



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-302564-18

Case Reference / Description	446 no. residential units (259 no. houses, 182 no. apartments), crèche and all associated site works. Castletreasure/Maryborough (townlands), Carr's Hill, Douglas, Co. Cork.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
1st/2nd/3rd Meeting	1 st Meeting		
Date:	25 th October, 2018	Start Time	11:30 a.m.
Location	Offices of Cork County Council	End Time	13:30 p.m.
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Joanna Kelly, Senior Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Aidan McLernon, Cairn Homes (applicant)
Daibhi Mac Domhnaill, Cairn Homes (applicant)
Mark Dignam, Meitheal Architects
Gerry O'Sullivan, Meitheal Architects
Donal Murphy, Meitheal Architects
Tim Finn, JB Barry Consulting Engineers
Ross Loughnane, AECOM (landscape and Visual)
Joerg Schulze, AECOM (landscape and Visual)
Katherine Kelleher, (Kelleher Ecology)
Tom Halley, McCutcheon Halley Planning Consultants
Orla O'Sullivan, McCutcheon Halley Planning Consultants

Representing Planning Authority

Paul Murphy, Senior Planner
Greg Simpson, Senior Executive Planner
Eileen Coleman, Executive Engineer Roads
Madeleine Healy, Senior Executive Engineer – Roads & Engineering
Mark Collins, County Architect
Michael Mulconry, Executive Engineer – Traffic & Transport
Seán O'Brien, Administrative Officer

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 10th October 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 14th September 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. **Specific Local Objectives pertaining to the site namely SE-R-06 and SE-U-04.**
2. **Green Infrastructure to include retention and protection of existing trees, landscaping and hierarchy and function of public open spaces, biodiversity and movement corridors, SUDS and archaeological constraints.**
3. **Development Standards to include density, layout, unit typology and mix, urban design.**
4. **Visual Impact Assessment**
5. **Connectivity and Movement to include DMURS and consideration of impacts on the local and wider road network.**
6. **Flood Risk**
7. **Any other matters**

1. **D Specific Local Objectives pertaining to the site namely SE-R-06 and SE-U-04.**

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- How the proposal is consistent with these policy objectives for the site
- Rationale for the proposed density of 32.6 per hectare having regard to national policy and location of the site within the Cork Metropolitan Area.
- Provision of useable open space

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Topography of the area is very challenging
- Achieving a density of 35 to the hectare is difficult
- A number of units are apartments to increase density
- Some areas on the site are undevelopable
- There are slopes of 1 in 3 and 1 in 4
- Capacity for increasing the density is limited

Planning Authority's comments:

- Acknowledges that the site has difficult topography
- There are a number of slopes on the site
- Unsure how a density of 33 to the hectare could be achieved
- TPO not identified in the LAP plan

Further ABP comments:

- Should establish/demonstrate a hierarchy for the open space
- Highlight how the layout is consistent with SE-U-04
- Clarify the TPO boundary/location.

- Specify the difference between the net and gross density and show how the net density was calculated having regard to provisions in Appendix A of Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas Guidelines.

2. Green Infrastructure to include retention and protection of existing trees, landscaping and hierarchy and function of public open spaces, biodiversity and movement corridors, SUDS and archaeological constraints.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Extent of trees/hedgerows to be maintained
- Hierarchy of public open space and its functional and qualitative nature
- Archaeological monitoring
- Public lighting and impact on ecology and associated movement corridors.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Some zones on the site are challenging for tree removal
- Will work to ensure the protection of trees
- Parts of the site are not accessible
- The nearest monument is 500 metres from the site
- Geo Phys and test trenching will be carried out
- Aware that lighting can conflict with ecology and need to take a balanced approach

Planning Authority's comments:

- In favour of archaeological testing prior to lodging application
- Area 3 – could this be developed for a green relief active open space
- Agree that lighting must be low level along greenways

Further ABP comments:

- It would be useful if the design statement addressed 'green infrastructure' in general having regard to the site context and inter-relationship of each component and these considerations influenced layout
- Details on what trees are to be retained and protection measures should be submitted.
- Advised to consult with the D.A.U regarding archaeology
- Details are required on SUDS measures how these are integrated into the scheme
- Consider local heritage objectives contained in the CDP

