No: 17/158). A copy of this correspondence is enclosed in Appendix D of this Planning Report & Statement of Consistency. The Phase 2 creche has a gross floor area of 444.4 sq.m. Notwithstanding that GCCC consider the Phase 2 creche to be adequate in terms of size/capacity to cater for the proposed development, the applicant



has nonetheless included for the provision of a 174 sq.m creche in Block A of the proposed development. It is considered that the Phase 2 creche and the proposed creche will adequately accommodate the demand generated by the residential content of the proposed development.

7.9

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

A comprehensive Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been prepared by MKO. The landscape and visual impact assessment has been carried out by a Chartered Landscape Architect, Ms Joanna Mole, BSc, PGDipLA, MSc, CMLI. The report includes a visual impact assessment of the proposed development and is based on field surveys of the site and surrounds and the use of photographs from representative viewpoints of the site. The assessment concludes the following:

'The predicted landscape and visual impacts are considered Medium and the overall landscape character of the area will be slightly affected.'

It is considered that the height, scale and massing of the proposed development are appropriate in the context of site and its surroundings. For more information in respect of these matters please see enclosed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and Design Report prepared by Reddy Architects.

7.10 Other Matters

7.10.1 **Drainage & Construction Management Plan**

Enclosed with this submission is a comprehensive engineering package prepared by DBFL Engineering Ltd. It includes for technical drawings and associated reports. It also includes a Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment and a Preliminary Construction Management Plan.

7.10.2 Mechanical and Electrical Services

This submission is accompanied by a Mechanical and Electrical Services Report prepared by Ethos Engineering Ltd. which sets out the mechanical and electrical strategy for the proposed development and also includes an energy report.

7.10.3 **Taken in Charge**

The proposed development incorporates significant areas of public open space including the proposed public plaza. The red line boundary for the planning application will include the new internal link road between the Gateway Retail Park Road and Gort na Bró. It will also include the existing Gateway Retail Park Road along a portion of its length adjacent to the application site. It is envisioned that both of these roadways would be taken in charge by the Planning Authority upon completion of the proposed development. Please note however that it is not the intention for the set down area or footpaths in front of the ground floor retail units in Block E to be taken in charge.

The proposed civic open space is of critical importance to the commercial success of the retail development which surrounds it but also to the wider scheme as a whole. For this reason, it is intended that this area will be managed by a private management company and it is not intended for this area to be taken in charge by the Planning Authority. Similarly, the design standards and specification associated with the remainder of the public open space within the development (i.e. courtyard and podium) will be of a very high quality and include a high-quality material specification. It is very important to the developer, and the scheme as a whole, that the quality of these areas in controlled and maintained. For this reason, it is envisioned that these areas will also be managed by a private management company and not taken in charge by the Planning Authority. Enclosed in the architectural drawings pack is a Taken in Charge drawing (Ref: 18179_1015) which illustrates the extent of the development which it is envisioned will be taken in charge.



7.10.4 Wind Microclimate Assessment

This submission is accompanied by a Wind Microclimate Assessment prepared by Metec Consulting Engineers. This document of provides a comprehensive assessment of the impact of wind, in a variety of climactic and seasonal scenarios, on the proposed development. This assessment establishes that none of the communal areas or private balconies in the proposed development will be adversely affected by wind, in typical seasonal conditions, so as to render them unusable.

7.10.5 Waste Management

This submission is accompanied by a Construction & Demolition Waste Management Plan (CDWP) and an Operational Waste Management Plan (OWP) both of which have been prepared by AWN Consulting Ltd.

The purpose of the CDWP is to provide information necessary to ensure that the management of the construction and demolition waste at the site is undertaken in accordance with current legal and industry standards. The purpose of the OWP is to ensure that the management of waste during the operational phase of the proposed development is undertaken in accordance with the current legal and industry standards

7.10.6 Fire Safety

This submission is accompanied by a Fire Strategy Report prepared by Maurice Johnson & Partners Ltd. The purpose of this report is to provide an outline of the proposed fire strategy for the residential element of the proposed SHD development.

8.

ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

8.1 Legislative Context

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) requirements derive from EU Directives. The requirements of Directive 2011/92/EU and preceding directives have been transposed into Irish Legalisation. EU Directive 2014/52/EU amends EIA law in several respects by amending Directive 2011/92/EU. The 2014 Directive was required to be transposed by 16 May 2017, but has not yet been transposed into Irish planning legislation. The Key Issues Consultation Paper, May 2017, issued by the Department of Housing, Planning, Community and Local Government, outlines the Government's proposals for transposing the 2014 Directive into Irish legislation. This screening report is drafted based on the requirements of EU Directive 2014/52EU, notwithstanding that the directive is yet to be transposed into planning legislation.

In accordance with the provisions of Part X of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), an EIA shall be carried out in respect of an application for development which is specified in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) [the Regulations]. A mandatory EIA is required for developments which fall within the remit of Schedule 5.

In addition, a 'sub-threshold' EIA may be required, if the Planning Authority determines that the development would be likely to have significant effects on the environment. Schedule 7 of the Regulations, details the criteria for determining whether a development would, or would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment, and this was transposed directly from Annex III of the 2011 Directive. The 2014 Directive provides a revised Annex III and its transposition into national legislation is mandatory. This screening report, therefore, refers to Annex III of the 2014 Directive.

8.2 Mandatory EIA

The proposed development for residential development and ancillary childcare facility falls within the category of an 'Infrastructure Project' within Schedule 5 (10) (b) of the Planning and Development Regulations, which provides that a mandatory EIA must be carried out for the following projects:

b)

- (i) Construction of more than 500 dwellings
- (ii) Construction of a car-park providing more than 400 spaces, other than a car-park provided as part of, and incidental to the primary purpose of, a development.
- (iii) Construction of a shopping centre with a gross floor space exceeding 10,000 square metres.
- (iv) Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere.

(In this paragraph, "business district" means a district within a city or town in which the predominant land use is retail or commercial use.)

The proposed development is for 332 no. apartments 2,667 sq.m of retail floor space on a site area of 2.43 ha. Given the area of the subject site it is considered that the proposed development exceeds threshold (b)(iv) as per the above and therefore this planning application is accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment Report.



9

CONCLUSION

This Planning Report & Statement of Consistency, which has been prepared by MKO, supports an application to An Bord Pleanála under the *Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended by the Residential Tenancies Act 2016*).

The proposed development will assist Galway City Council in meeting its commitment to provide for residential development and for associated support development, which will ensure the protection of existing residential amenity and will contribute to sustainable residential neighbourhoods.

The proposed site is located on Gort na Bró, Rahoon, Knocknacarra, Galway approximately 3.1km west of Galway City Centre. The surrounding area is characterised by the established residential suburb of Knocknacarra. The lands adjoining the site to the west are the location of the Gateway Retail Park which is the primary district retail centre serving the surrounding area. The application site is located in an area zoned 'CI-Commercial/Industrial' within the Galway City Development Plan 2017-2023 (GCDP). The proposed development is considered to accord with the provisions of the Galway City Development Plan.

The proposed development provides for the creation of a high quality, mixed use development on a strategic site at the Knocknacarra District Centre and has been designed in accordance with all relevant national, regional and local planning policy.

In summary, it is submitted that the proposal results in a development which accords fully with the proper planning and sustainable development. The proposal will provide an attractive, high quality, contemporary development which enhances the local area. It is submitted that the proposed scheme represents a significant planning gain for the area for the following reasons:

- The proposed development provides for 332 no. residential units and provides a significant response to Galway's housing needs in accordance with the adopted Housing Strategy 2017-23, which has been informed by the Core Strategy of the GCDP.
- The scheme includes for the provision of 2,667 sqm. of commercial floorspace
- > The scheme proposes generous outdoor active and passive recreation opportunities, including a Public Plaza, a Residential Courtyard and a Landscaped Podium.
- The overall site layout has been influenced by the access from the Western Distributor Road to the south and the Rahoon Road to the north.
- The application proposes to provide 41 no. units to fulfil the schemes obligation as set out below. The number of Part V units proposed exceeds the minimum 10% requirement as outlined under Section 96 of the Planning & Development Act 2000 (as amended).





APPENDIX A

MEETING MINUTES

McCarthy Keville O'Sullivan Ltd. Planning & Environmental Consultants

McCarthy Keville O'Sullivan Ltd.Tel: +353 (0) 91 73 56 11Block 1, G.F.S.C.Fax: +353 (0) 91 77 12 79Moneenageisha RoadE-mail: info@mccarthykos.ieGalwayWebsite: www.mccarthykos.ie

MEETING MINUTES

Project/Reference:	180531
Time & Date:	2.30pm 21 st November 2018
Meeting Type:	Stage SHD Meeting
Location:	Galway City Council
Minutes By:	SMC
Issue Date:	22 nd November 2018
Filename:	MM – F – 180531 – 2018.11.22

McCarthy Keville O'Sullivan

Attendance Details

Individual	Company	Abbreviation
Chris McGarry	Glenveagh	CMG
Shane Scully	Glenveagh	SS
Aisling Byrne	Glenveagh	AB
Paddy O'Connor	Sigma Retail	POC
Lisa Cassidy	Sigma Retail	POC
Sean McCarthy	MKOS	SMC
Sharon Connolly	Atkins	SC
Mike Freaney	Reddys	MF
Dan Reilly	DBFL	DR
Noel Gorman	DBFL	NG
Richard Jolly	Ait	RJ
Caroline Phelan (Senior Planner)	GCC	СР
Liam Blake (Senior Executive Planner)	GCC	LB
John Doody (Area Planner)	GCC	JD
Brid Dawson (Roads)	GCC	BD
Frank Clancy (Engineering/Drainage)	GCC	FC
Stephen Walsh (Parks)	GCC	SW

Circulation: Design Team Only

Item	Description	Action
1.0	Introductions	
2.0	SMC set out the background to the applicants, the proposal, and what the project team hoped to get out of the meeting.	
3.0	MF presented the architectural overview and rationale for the scheme.	
4.0	CP queried the nature of the model intended to be utilised i.e. build to rent MF clarified this point	
5.0	MF set out detail in relation to the open space provision, nature of car parking provision and nature of retail provision	

6.0	MF set out detail in relation to the massing and heights and the shadow analysis that has been undertaken to date.	
	CP requested that shadow analysis be undertaken using a Summer month	
7.0	RJ set out strategy in relation to landscaping and open space provision.	
	Robust and flexible space in respect of active ground floors. Picking up on pedestrian connections. Tree lined boulevard through the heart of the	
	development. Treelined and green area between the site and the Gaelscoil.	
	RJ specified 70/30 split between hard and soft landscaping in the open space areas.	
8.0	MF set out more detail in respect of massing of the proposal, introduced the	
	3d models and explained the rationale behind it. Also set out initial thoughts	
	on materials and included some sample elevations.	
9.0	DR set out detail in relation to the fact that the lands are serviced by previous	
	enabling works. Existing surface water and foul water services and public	
	water supplies are in place. Pre-connection enquiry to IW is going in	
	imminently once number of units has been finalised. Drainage Design will utilise Attenuation and SUDS. Site specific Flood Risk Assessment will be	
	undertaken.	
	MF stated that there is no issue with utilities i.e. ESB, Gas and Eir.	
10.0	SC made the following comments:	
	 We have taken the N6 design and incorporated it into to our site 	
	design.	
	 We will be providing 2 lane in-out of the realigned link road. 	
	 Signalising the junction with Gort na mBro 	
	 SC set out that we are proposing to provide a bus lay-by on the link 	
	 road and are liaising with NTA Traffic counts are completed, and all of this information will feed into 	
	a TTA and an assessment of car parking provision.	
	 Parking counts will establish demand in the area and should 	
	ultimately demonstrate that there is adequate capacity for the	
	proposed development.	
	 BD - The development should consider the hierarchy of needs – 	
	cycling and pedestrians	
	 SC- Explained that this is being done and will be considered within 	
	the development. Pedestrian and Cycle links from the site to the rear	
	of the schools are being considered.	
	 BD – Querying the radius of the junction. 	
	 SC – It is part of the design standards and DMURS. DD – Chausill environment and the second standards are second standards and the second standards are second standards and the second standards are second standards are	
	 BD – She will review the parking document. SC- will update that and send it back to BD and propage the TTA 	
	 send it back to BD and prepare the TTA. BD – Reiterated the importance of the hierarchy of needs - 	
	Pedestrian and cycle linkages can cycle parking provision.	
	 BD – Need to be cognisant of what is happening with the N6 and the 	
	CPO	
	 BD and SC will liaise in relation to the specifics. 	
11.0	POC - Set out the state of play in the Phase 2 development, progress and	
	users. Phase 3- District Centre Uses – neighborhood uses. Public Square –	
	food and beverage use.	
	POC stated that Phase 2 will comprise 6 no. separate units and negotiations	
	are under way with end users are currently being signed up.	

	CP – significant concerns in relation to the linkages between the Phase 1 car park and the Phase 3 civic opens space in terms of public realm. Alleged that it will not tie in effectively. Ownership of the internal link road and retail park road was queried and how they will be treated in the post development scenario. This link road will be a busy vehicular thoroughfare.
	CP -How will the internal Gateway Retail road be managed in a post-CPO scenario?
	CP – The Phase 1 Car Park has not been developed in accordance with its planning permission. Project Team advised to review the original scheme for the car park.
	POC – internal road is owned by TIO. This gives us some flexibility in how it is treated.
	CP queried parking provision – skeptical that the methodology set out by the project team will be effective/acceptable. Implied that there may be a net loss of parking in the western part of the Phase 1 car park to facilitate an appropriate tie in with Phase 3 Civic Open Space.
	CP stressed the importance of resolving the issue with the interface between the existing car park and any future civic open space.
12.0	LB stated that the number of units is in excess of what would be considered appropriate for the site i.e. density is on the high side.
	LB stated that the Mix of Units not considered appropriate – too many 1 beds not enough 3 beds.
	CP & LB - Provision of 1 beds – exceeds the quantum of provision that GCC would consider appropriate in the context of the studies which inform the Core Strategy.
	LB – Retail park road will be a vehicular dominated road- how will people slow down. This will have an adverse impact on quality of Civic Open Space.
	CP & LB – Concerns around the nature and disposition of the proposed development in terms of its structural form and open space typology and provision.
	LB queried the management of the Civic Open Space and stated that 70/30 split between hard and soft landscaping was excessive.
	LB & CP – Concerns in relation to the 'social give' arising from the proposed green areas. Concerns around the ease of access, permeability and visibility of open space. Deficit of detail make it difficult to make definitive call.
	CP – Concerns around the 'towering' aspect of some parts of the proposal and how this relates back to the existing context in Knocknacarra i.e. suburban setting.
	LB - Cultural area (community space) appears to be peripheral. It should be more prominent.
13.0	JD – project team should consider other precedents in relation to the provision of the open space (cultural give).

