“This report shows that for numerous structural and administrative reasons – and despite obvious demand for new houses and apartments – it still takes upwards of three years for new homes to become available to purchase or rent.”
Executive Summary

The purpose of this RIAI research report is to set out the current timeline for new housing development. The report shows the lengthy process for delivering housing. While it may appear that there are potential development sites on which no activity is taking place, in fact pre-construction work on new housing schemes may be progressing.

In recent years, Government policy has used planning and taxation policy to encourage the faster delivery of new multi-unit residential developments. Notwithstanding these efforts, the process of bringing a new housing scheme to occupation remains very slow. This explains why, for example, the number of planning consents has increased in recent months, yet the volume of completed new homes remains low.

This report shows that for numerous structural and administrative reasons – and despite obvious demand for new houses and apartments – it still takes upwards of three years for new homes to become available to purchase or rent.

The report makes recommendations for policy-makers about reforms of policy, planning processes and procedures, which could allow new housing developments to proceed through the pre-construction stages of development more rapidly without undermining existing regulations or sacrificing standards of design or construction.

A plethora of regulations, guidance documents and policies, with huge variation between planning authorities on how they are interpreted, has an impact on how our homes are designed and delivered.

Cumulatively, it must be asked whether the current planning system is eroding the potential to harness innovative housing design and the adoption of international best practice in Ireland.

“This report hopes to stimulate a wider debate in Irish housing policy in respect of the role of the planning system in the delivery of housing.”
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Methodology

Interviews were held with the principals of a number of large and medium architectural practices located around Ireland which are currently active in designing multi-unit housing and apartment developments for various private and public clients.

The RIAI Work Stages publication details the services provided by design teams to clients (whether developers or public sector clients) through eight stages of development from initial project inception to final site completion.

It should be noted, however, that the timeline in this report commences with the appointment of a design team; it does not detail the time spent raising finance, acquiring the site, resolving legal disputes over title, or identifying and resolving issues relating to utilities and infrastructure. This is discussed in further detail below.

Architects were asked to account for the time spent on each RIAI Work Stage for housing/apartment projects on which they have recently been engaged.

By using a common timeline across many developments and practices, it is possible to compare the time spent on each stage in different projects in different areas of Ireland and for different clients. Examples of delays (whether foreseeable or unforeseen) can then be evaluated, and proposals for reform set out.

What is presented here is an account of the time spent on new housing and apartment development by clients, design teams and contractors. This is accompanied by a commentary about procedures and practices which could reasonably be improved to make the completion of each stage more efficient. A set of recommendations completes this report together with case studies.
Housing Delivery - Development Work Stages

8 RIAI WORK STAGES
1. Project Inception and General Services
2. Outline Proposals
3. Scheme Design
4. Detail Design / Building Regulations
5. Production of Information
6. Tender Action
7. Project Planning
8. Operations on Site and Completion

The table below shows the work involved in completing each of the 8 RIAI Work Stages in the development process above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIAI WORK STAGE</th>
<th>TASKS FOR DESIGN TEAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| WORK STAGE 1: Project Inception and General Services | • Meetings between client and design teams  
  • Preparation of sketch project plans and general site maps |
| WORK STAGE 2: Outline Proposals        | • Early engagement between design teams and planners  
  • Pre-planning meetings with planning authorities and development of detailed site-specific plans |
| WORK STAGE 3: Scheme Design            | • Preparation of documentation for Planning application  
  • Submission of further information on request from Planning Authority  
  • Planning permission granted or refused  
  • Planning appeal and engagement with An Bord Pleanála (ABP) (if required) |
| WORK STAGE 4: Detail Design / Building Regulations | • Engagement with fire officer and other Planning Authority officers (e.g. access for persons with disabilities etc.) to obtain necessary certificates to prove conformity with regulations |
| WORK STAGE 5: Production of Information | • Preparation of tender documentation to obtain and report on construction cost quotations received from contractors and specialist sub-contractors. |
| WORK STAGE 6: Tender Action            | • Selection of preferred contractor and specialist sub-contractors, and contract appointment |
| WORK STAGE 7: Project Planning         | • Preparation of construction scheme |
| WORK STAGE 8: Operations on Site and Completion | • Monitoring of onsite construction and management of compliance with Building Regulations and other regulations.  
  Final snag list and site completion |
Pre-Design Stages of Development

Prior to the appointment of the Architect and other consultants and the commencement of the Work Stages, there are a number of pre-design tasks to be completed by the developer relating to the acquisition and preparation of the site. These issues are largely site-specific and not all apply in every case. Nonetheless, they can account for a significant amount of time before the tasks reviewed in this study are commenced.

