



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Commission Direction
CD-000841
PL-500910-CC-26

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 06 July 2026.

The Commission decided to refuse permission, generally in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation, for the following reasons and considerations.

Planning Commissioner:

Liam McGree

Date:

6th day of July 2026

DRAFT WORDING FOR ORDER

Reasons and Considerations

1. Given the constrained nature of the site, its sloping topography, the presence of existing underground services within and across the site, and the split-level nature of the proposed development, it is considered that the applicant has failed

to demonstrate that the development would not have an adverse impact on receiving underground infrastructure, which is a stormwater sewer and storage tank, servicing the proposed and existing developments. As such the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not adversely impact on other service users giving rise to serious concerns with regard to impacts on public safety and public health and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Note: The Commission considered that, due to an absence of detailed mapping addressing the issue, there was a degree of uncertainty as to the extent to which the proposed development would overlap the area zoned Objective ZO15 (Public Open Space) in the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028, and considered that, based on the information as submitted, that there was insufficient evidence to support a conclusion that the proposed development would contravene a zoning objective of the Development Plan and, therefore, decided not to include the first reason for refusal as recommended by the Commission's Inspector.

In addition, the Commission considered that external appearance of the proposed development, as amended at further information stage, could be further amended, or conditioned, so as to ensure that the proposal would not seriously injure the visual amenities of the area and would not be incongruous, would not be out of character with the streetscape, or would not set an undesirable precedent for future development in this area. For this reason, the Commission decided not to include the second reason for refusal as recommended by the Commission's Inspector.