16.0 N D	Meeting Ended	
15.0	FC flagged Public Lighting Design in context of areas that would intended to be taken in charge. Public spaces should meet a certain standard. Energy consumption etc. Full detail – central management system.	
	 It would be the City Council's intention to run and facilitate events in the civic open space area similar to those which occur in South Park, Spanish Arch, Eyre Square. Climatic conditions should be carefully considered in the context of the civic open space and other open space areas within the development. Open space needs to be serviced. Funfairs, outdoor music events should be facilitated. Public Plaza is isolated from the green network (greenway along Millers Lane/Gort na Mbro). SW queried the nature of the Semi Private Open Space for the use of the residents or for public also? SW queried whether the civic open space and green areas would be taken in charge. The Phase 1 development did not take place in the way GCC would have wished - avoid repetition of this issue. Important to ensure that open space areas should be accessible to all ages. Landscape Plan is very conceptual but SW happy to liaise with RJ Active recreation needs to be considered in the context of the 900 residents. 70/30 hard/soft is not considered appropriate. Increase soft landscaping. Using sculpture for play – public liability. 	
14.0	SW – he would like to link in with RJ in relation to the open space strategy and 'event' strategy.	
	CP - Certain amount of engagement should be undertaken in relation to the community space maybe with the school but also with GCC.	
	 The civic open space is likely to be conditioned to facilitate certain uses at certain times i.e. markets or outdoor events. The community space is divorced from civic open space area. Can the civic open space be more expansive or open. It will be the focal point for the Knocknacarra area and for the 900 residents who 	

Meeting:	18106 – Gateway Phase 3 Project Galway City Council Section 247 Mtg. No.2 Stage 1 SHD	Date:	20 th February 2019
Location:	Galway City Council Offices, Galway	Ref:	18106
Present:	Shane Scully, Aisling Byrne		Glenveagh Living (GL)
	Paddy O Connor		Sigma Retail Partners (SRP)
	Tony Reddy, Mike Freaney, Owen Morgan		Reddy Architecture (RAU)
	Sean McCarthy, Colm Ryan		МКО
	Kasia Garvey		Atkins
	Nick Fenner		DBFL
	Richard Jolly		Ait
	Garret Collins		Lafferty
	Caroline Phelan (Senior Planner)		GCC
	Liam Blake (Senior Executive Planner)		GCC
	John Doody (Area Planner)		GCC
	Stephen Walsh (Parks)		GCC
	Others (GCC)		GCC

Distribution:

All present, plus: Neil Bannon

Sigma Retail Partners (SRP)

PROJECT MANAGERS

ITEM	KEY NOTES/ACTIONS ARISING FROM MEETING	ACTION	ACTION BY DATE
1.0	Introduction / Architectural Presentation		
1.1	MKO (SMC) introduced the client and design team and set out the plan for	Note	
	today		
1.2	RAU (MF) presented the Architectural overview and noted the following: -	Note	
	 key design features including master planning of the open spaces. 		
	 160 units per hectare although this would come down to ~60 units 		
	per hectare if the overall Gateway site is considered.		
	 the neighbourhood shopping retail units and the food & beverage 		
	units fronting onto the Civic Space		
	 the location of residential amenity spaces and community building 		
	 the new link road alignment and various matters that have been 		
	addressed since the first S247 meeting.		
	 Explained the massing and noted that the community unit has 		
	moved closer to the square		
	 Explained the massing and scale using a section drawing noting the 		
	storey heights dropping to suit the sunlight angle		
	 Streetscape with varying materials and heights giving façade 		
	variance with layering from the road to ground floor terrace		
	 CGI of the new link road showing a focal point at the entrance 		
	 Some ambulant disabled ground units 		
	- Engagement with housing providers		
	- Mix of typologies		
	- Predominantly 2-bed with 6% 3-bed adding that a study has been		
	issued to support the mix and demand is there for the 2-beds		

LAFFERTY. Project managers

Minutes

ITEM	KEY NOTES/ACTIONS ARISING FROM MEETING	ACTION	ACTION BY DATE
	- Shadow and daylight studies taken at key times with no significant		
	impact on the school		
	- Taken in Charge drawing which we will issue separately showing the		
	impact from the new road.		
2.0	Landscaping Presentation		
2.1	Ait (RJ) presented the primary spaces, secondary spaces, cycle routes, play	Note	
	areas and tree lined courtyard and noted the following: -		
	 the public plaza as robust and flexible with active frontage, planted islands that facilitate meandering, softened areas and secting 		
	 islands that facilitate meandering, softened areas and seating high polished in-situ concrete with desire lines criss-crossing 		
	 feature lights and tree planting to give interest and structure 		
	 more green space and ability for various public events 		
	 more greet space and ability for various public events more streetscape animation and importance of scale 		
	- future cinema site		
	- day and night viability		
	- precedent images of other civic spaces		
	- natural desire lines and event options		
	- Semi-private courtyard – mostly soft landscape overlooked by		
	surrounding units		
	 residential amenity space 		
	- Landscaped podium with play area shared by residents from the 1 st		
	floor		
	- Elevated and sunny area		
3.0	Traffic and Parking		
3.1	Atkins (KG) presented Atkins findings and noted the following: -	Note	
	 TTA has been issued and Atkins have reviewed separately with GCC The site is considered an accessible urban location 		
	 Having considered similar locations, all residents do not own a car 		
	 Car space ratio of 0.8 is in line with Galway and national policies 		
	 Proposed improvements for cars and cyclists to Knocknacarra which 		
	improves serviceability including the link road and signalised		
	junction		
	- The impact on the neighbouring roads is no worse than before and		
	is in fact positive in light of all modes as it promotes public		
	transport, cycling and walking.		
	 Working the model +15 years there is still capacity 		
	- The model shows two junctions close to capacity but the impact is		
	minimal with all committed developments taken into account.		
4.0	Civil Engineering		
4.1	DBFL (NF) noted all drainage is designed to agreed standards with	Note	
	attenuation volumes for 100-year design.	N1 - 1 -	
4.2	Filtered drains, etc integrated with the landscaping.	Note	
4.3 5.0	All agreed with GCC civils. Feedback from GCC	Note	
5.1	LB noted they had reviewed the pack of information issued on 7 th Feb and	Note	
5.1	noted the quality of the open space and the creche has moved to a more	NOLE	
	helpful location.		
5.2	GCC noted they are still unsure how the spaces will work but significant	Note	
	improvements have been made in the design.		
5.3	GCC noted a high percentage of 1-beds with very few 3-beds	Note	