- Raising finance to fund purchase of site and construction
- Purchasing parcels of land to form development site
- Resolving deficiencies in title of land
- Identification of utilities, services and infrastructure
- Identification of conservation requirements, rights of way and access points
- Feasibility assessments by Architects and other advisors on site potential
- Negotiation with Local Authority regarding development levies, and engagement with approved housing bodies and others in relation to the provision of social housing

Bleach Road, Winner Best House Leinster, RIAI Irish Architecture Awards 2017, Boyd Cody Architects, Photo: Marie-Louise Halpenny
Analysis

This section of the report summarises the views of the Architect interviewees about their role in each Work Stage, and of the role of the various teams involved in the completion of each Work Stage. It identifies the factors which may result in a delay to the timely progression of the development project onto the next stage.

WORK STAGE 1: Project Inception and General Services

Once the site has been acquired, the Architect and other consultants in the design team will begin work on the general scheme design. It should be noted that the site purchase process itself may be complex and beset by delays, especially in circumstances where the site has a disputed legal title or where there are unknown archaeological or heritage features, or competing rights of way.

Many centrally-located development sites in urban areas are land-locked, and it is difficult for any new housing development to be designed until other parcels of land are acquired to make for appropriate points of entry. Putting together a developable site can delay the initial project design, and may even require revisions to the developed design at a later stage.

The first part of the development process involving the design team is in preparing an initial outline design for the required buildings and the site itself.

The Local Area Plan (LAP) and/or County Development Plan (CPD) provides details of the usage, density and infrastructural requirements of the Local Authority for the site, and is used by the design team to prepare the initial site plan. As discussed in more detail below, the LAP or CDP has a finite lifespan. Prior to the expiry of an LAP or CDP the plan, the relevant Planning Authority undertakes a public consultation exercise and calls for the submission of opinions and research, before seeking the formal adoption of the new plan by the elected members.

WORK STAGE 2: Outline Proposals

Early informal engagement with the Planning Authority is vital at this stage. The process of preparing documentation for the planning application is complex, and therefore legislation allows for early engagement between the Planning Authority and the applicant to discuss the broad scheme of the proposed development. This allows the Architect to fully understand the priorities of the Planning Authority for the desired development of the site. Difficulty can arise here when the development is
going to take place in an area with a Local Area Plan or County Development Plan which is coming to an end. The Architect must design the outline scheme in compliance with the rules of the existing Local Area Plan or County Development Plan but if they know the requirements are going to change in a new plan, it is not certain which rules will apply. This can result in uncertainty about whether planning consent will be granted and may require design revision in accordance with the plan, either at outline stage or later.

In recent years, a lack of resources within planning authorities and an ever longer public consultation process means there may be a delay between the expiry of one LAP and the formal adoption by the Local Authority of the next plan.

Another potential delay during this Work Stage is in the provision of physical infrastructure. Servicing of land and the connection of site infrastructure to public utilities has become complex in recent years. It is not always clear at this stage where the responsibility rests for the provision of infrastructure, or how the contractor and utility companies (including local authorities) are expected to deliver utility connections.

“The lack of clarity on the utilities available to a site or the planned provision of those utilities is leading to significant delays.”

**WORK STAGE 3:**

**Scheme Design**

The Scheme Design is developed at this stage and factors informing the Architect’s design include: number of units; density of the scheme; site coverage; car parking; drainage and utilities; design and statutory requirements. This information is to take the project to pre-planning meetings.

While the format of pre-planning consultation is set out in legislation, custom and practice varies widely between planning authorities, and even between planners within an individual Planning Authority.

Some Local Authorities effectively want the Architects to present them with a set of drawings and models to show how the scheme will look and operate when complete, while others seek early initial discussions. The former requires the Architect, design team and the client to expend time and money in taking the scheme through to completion only for it to be revised following the pre-planning meeting. This is very inefficient, and leads to repetition of Work Stages 2 and 3 in order to hone the project to its required level of detail. A pragmatic and conversational approach is the preferred option.

The latter format, where the Planning Authority requires a scheme at initial design stage allows the Architect to present the Planning Authority with an overview of the client’s objectives with the detail to be completed once the
Architect is satisfied that they will be able to incorporate the requirements of the Planning Authority.

