

---

PROJECT:	Finches, Neilstown	FILE REF.:	9816_03-2401
CLIENT:	Old Nangor Road Ltd.	DATE:	23 <sup>rd</sup> January 2023

---

## **Additional Information - Planning Reference SD22A/0346**

The following is a response to a request for Additional Information for Planning Ref: SD22A/0346 received on the 24-Oct-2022.

A meeting was held on the 24<sup>th</sup> November 2022 with Caitlin O'Shea and Deirdre Kirwan of South Dublin County Council's Planning Department to review our intended response to the request for Additional Information. We include the outcome of this meeting with each point in the order of the request followed with our response in **bold**.

Caitlin O'Shea expressed that this was an informal meeting for guidance only and that no opinions expressed could be interpreted as approvals. The general consensus was that there support for this planning application.

### *Item 1(a)*

*On the western and northern elevations, ground floor Apartments 1, 2 and 3 would have windows to habitable rooms in close proximity to the public footpath with limited setback and privacy strip width provided. This would not provide an appropriate level of privacy to these apartments and lead to a substandard form of development. These should be revised to provide a greater setback of these windows from the public realm and adequate privacy strip.*

### **Notes from Meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup> November item 1(a):**

At our meeting of the 24<sup>th</sup> November, we had a discussion on the draft drawing of the Ground Floor plan submitted with the request for the meeting.

- The planners noted that the revisions to apartments 1, 2 and 3 improved the privacy and defensible space from the public realm for these apartments. They requested that we explain how we achieved the defensible space for these apartments. Apartment 2 & 3 have been mirrored and apartment 1 has had the balcony and windows adjusted.
- They recommended that we should emphasise in our re-submission that although these are single aspect apartments they constitute a very small proportion of the overall scheme, especially since this scheme has been revised in this new submission.
- They recommended a daylight study should be carried out on these apartments to ensure that they comply with daylight standards.
- It should also be noted highlighted that these apartments have a higher floor to ceiling to facilitate possible conversion to retail in the future.
- They recommend highlighting that these three apartments exceed the requirements for Part L in order to accommodate seriously disabled individuals.

### **Our Response to 1(a):**

**To improve the privacy and setback of the ground floor apartments 1, 2 & 3, we have flipped both apartments 2 & 3 (see enclosed drawing 9816\_03-2201\_D). This allows the kitchen / dining & living space to be located deeper into building which in turn reduces the projection of the ground floor bay windows. This increases the width of the raised planters which improves the defensible space.**

In conjunction with these changes, we have consulted with our shadow analysis consultants who confirm that the average daylight factor is still compliant. See attached ADF results from IESVE.

For apartment 1, we have made changes to the corner glazing for bedroom 2 which was right on the street, to two single bedroom windows positioned away from the street, facing into the balcony. These are now within the defensible space of the balcony and raised planters (Balcony further discussed in item (b) below).

**Item 1(b)**

*Some further variation in material, colour and form would be welcomed, particularly on the norther elevation, given the site's prominent location. The circular form balconies on the corner of the building are not considered to be a visually acceptable design response and should be redesigned to a more appropriate form. The submission of CGI images or elevational drawings with colour would be welcomed in order to adequately assess the design of the propose building.*

**Notes from Meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup> November item 1(b):**

In our discussion the importance of this building at this location was noted again by the planners and it was recommended that a CGI should accompany the submission to demonstrate how the building addresses its importance, particularly at the corner. It was mentioned that they were not in favour of a curved balcony.

**Our Response to 1(b):**

As suggested, we now enclose a CGI image of the proposed development (see also elevation drawing 9816\_03\_2207\_D). For the CGI image, we have chosen the most important view of the building as it addresses the junction of the two roads (Neilstown Road and Collinstown Road)



To add more variation in materials and colour we have introduced stone cladding to the ground floor bay windows and entrances and to the raised planters. This creates a visual base for the development out of which the brickwork of the upper floors rises emphasized by the verticality of the windows.

The curved corner balconies have now been replaced by a featured balcony structure that is cladded in a similar stone.

**Item 2.**

*The applicant is requested to demonstrate how they can achieve a minimum Green Space Factor (GSF) scoring requirement in accordance with Policy G15 Objective 4 of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028. Compliance will be demonstrated through the submission of a Green Space Factor (GSF) Worksheet.*

**Our Response to item 2:**

**Please find enclosed Green Space Factor Worksheet and updated landscaping drawings from RMDA.**

**Item 3.**

*The applicant is requested to provide the following in relation to access and parking:*

**Item 3(a)**

*A revised layout for provision of further car parking space(s) onsite.*

**Our Response to item 3(a):**

**See attached drawing (9816\_03\_2201\_D)**

**The staircases that connect the carpark to the apartments have been revised to allow for 1 additional carparking space. This brings the car parking spaces numbers from 12 to 13 car park spaces for 26 apartments exceeding (in ratio) the previous agreed figure of 14 for 29 apartments.**

**As mentioned in NRB Consulting Engineers Traffic Report which was submitted with this application,**

**"Section 4.19 of the guidelines notes that in larger-scale & higher-density developments, comprising wholly of apartments in more central locations that are well served by public transport, the default policy is for car parking provision to be "wholly eliminated or substantially reduced". This may apply in very accessible areas such as in or adjoining city cores or at a confluence of public transport systems.**

**Section 4.20 specifically describes these suitable locations. These locations are most likely to be in cities, especially in or adjacent to (i.e., within 15 minutes walking distance of) city centres or centrally located employment locations. This includes 10 minutes walking distance of DART or Luas stops or within 5 minutes walking distance of high frequency (min 10-minute peak hour frequency) bus services. The site is in a neighbourhood centre and adjacent a high frequency bus service. These guidelines support the case for limited parking provision as part of this development.**

**Item 3(b)**

*Revised layout of not less than 1:100 scale, showing a swept path analysis drawing (i.e. Autotrack or similar) demonstrating that fire tenders and large refuse vehicles can access/egress the site, and that that vehicles can exit the development in a forward direction if the car park is full. Detailing the location of refuse collection areas.*

**Our Response to item 3(b):**

**Refuse from the existing premises is collected from the rear laneway / right of way at the existing rear gates to the premises. It is proposed to continue refuse collection from this point. See attached drawing (9816\_03\_2201\_D) for location of refuse collection area. See also attached swept path analysis from Kavanagh Burke Consulting Engineers which demonstrates that this area is accessible to refuse truck with access and exit in a forward direction.**

**In relation to Fire Tenders, TGD Part B Fire Safety (2006) paragraph 5.2.2 Provision of Vehicle Access and table 5.1 state that fire tender requires access to 50% of the buildings perimeter (based on the proposed buildings volume falling between 7000-28000m<sup>3</sup>) and height over 10m's. This can be achieved from the north and west street elevations.**

**Item 4.**

*The applicant has proposed to discharge surface water run off from the proposed development to the foul water drainage network. This is not permitted by SDCC drainage section so alternative means of discharging surface water must be submitted by the applicant.*

**Our Response to item 4:**

**Please find enclosed letter from Kavanagh Burke Consulting Engineers with the following extract:**

**“It is not proposed to discharge surface water drainage to the foul system. There are 2 gullies at the entrance to the under-croft car-park which are provided to take any excess water that would run off the cars. As the under-croft car park is fully covered there will be no direct rainfall in this area. Generally, this water is classified as dirty water and is therefore discharged to the foul system via a petrol interceptor.”**