the junction is robust. GCC do not recommend the use of TRICS. Further meeting with Atkins required.Note5.16A car parking ratio of 0.8 is noted. GCC queried how the residential spaces are allocated. GCC queried if there are any current issues with the neighbouring office cars.Note5.17Sigma noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking.Note5.18GCC queried how overspill of residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Noted that residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan.Atkins (SC)5.19GCC noted there is plenty of parking and therefore no need for the flanking spaces on the roadway.Note5.20Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC noted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote	ITEM	KEY NOTES/ACTIONS ARISING FROM MEETING	ACTION	ACTION BY DATE
5.5 CP noted the current Phase 1 car park is failing as it doesn't comply with regional landscaping due to the difference of colour and amount of trees. MKD onted that the Phase 1 car park is not part of the current scheme apart from the areas to be taken in charge. Note 5.6 CP noted without knowing the timing of the cinema, the civic square will be affected by wind. Noted the average weather in Galway is not good and the square is exposed at the edges. Note 5.7 GCC requested more detail at the northern boundary with the school. RAU (MF) 14.03.15 5.8 SW noted some healthy existing trees are on the site. Note Note 5.9 CP noted units with direct door access on the new road are good but there are a large amount of utilites before the end of this road. She would prefer more active frontage for pedestrian flow, etc. Note Note 5.10 CP noted the 'tower' aspect into good design coming from the higher access road as it jars from proportionality and perspective. CP feels that this additional two storey 'tower' is not appropriate. Note 5.11 GCC concerned with substantial, generous balconies. How they are over- looking and how they will be used – bicycles, laundry, etc Note 5.13 GCC noted they have met with Atkins to review traffic and have some issues to be resolved. Note 5.14 GCC capureid fi studies are taken with or without the N6 future development. Atkins noted model is without t	5.4	CP noted GCC will review the document issued by Future Analytics for	Note	
regional landscaping due to the difference of colour and amount of trees. MKO noted that the Phase 1 car park is not part of the current scheme apart from the areas to be taken in charge. 5.6 CP noted without knowing the timing of the cinema, the civic square will be affected by wind. Noted the average weather in Galway is not good and the square is exposed at the edges. Note 5.7 GCC requested more detail at the northern boundary with the school. RAU (MF) 14.03.15 5.8 SW noted some healthy existing trees are on the site. Note Note 5.9 CP noted units with direct door access on the new road are good but there are a large amount of utilities before the end of this road. She would prefer more active fromt age for pedestrian flow, etc. Note Note 5.10 CP noted the 'tower' aspect into good design coming from the higher access road as it jars from proportionality and perspective. CP feels that this additional two storey 'tower' is not appropriate. Note 5.11 GCC concerned with substantial, generous balconies. How they are overlooking and how they will be used – bicycles, laundry, etc Note Note 5.12 GCC concerned with substantial, generous balconies. How they are overlooking and how they will be used - bicycles, laundry, etc Note 5.13 GCC upreid if studies are taken with or without the N6 future development. Atkins noted model is without the N6 upgrade as this is the worst case. GCC queried if studies are taken wi				
MKO noted that the Phase 1 car park is not part of the current scheme apart from the areas to be taken in charge. Note 5.6 CP noted without knowing the timing of the cinema, the civic square will be affected by wind. Noted the average weather in Galway is not good and the square is exposed at the edges. Note 5.7 GCC requested more detail at the northern boundary with the school. RAU (MF) 14.03.12 5.8 SW noted some healthy existing trees are on the site. Note Note 5.9 CP noted units with direct door access on the new road are good but there are a large amound of utilities before the end of this road. She would prefer more active frontage for pedestrian flow, etc. Note 5.10 CP noted the 'tower' aspect into good design coming from the higher access road as it jars from proportionality and perspective. CP feels that this additional two storey 'tower' is not appropriate. Note 5.11 GCC concerned with substantial, generous balconies. How they are over- looking and how they will be used - bicycles, laundry, etc Note 5.13 GCC noted they have met with Atkins to review traffic and have some issues to be resolved. Note 5.14 GCC queried if studies are taken withor without the N6 future development. Atkins noted model is without the N6 ugrade as this is the worst case. GCC queried if commuter times have been considered. Atkins to confirm in writing to GCC. Note 5.15 </th <th>5.5</th> <th></th> <th>Note</th> <th></th>	5.5		Note	
from the areas to be taken in charge. Note 5.6 CP noted without knowing the timing of the cinema, the civic square will be affected by wind. Noted the average weather in Galway is not good and the square is exposed at the edges. Note 5.7 GCC requested more detail at the northern boundary with the school. RAU (MF) 14.03.15 5.8 SW noted some healthy existing trees are on the site. Note Note 5.9 CP noted units with direct door access on the new road are good but there are a large amount of utilities before the end of this road. She would prefer more active frontage for pedestrian flow, etc. Note 5.10 CP noted the 'towe' aspect into good design coming from the higher access road as it jars from proportionality and perspective. CP feels that this additional two storey 'tower' is not appropriate. Note 5.11 GCC concerned with substantial, generous balconies. How they are overloking and how they will be used - bicycles, laundry, etc Note 5.13 GCC concerned with substantial, generous balconies. How they are overloking node mode lis without the N6 upgrade as this is the worst case. GCC queried if studies are taken with or without the N6 future development. Atkins noted mode lis without the N6 upgrade as this is the worst case. GCC queried if studies are taken with or without the N6 future development. Atkins (SC) 14.03.15 5.14 GCC queried if studies are taken with or without the N6 future development. Atkins (SC) <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>				
5.6 CP noted without knowing the timing of the cinema, the civic square will be affected by wind. Noted the average weather in Galway is not good and the square is exposed at the edges. Note 5.7 GCC requested more detail at the northern boundary with the school. RAU (MF) 14.03.15 5.8 SW noted some healthy existing trees are on the site. Note Note 5.9 CP noted units with direct door access on the new road are good but there are a large amount of utilities before the end of this road. She would prefer more active frontage for pedestrian flow, etc. Note Note 5.0 CP noted units with direct door access on the new road are good but there are a large amount of utilities before the end of this road. She would prefer more active frontage for pedestrian flow, etc. Note Note 5.10 CP noted units flow or cares, on the per yorad. Note Note 5.11 GCC wart more detail on materials, panelling, etc with explanation on how they will be used – bicycles, laundry, etc Note Note 5.13 GCC noted they have met with Atkins to review traffic and have some issues to be resolved. Note Note 5.14 GCC queried if studies are taken with or without the N6 future development. Atkins noted model is without the N6 upgrade as this is the worst case. GCC queried for mouter times have been considered. Atkins to confirm in writing to GCC. Atkins (SC) 14.03.15				
affected by wind. Noted the average weather in Galway is not good and the square is exposed at the edges. RAU (MF) 5.7 GCC requested more detail at the northern boundary with the school. RAU (MF) 14.03.15 SW noted some healthy existing trees are on the site. Note 5.9 CP noted units with direct door access on the new road are good but there are a large amount of utilities before the end of this road. She would prefer more active frontage for pedestrian flow, etc. Note 5.10 CP noted the 'tower' aspect into good design coming from the higher access road as it jars from proportionality and perspective. CP feels that this additional two storey 'tower' is not appropriate. Note 5.11 GCC concerned with substantial, generous balconies. How they are overlooking and how they will be used – bicycles, laundry, etc Note 5.12 GCC concerned with substantial, generous balconies. How they are overlooking and how they will be used – bicycles, laundry, etc Note 5.14 GCC queried if studies are taken with or without the N6 future development. Atkins noted model is without the N6 upgrade as this is the worst case. GCC queried if output these have been considered. Atkins to confirm in writing to GCC. I4.03.15 5.15 GCC have concerns over the trip rates used by Atkins and if the analysis of the junction is robust. GCC do not recommend the use of TRICS. Further meeting with Atkins required. I4.03.15 5.16 A car parking ratio of 0.8 is noted. G				
square is exposed at the edges. RAU (MF) 5.7 GCC requested more detail at the northern boundary with the school. RAU (MF) 5.8 SW noted some healthy existing trees are on the site. Note 5.9 CP noted units with direct door access on the new road are good but there are a large amount of utilities before the end of this road. She would prefer more active frontage for pedestrian flow, etc. Note 5.10 CP noted the 'tower' aspect into good design coming from the higher access road as it jars from proportionality and perspective. CP feels that this additional two storey 'tower' is not appropriate. Note 5.11 GCC concerned with substantial, generous balconies. How they are overlooking and how they will be used – bicycles, laundry, etc Note 5.12 GCC concerned with substantial, generous balconies. How they are overlooking and how they will be used – bicycles, laundry, etc Note 5.13 GCC noted they have met with Atkins to review traffic and have some issues to be resolved. Note 5.14 GCC queried if studies are taken with or without the N6 future development. Atkins noted model is without the N6 upgrade as this is the worst case. GCC queried if commuter times have been considered. Atkins to confirm in writing to GCC. Note 5.15 GCC have concerns over the trip rates used by Atkins and if the analysis of the junction is robust. GCC do not recommend the use of TRICS. Further meeting with Atkins requireed. Note </th <th>5.6</th> <th></th> <th>Note</th> <th></th>	5.6		Note	
5.7 GCC requested more detail at the northern boundary with the school. RAU (MF) 14.03.15 5.8 SW noted some healthy existing trees are on the site. Note 5.9 CP noted units with direct door access on the new road are good but there are a large amount of utilities before the end of this road. She would prefer more active frontage for pedestrian flow, etc. Note 5.10 CP noted the 'tower' aspect into good design coming from the higher access road as it jars from proportionality and perspective. CP feels that this additional two storey 'tower' is not appropriate. Note 5.11 GCC concerned with substantial, generous balconies. How they are overlooking and how they will be used – bicycles, laundry, etc Note 5.12 GCC noted they have met with Atkins to review traffic and have some issues to be resolved. Note 5.14 GCC queried if studies are taken with or without the N6 future development. Atkins noted model is without the N6 upgrade as this is the worst case. GCC queried for commuter times have been considered. Atkins to confirm in writing to GCC. Atkins (SC) 14.03.15 5.15 GC have concerns over the trip rates used by Atkins and if the analysis of the junction is robust. GCC do not recommend the use of TRICS. Further meeting with Atkins required. S.16 A car parking ratio of 0.8 is noted. GCC queried how the residential spaces is managed. Noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking. S.18 GCC queried		, , , , ,		
5.8 SW noted some healthy existing trees are on the site. Note 5.9 CP noted units with direct door access on the new road are good but there are a large amount of utilities before the end of this road. She would prefer more active frontage for pedestrian flow, etc. Note 5.10 CP noted the 'tower' aspect into good design coming from the higher access road as it jars from proportionality and perspective. CP feels that this additional two storey 'tower' is not appropriate. Note 5.11 GCC want more detail on materials, panelling, etc with explanation on how they ware. Note 5.12 GCC concerned with substantial, generous balconies. How they are overlooking and how they will be used – bicycles, laundry, etc Note 5.13 GCC noted they have met with Atkins to review traffic and have some issues to be resolved. Note 5.14 GCC queried if studies are taken with or without the N6 future development. Atkins noted model is without the N6 upgrade as this is the worst case. GCC queried if commuter times have been considered. Atkins to confirm in writing to GCC. Note 5.15 GCC have concerns over the trip rates used by Atkins and if the analysis of the junction is robust. GCC do not recommend the use of TRICS. Further meeting with Atkins required. Note 5.16 A car parking ratio of 0.8 is noted. GCC queried how the residential spaces is managed. Noted that residential parking. Note 5.18 GCC queried if there are any current issue	F 7			14.02.10
5.9 CP noted units with direct door access on the new road are good but there are a large amount of utilities before the end of this road. She would prefer more active frontage for pedestrian flow, etc. Note 5.10 CP noted the 'tower' aspect into good design coming from the higher access road as it jars from proportionality and perspective. CP feels that this additional two storey 'tower' is not appropriate. Note 5.11 GCC concerned with substantial, generous balconies. How they are overlooking and how they will be used – bicycles, laundry, etc Note 5.13 GCC noted they have met with Atkins to review traffic and have some issues to be resolved. Note 5.14 GCC queried if studies are taken with or without the N6 future development. Atkins noted model is without the N6 upgrade as this is the worst case. GCC queried if commuter times have been considered. Atkins to confirm in writing to GCC. Note 5.15 GCC have concerns over the trip rates used by Atkins and if the analysis of the junction is robust. GCC do not recommend the use of TRICS. Further meeting with Atkins required. Note 5.18 GCC queried if there are any current issues with the neighbouring office cars. Note 5.19 GCC queried if one operating. Atkins (SC) 14.03.15 5.18 GCC queried if on the residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking. Note 5.19 </th <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>14.03.19</th>				14.03.19
are a large amount of utilities before the end of this road. She would prefer more active frontage for pedestrian flow, etc. 5.10 CP noted the 'tower' aspect into good design coming from the higher access road as it jars from proportionality and perspective. CP feels that this additional two storey 'tower' is not appropriate. Note 5.11 GCC want more detail on materials, panelling, etc with explanation on how they wear. Note 5.12 GCC concerned with substantial, generous balconies. How they are overlooking and how they will be used – bicycles, laundry, etc Note 5.13 GCC queried if studies are taken with or without the N6 future development. Atkins noted model is without the N6 upgrade as this is the worst case. GCC queried if commuter times have been considered. Atkins to confirm in writing to GCC. Note 5.14 GCC have concerns over the trip rates used by Atkins and if the analysis of the junction is robust. GCC do not recommend the use of TRICS. Further meeting with Atkins required. Atkins (SC) 14.03.15 5.16 A car parking ratio of 0.8 is noted. GCC queried how the residential spaces are allocated. GCC queried if there are any current issues with the neighbouring office cars. Note 5.18 GCC queried how overspill of residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking. Atkins (SC) 14.03.15 5.18 GCC queried how overspill of residential cars into the retail spa				
more active frontage for pedestrian flow, etc. Note 5.10 CP noted the 'tower' aspect into good design coming from the higher access road as it jars from proportionality and perspective. CP feels that this additional two storey 'tower' is not appropriate. Note 5.11 GCC want more detail on materials, panelling, etc with explanation on how they wear. Note 5.12 GCC concerned with substantial, generous balconies. How they are overlooking and how they will be used – bicycles, laundry, etc Note 5.13 GCC noted they have met with Atkins to review traffic and have some issues to be resolved. Note 5.14 GCC queried if studies are taken with or without the N6 future development. Atkins noted model is without the N6 upgrade as this is the worst case. GCC queried if commuter times have been considered. Atkins to confirm in writing to GCC. Note 5.15 GCC have concerns over the trip rates used by Atkins and if the analysis of the junction is robust. GCC do not recommend the use of TRICS. Further meeting with Atkins required. Note 5.16 A car parking ratio of 0.8 is noted. GCC queried how the residential spaces is are allocated. GCC queried if there are any current issues with the neighbouring office cars. Note 5.17 Sigma noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking. Atkins (SC) 14.03.19 managed. Noted that residential parking will be ma	5.9		Note	
5.10 CP noted the 'tower' aspect into good design coming from the higher access road as it jars from proportionality and perspective. CP feels that this additional two storey 'tower' is not appropriate. Note 5.11 GCC want more detail on materials, panelling, etc with explanation on how they wear. Note 5.12 GCC concerned with substantial, generous balconies. How they are overlooking and how they will be used – bicycles, laundry, etc Note 5.13 GCC noted they have met with Atkins to review traffic and have some issues to be resolved. Note 5.14 GCC queried if studies are taken with or without the N6 future development. Atkins noted model is without the N6 upgrade as this is the worst case. GCC queried if commuter times have been considered. Atkins to confirm in writing to GCC. Note 5.15 GCC have concerns over the trip rates used by Atkins and if the analysis of the junction is robust. GCC do not recommend the use of TRICS. Further meeting with Atkins required. Note 5.16 A car parking ratio of 0.8 is noted. GCC queried how the residential spaces are allocated. GCC queried if there are any current issues with the neighbouring office cars. Note 5.17 Sigma noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan. Note 5.18 GCC queried how overspill of residential cars parks. Noted that we w				
road as it jars from proportionality and perspective. CP feels that this additional two storey 'tower' is not appropriate.5.11GCC want more detail on materials, panelling, etc with explanation on how they wear.Note5.12GCC concerned with substantial, generous balconies. How they are over- looking and how they will be used – bicycles, laundry, etcNote5.13GCC noted they have met with Atkins to review traffic and have some issues to be resolved.Note5.14GCC queried if studies are taken with or without the N6 future development. Atkins noted model is without the N6 upgrade as this is the worst case. GCC queried if commuter times have been considered. Atkins to confirm in writing to GCC.Note5.15GCC have concerns over the trip rates used by Atkins and if the analysis of the junction is robust. GCC do not recommend the use of TRICS. Further meeting with Atkins required.Note5.16A car parking ratio of 0.8 is noted. GCC queried how the residential spaces are allocated. GCC queried if there are any current issues with the neighbouring office cars.Note5.17Sigma noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan.Note5.20Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC noted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if addressings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail sp	E 10		Noto	
additional two storey 'tower' is not appropriate. Note 5.11 GCC want more detail on materials, panelling, etc with explanation on how they wear. Note 5.12 GCC concerned with substantial, generous balconies. How they are overloxing and how they will be used – bicycles, laundry, etc Note 5.13 GCC noted they have met with Atkins to review traffic and have some issues to be resolved. Note 5.14 GCC queried if studies are taken with or without the N6 future development. Atkins noted model is without the N6 upgrade as this is the worst case. GCC queried if commuter times have been considered. Atkins to confirm in writing to GCC. Note 5.15 GCC have concerns over the trip rates used by Atkins and if the analysis of the junction is robust. GCC do not recommend the use of TRICS. Further meeting with Atkins required. Atkins (SC) 14.03.15 5.16 A car parking ratio of 0.8 is noted. GCC queried how the residential spaces are allocated. GCC queried if there are any current issues with the neighbouring office cars. Note 14.03.15 5.17 Sigma noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space is managed. Noted that residential parking. Atkins (SC) 14.03.15 5.18 GCC coueried in the residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Noted that residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan. Step spaces on the ro	3.10		NOLE	
5.11 GCC want more detail on materials, panelling, etc with explanation on how they wear. Note 5.12 GCC concerned with substantial, generous balconies. How they are overlooking and how they will be used – bicycles, laundry, etc Note 5.13 GCC noted they have met with Atkins to review traffic and have some issues to be resolved. Note 5.14 GCC queried if studies are taken with or without the N6 future development. Atkins noted model is without the N6 upgrade as this is the worst case. GCC queried if commuter times have been considered. Atkins to confirm in writing to GCC. Note 5.15 GCC have concerns over the trip rates used by Atkins and if the analysis of the junction is robust. GCC do not recommend the use of TRICS. Further meeting with Atkins required. Atkins (SC) 14.03.15 5.16 A car parking ratio of 0.8 is noted. GCC queried how the residential spaces are allocated. GCC queried if there are any current issues with the neighbouring office cars. Note 5.17 Sigma noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking. Note 5.18 GCC queried how overspill of residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Noted that residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan. Step Phase 1 14.03.15 5.19 GCC queried how overspill of residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Noted tha				
they wear.Note5.12GCC concerned with substantial, generous balconies. How they are over- looking and how they will be used – bicycles, laundry, etcNote5.13GCC noted they have met with Atkins to review traffic and have some issues to be resolved.Note5.14GCC queried if studies are taken with or without the N6 future development. Atkins noted model is without the N6 upgrade as this is the worst case. GCC queried if commuter times have been considered. Atkins to confirm in writing to GCC.Note5.15GCC have concerns over the trip rates used by Atkins and if the analysis of the junction is robust. GCC do not recommend the use of TRICS. Further meeting with Atkins required.Atkins (SC)5.16A car parking ratio of 0.8 is noted. GCC queried how the residential spaces are allocated. GCC queried if there are any current issues with the neighbouring office cars.Note5.17Sigma noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking.Atkins (SC)14.03.195.18GCC queried how overspill of residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Noted that residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan.Note5.20Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC noted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if handscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisN	5.11		Note	
5.12 GCC concerned with substantial, generous balconies. How they are overlooking and how they will be used – bicycles, laundry, etc Note 5.13 GCC noted they have met with Atkins to review traffic and have some issues to be resolved. Note 5.14 GCC queried if studies are taken with or without the N6 future development. Atkins noted model is without the N6 upgrade as this is the worst case. GCC queried if commuter times have been considered. Atkins to confirm in writing to GCC. Note 5.15 GCC have concerns over the trip rates used by Atkins and if the analysis of the junction is robust. GCC do not recommend the use of TRICS. Further meeting with Atkins required. Atkins (SC) 14.03.19 5.16 A car parking ratio of 0.8 is noted. GCC queried how the residential spaces are allocated. GCC queried if there are any current issues with the neighbouring office cars. Note Note 5.17 Sigma noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking. Note 14.03.19 5.18 GCC queried how overspill of residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Noted that residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan. 14.03.19 5.19 GCC noted there is plenty of parking and therefore no need for the flanking spaces on the roadway. 14.03.19 5.20 Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off th	5.11		Hote	
Iooking and how they will be used – bicycles, laundry, etc5.13GCC noted they have met with Atkins to review traffic and have some issues to be resolved.Note5.14GCC queried if studies are taken with or without the N6 future development. Atkins noted model is without the N6 upgrade as this is the worst case. GCC queried if commuter times have been considered. Atkins to confirm in writing to GCC.Note5.15GCC have concerns over the trip rates used by Atkins and if the analysis of the junction is robust. GCC do not recommend the use of TRICS. Further meeting with Atkins required.Atkins (SC)14.03.195.16A car parking ratio of 0.8 is noted. GCC queried how the residential spaces are allocated. GCC queried if there are any current issues with the neighbouring office cars.Note5.17Sigma noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking.Atkins (SC)14.03.195.18GCC queried how overspill of residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Noted that residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan.14.03.195.20Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote	5.12		Note	
5.13 GCC noted they have met with Atkins to review traffic and have some issues to be resolved. Note 5.14 GCC queried if studies are taken with or without the N6 future development. Atkins noted model is without the N6 upgrade as this is the worst case. GCC queried if commuter times have been considered. Atkins to confirm in writing to GCC. Note 5.15 GCC have concerns over the trip rates used by Atkins and if the analysis of the junction is robust. GCC do not recommend the use of TRICS. Further meeting with Atkins required. Atkins (SC) 14.03.19 5.16 A car parking ratio of 0.8 is noted. GCC queried how the residential spaces are allocated. GCC queried if there are any current issues with the neighbouring office cars. Note 5.17 Sigma noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking. Note 5.18 GCC queried how the residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Note dthat residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan. 14.03.19 5.19 GCC noted there is plenty of parking and therefore no need for the flanking spaces on the roadway. Note 5.20 Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers. Note 5.21 GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to		-		
to be resolved.Note5.14GCC queried if studies are taken with or without the N6 future development. Atkins noted model is without the N6 upgrade as this is the worst case. GCC queried if commuter times have been considered. Atkins to confirm in writing to GCC.Note5.15GCC have concerns over the trip rates used by Atkins and if the analysis of the junction is robust. GCC do not recommend the use of TRICS. Further meeting with Atkins required.Atkins (SC)14.03.195.16A car parking ratio of 0.8 is noted. GCC queried how the residential spaces are allocated. GCC queried if there are any current issues with the neighbouring office cars.Note5.17Sigma noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking.Atkins (SC)14.03.195.18GCC queried how overspill of residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Noted that residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan.Note14.03.195.19GCC noted there is plenty of parking and therefore no need for the flanking spaces on the roadway.Note14.03.195.21GCC nueried in landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote	5.13		Note	
Atkins noted model is without the N6 upgrade as this is the worst case. GCC queried if commuter times have been considered. Atkins to confirm in writing to GCC.Atkins (SC)14.03.195.15GCC have concerns over the trip rates used by Atkins and if the analysis of the junction is robust. GCC do not recommend the use of TRICS. Further meeting with Atkins required.Atkins (SC)14.03.195.16A car parking ratio of 0.8 is noted. GCC queried how the residential spaces are allocated. GCC queried if there are any current issues with the neighbouring office cars.Note5.17Sigma noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking.Note5.18GCC queried how overspill of residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Noted that residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan.Note5.19GCC noted there is plenty of parking and therefore no need for the flanking spaces on the roadway.Note5.20Note that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC nucted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote		•		
queried if commuter times have been considered. Atkins to confirm in writing to GCC.Atkins (SC)5.15GCC have concerns over the trip rates used by Atkins and if the analysis of the junction is robust. GCC do not recommend the use of TRICS. Further meeting with Atkins required.Atkins (SC)14.03.195.16A car parking ratio of 0.8 is noted. GCC queried how the residential spaces are allocated. GCC queried if there are any current issues with the neighbouring office cars.Note5.17Sigma noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking.Note5.18GCC queried how overspill of residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Noted that residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan.AtkinsSCC5.19GCC noted there is plenty of parking and therefore no need for the flanking spaces on the roadway.Note5.20Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC noted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote	5.14	GCC queried if studies are taken with or without the N6 future development.	Note	
writing to GCC.Atkins (SC)5.15GCC have concerns over the trip rates used by Atkins and if the analysis of the junction is robust. GCC do not recommend the use of TRICS. Further meeting with Atkins required.Atkins (SC)5.16A car parking ratio of 0.8 is noted. GCC queried how the residential spaces are allocated. GCC queried if there are any current issues with the neighbouring office cars.Note5.17Sigma noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking.Note5.18GCC queried how overspill of residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Noted that residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan.Atkins (SC)5.19GCC noted there is plenty of parking and therefore no need for the flanking spaces on the roadway.Note5.20Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC noted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote		Atkins noted model is without the N6 upgrade as this is the worst case. GCC		
5.15GCC have concerns over the trip rates used by Atkins and if the analysis of the junction is robust. GCC do not recommend the use of TRICS. Further meeting with Atkins required.Atkins (SC)14.03.195.16A car parking ratio of 0.8 is noted. GCC queried how the residential spaces are allocated. GCC queried if there are any current issues with the neighbouring office cars.Note5.17Sigma noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking.Note5.18GCC queried how overspill of residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Noted that residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan.Note5.19GCC noted there is plenty of parking and therefore no need for the flanking spaces on the roadway.Note5.20Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC noted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote		queried if commuter times have been considered. Atkins to confirm in		
the junction is robust. GCC do not recommend the use of TRICS. Further meeting with Atkins required.Note5.16A car parking ratio of 0.8 is noted. GCC queried how the residential spaces are allocated. GCC queried if there are any current issues with the neighbouring office cars.Note5.17Sigma noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking.Note5.18GCC queried how overspill of residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Noted that residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan.Note5.19GCC noted there is plenty of parking and therefore no need for the flanking spaces on the roadway.Note5.20Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC noted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote				
meeting with Atkins required.Note5.16A car parking ratio of 0.8 is noted. GCC queried how the residential spaces are allocated. GCC queried if there are any current issues with the neighbouring office cars.Note5.17Sigma noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking.Note5.18GCC queried how overspill of residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Noted that residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan.Atkins (SC)14.03.195.19GCC noted there is plenty of parking and therefore no need for the flanking spaces on the roadway.Note5.20Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC noted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote	5.15		Atkins (SC)	14.03.19
5.16A car parking ratio of 0.8 is noted. GCC queried how the residential spaces are allocated. GCC queried if there are any current issues with the neighbouring office cars.Note5.17Sigma noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking.Note5.18GCC queried how overspill of residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Noted that residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan.Atkins (SC)14.03.195.19GCC noted there is plenty of parking and therefore no need for the flanking spaces on the roadway.NoteNote5.20Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC noted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote				
are allocated. GCC queried if there are any current issues with the neighbouring office cars.Note5.17Sigma noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking.Note5.18GCC queried how overspill of residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Noted that residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan.Atkins (SC)14.03.195.19GCC noted there is plenty of parking and therefore no need for the flanking spaces on the roadway.NoteNote5.20Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC noted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote				
neighbouring office cars.Note5.17Sigma noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking.Note5.18GCC queried how overspill of residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Noted that residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan.Atkins (SC)14.03.195.19GCC noted there is plenty of parking and therefore no need for the flanking spaces on the roadway.NoteNote5.20Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC noted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote	5.16		Note	
5.17Sigma noted that the planning for Phase 2 included a basement void space for Phase 3 residential parking.Note5.18GCC queried how overspill of residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Noted that residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan.Atkins (SC)14.03.195.19GCC noted there is plenty of parking and therefore no need for the flanking spaces on the roadway.NoteNote5.20Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.NoteNote5.21GCC noted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote				
for Phase 3 residential parking.Atkins (SC)5.18GCC queried how overspill of residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Noted that residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan.Atkins (SC)14.03.195.19GCC noted there is plenty of parking and therefore no need for the flanking spaces on the roadway.Note5.20Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC noted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote				
5.18GCC queried how overspill of residential cars into the retail spaces is managed. Noted that residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan.Atkins (SC)14.03.195.19GCC noted there is plenty of parking and therefore no need for the flanking spaces on the roadway.NoteNote5.20Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC noted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote	5.17		Note	
managed. Noted that residential parking will be managed by barriers and clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan.Note5.19GCC noted there is plenty of parking and therefore no need for the flanking spaces on the roadway.Note5.20Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC noted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote	5.40			44.00.40
clamping is already in operation in the retail car parks. Noted that we will provide a parking management plan.Note5.19GCC noted there is plenty of parking and therefore no need for the flanking spaces on the roadway.Note5.20Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC noted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote	5.18		Atkins (SC)	14.03.19
provide a parking management plan.Note5.19GCC noted there is plenty of parking and therefore no need for the flanking spaces on the roadway.Note5.20Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC noted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote				
5.19GCC noted there is plenty of parking and therefore no need for the flanking spaces on the roadway.Note5.20Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC noted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote				
spaces on the roadway.Noted5.20Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC noted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote	5 10		Note	
5.20Noted that we can provide a new bus stop location off the square. GCC noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC noted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote	3.15		Note	
noted this cannot be considered without commitment from providers.Note5.21GCC noted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote	5.20		Note	
5.21GCC noted interest in what is being done to the existing Phase 1 retail car park. GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted thisNote	3.20			
park. GCC queried if landscaping and crossings can be improved. Sigma noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted this	5.21		Note	
noted they are contractually obliged to provide retail spaces. GCC noted this				
is a hostile environment for pedestrians.				
	5.22	•	Ait (RJ)	14.03.19
line. GCC would like to see some improvements made. Further consideration	_			
needed.				