Many Architects organise bilateral meetings with individual departments within planning authorities (e.g. conservation, fire departments) to ensure that their support in principle is secured at an early stage, and any potential concerns are addressed at the full pre-planning meeting.

One significant concern at this stage is a lack of consistency of personnel during the pre-planning meetings. It is important that – as the project develops through early engagement with the Planning Authority towards presentation for consent – there is a consistency of engagement to ensure that the project is developed fully in line with the requirements of the Planning Authority, and any conditions of the permission granted.

THE FAST TRACK PLANNING SYSTEM
PLANNING REFORMS IN 2016

Part 2 of the Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 2016 creates a new “fast-track” planning system for large-scale housing developments (greater than 100 units), with the intention of providing speed and certainty to the planning system. The RIAI welcomes this system. Under this system, following pre-planning discussions with the relevant Local Authority, a pre-planning meeting will be held with An Bord Pleanála (ABP) at which the Architect will need to provide sufficient information to enable ABP offer “an opinion”. It should be noted that the 25 weeks process time specified by An Bord Pleanála as a maximum period for receiving a planning decision through the Strategic Housing Unit does not include any design, consultation or documentation preparation time.

The “opinion” should give direction on any amendments ABP requires in order to allow the project proceed to application stage. If minor changes are requested these should be easily dealt with. However, if significant changes are requested, this may result in major redesign work for the Architect and other design team members.

Architects using the new process report that the very minimum timeframe from commencement of a project to receipt of an ABP decision under the fast track system is 42 weeks, excluding holiday periods.

It is also being reported that case planners in some planning authorities require detailed drawings to be submitted ahead of the pre-planning meeting, while other planning authorities have developed their own pre-planning documentary requirements.
This is an issue regarding interpretation of the pre-application requirements, as Section 247 meetings are to facilitate design development in advance of the ABP pre-planning meeting. If the Architect and design team were expected to prepare the full application in advance of having the first pre-application meeting with the Local Authority, this would lead to serious delay and cost issues for applicants.

WORK STAGE 4:  
Detail Design / Building Regulations

While the Planning Authority is deciding whether the grant planning consent, the Architect team must obtain certification to show that the development is in conformity with Building Control Regulations. These relate to Fire Safety Certificate (Part B), DAC (Part M) and Preliminary BER (Part L).

There is significant power for officials to require significant changes to developments at this stage, and many Architects find that there is a lack of consistency on the interpretation and application of regulations in the areas of fire control and access for persons with disabilities. This highlights the importance of early engagement with these officials at the pre-planning stage so that the Architect and design team are aware of the individual officers’ interpretation of regulations.

WORK STAGE 5:  
Production of Information

During this stage, detailed design work is undertaken to finalise the design and specification of the houses, apartments and amenities within the scheme. This information enables a contractor to price the project for a comparative competitive tendering process. The duration of time to prepare the information for tendering purposes is dependent on the scale and complexity of the project but is under the control of the Architect and sub-consultants.

In recent months, as the volume of new projects moving through the planning system has increased, bottlenecks have begun to occur as a lack of capacity in the construction sector becomes evident.

WORK STAGE 6:  
Tender Action

It is the role of the Architect and the developer to select the teams of specialist contractors and sub-contractors who will undertake the on-site development, following the evaluation of the returned tenders. The uncertainty of the planning system can often make it difficult for developers to inform contractors when the development will proceed to construction, thereby making the tender process more complex than necessary.
WORK STAGE 7: Project Planning
In some Local Authority and approved housing body developments, an Architect works simply on a “design and build model”, where tender documentation is prepared internally within the authority. While this removes the need for the Architect to oversee this process, it is still an administrative part of the housing development process. However, in most developments, bringing the development from planning consent to construction requires input from the Architect to prepare tender documents to engage contractors.

WORK STAGE 8: Operations on Site and Completions
This final stage involves the administration of the contract between the developer and contractor by the Architect to ensure the quality and progress of the project. The Architect is often providing the services of Assigned Certifier under BC(A)R.

The progress of this stage is dependent on the capacity of the developer, Architect, design team and contractor.

Where the houses or apartments are practically complete, the Assigned Certifier and contractor must apply to have the houses or apartments included on the BCMS Statutory Register. It will be important that – as housing and apartment delivery increases - the BCMS and local authorities are sufficiently resourced to avoid delays.

