



Planning & Development Consultants

63 York Road, Dun Laoghaire, Co. Dublin  
www.brockmcclure.ie

01 - 5593859

## **Pre-Planning Meeting- 27.06.18 – Dublin City Council – Davitt Road PP Meeting No. 4 – SHM**

### **Attendees - Design Team**

Anthony Durkan (AD) - BD  
Tim Walsh (TW) - BD  
Rachel Moore (RM) – JFA  
Laura Brock (LB) – BMcC  
Michael Moran (MM) – TPS  
Ulick Burke (UB) – KB  
Gavin Foy (GF) – AIT

### **Attendees – Dublin City Council**

Emer Ui Fhatharta (EF) – Senior Exec Planner  
**AN Other ?? – Assistant Planner**  
Edel Kelly (EK) - Roads and Transport

### **Development Proposal & Process to date**

- LB provided a brief update on design progress and revision to strategy.
- Updated details of the scheme relayed to Planning Team.

### **Notes & Feedback**

#### **Design and Scale**

- EF noted that Rhona Naughton sent her apologies and was not able to attend the meeting.
- EF noted a concern with the overall elevation treatment. Would prefer a more “animated” elevation.
- EF would prefer that balconies are not cantilevered, and that they do not project past the building line.
- EF noted a concern with the residential and visual amenity of existing residences in the immediate vicinity of the site.
- EF noted a concern with the scale/ bulk of the proposal and its ‘overall design’.
- EF noted a concern with the transition between the existing dwelling houses and that now proposed.
- She would like to see all our ‘alternative’ design options forming part of our application to ABP.



- EF agreed BTL is appropriate here
- EF noted that the heights and density proposed were in compliance with current development plan, and its proximity to existing public transport. But does not consider them appropriate in this context.
- Finally, EF concluded that the height and set back distances from existing are potentially ok, but some work is needed on the elevation treatment.

### **Internal Residential Amenity**

- EF stated she required additional bed-space analysis.
- Based on the current bed-space provision it is her view that not enough residential amenity areas are provided.
- She would like to see a per/m<sup>2</sup> analysis of the amenity space which will include dining rooms and break out spaces. We confirmed that we were taking advice from Agents in relation to this matter and that the quantum provided here were market appropriate.
- A full residential amenity assessment will be required.
- EF also noted they would like to see Childcare Provision analysis undertaken.
- EF concluded the meeting by agreeing that all required standards have been met.

### **Roads and Traffic**

- EK requires a clear and unambiguous car parking strategy to be considered in tandem with BTR scheme . A management strategy for this is crucial.
- Go Car spaces are required at basement level not at grade.
- EK will require a full Residential Travel Plan.
- EK noted and welcomed the relocation of the entrance point.
- 0.6/0.7 spaces per unit is appropriate with a robust parking and travel management strategy accompanying the application.
- EK noted that existing pedestrian crossing and bus stops etc should be shown on drawings
- EK requires a clear plan for loading/ deliveries to retail units

### **Street and Public Realm**

- EK requires a wider footpath along Davitt Road if the currently proposed height is to be maintained. 2m behind the loading bay was referenced. This may not be necessary if the current height is reduced. This is to avoid the perceived “tunneling effect” on the road.
- EK and EF queried our assumption that we could cantilever over the red line. Noted that it was unlikely that consent from DCC would be forthcoming.
- Servicing of the retail units to be further considered in addition to the impact on existing pedestrian linkages.
- Consideration of the public realm and footpaths to the rear of the site is also required.
- EK noted some of the ideas in the Drimnagh IAP 2009 (non-statutory document , prepared under the old Development Plan) relating to public realm and seating areas were still relevant.
- They seemed generally happy with the overall landscaping and communal open spaces. Further consideration might be need to show how residences and activity to the rear of the site interfaces with the development proposal.

## Legal

- EF noted that a legal submission will be required to demonstrate compliance with 15 year covenant.

## Opinion

- As agreed, some work is required on the elevations and the transition to the existing residences.
- It is my view that whilst some amendments are required, the extent of the changes now required by DCC will result in a significant reduction in numbers.
- Work is needed on demonstrating the residential amenity available to residents. Again, I'm not sure additional space is necessary however, we do need to consider are the communal spaces sufficient? The optics of additional space might be good for a hearing with ABP and can always be revisited once planning is secured.
- The issue of the 'red line' is one that should be explicitly addressed – we don't want a 'consent' issue arising in our meeting with ABP and therefore need to examine further.
- The car parking management strategy must be worked up and should, if possible, be agreed with EK. It was my opinion that her stance on this matter had certainly softened.
- We need to be sure that the servicing of the retail unit etc. is appropriate.
- Strong views and CGI's will be key to selling this level of development to ABP.
- A robust application is needed including all reports referenced at all PP meetings with DCC. It is imperative that Visual Impact, Sunlight and Daylight and Overshadowing Assessments are accurate, robust and favourable.

**Laura Brock**

**Brock McClure Consultants**

**10 July 2018**