LAFFERTY. Project managers



ITEM	KEY NOTES/ACTIONS ARISING FROM MEETING	ACTION	ACTION BY DATE
5.23	SW noted the design has advanced a lot regarding the recreational quality	Note	
	but he would like to see sustainability in the detail design. Localised		
	attenuation or irrigation should be used as the dry summer of 2018 would		
	be an issue.	•• •	
5.24	SW noted the long-term management of planting should be considered as	Note	
	this wasn't thought of in Phase 1 with arbitrary pots a waste of opportunity.		
	It was noted that the existing car park is on podium and so large planting is		
5.25	not possible.	Noto	
5.25	RAU (MF) noted that visible connections are needed for the retail to work	Note	
	and there are currently three pedestrian links through Phase 1 that will connect to Phase 3. CP noted there is still a chance to link up better with		
	Phase 1.		
5.26	SW queried if there is a chance to soften the Phase 1 development. Sigma	Note	
5.20	noted they are looking at a solution to soften the permitted Drive Thru	Note	
	which would help.		
5.27	CP noted that the Phase 1 car park is linked. She queried the compliance of	Note	
5.27	same and noted that the finishes and walkways could be improved. CP		
	noted that the previous colour variance of the spaces is being removed.		
5.28	CP noted that the residential design is good.	Note	
5.29	CP noted that the density of the whole scheme is good although the	Note	
	significant amount of 1-beds is not great. CP to review the Future Analytics		
	study further.		
5.30	CP would like to see more detail / samples of the elevations and details of	RAU (MF)	14.03.19
	the plaza and noted too much utilities on the link road.		
5.31	GCC noted they are concerned with long term maintenance and	Note	
	sustainability.		
5.32	JD queried if the Creche is moving. JD noted that we need to demonstrate	Note	
	there are sufficient Creche spaces. It was clarified that the Creche in Phase 2		
	has sufficient capacity and this is dealt with in the Planning Report. The		
	space noted in Phase 3 is a Community Space.		
5.33	GCC queried the use of the Community space and noted that we should	Note	
	liaise with potential operators.		
5.34	GCC noted that Taken in Charge was only of concern for the school but no	Note	
	real issue for others. It was noted that a management company currently		
	manages the estate roads. GCC noted there would be a large snag list before		
	roads would be taken in charge and this is the remit of the Roads Dept. GCC		
_ -	noted this is premature at this time.		
5.35	GCC noted the junction is part of the N6 CPO and GCC would take in charge	Note	
	from them.		
6.0	Design Team Response	N 1 - 1	
6.1	RAU (TR) noted that we take public realm design very seriously as will this	Note	
6.2	project.		14 02 10
6.2	RAU (TR) noted that they would like to engage offline with CP to close out	RAU (MF)	14.03.19
	concerns noted today and to show material samples. This was welcomed by CP.		
6.3	RAU (TR) noted they must be guided by national guidelines and this mix is	Note	
0.3	correct. Noted that these apartments are needed in Galway but would like	Note	
	to meet with CP offline to 'put your mind at rest'.		
6.4	RAU (TR) noted they have listened to the view of CP on the higher	Note	
0.4	residential block but disagrees as a designer. TR believes the two-storey	NOLE	
	addition is correct in proportionality and shape and national guidelines take		
			l



ITEM	KEY NOTES/ACTIONS ARISING FROM MEETING	ACTION	ACTION BY DATE
	precedence. CP noted this is open to interpretation and she needs to be convinced.		
6.5	GCC noted a lot of westerly protruding balconies for a Galway site and indented balconies are better. RAU (TR) noted that various architectural language is needed and the vagaries of the planning standards must be dealt with. GCC would like to understand how they will be used and noted the usability of north facing balconies is difficult.	Note	
6.6	RAU noted the usability of the Square is covered in the documents and the communal spaces will be managed by the management company. Metrics will be provided.	Note	
6.7	LB queried how the F&B is serviced. Noted that these are serviced from the rear with ventilation ducts up to the roof.	Note	
6.8	MKO noted it is our intention to close out the issues raised today with GCC and then lodge the Pre-App with ABP. CP noted this is at your discretion. MKO noted we will revert with a timeline but our client is eager to progress.	мко (ѕмс)	14.03.19
6.9	MKO noted that we appreciate the feedback from GCC and their time.	Note	
	End of Meeting		



An Bord Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-304618-19

Case Reference / Description	335 no. apartments and associated site works. Knocknacarra District Centre, Rahoon, Co. Galway.							
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request						
1 st /2 nd /3 rd Meeting	1 st Meeting							
Date:	18 th July 2019	Start Time	11:00 a.m.					
Location	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	12:15 p.m.					
Chairperson Tom Rabbette Executive Officer Ciaran Hand								

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning	
Karen Hamilton, Planning Inspector	
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer	

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Caroline Phelan, Senior Planner
Theo McLoughlin, Executive Engineer Transportation
Susan Loughnane, Executive Engineer Transportation
Joe McGuire, Executive Engineer Water Services
Stephen Walsh, Executive Engineer Water Services
John Doody, Executive Planner
Brendan Gallagher, Senior Executive Engineer
Norann Keane, Administration
Cathy Keane, Executive Technician
Joan Higgins, Administration

Representing Planning Authority

11.1.1

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, along with that file, should an application arise following the conclusion of this consultation process,
- ABP received a submission from the PA on 1st July 2019 providing the records of consultations held pursuant to section 247 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 5th June 2019 formally requesting pre-application consultations with ABP. Prospective applicant advised of the need to comply with definition of SHD as set out in the Act of 2016, in relation to thresholds of development. It was also noted that the Inspector dealing with the pre-application consultation request would be different to who would deal with the application when it was submitted. Recording of the meeting is prohibited.

<u>Agenda</u>

- 1. Compliance with land use zoning,
- 2. Road realignment and taking in charge.
- 3. Development Strategy for the site to include inter alia:
 - Architectural Response and external material rationale,
 - Layout and design of interface areas including the Western Distributor Road, Gaelscoil Mhic Amlaigh and the proposed cinema site.
 - Quality and design of open space provision including sunlight analysis and surveillance,
 - > Daylight and sunlight analysis for Gaelscoil Mhic Amlaigh,
 - Boundary treatments and ground floor design.
- 4. Compliance with S. 28 Guidance.
- 5. Provision of shared services, childcare and residential amenity provision.
- 6. Management of apartments and retail accommodation.
- 7. Any other matters.

1. Compliance with land use zoning

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- The zoning of the site is for CI, commercial / industrial, where commercial use is permitted other than those reserved to the CC, City Centre zoning.
- The site specific zoning supports a small number of retail/ service units in line with the support for District Centres.
- The proposal includes retail/ commercial.

Planning Authority's comments:

The applicant should take a holistic view of the proposed development and the provision of a range of uses within the site is supported.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The proposal includes a mix of uses.
- The exact uses within the units has not been determined as yet.
- > A broad range of proposed uses can be included in any future application.

Further ABP comments:

Justification within the documentation of proposed uses and compliance with any land use zonings.

2. Road realignment and taking in charge

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- > The documentation includes alterations to the road layout.
- > There is a right of way over the current road.
- > It is unclear if the road is a public road/ and or taken in charge.
- > The rate of car parking provision.

