

Record of Meeting ABP-304211-19

Case Reference / Description	302 no. residential units, ground floor retail, creche and associated site works. Horgan Quay, Railway Street, Cork.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	9 th May, 2019	Start Time	2.30 p.m
Location	Offices of Cork City Council	End Time	3.30 p.m
Chairperson	Rachel Kenny	Executive Officer	Cora Cunningham

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

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

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Harry Walsh, HW Planning
Bernard Dywer, HW Planning
Conor Kinsella, O'Mahony Pike Architects
Soléne Vermont, O'Mahony Pike Architects
Feargal O'Sullivan, ARUP
Alan Leen, ARUP
Clifford Killeen, ARUP

Representing Planning Authority

Gwen Jordan, Senior Executive Planner
Grainne Morgan, Executive Engineer
Alison O'Rourke, Executive Officer
Simon Lyons, Executive Engineer
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 13th May, 2019 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 16th April, 2019 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. Enhancement/integration setting and context
- 2. Phasing parent permission interdependencies
- 3. Architectural Heritage
- 4. Car Parking
- 5. Flood Risk
- 6. Any other matters

1. Enhancement/integration – setting and context

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- ➤ The advice provided by the Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines in relation to building height and context
- Building form, mass, setting and context of the site, specifically the river side setting
- Rationale for the building style and form and how that is articulated in documentation

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Proposed development on same footprint as preciously approved development
- Current proposal more viable having regard to 2018 Building Height Guidelines
- > Change in architect from previously permitted development
- Issues relating to distances between buildings adjacencies and protected structures
- Similar height as previously permitted but allocated differently, height along river to create residential amenity with views across the river, PA allowed flexibility along heights
- Lower structures located beside protected structure
- Different context proposed to front and back of building, finishes differ to show context
- Emerging roof scape from city

Planning Authority's comments:

- Proposed development doesn't read as one block due to different finishes on elevations
- ➤ Given the location which is of strategic importance proposed development will give greater significance to the area

Further ABP comments:

- There may be an opportunity to add greater height to sections of the proposed apartments and improve detailing, emphasising different elements and articulation
- ➤ The CGI's submitted don't reflect the text description of the proposed development, CGI's should be more carefully selected and informative
- Have regard to how ABP deal with height and density in terms of context and setting, and building detailing

2. Phasing – parent permission interdependencies

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

Ensuring proposed development can be standalone

Prospective Applicant's response:

Standalone development was key driver of designing proposed development, informed thinking when creating masterplan Public realm/design strategy was created to include 1 protected structure in each of the 3 elements of the overall development, ensuring each element could be built independently of each other

Planning Authority's comments:

No concern with proposed phasing, satisfied with detail showing how phasing is plotted out

Further ABP comments:

Set out the phasing details in the application in terms of any amenities or public realm shared with the overall development

3. Architectural Heritage

ABP comments:

Detail the residential amenity located adjacent to the station masters building and show how amenity space will plug into the protected structure

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Proposed development follows a masterplan
- Station masters building will have visual connections into proposed development and drawings will show the detail of connections between building and amenity space

4. Car Parking

ABP comments:

- ➤ The PA Opinion raises an issue in relation to car parking spaces proposed and the commercial component of emerging development
- > Submit a Mobility Management Plan, set out purpose of car parking proposed
- Create rationale for setdown in relation to crèche
- ➤ Have regard to provision of parking for crèche staff, ensure no overspill into setdown spaces

Prospective Applicant's rsesponse:

- No dedicated parking for retail, envisaged for residential use only, more detail to be submitted in application, spaces will not be allocated
- Limited number of spaces for crèche setdown, envisaged those travelling into city on train will use crèche on route to work, crèche parking will be clarified in application, setdown areas also available across street

Planning Authority's comments:

- Car parking reduced from that previously permitted having regard to sustainable transport
- > Proposed parking in line with Development Plan, have regard to disability parking
- Consider setdown parking for créche

5. Flood Risk

ABP comments:

> Proximity to River Lee, reference to flood risk in previously approved application

Prospective Applicant's response:

- > Flood Risk Assessment submitted with previous application
- > Site not located in a flood zone, no further justifications tests required
- Electrical fittings raised above water level, no material changes in the proposed development having regard to the previous report

Planning Authority's comments:

No comments at pre-application stage

ABP comments:

➤ It would be useful if the FRA details that accompanied the previous application, and if applicable to this development, should be revised and submitted again

6. Any other matters

ABP comments:

- ➤ Have regard to and consider what is on and off site in relation to bicycle parking provision but not to rely on off site provision of cycle facilities
- ➤ Have an assessment of the cumulative effects on those using bike schemes, submit a rationale in the application
- ➤ Have regard to the quality of cycle spaces being provided, ensure they are safe, secure and usable
- Consider the apartments in excess of minimum standard requirements and clearly detail calculations made in relation to advice provided by guidelines
- Previously approved development on site contained EIAR, ensure Environmental Report addresses same

Applicants Comments:

- Apartment guidelines versus PA guidelines for cycle parking, what standards need to be applied when other options available
- Circumstances have changed in relation to cycle parking, bicycles are now coming out and going into the city centre locations to the train station where previously they only went into the city centre locations
- Cycle parking split across 2 locations on proposed development site with street access
- Schedule 7(a) details contained in Environmental Report

Planning Authority's comments:

- There area number of Coca Cola Bikes (Bike Scheme) in close proximity to proposed development
- ➤ No cycle provision coming up to Kent Train Station from city centre
- > HQA should show excess of minimum standards

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 <u>cdsdesignqa@water.ie</u> 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
June, 2019

ABP-304211-19 An Bord Pleanála Page 6 of 6