



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Record of Meeting ABP-300025-17

<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	159 no. dwelling units (156 no. houses, 3 no. apartments), crèche, doctor's surgery, play area and all associated infrastructure and services and associated ancillary works. Johnstown/Killahora, Glounthaune, Co. Cork.		
<b>Case Type</b>	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
<b>1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> Meeting		
<b>Date:</b>	27 <sup>th</sup> November 2017	<b>Start Time</b>	11.30
<b>Location</b>	Office of An Bord Pleanála	<b>End Time</b>	13.00
<b>Chairperson</b>	Tom Rabbette	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Lianna Slowey

### Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Una Crosse, Senior Planning Inspector
Lianna Slowey, Executive Officer

### Representing Prospective Applicant:

Frank O'Mahony, O'Mahony Developments
Martin O'Mahony, O'Mahony Developments
Kevin O'Mahony, O'Mahony Developments
Kieran Barry, Kieran J. Barry & Associates Engineers
Aoife Roche, O'Mahony Pike Architects
Martin Hanley, MHL Consulting Engineers (Traffic)
David Bosonnet, Brady Shipman Martin (Landscape/Ecology)
Cora Savage, McCutcheon Halley Planning Consultants
Andrea McAuliffe, McCutcheon Halley Planning Consultants
Tom Halley, McCutcheon Halley Planning Consultants
Sue Cullen, McCutcheon Halley Planning Consultants

## Representing Planning Authority

Noel Sheridan, A/Senior Planner
Enda Quinn, A/Senior Executive Planner
Chris Kenyon, Assistant Planner
Micheál Mulconry, Executive Engineer – Traffic and Transport
Robert O’Sullivan, Executive Engineer – Roads Operations
Yvonne O’Brien, Executive Engineer – Estates
Mark Collins, A/County Architect
Seán O’Brien, Administrative Officer

### Introduction

The representatives of An Bord Pleanála (ABP) welcomed the prospective applicant and Planning Authority (PA), 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 20<sup>th</sup> November, 2017 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 opinion,
- 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 may 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 24<sup>th</sup> October, 2017 formally requesting pre-application consultations with ABP. The prospective applicant was 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.

## **Agenda**

1. Principle of Proposal, Scale and Phasing
2. Development Strategy for the Site including: Density, Layout and Open Space
3. Connectivity, Transportation, Access and Traffic
4. Boundary Treatment
5. Any other matters.

### **1. Principle of Proposal, Scale and Phasing**

#### **ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- LAP core strategy for 400 additional units in Glounthaune up to 2023 and implementation policy for same.
- Grounds of previous refusal on site.
- Delivery and phasing of units, rationale behind seeking 10-year permission.

#### **Prospective Applicant's response:**

- The site can accommodate a large number of residential units in a sympathetic way, demonstrated in previous approval on site for 250 residential units.
- Glounthaune fits between town and village status – growth of up to 400 residential units as indicated in LAP is exceptional for a key village.
- Incremental expansion is proposed over 4 phases of 40 units each, which ties into LAP core strategy.
- Likely that delivery of units would take more than 5 years to complete.
- Site is fully serviced, there are no issues re. infrastructure/services.
- Connectivity to train station/village – have been working with the PA since pre-application consultation request submitted in relation to addressing connectivity.
- New Strategic Land Reserve designation in LAP for lands to the east/proposed link road which will change the context of the site.

#### **Planning Authority's comments:**

- The wording of current LAP is more flexible than the previous LAP in relation to consideration of developments over 40 units.
- 10-year permission being sought is an acknowledgement of the LAP, allowed for in legislation where it may take longer to deliver units.
- Similar proposal in Killea, Co. Cork for a 93 house scheme to be delivered in a phased manner, not dissimilar to the proposed development.

#### **ABP comments re. application stage:**

- Justification/rationale required regarding location of site vis-à-vis adjacent development, illustrate with radii circles and provide distances from the proposed development to Glounthaune village and train station.
- Outline the phasing and delivery of the proposed development works.
- Robust justification required in relation to the previous grounds for refusal on site having regard to the LAP, County Development Plan and national guidance.
- Distinction of character areas to be clearly illustrated.

## **2. Development Strategy for the Site including: Density, Layout and Open Space**

### **ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Density – having regard to the site’s location on edge of village and proximity to Glounthaune train station connecting to the Cork Metropolitan area.
- Gross density figures v net density figures to be clarified.

### **Prospective Applicant’s response:**

- Net density figure approx. 25 units per hectare, omitting area for spine road and crèche/doctors’ surgery.
- Usable open space = approx.12-13% of site area.
- Guidelines suggest new housing stock should not represent more than 20% of existing development in an area.
- Proposed density is within the Median B range of Cork County Development Plan – towards the higher end of this bracket.
- Train station is approx. 600m from the site – within 5-6 minutes walking distance or 2-3 minutes by bicycle.
- The station is served by the Cobh and Midleton rail lines which operate 45 services a day, running every 15 minutes at peak travel times.
- Glounthaune is situated between 2 major employment hubs of Carrigtwohill and Little Island.
- The urban grain of Glounthaune is not typical as the urban core is very small. Need to strike a balance between the strategic location of the site and the existing context.
- The prospective applicant has addressed the core basic principles of development and will articulate this at application stage.