Planning Authority's comments:

- > The location of the site is along the Western Bypass which is a strategic corridor.
- > The right of way is not registered.
- > The applicant's proposals are in line with plans for the area and discussions have been held with the N6 Design Team.
- > Car parking spaces of 0.88 are adequate.
- There should be no overflow parking and both commercial and residential should be accommodated.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- More detail will be shown regarding the proposed works, right of way and letters of consent.
- There is on-going discussions with the N6 Design team in regard to the design and potential connection with future proposals.
- > Taken in charge will be shown on a separate drawing.
- CSO stats and public transport have been taken into account when calculating car parking.
- > Retail spaces will have controlled barriers.

Further ABP comments:

- > In regard to ownership show consent letters
- > Clarity in relation to the right of way and/ or taking in charge, including a map.
- > Detail the management of retail parking spaces in particular the proposed spaces within the Gateway Retail Park.
- > There is a need to finalise discussions with the N6 design team as there is no provision for further information in any application.

3. Development Strategy for the site to include inter alia:

- > Architectural Response and external material rationale,
- Layout and design of interface areas including the Western Distributor Road, Gaelscoil Mhic Amlaigh and the proposed cinema site,
- Quality and design of open space provision including sunlight analysis and surveillance,
- > Daylight and sunlight analysis for Gaelscoil Mhic Amlaigh,
- > Boundary treatments and ground floor design.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

The design of Block B, in particular the blank gable elevation onto the western distributor road.

- Details of the proposed interface of the ground floor apartments, in particular design of landscaping adjoining the recycling facilities, protection of residential amenity.
- Separation distance, location of proposed windows and relationship with the Gaelscoil to the north of the site.
- Justification of the proposed external materials, in particular the render, and inclusion of a Building Lifecycle Report.
- The interface between the retail and residential space, in particular the rear of Block D and the open space courtyard.
- The public open space and lack of surveillance and treatment of the MUGA and courtyard at Block B.
- Pedestrian access route between Block B & A is not inviting or appropriately designed for public access.

Planning Authority's comments:

- There is concern over the scale of the proposed development, in particular the 7 storey element of Block B.
- It is considered the 5 storeys is generous.
- The density is compliant with the zoning although it is noted the public road is included within the calculations.
- Urban design is equally important to density.
- More photomontages are required
- Agree with the MUGA surveillance.
- The treatment of the public plaza and management of the spaces requires justification. There is a history on the site which would indicate the space to be privately managed.
- Ensure that the event space is designed under event space protocols
- The public spaces should accommodate all age groups and should integrate age equality proposals
- An ecological report and tree survey should be submitted alongside support for national documentation promoting biodiversity, preventing the use of herbicides and supporting pollinators.
- There are projecting balconies and diagonal access through the courtyard needs to be addressed.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The link to the street has been designed specifically to promote good urban design.
- > The treatment of the ground floor interface will be investigated.
- > Blank gable floors on block B will be examined.
- A scale of 5 and / or more storeys is in line with the national guidelines and the use of a gateway piece will enhance the site.
- Light analysis has been done
- Treatment of retail and associated spaces will be addressed
- Types of activity in spaces will be illustrated.
- Details of the management structure will be submitted
- Trees can be retained and biodiversity examined

- > Access routes to blocks A and B are not gated and the design will be examined.
- The OPW have been contacted and floor plans of the school rooms have been provided.

Further ABP comments:

- There needs to be daylight and sunlight analysis of all areas including existing building, proposed rooms and open space areas.
- Access to the courtyards needs examining and surveillance for the MUGA
- > The inclusion of boundary treatment requires examination.
- Ensure the safety of the access between routes to blocks A and B and interface between retail and residential is considered.

4. Compliance with S. 28 Guidance.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

Compliance with the apartment guidelines, in particular the provision of storage outside the use of kitchen cupboards and bedroom wardrobes.

Planning Authority's comments:

No comment

Prospective Applicant's response:

> There will be compliance with the relevant standards

Further ABP comments:

- Ensure compliance with apartment guidelines and address storage
- 5. Provision of shared services, childcare and residential amenity provision.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Co-working spaces, the servicing of same and provision of public or private facilities
- Justification for the location of the childcare facility within Phase 2, Gateway Retail Park.
- > The proposed childcare spaces, range of facilities and servicing of the overall scheme.
- The use of the Residential amenities spaces included within the ground floor of Block F and provided on separate floor spaces.

Planning Authority's comments:

- > Clarify the proposed crèche figures.
- > The communal space is small and needs proofing
- > There is a need to balance both residential and commercial concerns.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Discussions have taken place within the crèche provider.
- The Phase 2 crèche was to facilitate drop off for the retail and had additional spaces for children in the vicinity.
- The childcare facility could be in phase 3.
- There is an agreement with a crèche provider
- Crèche could serve all the community and not just retail

Further ABP comments:

- Confirmation of the proposed use and management of all the communal residential facilities.
- Ensure compliance with national guidelines
- Detail the proposed crèche figures
- Galway County Childcare Committee should be consulted.

6. Management of apartments and retail accommodation.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

Management in relation to apartments and retail

Planning Authority's comments:

No comment

Prospective Applicant's response:

A management report will be submitted

Further ABP comments:

- Details will be required regarding external materials and finishes in conjunction with a building lifecycle report
- Management of development at operational stage should be outlined in the application.

7. Any other business

ABP comments:

- Justify the housing mix
- NIS shall have regard to the regulations
- Size of the proposal, threshold and provision of Schedule 7 information

Planning Authority's comments:

- Applicant should examine the housing mix, there is an overprovision of one bedroom units.
- Lifetime cycles should be taken into account

Applicants Comments:

- Retail uses will be detailed
- Housing mix is reflective of the trend

- > Civic space is landscaped with tree planting
- > Submission of Schedule 7 information

Conclusions

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

Tom Rabbette Assistant Director of Planning August, 2019







An Bord Pleanála 64 Marlborough Street Dublin 1 D01V902

Our Ref: 180531 Your Ref: ABP-304618-19

01 November 2019

Re: Strategic Housing Development Application to An Bord Pleanála in respect of the development of 332 no. residential units at Knocknacarra District Centre, Gort na Bró, Rahoon, Galway – Part V Provision

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please see below costings in relation to the proposed Part V provision associated with the planning application for the development described above. It is proposed that our client will satisfy the requirements of Part V by providing 41 units in Block B. These 41 units will consist of the 10% requirement for the purposes of Part V with the balance of units being acquired by an Approved Housing Body.

Costs	1 Bed Apartment (5 no.)	2 Bed Apartment (30 no.)	3 Bed Apartment (6 no.)
Size (NIA sqft)	574	866	1,067
Construction Costs	145,790	219,840	270,967
Profit on Costs	14,579	21,984	27,097
Development Cost	31,194	47,038	57,978
Land Cost	TBD	TBD	TBD
(Shortfall) / Surplus	TBD	TBD	TBD
Subtotal	191,563	288,863	356,042
Sales Costs	1,500	1,500	1,500
VAT @ 13.5%	26,063	39,199	48,268
Cost per Unit	219,126	329,561	405,810
Total Cost €	1,095,632	9,886,845	2,434,860



Enclosed with this letter are drawings identifying the location of the proposed Part V Units and detailed drawings of the subject units.

Yours sincerely,

Sean McCarthy BSc. (Hons) MURP MRTPI Project Planner McCarthy Keville O'Sullivan Ltd.



18-179DEVELOPMENT MATRIX - KNOCKNACARRA DISTRICT CENTRE, RAHOON, GALWAY2019 10 30

BLOCK STATISTICS							NIA - SQM							
UNITS NUMBERS GDA - SQM				RESIDENTIAL	RESIDENTIAL AMENITY RETAIL CRECHE COMMUNITY BIKE STORES BIN STORES SERVICES TOTAL NIA/GDA									
BLOCK A			9450	6700	260		174		43	47	145	7369	78%	
L BED	32	33.3%												
2 BED	64	66.7%												
B BED	0	0.0%												
TOTAL	96	100%												
BLOCK B			4207	3274	49	103			54	29		3509	83%	
L BED	5	12.2%												
2 BED	30	73.2%												
B BED	6	14.6%												
TOTAL	41	100%												
BLOCK C			424			275		93		48		416	98%	
BLOCK D			9183	5917		1467				64	75	7523	82%	
L BED	18	22.8%												
2 BED	56	70.9%												
B BED	5	6.3%												
TOTAL	79	100%												
BLOCK E			4944	3105		822				58		3985	81%	
L BED	16	36.4%												
2 BED	24	54.5%												
B BED	4	9.1%												
TOTAL	44	100%												
BLOCK F			7194	5070	161				166	90	155	5642	78%	
L BED	22	30.6%												
2 BED	45	62.5%												
B BED	5	6.9%												
TOTAL	72	100%												
				24066	470	2667	174	93	263	336	375	28444		
TOTAL	332	100%	35402										83%	
L BED	93	28.0%												
2 BED	219	66.0%												
B BED	20	6.0%												
DUAL ASP		203	61%											
	ER 10%	167	50%											

24

ITE AREA (Excludes Phase 02 Basement)	
4323 SQM / 2.43 Ha / 6.01 Acres	
ITE COVERAGE	
0%	
LOT RATIO	
.46	
ESIDENTIAL UNITS PER HECTARE	
37	
VERALL DEVELOPMENT AREA - SQM	
5402	

OMMUNAL RESIDENTIAL AMENITY	SQM
ISTRICT PLAZA	2166
ESIDENTIAL COURTYARD	1350
ANDSCAPED PODIUM	1054
LOCK B LANDSCAPING	475
OTAL	2879
EQUIRED	2167
ESIDENTIAL PARKING	
LOCK F	82
OFF-STREET	3
HASE 02	181
OTAL	266
AR SPACE PER UNIT RATIO	0.80
ESIDENTIAL & VISITOR CYCLE PARKING	
LOCK A - ENCLOSED	64
LOCK B - ENCLOSED	70
LOCK F - ENCLOSED	252
URFACE STAND SPACES	291
OTAL	677
•

5 - Appendix A - Housing Quality Assessment Schedule

2																		
18-179 - Ki	NOCKNACA	RRA DISTRICT CENT	re, rahoon, (GALWAY		BLOCK B												
Level / Floor	Unit Number	Description	Туре	Unit Size (m²)	Unit Size Required	Unit + 10%	Number of Bedrooms	Bed Spaces	Aggregate Bedroom Area (m²)	Aggregate Bedroom Area Required (m²)	Aggregate Living Area (m²)	Aggregate Living Area Required (m²)	Storage Provided in Unit (m²)	Storage Required (m²)	Dual Aspect	Private Amenity Space Provided	Private Amenity Space Required	Communal Amenity Space Required
00 - Ground	1	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment	2 Bed Unit Type J	85.5	73	Yes	2	4	25.4	24.4	30.8	30.0	8.2	6.0	Yes	7.3	7	7
00 - Ground	2	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment	2 Bed Unit Type H	80.5	73	Yes	2	4	24.8	24.4	30.0	30.0	6.9	6.0	Yes	7.4	7	7
00 - Ground	3	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment		80.5	73	Yes	2	4	24.8	24.4	30.0	30.0	6.9	6.0	Yes	7.4	7	7
00 - Ground	4	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment		80.5	73	Yes	2	4	24.8	24.4	30.0	30.0	6.9	6.0	Yes	7.4	7	7
00 - Ground	5	2 Bed - 3 Person Apartment	2 Bed Unit Type K	75.8	63	Yes	2	3	23.5	20.1	28.7	28.0	5.7	5.0	No	7.0	6	6
Totals	5			402.9			10	19										
01 Eirot	6	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment	2 Pad Linit Type	85.5	72	Vec.	2	1 4	25.4	24.4	30.8	30.0	8.2	6.0	Yes	7.3	7	7
01 - First 01 - First	6	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment 2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment		80.5	73 73	Yes Yes	2	4	24.8	24.4	30.0	30.0	6.9	6.0	Yes	7.3	7	7
01 - First	8	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment		80.5	73	Yes	2	4	24.8	24.4	30.0	30.0	6.9	6.0	Yes	7.4	7	7
01 - First	9	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment		80.5	73	Yes	2	4	24.8	24.4	30.0	30.0	6.9	6.0	Yes	7.4	7	7
01 - First	10	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment		80.5	73	Yes	2	4	24.8	24.4	30.0	30.0	6.9	6.0	Yes	7.4	7	7
01 - First	11		1 Bed Unit Type D	53.3	45	Yes	1	2	13.5	11.4	24.9	23.0	3.4	3.0	Yes	5.4	5	5
01 - First	12	2 Bed - 3 Person Apartment		75.8	63	Yes	2	3	23.5	20.1	28.7	28.0	5.7	5.0	No	7.0	6	6
01 - First	13		3 Bed Unit Type C	99.1	90	Yes	3	5	32.1	31.5	34.1	34.0	9.0	9.0	Yes	9.1	9	9
Totals	A			635.9			16	30									Π.	
						-											-	
02 - Second	14	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment		85.5	73	Yes	2	4	25.4	24.4	30.8	30.0	8.2	6.0	Yes	7.3	7	7
02 - Second	15	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment		80.5 80.5	73	Yes	2	4	24.8	24.4	30.0 30.0	30.0 30.0	6.9	6.0	Yes	7.4	7	<u> </u>
02 - Second	16 17	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment 2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment		80.5	73	Yes	2	4	24.8 24.8	24.4	30.0	30.0	6.9	6.0	Yes	7.4	7	7
02 - Second 02 - Second	17	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment 2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment		80.5	73 73	Yes Yes	2	4	24.8	24.4	30.0	30.0	6.9 6.9	6.0 6.0	Yes Yes	7.4	7	7
02 - Second	19		1 Bed Unit Type D	53.3	45	Yes	1	2	13.5	11.4	24.9	23.0	3.4	3.0	Yes	5.4	5	5
02 - Second	20	2 Bed - 3 Person Apartment		75.8	63	Yes	2	3	23.5	20.1	28.7	28.0	5.7	5.0	No	7.0	6	6
02 - Second	20		3 Bed Unit Type C	99.1	90	Yes	3	5	32.1	31.5	34.1	34.0	9.0	9.0	Yes	9.1	9	9
Totals	8			635.9			16	30									~	
J																		
03 - Third	22	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment		85.5	73	Yes	2	4	25.4	24.4	30.8	30.0	8.2	6.0	Yes	7.3	7	7
03 - Third	23	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment		80.5	73	Yes	2	4	24.8	24.4	30.0	30.0	6.9	6.0	Yes	7.4	7	7
03 - Third	24	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment		80.5	73	Yes	2	4	24.8	24.4	30.0	30.0	6.9	6.0	Yes	7.4	7	7
03 - Third	25	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment		80.5	73	Yes	2	4	24.8	24.4	30.0	30.0	6.9	6.0	Yes	7.4	7	7
03 - Third	26	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment		80.5	73	Yes	2	4	24.8	24.4	30.0	30.0	6.9	6.0	Yes	7.4	1	
03 - Third 03 - Third	27 28	2 Bed - 3 Person Apartment	1 Bed Unit Type D	53.3 75.8	45 63	Yes Yes	1 2	2	13.5 23.5	11.4 20.1	24.9 28.7	23.0 28.0	3.4	3.0 5.0	Yes No	5.4 7.0	5	5
03 - Third	28		3 Bed Unit Type C	99.1	90	Yes	3	5	32.1	31.5	34.1	34.0	9.0	9.0	Yes	9.1	9	9
Totals	8	5 Ded Apariment	To bed on Type C	635.9	30	165	16	30	J2.1	51.5	34.1		5.0	5.0	Tes	2.1	3	
Totala	v			003.3			10	00										
04 - Fourth	30	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment	2 Bed Unit Type J	85.5	73	Yes	2	4	25.4	24.4	30.8	30.0	8.2	6.0	Yes	7.3	7	7
04 - Fourth	31	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment	2 Bed Unit Type H	80.5	73	Yes	2	4	24.8	24.4	30.0	30.0	6.9	6.0	Yes	7.4	7	7
04 - Fourth	32	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment		80.5	73	Yes	2	4	24.8	24.4	30.0	30.0	6.9	6.0	Yes	7.4	7	7
04 - Fourth	33	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment		80.5	73	Yes	2	4	24.8	24.4	30.0	30.0	6.9	6.0	Yes	7.4	7	7
04 - Fourth	34	2 Bed - 4 Person Apartment		80.5	73	Yes	2	4	24.8	24.4	30.0	30.0	6.9	6.0	Yes	7.4	7	7
04 - Fourth	35		1 Bed Unit Type D	53.3	45	Yes	1	2	13.5	11.4	24.9	23.0	3.4	3.0	Yes	5.4	5	5
04 - Fourth	36	2 Bed - 3 Person Apartment		75.8	63	Yes	2	3	23.5	20.1	28.7	28.0	5.7	5.0	No	7.0	6	6
04 - Fourth	37	3 Bed Apartment	3 Bed Unit Type C	99.1 635.9	90	Yes	3	5	32.1	31.5	34.1	34.0	9.0	9.0	Yes	9.1	9	9
Totals	8			035.9			16	30										
05 - Fifth	38	1 Red Anartment	1 Bed Unit Type D	53.3	45	Yes	1	2	13.5	11.4	24.9	23.0	3.4	3.0	Yes	5.4	5	5
05 - Fifth	39	2 Bed - 3 Person Apartment		75.8	63	Yes	2	3	23.5	20.1	24.5	28.0	5.7	5.0	No	7.0	6	
05 - Fifth	40		3 Bed Unit Type C	99.1	90	Yes	3	5	32.1	31.5	34.1	34.0	9.0	9.0	Yes	9.1	9	9
Totals	3			228.3			6	10										
06 - Sixth	41	3 Bed Apartment	3 Bed Unit Type C	99.1	90	Yes	3	5	32.1	31.5	34.1	34.0	9.0	9.0	Yes	9.1	9	9
Totals	1			99.1			3	5									472.	
Totals:	41	Apartments		3274 m²		41	83	154							35			283
Percentages:						100%												