It should also be noted that a lack of sites for the safe disposal of construction and demolition waste means that the process of site clearance and construction is slowed. It is likely that Irish landfill sites will soon reach full capacity and therefore inert building waste will be disposed of overseas, further delaying and adding costs to the construction process.

“There is a lack of consistency on the interpretation and application of regulations in the areas of fire control and access for persons with disabilities across planning authorities, and between officers within planning authorities.”
Conclusion

The minimum statutory period for a Planning Authority to reach a decision on an application is set out below. It is obvious from this study that this statutory process is totally at odds with the reality of bringing a new development through the planning system. Issues such as requests for further information and the potential for an appeal to An Bord Pleanála can significantly increase the time a project spends in planning. Indeed research by the Department of Housing, Planning and Local Government in 2016 suggested that the overall time period may be around 72 weeks. This research reinforces that view.

**FAST-TRACK PLANNING PROCESS**

The fast-track planning process is new and aims to bring certainty to the planning process. It will place increased burdens on An Bord Pleanála and – as the local Planning Authority remains a key actor in this new process – it is vital that all planning bodies are resourced adequately to perform their statutory functions efficiently. It is hoped that this new regime will reduce the planning period from approx. 72 weeks to approx. 42 weeks.

The case studies in this report show that the development of new housing schemes can take anywhere between two and five years from the point where an Architect is engaged, through to occupancy of the home or apartment. As noted earlier, this omits any pre-design delays relating to the acquisition of the site, and funding of the development.

There are a wide range of issues which will vary the timeline for new development, and this research has set out when and how these variations occur, and makes recommendations for reform which will allow new housing developments to reach occupancy without eroding standards or reducing quality of design or construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMESCALE</th>
<th>Process Commences</th>
<th>2 weeks later</th>
<th>Between 2 – 5 weeks</th>
<th>Between 5 -8 weeks later</th>
<th>4 weeks after issue of notice of decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>Notice published in newspaper and site notice erected.</td>
<td>Latest date for lodging application.</td>
<td>Application is validated by the Planning Authority. Submissions or objections are considered.</td>
<td>Planning Authority issue notice of their decision on the application. Alternatively, it may request further information.</td>
<td>If no appeal is made, the Planning Authority will issue grant of permission, or outline permission, except where it has already indicated a decision to refuse.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations

DEVELOP A SHARED SERVICE MODEL FOR RECEIVING PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Context
Many Architects report delays in planning caused as a result of resource starvation at Planning Authority level. It is important, however, that Architects are aware of what materials are required by planning authorities to allow them to make planning decisions. Small planning departments no longer have the capacity to cope with an unexpected influx of planning applications. There is some evidence of planning authorities using invalidation procedures and requests for further information as tools to slow and regulate the receipt of planning applications which it receives.

Recommendation 1
A Shared Service Model is needed whereby planning applications are received by one central agency on behalf of a number of planning authorities.

It should be the responsibility of that centralised front-desk, staffed by a combination of qualified planners and administrators, to ensure applications are valid, and that all administrative tasks (including using online technology to distribute copies of documentation to all relevant officials) are facilitated prior to being sent to the Planning Authority for decision.

This would mean that, once accepted, the application would be determined on the merit of the development rather than rejected because of errors on the face of the documents.

INCREASE CAPACITY WITHIN PLANNING AUTHORITIES

Context
In some cases, an applicant may wait up to 3 months for a preliminary pre-planning meeting with the Planning Authority. It is vital that this meeting happens at an early stage of development, and that the meeting takes place with the relevant persons within the Planning Authority who are senior enough to make decisions.

The pre-planning process is a very useful tool for informal dialogue. Where there are different divisions within planning authorities, differences of requirements, or indeed conflicting requirements, may only come to light at the pre-planning meeting (e.g. parks department/heritage/housing). There should be a requirement for each division with an interest in the
development to meet internally before meeting with the design team to raise and resolve internal conflicts prior to the pre-planning meeting. This would increase the usefulness of the pre-planning meeting, and assist the design team understand exactly what the Planning Authority requires.

Legislation requires the Planning Authority to minute the pre-planning meeting and the Planning Authority should send a formal memorandum to the design team on how any internal disputes have been resolved, thereby giving a clear direction to the design team in preparing the planning application.