3. Development Standards to include density, layout, unit typology and mix, urban design.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Proposed density having regard to local and national guidance
- Layout of the proposed development in particular the interrelationship of urban blocks, open space and roof levels having regard to the difference in levels
- Quality of the public realm and use of materials
- Type of units/design of blocks so as to ensure optimum passive surveillance and high quality streetscapes
- The creche spaces provided having regard to comments in the planning authority's opinion.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Dual frontage units are provided along the river valley and Carrigaline Road
- Typology has been considered in the design
- Balconies are overlooking green spaces
- Access to/from units along Carrigaline road is facing into the amenity area
- A childcare assessment has been carried out

Planning Authority's comments:

- Satisfied with the design and mix
- Childcare provision needs analysis

Further ABP comments:

- Examine the treatment to the back of the units e.g. boundary treatments
- Consider the location of bin stores (and satellite dishes etc) at rear of structures, given the difference in levels and visual impacts that may arise
- Cross sections are important for the application given the differential in levels across the site, CG1 would also be helpful/useful at application stage
- Address the number of childcare spaces required
- Consider the use of a more varied colour palette on the layout plan for differentiating unit types so as to make plan more legible
- Planning Authority's specific comments regarding different areas within the scheme is useful and should be considered by applicant

4. Visual Impact Assessment

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Visual impact having regard to site context
- Key vantage points for which CGIs should be prepared
- Will the development be visible from the M28 interchange
- Interchange is to be upgraded – will there be new views?

Prospective Applicant's response:

- 11 visual impact points - 3 are contained on the Carrigaline road
- Further examination of the visual impact assessment will be carried out

Planning Authority's comments:

- Examine the impact on the Carrigaline road
- Will have further discussion with the applicant regarding the visual impact

Further ABP comments:

- CGI'S will be required for the Carrigaline road and details should be clear what visual changes will occur along Carrigaline road e.g. hedgerow removal

5. Connectivity and Movement to include DMURS and consideration of impacts on the local and wider road network.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- How the principles of DMURS are being applied to the scheme e.g. street hierarchy
- Vision/treatment of the Carrigaline road having regard to the existing context and proposed urbanisation of these lands and traffic calming measures
- Proposed connections from adjacent residential lands and whether these were taken in charge
- Potential for future connections to lands south of the development lands
- Whether a special development contribution would apply similar to that applied in the planning consent for the school

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Lands south of the proposed development are not zoned
- There are potential connection points both vehicular and pedestrian
- Lands to the south will have primary access areas- which can be shown at application stage
- Traffic calming may be required on Carrigaline Road
- Access through the Vicarage development could be limited

Planning Authority's comments:

- Unsure if lands to the south will be developed
- Access to the site is difficult
- Topography of the site will affect potential for road links
- Possibility of a special levy contribution
- Concerned that access through the Vicarage development could be used as an alternative to the signalised junction during peak school times

Further ABP comments:

- Where future connections are proposed they should be brought right up to the party boundary to avoid ransom strips
- Boundary treatment at these future connection locations should be suggestive of future connections so solid walls should be avoided
- A taking in charge plan should be submitted including sections of road up to the party boundary

- Suggest that long cross-sections are submitted to highlight quality of streetscapes, indicate slopes, steps and changes in roof levels.
- Suggest that further discussion between the PA and the applicant regarding application of any special contribution

6. Flood Risk

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Flood Zone A lands within the site
- Issue of displaced waters and potential for increased flood risk downstream
- Provision of attenuation measures for the scheme and proposed phasing plan

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Proposed development is not impacting on the floodplain
- The flood line is tight to the stream but does not encroach into the development

Planning Authority's comments:

- Will liaise with the applicant regarding any outstanding issues

Further ABP comments:

- There is no further information mechanism in SHD applications so suggest that further discussions are held to ensure PA are satisfied with proposals

7. Any other matters

ABP comments:

- Any changes to Part V to be discussed with the P.A
- Demonstrate the extent of proposed 'cut and fill' operations through the use of cross sections and provide existing and proposed contour levels that are legible.
- Consider proposed phasing arrangement of the development
- Informed the prospective applicant regarding EIAR screening and procedures
- Playgrounds will be required to be provided where indicated by the applicant

Prospective Applicant's comments:

- Density will be examined
- Open space and play/recreational strategy has been considered for the development with playgrounds provided through the development which has regard to site context
- Further discussions to take place with the planning authority regarding issues raised

Planning Authority's comments:

- Concerns raised regarding provision of open space having regard to recreation and amenity policy in CDP
- Further discussions to take place with the applicant regarding issues raised

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 **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

Tom Rabbette
Assistant Director of Planning
November, 2018