BLOCK B - GROSS INTER	RNAL AREA
-----------------------	-----------

Name	Area
------	------

Block B Level GF GIA	762 m ²
Block B Level 01 GIA	748 m ²
Block B Level 02 GIA	748 m ²
Block B Level 03 GIA	749 m ²
Block B Level 04 GIA	748 m ²
Block B Level 05 GIA	303 m ²
Block B Level 06 GIA	149 m ²
	4207 m ²

E	BLOCK B - BIN STO	ORE
Level	Name	Area

Ground Floor Level

Ground Floor Level	BIN STORE	29 m²
		$00 m^{2}$

29 m²

BLOCK B - BIKE	STORE
Name	Area

Ground Floor Level	
BIKE STORE	54 m²

BLOCK B - NET INTERNAL AREA - RESIDENTIAL					
TYPE	Count	Area			
1 BED TYPE D	5	267 m ²			
2 BED TYPE H	19	1530 m ²			
2 BED TYPE J	5	427 m ²			
2 BED TYPE K	6	455 m ²			
3 BED TYPE C	6	595 m ²			
	41	3274 m ²			

BLOCK	B - RETAIL INFORM	IATION
Level	Name	Area

Ground Floor Level

Ground	RETAIL / F&B	103 m ²
Floor Level		

103 m²



BLOCK B - APT TOTALS SCHEDULES	

Туре	Count
XXXX-RAU-ZZ-XX-M3-A-5000_2 Bed Unit Type H.rvt	19
XXXX-RAU-ZZ-XX-M3-A-5000_2 Bed Unit Type J.rvt	5
XXXX-RAU-ZZ-XX-M3-A-5005_1 Bed Unit Type D.rvt	5
XXXX-RAU-ZZ-XX-M3-A-5010_2 Bed Unit Type K.rvt	6
XXXX-RAU-ZZ-XX-M3-A-5012_3 Bed Unit Type C.rvt	6

Grand total: 41

BLOCK B - RESIDENTIAL AMENITY		
Level	Name	Area

Ground Floor Level

Ground Floor Level	RESIDENTIAL OFFICE	17 m²
Ground Floor Level	LOBBY	31 m ²

49 m²

3 BED APARTMENT TYPOLOGIES

3 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE A 1 : 100



3 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE B 1 : 100



1 BED APARTMENT TYPOLOGIES

1 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE F 1:100







1 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE A.1

1:100







1 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE B 1 : 100

1 BED TYPE B 51.17 m²

3 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE C 1 : 100



3 BED TYPE C



1 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE C.1 1:100



1 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE C 1 : 100



1 BED TYPE C 45.17 m²

1 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE D 1 : 100



1 BED TYPE D



DO NOT SCALE FROM THIS DRAWING. USE FIGURED DIMENSIONS IN ALL CASES. VERIFY DIMENSIONS ON SITE AND REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES TO THE ARCHITECTS IMMEDIATELY. THIS DRAWING TO BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE ARCHITECTS SPECIFICATION. © THIS DRAWING IS COPYRIGHT AND MAY ONLY BE REPRODUCED WITH THE ARCHITECTS -PERMISSION.-Entrance/Hallway Kitchen / Dining / Living Note: Refer to quality apartment assessment for private

Scale@A1 1:100

Drawn By:

O.MORGAN

Revision

А

2 BED APARTMENT TYPOLOGIES

2 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE H 1 : 100



2 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE D 1 : 100



2 BED TYPE H

2 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE A 1 : 100



2 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE I 1 : 100



2 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE E 1 : 100



2 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE B 1 : 100



2 BED TYPE B 75.09 m²

2 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE J 1 : 100



2 BED TYPE J

2 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE F 1:100



2 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE C 1 : 100



2 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE C_01 1 : 100

2 BED TYPE F_01

78.13 m²

Ensuite 3.56 m²

chen / Dining Living

2 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE F_01

Bedroom 0

1600

1:100

Storage 3.50 m²





1:100



2 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE K 1 : 100





2 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE C_02

1:100

2 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE G



2 BEDROOM APARTMENT TYPE L 1 : 100

Notes: DO NOT SCALE FROM THIS DRAWING. USE FIGURED DIMENSIONS IN ALL CASES. VERIFY DIMENSIONS ON SITE AND REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES TO THE ARCHITECTS IMMEDIATELY. THIS DRAWING TO BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE ARCHITECTS SPECIFICATION. © THIS DRAWING IS COPYRIGHT AND MAY ONLY BE REPRODUCED WITH THE ARCHITECTS PERMISSION.
Drawing Notes:
Bathroom
Bedroom 01
Bedroom 02
Bedroom 03
Ensuite
Entrance/Hallway
H.P
Kitchen / Dining / Living
Storage
Note: Refer to quality apartment assessment for private amenity space per apartment.



P18179-RAU-ZZ-XX-DR-A-SLP-7151

А



Comhairle Cathrach na Gaillimhe Galway City Council Halla na Cathrach Bóthar an Choláiste Gaillimh H91 X4K8

City Hall College Road Galway H91 X4K8

11th September 2019

Clíodhna Bourke Graduate Planner MKO Tuam Road Galway

Carl KOS Received on 13: SEP 2019

Re: Part V – Strategic Housing Development Gateway Phase III, Knocknacarra

A Chara,

I wish to acknowledge receipt of your proposal to satisfy the Part V liability on the site on the Strategic Housing Development Application for Gateway Phase III in Knocknacarra, Galway of 332 units to provide 41 units in Block B of the development for social housing. These 41 units will consist of the 10% requirement for Part V social housing with the proposal for the balance of units being acquired by an Approved Housing Body.

Galway City Council <u>are agreeable in principle</u> to this proposal subject to a review of actual costings provided once the final grant of planning permission is received.

Yours sincerely,

10. Rhe

Laura Sharkey A/Administrative Officer Housing Capital Department

Fáiltítear roimh chomhfhreagras i nGaeilge / Correspondence in Irish is welcomed



\mathbf{O}

APPENDIX C

STATEMENT OF CONSISTENCY

Table of Contents

1.	Compliance with the National Planning framework	2
2.	Compliance with Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas (Cities, Towns & Villages), 2009	4
3.	Compliance with The Urban Design Manual: A best practice guide 2009	5
4.	Compliance with the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2018	7
5.	compliance with the Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2018	.11
6.	compliance with the Draft Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (Northern & Western Regional Assembly)	.12
7.	compliance with Childcare Facilities – Guidelines for planning authorities 2001	.12
8.	Compliance with the Galway City Development Plan 2017-2023 (GCDP)	.13

1. COMPLIANCE WITH THE NATIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK

Chapter	Policy Objective	Guidance / Requirement	Statement of Consistency
Chapter 2: A New Way Forward	National Policy Objective 3a	Deliver at least 40% of all new homes nationally, within the built-up footprint of existing settlements.	The proposed development will provide 332 no. residential units on residential zoned land within the Settlement of Galway City.
Chapter 2: A New Way Forward	National Policy Objective 3b	Deliver at least half (50%) of all new homes that are targeted in the five Cities and suburbs of Dublin, Cork, Limerick, Galway and Waterford, within their existing built-up footprints.	The proposed development will provide 332 no. residential units within the existing built-up footprint of Galway City.
Chapter 6 - People, Homes and Communities	National Policy Objective 32	To target the delivery of 550,000 additional households to 2040.	The proposed development will provide 332 no. residential units which will assist in the delivery of additional households.
Chapter 6 - People, Homes and Communities	National Policy Objective 33	Prioritise the provision of new homes at locations that can support sustainable development and at an appropriate scale of provision relative to location.	The proposed site forms part of the Knocknacarra District Centre which is an appropriate location for new residential development. The Galway City Development Plan identifies this site as being suitable for residential development which will ensure the protection of existing residential amenity and will contribute to sustainable residential neighbourhoods.
Chapter 6 – People, Homes and Communities	National Policy Objective 34	Support the provision of lifetime adaptable homes that can accommodate the changing needs of a household over time.	The proposed development provides for 332 no. residential units and provides a significant response to Galway's housing needs in accordance with the adopted Housing Strategy. The scheme includes a range of house types and sizes:

Chapter	Policy Objective	Guidance / Requirement	Statement of Consistency
			 93 no. 1 bed apartments 219 no. 2 bed apartments 20 no. 3 bed apartments 20 no. 3 bed apartments The development proposal is cognisant of demographic shifts that are occurring in Galway i.e. the trend towards smaller household sizes. The makeup of the proposed development is reflective of this demographic trend in that 93% of the units proposed are 1 and 2 bed. In addition, the units have been designed to comply with energy efficiency standards.
Chapter 6 – People, Homes and Communities	National Policy Objective 35	Increase residential density in settlements, through a range of measures including reductions in vacancy, re-use of existing buildings, infill development schemes, area or site- based regeneration and increased building heights	The area in which the development is proposed can be characterised by established residential development. The proposed development proposes increased building heights in compliance with the National Planning Framework and the Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines for Planning Authorities.

2. COMPLIANCE WITH SUSTAINABLE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN URBAN AREAS (CITIES, TOWNS & VILLAGES), 2009

Apartment Design Standards	Guidance / Requirement	Statement of Consistency
Sequential Approach to the Development	The Guidelines reinforce the need to adopt a sequential approach to the development of land and note in Section 2.3 and 'the sequential approach as set out in the Departments Development Plan Guidelines (DoEHLG, 2007) specifies that zoning shall extend outwards from the centre of an urban area, with undeveloped lands closest to the core and public transport routes being given preference, encouraging infill opportunities'.	The subject site is zoned for 'Commerical' use under the operative GCDP, with a specific objective requiring the provision of residential development.
Community Facilities	Sustainable neighbourhoods require a range of community facilities, and each district/neighbourhood will need to be considered within its own wider locality, as some facilities may be available in the wider area while others will need to be provided locally	The proposal includes a communal facility.
Density	 Development sites which are identified for increased levels of density, among others, are those located on public transport corridors. The guidelines state the following in respect of such sites- 'In general, minimum net densities of 50 dwellings per hectare, subject to appropriate design and amenity standards, should be applied within public transport corridors, with the highest densities being located at rail 	The subject site exceeds the minimum net density threshold specified in the Guidelines.
	stations/bus stops, and decreasing with distance away from such nodes.'	

