



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Record of Meeting ABP-301345-18

<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	382 no. apartments, neighbourhood centre, 3 no. additional access points to the adjacent Lough Mahon walkway/cycleway, upgrades to a section of the Mahon Link Road (R852) to the north of the N40 interchange to incorporate a shared bus and cycle lane and all associated works. Jacobs Island, Mahon, 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>	4 <sup>th</sup> May, 2018	<b>Start Time</b>	11.30 am
<b>Location</b>	Cork City Council Offices	<b>End Time</b>	1.10 pm
<b>Chairperson</b>	Rachel Kenny	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Cora Cunningham

### Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Rachel Kenny, Director of Planning
Una Crosse, Senior Planning Inspector
Cora Cunningham, Executive Officer

### Representing Prospective Applicant:

Conor Kinsella, O'Mahony Pike Architects
Christopher Collins, O'Mahony Pike Architects
Martin Murphy, Murphy Matson O'Sullivan
Liam Luddy, Arup
Niall Harte, Arup
Jeorg Schultze, AECOM
Bernard Dwyer, HW Planning
Harry Walsh, HW Planning

## Representing Planning Authority

Kevin O'Connor, Senior Executive Planner
Tony Duggan, City Architect
Tony T. O' Sullivan, Environment
Simon Lyons, Water/Drainage
Niamh O'Brien, Transportation
Kevin Gallagher, Roads Design
Gillian O'Sullivan, Planning Roads Engineer
Alison O'Rourke, Housing (Part V)
Sharon O'Connell, Planner
Jeremy Ward, Planning Policy
John A. Murphy, Admin, Planning

### Introduction

The representatives of An Bord Pleanála (ABP) welcomed the prospective applicant, Planning Authority (PA) and 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> April, 2018 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 decision,
- 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 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 29<sup>th</sup> March, 2018 formally requesting pre-application consultations with ABP. Prospective applicant 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. Visual Impact, Design of Tall Building and Detail of Finishes**
- 2. Traffic Impact, Access and Sustainable Parking**
- 3. Pedestrian/Cycle Connectivity**
- 4. Residential Amenity – external and internal**
- 5. Water and Foul Services and Surface Water Management. SuDS**
- 6. Environmental Impact Assessment and Appropriate Assessment**
- 7. Any other matters**

### **1. Visual Impact, Design of Tall Building and Detail of Finishes**

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

- Visual Impact, LAP and City Plan
- Site specific objective for tall building: query as to rationale behind proposed height, and whether building should be taller to meet requirements of Cork City Council (re positive visual impact)
- Policy relating to tall buildings and the rationale, from 2009 to date (NPF, etc.)
- External finishes and design

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

- Policy introduced in 2009 (Height Study 2008 and incorporated in to 2009 City Plan)
- Viability and cost taken into consideration in relation to height
- Height/slenderness ratio is less than ideal and recognition that building could be more slender, accepted that building could be higher but no tests carried out to determine viability and visual/residential impact
- Complying in principle with policy, cognisance that building will be standing alone on site
- Architectural needs to be timeless, didn't want to go beyond constraints relating to height policy
- Render considered and durable

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

- Tall building study based on hierarchy of tall buildings for city, rationale based on study
- Justification needed to give landmark building to neighbourhood, rationale to design that will stand the test of time
- Threshold between public and private space needs to be clearly defined
- Building should give an identity to the area creating a sense of place
- Interpretation of height restrictions on sites across city, argument needs to be fully justified in application, although would not be de facto ruled out by PA

**Further ABP comments:**

- Opportunity to have tall building which should be designed to be the maximum height appropriate for the site
- Chance to create a landmark building, if justification can be given in architectural statement to put an argument forward to design a higher building
- Justification for best building design on site, exemplar timeless finishes, high quality render due to exposure
- Have regard to National Planning Framework

**2. Traffic Impact, Access and Sustainable Parking**

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

- PA's comments regarding traffic and impacts, TTA have said development will not have a negative impact on junctions
- Proposed creation of bus lane

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Works proposed between the site and the City are at different stages of completion

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Traffic sensitive area, Traffic Impact Assessment addresses problems
- No impacts considered on the N40 or Dunkettle roundabout
- Travel sustainable within the Mahon area, proposals to carry out a mobility management plan
- NTA funding works under construction

**Further ABP comments:**

- NTA and TII have been notified and response will be appended to ABP Opinion
- Works being carried out around area to be included as well as details regarding when infrastructure upgrade will be completed and by who
- Time lines in relation to bus lane being completed as to when and by who
- Ensure works are included in redline
- Sustainable parking and provision of GoCar documents in pre-application but more detail required in application

**3. Pedestrian/Cycle Connectivity**

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

- Pedestrian and cycle connectivity from proposed development to Mahon and surrounding areas
- Amenity space proposed including detail

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Apartments can be built to sell or build to rent
- Space provision will be detailed out in application
- Amenity space proposed outside of gate to deal with visitors/post/packages

- Internally will be privately taken in charge
- 4 blocks not gated have roads up to development taken in charge

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Address signage in Mobility Management Plan
- Road Safety Audit required, taking in charge internally
- Satisfied with proposals

**Further ABP comments:**

- Pedestrian connection to Mahon to be shown in application documents
- Pedestrian crossing sequence to be shown in conjunction with traffic lights
- Critical connection and needs to be shown in all drawings
- Concierge/Tenant amenity need more detail in application documents
- Have regard to apartment guidelines, submit lifetime of cost of building (build to rent or build to sell)

**4. Residential Amenity – external and internal**

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

- Existing dwellings to south of site
- Address issues of overshadowing/overlooking/overbearing relating to existing residents
- Residential amenity between blocks
- Noise in relation to N40

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Screening proposed for first few floors, less noise higher up building
- Balconies not overlooking N40 on upper floors

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Address possible noise issues
- Existing sub-station on site to be taken into consideration and any impact it may have on proposed development

**Further ABP comments:**

- Address possible wind tunnelling in application
- Clearly show distances between adjoining properties
- Provide standalone document addressing residential amenity
- Justification of design in relation to noise

**5. Water and Foul Services and Surface Water Management. SuDS**

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

- Surface water management and use of SuDS
- Possible sustainable drainage on site
- Drainage report may not spell out natural drainage available on site

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Surface water will drain into estuary
- No proposals to put attenuation on site
- Soft landscaping proposed
- Road up to turning circle for buses taken in charge

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Existing infrastructure can cope with discharge, maintaining quality of discharge rather than quantity
- Ongoing discussions with prospective applicant

**Further ABP comments:**

- Clearly outline in any justification that proposals have gone as far as possible in relation to SuDS
- Clearly outline/interpret what Irish Water detail in their report

## **6. Environmental Impact Assessment and Appropriate Assessment**

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

- Documents submitted show EIA not required
- Proximity to SPA

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Proposed development falls below threshold, established residential area so issues previously addressed
- AA screening report being prepared to be submitted with application
- Ecologist will address height and location in AA report

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- EIAR (EIS) covered original planning application for site

## **7. Any other matters**

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

- Proposals for the lands on opposite side of road
- Density not expressed as gross or net in pre-application documentation

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Permission extended to July 2020 of lands on opposite side of road
- Waste Management Plan to have regard to bin storage

## Conclusions

### 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)

---

Rachel Kenny  
Director of Planning  
May, 2018