### **Planning Authority’s comments:**

- Sensitivity of the site as it offers considerable amenity value – proximity to small historic village core and strategic location close to rail station connecting to Cork metropolitan area. The proposed development needs to strike the right balance between the two.
- Satisfied with the proposed density and the strategy to deliver units in neighbourhood clusters.
- Follow through at design stage crucial in terms of the materials and finishing of units and shared surfaces.

## **3. Connectivity, Transportation, Access and Traffic**

### **ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Pedestrian/cycle paths along the former N25 – how are these to be delivered?
- Speed limit along the former N25.
- Delivery of paths and maintaining existing stone wall along road side.
- Traffic calming at village – is it proposed to continue this towards the site?

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- PA have carried out Part VIII improvement works to the village.
- Have assessed what the appropriate infrastructure connections are required to the village and train station, plenty of hard shoulder space along former N25, propose to reduce the carriageways in order to introduce footpaths and cycle paths.
- Acknowledge special contributions may be required.
- Propose to build on the infrastructure works that have been delivered to date and address the area to the east of the site towards The Elm Tree restaurant.
- Propose to provide cycle connectivity to the southern side of the road adjacent the rail line as there are fewer junctions.
- Pedestrian footpath proposed along the northern side of the road. Footpaths can be delivered on either side of the road by agreement.
- Former N25 was a national primary road and is now a local road (L3004), large amount of space available, no reason why path infrastructure works can't proceed at an early stage.
- Timeframe for delivery of paths could be provided and could be delivered with the time frame of the permission, if granted.
- Paths along section of roadway in control of prospective applicant can easily be delivered with the application.
- Cognisant of the need to demonstrate deliverability of the infrastructure which can be done in tandem with the development, will provide this information with the application.
- Will prepare a Traffic Impact Assessment in conjunction with the PA, will address adjacent junctions at Carrigtwohill.
- 4m grass verge exists between the existing trees and stone wall, 2m grass verge is proposed between the wall and the footpath with a cycle path to be provided on the opposite side of the road. Sight lines are to be maintained, plenty of room/scope for works to be carried out.
- It is proposed to narrow the road carriageway to 6m which will act as a traffic calming measure by helping to reduce traffic speed in the area.
- Speed limit along the road has changed since the previous refusal.

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- National cycle plan provides for 1m verge for a 2-way cycle path.
- Footpath vital for connectivity – cannot build development without a footpath.
- Cycle path is desirable.
- Process has not commenced and no funding at present for the delivery of footpaths/cycle paths.
- Cork Cycle Network Plan – a cycle link is proposed from Carrigtwohill to Glanmire, no funding at present.
- No 3<sup>rd</sup> party lands involved/no CPO requirement for delivery of paths, could form a special contribution condition.
- LAP refers to speed limit along former N25 as being 50km/hour, this should read 60km/hour.

- No issue re. access from site along L3004 (former N25), rarely used as a diversion off new M25.
- It is not considered necessary to continue traffic calming measures along the road to the site of the proposed development.

**ABP comments re. application stage:**

- Clearly outline how, when and by whom the infrastructure will be delivered.
- Suggest agreement is reached with PA before application is lodged.

**4. Boundary Treatment**

**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Boundary with Killahora Lodge – is this a Protected Structure?
- Any works proposed to existing stone wall along the southern site boundary.

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Killahora Lodge is not a protected structure but is recorded on the NIAH. It is proposed to maintain the ha-ha wall as it is which offers a visual break between the site and the lodge with vegetation on the lodge's side of the boundary.
- Old dry stone wall and agricultural ditch situated along the southern site boundary. Proposed entrance will require some remedial works to be carried out.
- 1.2m drop between the existing stone wall and site levels, propose to erect a railing/fence to stop interference/restrict access to the stone wall.
- Propose to leave the character of walls as is along the southern and eastern boundaries.

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- No comments in relation to the above.

**ABP comments re. application stage:**

- Provide details of boundary treatments and illustrate with cross sections.

**5. Any Other Matters**

**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Surface water drainage.
- Need for a Construction Management Plan.
- Any restrictions regarding position of attenuation measures and usability of open space.

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Outfall pipe to estuary via south-eastern corner of the site. Mitigation ponds are proposed and attenuation measures such as hydrocarbon traps.
- Open space area at crèche is suitable for attenuation measures, propose to locate all attenuation measures in this area.

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Storm sewer in good working order at this location, recent survey carried out.
- Grit traps for attenuation is agreeable.
- Attenuation measures to be in areas of hardstanding or open space, need to be accessible for maintenance.

**An Bord Pleanála's comments re. application stage:**

- Surface water drainage outfall into estuary – clearly outline proposed mitigation measures and incorporate into Screening for Appropriate Assessment.
- Outline location of attenuation ponds.
- Agree surface water details with PA before making an application.
- Consider any safety issues re. use of open space and attenuation measures.

**ABP invited parties to raise any outstanding matters.**

**Prospective Applicant's comments:**

- Density – mindful of the character of Glounthaune and the site's proximity to train station, if density is too high it may not work re. the marketability of units.
- Will address the issues regarding density before making an application.
- Varying views at section 247 meeting with PA re. density.

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Density is critical, as is the quality and approach of layout.
- Acknowledged that the prospective applicant has sought to address the previous refusal on the site and has presented a reasonable approach to those grounds of refusal.

**Conclusion**

**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 [cdsdesignqa@water.ie](mailto:cdsdesignqa@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 [spatialplanning@water.ie](mailto:spatialplanning@water.ie)

---

Tom Rabbette  
Assistant Director of Planning  
November, 2017