3. COMPLIANCE WITH THE URBAN DESIGN MANUAL: A BEST PRACTICE GUIDE 2009

Criteria	Guidance / Requirement	Statement of Consistency
Context	How does the development respond to its surroundings?	The area is characterised by existing and emerging residential development. The proposed development is responsive to the site context and is in keeping with the existing character, amenity, heritage, environment and landscape of the surrounding area. The scheme as proposed conforms with the surrounding area in terms of its scale, height, massing, building line and housing mix.
Connections	How well connected is the new neighbourhood?	The proposal includes for vehicular, public transport, cycle and pedestrian linkages to the surrounding area.
Inclusivity	How easily can people use and access the development?	The scheme has been developed to create a new inclusive neighbourhood development. The proposal seeks to develop a series of accessible, safe play and amenity spaces, across the site. There is a range of public, communal and private amenity spaces and facilities for children of different ages, parents and the elderly. The proposed development will provide a variety of vehicle, and pedestrian routes throughout the site. The development will also provide disabled car parking spaces.
Variety	How does the development promote a good mix of activities?	There is a variety of unit types proposed, the design of which reflects the contemporary Galway vernacular aesthetic through the use of materials, colour and detailing.
Efficiency	How does the development make appropriate use of resources, including land?	The proposal harnesses the potential of higher density, taking into account appropriate accessibility by public transport and the objectives of good design. The proposed development layout achieves 137 units/hectare. The proposed density makes efficient use of zoned and serviced lands within Galway City. Landscaped areas are also designed to provide amenity and biodiversity, to protect buildings and spaces from the elements and to incorporate a sustainable

Criteria	Guidance / Requirement	Statement of Consistency
		drainage system. Buildings and public spaces are laid out to exploit the best solar orientation. Appropriate recycling facilities are also provided.
Distinctiveness	How do the proposals create a sense of place?	The proposed development is designed around a large civic open space which will become a focal point for the development itself but also the surrounding neighbourhood. It will also form the basis of the placemaking strategy for the development.
Layout	How does the proposal create people friendly streets and spaces?	The proposed development is designed around a large civic open space which will become a focal point for the development itself but also the surrounding neighbourhood. It will also provide high quality communal open spaces.
Public Realm	How safe, secure and enjoyable are the public areas?	The proposed development is designed around a large civic open space which will become a focal point for the development itself but also the surrounding neighbourhood. This civic space can be utilised for a wide variety of activities and will be overlooked by apartments on three sides. The other open space areas in the development and the pedestrian linkages between them are also all overlooked. A detailed public lighting scheme is being proposed to ensure that these areas are well it at night.
Adaptability	How will the buildings cope with change?	The unit typology of the proposed development has been designed in accordance with the Housing Need Assessment which is enclosed with this submission. This assessment identifies demographic trends into the future and the proposed development has been designed to take account of these trends i.e. growth in smaller households and associated demand for 1 and 2 bed units.
Privacy and Amenity	How does the scheme provide a decent standard of amenity?	The proposed development incorporates 4 no. high quality public amenity spaces in the form of the civic square, the courtyard and the podium open space area and the areas in the vicinity of Block B. These areas have been designed to a high quality, as per the enclosed landscape drawings and documentation and will provide a high standard of amenity. Each individual unit also has private open space provision in accordance with the standards set out in the

Criteria	Guidance / Requirement	Statement of Consistency
		Apartment Guidelines. The private open space areas will be designed in such a way as to avoid overlooking and therefore maintain privacy.
Parking	How will the parking be secure and attractive?	Appropriate car parking is provided in 3 no. separate locations, on-street, under the landscaped podium and in the underground car park in Phase 2 of the existing Gateway Development. The majority of the spaces are located in the underground car park and these are secure and have no visual impact. The podium car parking has been integrated with the podium open space area in a way which is secure and attractive.
Detailed Design	How well thought through is the building and landscape design?	A Design Statement prepared by Reddy Architecture is enclosed with this submission. This document provides detail in respect of the design principles behind the proposed development. A comprehensive landscaping plan has been prepared by Ait Landscaping which incorporates extensive areas of open space design.

4. COMPLIANCE WITH THE SUSTAINABLE URBAN HOUSING: DESIGN STANDARDS FOR NEW APARTMENTS GUIDELINES FOR PLANNING AUTHORITIES 2018

Apartment Design Standards	Guidance / Requirement	Statement of Consistency
Specific Planning Policy Requirement 1	Apartment developments may include up to 50% one-bedroom or studio type units (with no more than 20-25% of the total proposed development as studios) and there shall be no minimum requirement for apartments with three or more bedrooms. Statutory development plans may specify a mix for apartment and other housing developments, but only further to an evidence based	 The scheme includes a range of unit types and sizes: 93 no. 1 bed apartments (28%) 219 no. 2 bed apartments (66%) 20 no. 3 bed apartments (6%)

Apartment Design Standards	Guidance / Requirement	Statement of Consistency
	Housing Need and Demand Assessment (HNDA), that has been agreed on an area, county, city or metropolitan area basis and incorporated into the relevant development plan(s).	
Specific Planning Policy Requirement 2	 For all building refurbishment schemes on sites of any size, or urban infill schemes on sites of up to 0.25ha: Where up to 9 residential units are proposed, notwithstanding SPPR 1, there shall be no restriction on dwelling mix, provided no more than 50% of the development (i.e. up to 4 units) comprises studio-type units; Where between 10 to 49 residential units are proposed, the flexible dwelling mix provision for the first 9 units may be carried forward and the parameters set out in SPPR 1, shall apply from the 10th residential 6 unit to the 49th; For schemes of 50 or more units, SPPR 1 shall apply to the entire development. 	Not Applicable – The development is not a refurbishment or urban infill scheme.
Specific Planning Policy Requirement 3	 Minimum Apartment Floor Areas: Studio apartment (1 person) 37 sq.m 1-bedroom apartment (2 persons) 45 sq.m 2-bedroom apartment (4 persons) 73 sq.m 3-bedroom apartment (5 persons) 90 sq.m 	As per the Architectural Area Schedule prepared by Reddy Architecture.
Specific Planning Policy Requirement 4	Section 3.16 requires minimum 50% dual aspect apartments in urban locations. This may be reduced to a minimum 33% in certain circumstances where it is necessary to ensure good street frontage and subject to high quality design, usually on inner urban sites, near to city or town centres, including SDZ areas.	The apartment buildings have been carefully sited to exploit solar orientation. There is a limited number of single aspect units throughout the entire scheme. This will ensure that residents can benefit from both morning and evening light and reduce the use of artificial lighting. The majority of units across the development are dual aspect.
Specific Planning Policy Requirement 5	Section 3.20 requires that minimum ceiling heights accord with the Building Regulations (i.e. 2.4m). Ceiling heights at ground floor level should be greater, a minimum 2.7m and designers should consider 3.0m on the ground floor of multi-storey buildings.	Ceiling heights provided are well in excess of the minimum standards proposed.

Apartment Design Standards	Guidance / Requirement Statement of Consistency			
Floor to Ceiling Height				
Specific Planning Policy Requirement 6	A maximum of 12 apartments per floor per core may be provided in apartment schemes. This maximum provision may be increased for building refurbishment schemes on sites of any size or urban infill schemes on sites of up to 0.25ha, subject to overall design quality and compliance with building regulations.	The proposed development accords with this requirement.		
Other Design Criteria				
Internal Storage	Section 3.30 states that provision should be made for storage and utility (additional to kitchen/bedroom furniture), specifically for household utility functions such as clothes washing and the storage of bulky personal or household items. Section 3.32 and 3.33 states that secure storage can be provided outside individual units, and this may be used to satisfy up to half of the minimum storage requirement for individual apartment units.	Standard levels of storage have been provided within the Apartments.		
Private Amenity Space	Section 3.35 requires that private amenity space shall be provided in the form of gardens or patios/terraces for ground floor apartments and balconies at upper levels.	The proposed development has been designed in accordance with the relevant private and public amenity space standards.		
Security Considerations	Section 3.40 states that apartment developments should provide residents and visitors with a sense of safety, by maximising natural surveillance of streets, open spaces, play areas and any surface bicycle or car parking. Accordingly, blocks and buildings should overlook the public realm. Entrance points should be clearly indicated, well lit, and overlooked by adjoining dwellings. Particular attention should be given to the security of ground floor apartments and access to internal and external communal areas.	The proposed development has been designed in such way so that the public realm is always overlooked.		

Apartment Design Standards	Guidance / Requirement	Statement of Consistency
Communal Facilities in Apartments: Access and Services	Section 4.1 requires apartment schemes to be capable of meeting the changing needs of occupants through compliance with Part M of the building regulations	The proposed development has been designed to accord with Part M of the Building Regulations.
Refuse Storage	Section 4.8 requires that provision shall be made for the appropriate storage and collection of waste materials in apartment schemes. Within apartments, there should be adequate provision for the temporary storage of segregated materials prior to deposition in communal waste storage.	Recycling and bin stores are provided for all apartments in shared and screened facilities located adjacent to each of the apartment buildings.
Communal Amenity Facilities	Section 4.10 requires the provision and proper future maintenance of well- designed communal amenity space is critical in meeting the amenity needs of residents. The design must ensure that the heights and orientation of adjoining blocks permit adequate levels of sunlight.	The proposed development provides for a range of amenity and common spaces. The proposed public open space is comprised of a high-quality scheme of landscaping, which include areas of formal and informal play and passive amenity areas.
Children's Play	Section 4.13 requires that the recreational needs of children must be considered as part of communal amenity space within apartment schemes.	The proposed scheme includes a central area of public open space designed to incorporate both formal and informal play areas as well as a MUGA for Children's Play.
Bicycle Parking	Section 4.15 states that bicycle parking provision for residential development generally is a matter for individual planning authorities. Where provided, bicycle parking spaces should be conveniently accessible to residents, both in terms of proximity to access points i.e. stair/lift cores to apartments and routes to the external road/ street network.	Bicycle stands are proposed within the development to encourage non-motorised transport to and from the site. A total of 677 no. bicycle parking spaces are proposed.
Car Parking	Section 4.18 states that the quantum of car parking provision for residential developments generally is a matter for individual planning authorities having regard to local circumstances (notably location and access to public transport).	Car parking provided is in accordance with the Galway City Development Plan. The scheme proposes 266 no. car parking spaces in total which equates to 0.80 spaces per unit.

Apartment Design Standards	Guidance / Requirement	Statement of Consistency
Specific Planning Policy Requirements 7 to 9	Specific Planning Policy Requirements 7 to 9 relate to Build to Rent (BTR) and Shared Accommodation are not relevant to the current proposal.	N/A

5. COMPLIANCE WITH THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND BUILDING HEIGHT GUIDELINES FOR PLANNING AUTHORITIES 2018

Policy/Section	Guidance / Requirement	Statement of Consistency
Section 1.9	These guidelines require that the scope to consider general building heights of at least three to four storeys, coupled with appropriate density, in locations outside what would be defined as city and town centre areas, and which would include suburban areas, must be supported in principle at development plan and development management levels.	Please see Section 7.1.4 of Planning Report.
SPPR 4	It is a specific planning policy requirement that in planning the future development of greenfield or edge of city/town locations for housing purposes, planning authorities must secure: 1. the minimum densities for such locations set out in the Guidelines issued by the Minister under Section 28 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), titled "Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas (2007)" or any amending or replacement Guidelines; 2. a greater mix of building heights and typologies in planning for the future development of suburban locations; and 3. avoid mono-type building typologies (e.g. two storey or own-door houses only), particularly, but not exclusively so in any one development of 100 units or more	Please see Section 7.1.3 of Planning Report.

6. COMPLIANCE WITH THE DRAFT REGIONAL SPATIAL AND ECONOMIC STRATEGY (NORTHERN & WESTERN REGIONAL ASSEMBLY)

Regional Policy Objective	Guidance / Requirement	Statement of Consistency
Regional Policy Objective 11	Deliver at least 50% of new city housing within the existing built-up footprint of Galway City and suburbs.	The proposed development will provide 332 no. residential units in Galway City
Regional Policy Objective 19	Support the design of new/replacement/ refurbished dwellings to high energy efficiency standards that fully avail of renewable technologies, maximise solar gain, utilizing modern materials and design practices.	The proposed dwellings will be built to high energy efficiency standards.

7. COMPLIANCE WITH CHILDCARE FACILITIES – GUIDELINES FOR PLANNING AUTHORITIES 2001

Criteria	Guidance / Requirement	Statement of Consistency
Section 2.4 Appropriate Locations	Planning authorities should require the provision of at least one	Please see Section 7.7 of the Planning Report
for Childcare Facilities	childcare facility for new housing areas unless there are significant	
	reasons to the contrary for example, development consisting of	
	single bed apartments or where there are adequate childcare	
	facilities in adjoining developments. For new housing areas, an	
	average of one childcare facility for each 75 dwellings would be	
	appropriate.	

Criteria	Guidance / Requirement	Statement of Consistency

8. COMPLIANCE WITH THE GALWAY CITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2017-2023 (GCDP)

Chapter	Policy Objective	Development Plan Criteria	Statement of Compliance
Chapter 1 The Core Strategy	Section 1.4 Galway City	The Core Strategy includes for Galway to continue to be the regional growth centre and to create the synergies for wider prosperity in the West Region. The strengthening of the Gateway is considered to be mutually beneficial to the region and providing for housing demands and employment opportunities will be a critical factor in achieving this role.	The proposed development provides for the creation of a high quality, residential accommodation and ancillary facilities to serve the existing and future needs of the City's population. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
Chapter 2 Housing and Sustainable Neighbourhoods	Policy 2.2 Housing Strategy	Support a diverse range of housing types, sizes and tenures within housing developments in he interests of countering undue segregation and to allow for choice of community, for al persons irrespective of age, culture social background or ability.	 The scheme includes a range of unit types and sizes: 93 no. 1 bed apartments (28%) 219 no. 2 bed apartments (66%) 20 no. 3 bed apartments (6%)
Chapter 2 Housing and Sustainable Neighbourhoods	Policy 2.4 Neighbourhood Concepts	Encourage the development of sustainable residential neighbourhoods, which will provide for high quality, safe, accessible living environments which accommodates local community needs. Encourage sustainable neighbourhoods, through	The proposed development has been designed to function as a sustainable residential neighbourhood which will enhance the residential offering of Galway City.

Chapter	Policy Objective	Development Plan Criteria	Statement of Compliance
		appropriate guidelines and standards and through the implementation of local area plans, masterplans / frameworks / area plans.	
Chapter 2 Housing and Sustainable Neighbourhoods	Policy 2.5 Established Suburbs	Encourage higher residential densities at appropriate locations especially close to public transport routes Ensure that sustainable neighbourhoods are places where housing, streets, open spaces and local facilities come together in a coherent, integrated and attractive form. Ensure the layout of residential developments has regard to adjoining developments. Encourage a mix of housing types and sizes within residential developments. Encourage the use of homezones within residential developments. Require residential developments. Require residential developments of over 10 units to provide recreational facilities as an integral part of the proposed open space. Ensure a balance between the reasonable protection of the residential amenities of the outer suburbs and the protection of the established character and the need to provide for sustainable residential	The proposed development has been designed to ensure the protection of the residential amenity of adjoining and adjacent residential properties. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
Chapter 3 Transportation	Policy 3.2 Land Use and Transportation	Promote sustainable residential densities particularly along and close to routes where the Galway Transportation Strategy has proposals	The application site is located immediately adjacent to the 411 and 412 bus routes which are major arterial public transport routes linking the western suburbs with Galway City Centre. These routes combined operate 4 times per hour (every 15 minutes) between the application site and the City Centre. There are bus stops serving both

Chapter	Policy Objective	Development Plan Criteria	Statement of Compliance
		for a high-quality sustainable transport network service. Require new developments to be permeability proofed for walking, cycling and for access to public transport routes and endeavor to maximise permeability in existing developments and retain existing local links.	of these routes located in the immediate vicinity of the application site.
	Section 3.6 Cycling and Walking	Promote, facilitate and maintain maximum connectivity and permeability for pedestrians and cyclists in the design of new developments and in upgrading existing developments in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Urban</i> <i>Roads and Streets (2013)</i> and <i>Permeability a best practice guide</i> <i>(NTA, 2015)</i>	A total of 677 bicycle parking spaces are provided in the scheme.
	Policy 3.7 Road and Street Network and Accessibility	Implement best practice in road and street design as set out in the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (2013). Promote accessibility for people with disabilities and people with reduced mobility and have regard to best practice guidance from the National Disability Authority (NDA).	The proposed development has been designed in accordance with the principles of the <i>Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets</i> (DMURS).
Chapter 4 Natural Heritage, Recreation and Amenity	Section 4.2.1 European Designated Sites		MKO Ltd. Planning and Environmental Consultants have prepared a Natura Impact Statement to accompany the planning application.