Design teams find it very difficult to discuss timelines with any confidence with clients. When the design team is experienced they can anticipate the likelihood of appeals, and generally have an idea how long it takes planning authorities to reach decisions, as well as the preference for planning authorities with regard to pre-planning meetings.

UK and international clients find the Irish system very uncertain and unpredictable given the diverging approaches taken by different planning authorities. This uncertainty has an impact for the cost and availability of development finance. Uncertainty leading to a lack of project viability can be most acutely felt in specific development types such as student accommodation where it is vital for the project to be completed in August for occupation at the start of academic year.

Therefore, for many development projects, moving the development from pre-planning through planning and the appeals process can be fraught, and administratively burdensome. For some planning authorities numerous copies (as many as 27 copies) of documentation are required for planning to determine whether to consent to the application, and there is often little evidence of genuine harnessing and application of the benefits of using online technology.

**Recommendation 2**

*The pre-planning process should be made more efficient by requiring the Planning Authority to produce formal minutes of any engagement with applicants so that Architects can respond to queries, concerns and suggestions for improvement, and demonstrate at future meetings how the development is in conformity with Planning Authority requirements.*
The pre-planning meetings themselves should be standardised, with a necessary component that the same Planning Authority personnel attend all meetings to ensure consistency of application.

Context
The new planning consent route for large-scale developments through the new housing infrastructure development unit within An Bord Pleanála is intended to bring certainty and clarity to new housing development. The aim is to treat new housing development as a form of critical national infrastructure by removing the necessity to seek planning consent from the Planning Authority before seeking approval from the Board. This new route is in its initial stage and it is vital that it works efficiently to speed up the delivery of new homes as well as reduce the burden on individual planning authorities.

Recommendation 3
In order for this new route to work, it is important that An Bord Pleanála is resourced adequately so that applications can be determined within the statutory period. It is also important that those who are considering the application are suitably qualified and experienced so that it can be judged on its merits.

This should not mean that resources are taken from local planning authorities, but rather that there are enough qualified and senior planners at all levels to process applications through both the new fast-track route as well as the traditional route.

As an example of building certainty into the planning process, the example of Dublin Docklands should be explored as a template for use elsewhere. In this scenario, a masterplan is developed by a development agency for an entire area, with detailed requirements for specific plots within that area. Therefore any person seeking to develop land within the area covered by the masterplan knows exactly what conditions are likely to be imposed on any application for development. It also allows for the timely development of the entire site to include provision for social and economic infrastructure and a variety of housing types; more importantly, the masterplan is not subject to replacement in the same way as a local area plan, and therefore provides greater certainty than the county or local area plan.
DEVELOP A NATIONAL REFERRALS BODY FOR REGULATION

Context
The Architect is responsible for certifying developments that are designed in accordance with the Building Regulations and relies on Technical Guidance Documents (TGDs). In many cases, these TGDs are open to wide interpretation and it is not uncommon for, say, a fire officer within a Building Control Authority to refuse to grant a certificate because they interpret the documents in a different way to the Architect.

It is not acceptable for each Local Authority to work to its own subjective interpretation of the plethora of national housing and construction guidelines, regulations and policies.

Where the decision to refuse to grant a certificate is successfully appealed, unlike in law, this appeal decision does not create a binding precedent for future applications.

Recommendation 4
It is recommended that there should be a National Referrals Body to which questions on interpretations of regulations can be sent. This would avoid a lengthy appeal process and instead build up a body of precedents or exemplars to show how regulations are to be interpreted.

As this would be available for inspection by Architects and other consultants at an early stage in designing the project, it would lead to a more efficient certification process without eroding standards.

PREPARE NEW COUNTY LOCAL AREA PLANS (LAPS) PRIOR TO THE EXPIRY OF THE CURRENT PLAN

Context
Architects report difficulty in designing projects where an LAP plan is due to expire or has expired, as it determines important issues such as the required density of the project. Any interregnum between the plans inevitably forces the project into a hiatus. The project cannot proceed until the Architect has an idea of what the Planning Authority intends for the area in the next LAP.

Increasingly there are fewer resources within local authorities to develop the new plan without recourse to outside consultancies. In many cases, there is considerable delay in making an LAP required by time zoning, or the existing LAP is allowed to lapse. This
should happen seamlessly so that the new plan is ready to be enacted on the day the last one expires having been publicly available for a year so everyone interested in developing on land in the area knows what will be expected. It is useful to compare this process with legislation where the draft Bill is visible from a very early stage, and even once the Act is enacted, it may wait before being commenced to provide an opportunity to prepare for its commencement into law.

