



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Record of Meeting ABP-302800-18

<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	100 no. built to rent apartments and associated site works. Site bounded by South City Link Road (N27), Rockboro Road and Gasworks Road, 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>	22 <sup>nd</sup> November, 2018	<b>Start Time</b>	2.30 p.m.
<b>Location</b>	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	<b>End Time</b>	4.10 p.m.
<b>Chairperson</b>	Rachel Kenny	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Cora Cunningham

### Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Rachel Kenny, Director of Planning
Stephen Rhys Thomas, Planning Inspector
Cora Cunningham, Executive Officer

### Representing Prospective Applicant:

Seamus Scally, Applicant
Brendan Scally, Applicant
Patrick O'Toole, Meitheal Design Partners
Luke Hickson, Meitheal Design Partners
Donal Murphy, Meitheal Design Partners
Emma Fitzpatrick, Meitheal Design Partners
Martin Hanley, MHL and Associates Ltd
James Vaughan, O'Shea Leader Consulting Engineers
David Butler, O'Shea Leader Consulting Engineers
Orla O'Callaghan, Cunnane Stratton Reynolds
Daniel Sheedy, Cunnane Stratton Reynolds
Karen Banks, Greenleaf Ecology

## Representing Planning Authority

Brigh Ryan, Lead Planner
Gillian O'Sullivan, Roads
Kevin McGill, Environment
Simon Lyons, Drainage
Kevin O'Connor, Senior Planner
Siun McCarthy, Planner
Shane MacKay, Transportation
Diarmuid O'Connell, Housing
John A Murphy, Admin

### 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 11<sup>th</sup> November, 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 31<sup>st</sup> October, 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. Tall Buildings - City Development Plan objectives**
- 2. Residential amenity**
- 3. Public realm and heritage**
- 4. Access arrangements - compliance with DMURS**
- 5. Car parking quantum – general arrangement**
- 6. Building finishes**
- 7. Specific Planning Policy Requirements – covenant/legal agreement**
- 8. Any other matters**

### **1. Tall Buildings - City Development Plan objectives**

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

- How proposed development will fit in overall having regard to tall buildings and Cork City Development Plan

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

- Context of tall buildings continually changing, some developments have been permitted over standard height
- Consideration regarding access to public transport, site underutilised
- Design rationale set out in design statement
- Central location for pedestrian access
- Proposed development considered pier building rather than gateway building
- Context gave site strategy, did not want to compete with Elysian building

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

- Proposed development doesn't comply with Development Plan regarding tall buildings

#### **Further ABP comments:**

- Robust argument required in planning application regarding height of proposed development especially if considering higher height
- Include design rationale in application
- Issues with slenderness ratio of buildings

### **2. Residential amenity**

#### **ABP comments:**

- Interface with southern boundary
- Residential amenity for future occupants/residents

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

- Strong and definite planning history, considered what was best for site
- Courtyard gives best residential amenity, creates buffer on Rockboro Road
- Kept scale away from residential dwellings on adjacent site
- Used rock face for landscaping and creation of buffer
- Ensuring all apartments fit in with character of proposed development
- Inward Noise Impact Assessment to be submitted with application

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Applicants to be cognisant of two storey buildings
- Have regard to PA noise impact plan

**Further ABP comments:**

- Daylight/sunlight/overshadowing analysis required for application

**3. Public realm and heritage****ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- How proposed development fits in with railway heritage of the site
- How the proposed development responds to the ACA to the south of the site
- Pedestrian realm on Rockboro Road

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- PA concern with interface between petrol station and proposed development
- Ramp to strengthen proposed development to brickwork of railway arches
- Gasworks Road used as access into proposed development
- Pedestrian access from footbridge to create stronger sense of design and integration into proposed development
- Strong and robust design when dealing with how propose development will fit into ACA
- Visual Assessment completed in relation to dwellings in ACA
- Duplex units proposed to give variety in housing mix and give own door
- Proposals to continue footpath to join up to footbridge
- Will liaise further with PA

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- No footpaths on opposite side of road to proposed development, no details submitted to show proposals

**Further ABP comments:**

- Further discussions required in relation to Rockboro Road and the pedestrian activity/connection/permeability
- ABP have refused SHD developments due to lack of pedestrian connections
- Have regard to vehicle/pedestrian movements both inside and outside of proposed development

**4. Access arrangements - compliance with DMURS****ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Traffic entering and exiting proposed development
- Conflict with petrol station for pedestrian access to proposed development
- It is important to establish clear and safe routes for pedestrian and cycle access, with reference to the potential for conflicts around and in the petrol station forecourt

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Initial proposals for access onto N27, PA not in favour of access at this location
- TIA prepared
- Provision of main access to city from Rock Road
- Provision of pedestrian access from petrol station including pedestrian crossing across entrance
- Can consider other improvements that may be made but outside of redline
- Pedestrian bridge underutilised, upgrade to area would create public realm, main pedestrian access will be at podium level

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Difficult to implement main pedestrian entrance when shorter route available from N27
- Possible upgrades needed at junction
- No discussions with TII seem to have taken place, TII clearance requirement for footbridge
- Would propose upgrades completed prior to commencement of proposed development

**5. Car parking quantum – general arrangement**

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

- Car parking and reduced traffic movement

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Area at end of footbridge to include some covered cycle parking
- Service area will be located adjacent to petrol station

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Cycle parking all at basement level with access from ramp
- Build to Rent guidelines don't have requirement for high number of car parking, also taking central location into account
- PA want to promote sustainable travel
- Consideration of service area location

**Further ABP comments:**

- Consideration of shared car facilities
- Ramp may not need to be two way if car parking quantum is reduced
- More discussions on how building will function

**6. Building finishes**

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

- How building finishes will fit in and perform over the long term
- Maintenance of building along N27

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Limited palette of materials being used
- Overhang creating more of visual element

- Landscaping will create natural end to footpath along N27
- Emergency access onto petrol station, will discuss with fire officer

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Have concern regarding public element of proposed building
- Provide building lifecycle report
- Have regard to emergency exits and vehicles accessing same

**Further ABP comments:**

- Ensure information is provided that ensures roof spaces are usable or not
- Overhang creating shadow
- Have regard to building finishes and railway heritage, possibility of incorporating into proposed scheme

**7. Specific Planning Policy Requirements – covenant/legal agreement**

**ABP comments:**

- Draft covenant to be agreed before planning application lodged, covenant is for minimum 15 years, permission longer term, new application would be required if altering current proposals

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Aware of what is required and will submit with planning application

**8. Any other matters**

**ABP comments:**

- Include Assessment Quality Report in application
- Ensure redline covers all works proposed

**Prospective Applicant's comments:**

- Previous permission granted for commercial element on ground floor
- Issue with provision of street frontage onto N27, proposed development best option, would need for commercial element to be included

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- No residential development on ground floor
- Have regard to PA Opinion on previous proposals

**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  
December, 2018