Chapter	Policy Objective	Development Plan Criteria	Statement of Compliance
		Assessment of Plans and Projects in Ireland (2009) and potential impacts identified in the Natura Impact Report (NIR) of the City Development Plan relating to habitat loss and fragmentation, water quality, disturbance and in combination effects.	This assessment concludes that the proposed development will not have an impact on any European Site
Chapter 4 Natural Heritage, Recreation and Amenity	Policy 4.5.1 Community Spaces; Greenways	Continue to develop and improve the greenway network in the city, providing alternative accessible circulation routes for pedestrians and cyclists, for the enjoyment of the entire community.	The proposed development provides pedestrian linkages to the existing pedestrian network which in turn link into the green network in this part of the city (See Section 7.4.1 in the report)
Chapter 7 Community and Culture	Policy 7.4.3 Childcare Facility Education	Contribute to the provision of childcare facilities by requiring that such facilities be provided in conjunction with residential developments over 75 dwelling units.	Please see Section 7.7 of the Planning Report
Chapter 8 Built Heritage and Urban Design	Section 8.7 Urban Design	 Principles of good urban design: Character; Legibility; Ease of Movement and Connectivity; Quality of the Public Realm; Continuity and Enclosure; Diversity and Adaptability; Environmental Responsibility 	The scheme is supported by a Design Statement prepared by Reddy Architecture.
		Building Height: In the context of the city which is predominantly low rise with its sensitive historic core and unique natural amenity setting, there is little capacity for dramatic increases in	The height of the proposed development is considered to be appropriate in the context of the application site. Please refer to the Design Statement prepared by Reddy Architecture.

Chapter	Policy Objective	Development Plan Criteria	Statement of Compliance
		 height, however, it is recognised that modest increases at appropriate locations, can help use land efficiently and provide for sustainable high densities. In the assessment of development proposals, the following principles will be considered when assessing capacity for height: Protection of existing built heritage and residential amenity. Creation of landmarks that enhance the city's legibility without eroding its innate character. Retention of existing benchmark heights so as to retain strategic views and to protect and enhance the general character of sensitive locations. Promotion of higher density at centres/nodes of activity, on large scale infill sites and along public transport corridors. 	
Chapter 9 Environment and Infrastructure	Policy 9.5 Sustainable Building Design and Construction	Increase the energy performance of future buildings in the city by encouraging energy efficiency and energy conservation in the design and construction of development. Encourage new development to limit greenhouse gas emissions and make use of opportunities for renewable and low carbon energy including	All units are designed to a high standard of energy performance.

Chapter	Policy Objective	Development Plan Criteria	Statement of Compliance
		through design, layout, orientation and use of materials.	
Chapter 11 Land Use Zoning Objectives and Development	11.2.8 CI Commercial Land Use Zoning Objectives	The Development Plan sets out the land use zoning objectives for different areas within the City and indicates examples of uses that may or may not be acceptable within each use zone. Zoning seeks to promote the development of uses that achieve the objectives for the area concerned and to prevent the development of incompatible uses.	The proposed site is zoned Commercial (CI) within the Galway City Development Plan 2017-2023. This site forms part of the Knocknacarra District Centre where residential content is required. It is considered that the proposed development accords with the zoning objective and the site-specific zoning objectives in the City Development Plan.
Chapter 11 Land Use Zoning Objectives and Development	Section 11.3.1(a)	All relevant residential development shall comply with the requirements of the Housing Strategy.	The proposed development provides for 335 no. residential units and provides a significant response to Galway's needs in accordance with the adopted Housing Strategy 2017-2023.
Chapter 11 Land Use Zoning Objectives and Development		Planning applications for residential developments on sites over one hectare in area shall include a design statement that demonstrates the relationship between the proposed development to the site context, adjoining developments, the achievement of safe and convenient movement within the site, and how existing features are to be integrated into the development.	The scheme is supported by Design Statement prepared by Reddy Architecture.
Chapter 11 Land Use Zoning Objectives and Development		Residential development shall be laid out in such a way so as to maximise accessibility to local services, public transport and to encourage walking and cycling.	It is considered that the proposed development has been laid out in such a way so as to maximise pedestrian, cyclist and public transport connectivity.

Chapter	Policy Objective	Development Plan Criteria	Statement of Compliance
Chapter 11 Land Use Zoning Objectives and Development		Pedestrian, cycle and vehicular movement shall be convenient, safe and integrated into the overall layout of the development.	Pedestrian and Cyclist connections are incorporated into the design providing an accessible street network for disabled users, walkers and cyclists.
Chapter 11 Land Use Zoning Objectives and Development		The layout of all new residential development shall have regard to adjoining developments and undeveloped zoned land. Where appropriate, linkages and complementary open spaces shall be provided between adjoining developments.	The layout of the proposed scheme is cognisant of the required linkages to adjoining developments and provision is made for these.
Chapter 11 Land Use Zoning Objectives and Development		Gated residential developments will be discouraged.	The proposed development is not a gated development.
Chapter 11 Land Use Zoning Objectives and Development		Innovative layouts, including courtyard developments, shared open spaces and the clustering of dwellings shall be used, where appropriate, to achieve high standards of amenity.	It is considered that the proposed development represents and innovative design solution on the subject lands and provides for a courtyard and a civic open space.
Chapter 11 Land Use Zoning Objectives and Development		Existing hedgerow, trees, watercourses and stone walls shall be retained where feasible. A landscaping scheme including hard and soft landscaping, and incorporating SUDS principles where appropriate, shall be designed as an integral part of the development.	A comprehensive landscaping plan has been prepared by Ait Landscaping which incorporates extensive areas of open space.

Chapter	Policy Objective	Development Plan Criteria	Statement of Compliance
Chapter 11 Land Use Zoning Objectives and Development	Section 11.9.2 (Table 11.3)	The maximum attainable Plot Ratio of development on 'CI' zoned lands is 1.25:1	The plot ratio of the proposed development is 1.46:1 which contravenes the provisions of the Galway City Development Plan 2017-2023. A Statement of Material Contravention in relation to this matter is enclosed with this planning application submission.
Chapter 11 Land Use Zoning Objectives and Development	Section 11.29	Residential developments of 10 units and over shall normally provide a mix in type of residential units.	 The scheme includes a range of unit types and sizes: 93 no. 1 bed apartments (28%) 219 no. 2 bed apartments (66%) 20 no. 3 bed apartments (6%)
Chapter 11 Land Use Zoning Objectives and Development	Section 11.29	Where commercial developments are acceptable on residentially zoned land, 10% of the area of a site, shall normally be provided as open space. Where the development includes residential uses, communal and private open space standards in 11.3.1(c) shall apply.	The proposed layout incorporates circa 3,085 sqm of communal open space (including hard and soft landscaping) which exceeds the relevant requirement. The proposed development thereby complies with Section 11.29.
Chapter 11 Land Use Zoning Objectives and Development	Section 11.29	Childcare facilities shall be provided within residential development as indicated in 11.13 and Chapter 7.	Please see Section 7.7 of the Planning Report.
Chapter 11 Land Use Zoning Objectives and Development	Section 11.29	All construction associated with footpaths, sewers, drains and water supply in residential developments, shall comply with Recommendations for Site Development Works for Housing Areas (DELG 1998) and any subsequent amendments and/or any additional specification required by the City Council, Irish Water and Building Regulations.	The Engineering drawings prepared by DBFL outlines that the development complies with relevant standards.

Statement of Consistency





APPENDIX D

GALWAY COUNTY CHILDCARE COMMITTEE

Clíodhna Bourke

From:	Fionnuala <fionnuala@galwaychildcare.com></fionnuala@galwaychildcare.com>
Sent:	Tuesday 30 July 2019 14:15
То:	Clíodhna Bourke
Cc:	Sean McCarthy
Subject:	RE: 180531 - Glenveagh SHD - Creche Info
Follow Up Flag:	Follow up
Flag Status:	Completed

Hi Cliodhna,

Given the floor space and the outdoor play area in the plan attached for the proposed creche, it would likely be adequate to cater for the needs of families in your client's proposed apartment development close by.

However, there is currently significant unmet demand for childcare places in the general Knocknacarra/Rahoon area.

We appreciate your consultation with us regarding the above developments and we would welcome further consultation regarding any other proposed developments in Galway.

Kind regards Fionnuala

From: Clíodhna Bourke <cbourke@mkoireland.ie>
Sent: 29 July 2019 10:54
To: Fionnuala <fionnuala@galwaychildcare.com>
Cc: Sean McCarthy <smccarthy@mkoireland.ie>
Subject: 180531 - Glenveagh SHD - Creche Info

Morning Fionnuala,

Thank you for taking the time to meet with us on Friday last. Following on from our discussion regarding the development at Knocknacarra, please see below.

The development as proposed will consist of the following:

- 1) Construction of 335 no. residential units:
 - 96 no. 1 bed apartments
 - 218 no. 2 bed apartments
 - 21 no. 3 bed apartments
- 2) Provision of 2,571 sq.m of commercial floorspace
- Provision of 85 no. car parking spaces and provision of realigned road between Gort na mBro and Gateway Retail Park Road.
- 4) Change of use of underground void to 183 bay underground car park.

5) Provision of community space, shared communal and private open space, site landscaping, site services and all associated site development works.

With regard to the Creche facility currently under construction as part of Phase 2 developments at Knocknacarra, see below detail obtained from the Galway City Council online planning portal under Pl. Ref. 17/158.

The details of the creche are as follows:

• Unit 11 (Creche): Ground Floor Area [444.4 sqm.] with an external play area [245 sqm.]



Taking into consideration the information outlined above, we would be grateful if you could advise us on the requirements for a creche for the proposed development.

Should you have any queries in relation to the detail in this email, or require any further information, don't hesitate to contact Sean or I.

Kind regards,

Clíodhna



McCarthy Keville O'Sullivan Ltd. T/A MKO. Registered in Ireland No. 462657. VAT No. IE9693052R

This email and any attached files or emails transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity to whom it is addressed. If the reader is not a representative of the intended recipient(s), any review, dissemination or copying of this message or the information it contains is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender of the email and delete the email. MKO does not represent or warrant that any attachment hereto is free from computer viruses or other defects. The opinions expressed in this e-mail and any attachments may be those of the author and are not necessarily those of MKO



\mathbf{O}

APPENDIX E

TAKEN IN CHARGE



Comhairle Cathrach na Gaillimhe Galway City Council

(204) Our Ref.: R11 FMcE/JK/MG

Your Ref: 180531

5th April, 2019.

0 8 APR 2019

180531

Sean Mcothy

KO:

MKO Estates and Project Management, Tuam Road, Galway. H91 VW84

Re: Your Client: Glenveagh Living Limited. Written Confirmation of roads 'Taken in Charge'.

A Chara,

I refer to your letter dated 1^{st} April, 2019, together with attached map in respect of Roads and Services Certificate for the above named property. Receipt attached herewith in respect of fee of $\notin 140.00$.

The roads and footpaths shown coloured Blue (L50002) and Yellow (L5000) on the attached map which abut the estate of 'Gort Na Bro, Western Distributor Road, Galway, are taken in charge by Galway City Council. The services namely the sewers and watermain located therein are also taken in charge. However, the water and sewer service pipes of the property, which connects to the public watermain and sewer, are the responsibility of the property owners.

Should you require clarification, please submit your query in writing to john.kennedy@galwaycity.ie

Mise, le meas,

Francis McEvoy,

Senior Executive Engineer, Transportation, Planning and Physical Development Directorate.

<u>Note</u>: Irish Water has assumed responsibility for public watermains and public (foul and combined) sewerage networks from 1st January 2014.

Fáiltítear roimh chomhfhreagras i nGaeilge / Correspondence in Irish is welcomed

Halla na Cathrach Bóthar an Choláiste Gaillimh H91 X4K8

City Hall College Road Galway H91 X4K8 Planning | Environmental | Ecology | Ornithology | Estates and Project Management



Our Ref: 180531 Your Ref:

Constant Council

1211

1st April 2019

Re: Written Confirmation of roads 'Taken in Charge'

Dear Sirs,

On behalf our client, **Glenveagh Living Limited**, we are requesting written confirmation that 2 no. roads at Knocknacarra that have been taken in charge by Galway City Council. The roads to which to which this request relates are:

- Access road to Gort na Bro estate This is either No. L50001/L50002
- The road between the Gort na Bro roundabout and the Rahoon Rd No. L5000



Figure 1: Subject Roads



Following confirmation of the required fee with Jean Kennedy, please find enclosed \notin 140. If you require any further information, do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Challen Josee

Clíodhna Bourke Planner MKO







Hennessy O'Shea 46 Fitzwilliam Square West, Dublin 2, D02 PY01, Ireland DX: 109034 Fitzwilliam D. +353 (0)| 5|4 3644
E. info@hos.ie
W. www.hos.ie

Targeted Investment Opportunities ICAV (Acting solely on behalf of its sub-fund Strategic Opportunities Fund) ("**TIO**") 25-28 North Wall Quay Dublin 1 **By Email only**

Our Ref: AH\TAR0010003

Date: 30 September 2019

Matter: Phase 2, Gateway, Galwaywest Business & Retail Park Knocknacarra, Galway, Co Galway

Dear Sirs

We refer to your recent request to confirm the status of the Access Road shown coloured yellow on the **attached** plan ("**Plan**") which road is comprised in Folio GY121643F (the "Access Road").

We confirm as follows:

- 1. The Access Road is in the private ownership of TIO, is not in charge of the Galway City Council and the Access Road has not been designated as a public right of way.
- 2. The Access Road is subject to private easements, rights and privileges("Rights") granted by deed or agreement to (i) the owners, occupiers and licensees of the Retail Park (as shown coloured pink on the Plan); and (ii) the owners of other lands adjoining the Retail Park, including without limitation the school site as shown edged in blue on the Plan, which are directly serviced by the Access Road. Any right of TIO to vary the Rights would be governed by the terms of any deed or agreement that has been entered into by TIO and its predecessors on title with any parties whose lands have the benefit of such Rights.

Yours faithfully

Hennessyo

Hennessy O'Shea





