



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-302803-18

Case Reference / Description	Demolition of existing industrial building and derelict garage, construction of 418 no. student bed spaces, re-location of telecommunications mast and associated site works. Bandon Road and portion of the Church of the Immaculate Conception, Lough Road, Cork.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
1st/2nd/3rd Meeting	1 st Meeting		
Date:	22 nd November, 2018	Start Time	11.00 a.m.
Location	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	12.30 p.m.
Chairperson	Rachel Kenny	Executive Officer	Cora Cunningham

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

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

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Harry Walsh, HW Planning
Bernard Dwyer, HW Planning
Aoife Roche, O'Mahony Pike Architects
Alan Nolan, O'Mahony Pike Architects
Mike Waldvogel, Forestbird Design
Ken Manley, MHL Consultants
Kieran Coughlan, Lyonshall
Mike Waldvogel, Landscape Architect

Representing Planning Authority

Evelyn Mitchell, Lead Planner
Gillian O'Sullivan, Roads
Kevin McGill, Environment
Colm O'Connor, Drainage
Kevin O'Connor, Senior Planner
Grainne Morgan, Transportation
Pat Ruane, Conservation
John A Murphy, Admin
Niamh Twomey, Heritage

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 14th 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 1st November, 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. Permitted development**
- 2. Pedestrian permeability**
- 3. Public realm improvements**
- 4. Visual impact**
- 5. Supply of student accommodation analysis**
- 6. Any other matters**

1. Permitted development

ABP comments:

- Previous Board decision taken into account
- Appropriate location for student accommodation, height and density to be considered
- Board to ensure proposed development meets criteria of variation in Development Plan
- Proposed development in campus setting
- Ensure all issues on visual assessment are detailed in application as there is no provision for further information

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Previous permission granted earlier in 2018, predates draft guidelines on height, PA concern with long range views, blocks reduces, church views are not protected
- Proposed development in excess of certain standards, better scheme in current layout, visual assessment give high details of views

Planning Authority's comments:

- Have regard to variation of Development Plan which came in post ABP decision

2. Pedestrian permeability

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Pedestrian permeability through site
- PA Opinion refers to opening to create urban block

Prospective Applicant's response:

- No additional pedestrian permeability sought at other locations
- Students allowed traverse Church grounds
- Ridgeline is diving line with different urban fabric on each site, will reassess and address for application
- May provide for future permeability

Planning Authority's comments:

- Laneway locked due to anti-social behaviour
- Other accesses available
- Legal issues regarding locked laneway, will have to have regard to these issues

Further ABP comments:

- Look at other possible entrances including pedestrian accesses and address in application

3. Public realm improvements

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- The proposed development being gated
- How all the elements of the proposed development fits into the public realm and public domain
- Road improvements proposed

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Barrier entrance into proposed development with 24 hour security on site
- Block 1 contains social element onto front of proposed development with passive surveillance
- It is hoped to incorporate the 2 buildings adjacent to proposed development in the future
- Restrictions due to on street parking, DMURS requirements met, 30km proposed with traffic calming including pedestrian crossing, no additional parking required
- Roads to have raised surfaces with 2 crossing points, applicant to pay for upgrades as agreed under previous planning permission

Planning Authority's comments:

- Issues raised in section 247 meetings regarding creation of streetscape to include adjacent buildings
- Access doesn't meet DMURS for 50km, proposed reduced speed will help meet requirements

Further ABP comments:

- More details of improvements proposed
- Include pedestrian and cycle proposals
- Engineer and public realm drawings to be included in planning application

4. Visual impact

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Reasons for refusal in previous ABP appeal on site

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Looked at views that were designated and those that were not
- Layout not changed since previous planning permission
- Impacts unchanged since previous planning permission
- Increase of height did not create any additional negative impacts, did not want to destroy amenity of church, 9% view of lough from proposed development

Planning Authority's comments:

- Lough is part of Cork
- Local significant views, no protected views
- PA have issue with scale and massing of proposed development

Further ABP comments:

- ABP appeal did not have issue with proposed development being overbearing
- Board will assess what is over and above what was previously applied for

5. Supply of student accommodation analysis

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- High number of student accommodation in area

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Size of proposed development will ensure management of scheme
- Should free up of housing currently being used for student accommodation
- Operator will manage proposed development

Planning Authority's comments:

- Require onsite management on 24 hour basis

Further ABP comments:

- Student analysis relates to management regime
- Meeting targets set out in variation of Development Plan
- Management Plan provides certainty on how proposed development will be managed and how it fits into wider area
- Ensure summer months' usage is included in management plan

6. Any other matters

ABP comments:

- Liaise with ABP in relation to site notices

Prospective Applicant's comments:

- Appropriate Assessment and Ecological Assessment submitted with pre-application documentation
- Mobility Management Plan to be submitted
- No change in drainage proposals from previous planning application

Planning Authority's comments:

- Reviewed and updated Ecological Assessment to be submitted with planning application
- Traffic and Transport Assessment to be submitted with planning application
- Road Safety Audit to be carried out
- Reconsider bin storage location
- Drainage design not submitted

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

Rachel Kenny
Director of Planning
December, 2018