**Recommendation 5**

*Initial studies and reports to frame LAPs should be done during the life of the existing plan, not commissioned when the plan has expired.*

Regarding applications in areas where plans have lapsed but are still zoned, there are good examples of local authorities that will look at practical solutions compliant with the Zoning objectives and Development Plan, yet mindful of the old LAP albeit expired. This is recognised as not being perfect but where Local Authorities take a practical view, housing can still be delivered and this should be encouraged.
## Sample Case Studies: Large Developments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK STAGE</th>
<th>SCHEME 1</th>
<th>175 UNITS (150 houses + 25 apartments)</th>
<th>SCHEME 2</th>
<th>325 UNITS (250 houses + 75 apartments)</th>
<th>SCHEME 3</th>
<th>215 UNITS (200 apartments + 15 houses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Outline Proposals</strong></td>
<td>Dec 2008</td>
<td>Initial sketch layout</td>
<td>Sept - Dec 2014</td>
<td>Pre-planning meeting</td>
<td>Jan - Feb 2016</td>
<td>Pre-planning meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept 2010</td>
<td>First pre-planning meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2010</td>
<td>Planning Application submitted</td>
<td>Jan 2015</td>
<td>Planning Application submitted</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>Planning Application (Block A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2013</td>
<td>Revised Planning Application (house type changes) submitted</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
<td>Notification of decision to grant Planning Permission</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>Application (Blocks B, C &amp; Houses)</td>
<td>Oct 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Extension of Planning Application submitted</td>
<td>Aug 2015</td>
<td>Grant of Permission from ABP for 244 houses + 70 apartments</td>
<td>Oct 2016</td>
<td>Additional information required Additional information submitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2016</td>
<td>Additional options House type 1 Application submitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2016</td>
<td>Minor amendments / Additional options to house types Application submitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK STAGE</td>
<td>SCHEME 1</td>
<td>SCHEME 2</td>
<td>SCHEME 3</td>
<td>SCHEME 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Detail Design / Building Regulations</strong></td>
<td>Jan 2016 to date</td>
<td>May - June 2015</td>
<td>Jan - April 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Production Information</strong></td>
<td>Jan 2016 to date</td>
<td>July - Sept 2015</td>
<td>Jan - April 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Tender Action</strong></td>
<td>n/a (Design + Build)</td>
<td>Sept 2015</td>
<td>Tender date for first 140 units</td>
<td>n/a (Design + Build)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov 2015</td>
<td>Tender returns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 2016</td>
<td>Contractor appointed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Project Planning</strong></td>
<td>n/a (Design + Build)</td>
<td>Feb - March 2015</td>
<td>n/a (Design + Build)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Operations on Site and Completion</strong></td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>Houses commenced</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>Housing commenced</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr 2016</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr 2016</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>First apartments completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr 2016</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>First houses completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr 2016</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>First apartments completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall from Pre-Planning meeting to completion</strong></td>
<td>6 years 6 months</td>
<td>3 years 0 months</td>
<td>2 years 1 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sample Case Studies: Small Developments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Stage</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>Appointment of design team</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>Client delay relating to site purchase</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,4,5,6,7</td>
<td>Pre-planning meeting</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td>Initial project discussion</td>
<td>August 2016</td>
<td>Initial discussion</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss issues raised at Feb meeting</td>
<td>October 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>November 2014</td>
<td>Meeting solely with traffic division to discuss transport concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>Discuss outstanding issues and present updated drawings and reports</td>
<td>November 2016</td>
<td>Detailed discussion relating to neighbouring sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning application lodged</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>December 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requests for further information (RFI)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>December 2016</td>
<td>Concern regarding density</td>
<td>February 2015</td>
<td>Concerns regarding neighbours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reply to RFI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>April 2017</td>
<td>Revised scheme submitted</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
<td>Revised scheme submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision to grant planning</td>
<td>September 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal to An Bord Pleanála</td>
<td>September 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal refused</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>September 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>On site</td>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>February 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>August 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>August 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>September 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall time</td>
<td>1 year 7 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 years 7 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 years 0 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The overall time for each scheme is as follows:
  - Scheme 1: 1 year 7 months
  - Scheme 2: 3 years 7 months
  - Scheme 3: 3 years 0 months
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