



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-304987-19

Case Reference / Description	Proposed development of 201 no. build to rent units which will include the demolition of the former Sexton pub, and the reuse and renovation of 2 no. protected structures Ref. No. PS 1137, (also a Recorded Monument C0074-119002) and Ref No. PS 1138. Albert Quay, Cork City, Cork.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	5 th September, 2019	Start Time	11:30 a.m.
Location	Offices of Cork City Council	End Time	12:45 p.m.
Chairperson	Rachel Kenny	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Rachel Kenny, Director of Planning
Ronan O' Connor, Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

John Cleary, Progressive Commercial Construction Limited (Applicant)
Keith McMullin, Henry J Lyon & Partners (Architect)
Matthias Wunderlich, Urban Initiatives (Tall Buildings, Urban Design, Visual Impact)
Richard Coleman, City Designer (Architectural Advisor)
Jim Kelly, CSR (Landscape Architect)
Gareth O'Callaghan, JCA (Grade 1 Conservation Architect)
Clifford Killeen, Arup Consulting Engineers (Engineer - traffic and transportation)
Bairbre O'Breasail, Arup Consulting Engineers (Engineer – flooding)
Martin Murphy, MMOS Consulting Engineers (Engineer - services)
Aiden O'Neill, Coakley O'Neill Town Planning Ltd (Planner)
John Gleeson, IES (Daylight/Sunlight/Overshadowing)
Lori Clark, (JCD Group) Administrator

Representing Planning Authority

Gwen Jordan, Planner
Eoin Cullinane, Planner
Kevin O'Connor, Senior Planner
John A Murphy, Admin
Valerie Fenton, Roads
Tony Duggan, City Architect
Simon Lyons, Drainage
Alison O'Rourke, Housing
Cathy Beecher, Transportation
Thomas Watt, Planner

Introduction

The representatives of An Bord Pleanála (ABP) welcomed the prospective applicant, the Local Authority (LA) 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 P.A on 22nd August, 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 LA 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 26th July, 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. Residential Density**
- 2. Height (including justification/visual impact/impact on Protected Views)**
- 3. Design and Layout (e.g. scale and massing/internal layout and standards/public realm/streetscape)**
- 4. Conservation (Impact on ACA/Impact on Protected Structures)**
- 5. Transport (including car parking/cycle parking, transport links, required infrastructure upgrades)**
- 6. Infrastructure (water, wastewater etc)**
- 7. Flood Risk**
- 8. Any other matters**

1. Residential Density

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Justification for the proposed density. Was noted that the proposed density of 530 units/ha was the highest the Board would have considered. Robust justification would be required having regard to the site's location relative to public transport facilities. A high standard of design would be necessary.

Planning Authority's comments:

- The proposed development will contain at least 500 people
- Also noted the high density figure.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Rationale for the density is following the 2009 guidelines and the site's accessibility was noted, in particular the Kent Rail Station and the Bus Station. Was noted that the site is linked to surrounding areas and to the city centre via pedestrian and cycle networks also.
- The city centre/edge of centre location was noted a higher density was considered appropriate.

Further ABP comments:

- In the context of density – examine the proposed mix
- The population is transient
- Clarify if the density impacts on amenities
- Noted that density was only an indicator of the intensity of development – key considerations would be the quality of the scheme as a whole including design quality and internal standards for the units.
- Submit a rationale for density

2. Height (including justification/visual impact/impact on Protected Views)

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- ABP noted that robust justification for the proposed height at this location would be required.

- It was further noted that the site is not identified in the CPD as a location for a tall/landmark buildings. One of the key considerations, which ABP noted was shared by the PA, was whether the site is strategic in terms of its location.
- ABP also noted that a further key consideration would be the cumulative impact of the proposal in combination with other existing, permitted and proposed developments including the current application at the Custom House Site for a tall building, which is located close to this current site.

Planning Authority's response:

- This building will be the main entrance to the city and the site was considered an important site.
- The applicant needs to explain what the city is gaining from this tall building.
- This can act as a landmark.
- City Architect noted positive aspects of the proposal.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- This is an edge of city centre site.
- This is a changing area with an urban character.
- There are a number of high buildings existing or permitted in the city.
- Much consideration/design work has gone into ensuring the visual impact will be positive.
- In relation to the cumulative impact, the building will read as one of a cluster of tall buildings.
- This building supports the Custom House tower as there is a step-up in height from this building to the proposed Custom House tower.

Further ABP comments:

- Demonstrate how this building works with existing, permitted and proposed buildings in the Visual Impact Assessment/CGIs.
- Documentation should demonstrate the iterative design process that that been undertaken to arrive at the chosen design. This would help demonstrate that the building as proposed is the best solution for the site.

3. Design and Layout (e.g. scale and massing/internal layout and standards/public realm/streetscape)

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Scale and massing of the proposed development, in particular the 12 storey element and its relationship with the Navigation Square development to the east.
- Internal standards including provision of private amenity space – was consideration given to the provision of additional amenity space/winter gardens to the units. Was noted that many of the units do not have private amenity space.
- Given the units are BTR and not all have their own amenity space, the standard of the communal amenity spaces would have to be high/needs to be demonstrated that these spaces will be utilised.
- Permeability of the public realm - how accessible it is/impact of the proposed sitting out area associated with the bar use/has the potential to become a privatised space.

- Streetscape – has the potential to appear somewhat commercial in nature– is there potential to soften its appearance at street level/give it a more residential character?

Planning Authority's response:

- The treatment at the top of the tower could be improved
- Examine the step up from Navigation square
- Concerned that only 65% of apartments have private amenity space/spaces are undefined on the plans.
- The quantum of communal space needs to be examined
- Levels 12-24 have no communal space
- A rationale is required as to how these spaces will work.
- The quality of the private space needs to be clarified especially at street and podium level.
- The functionality of the plaza is important.
- This is a transitional area/clarify the connection/link between the docklands and the city area

Prospective Applicant's response:

- In relation to the step up from Navigation square – the lowest of the proposed buildings is nine storeys which is the same as Navigation square
- The façade is a unifying element.
- The proposed building contains five units per core.
- The context, slenderness and relationship of the tower to its neighbours has been Considered.
- The mix contains four unit types with no studio apartments.
- There is Juliet balconies on every apartment
- The living area is generous/private amenity space can be further defined.
- Units that don't have amenity spaces are larger.
- Daylight and sunlight levels are high.
- The roof garden can be examined
- The pub/restaurant has a function and street planting can happen to soften the landscape

Further ABP comments:

- Internal CGI's of a number of residential units would be beneficial – would help to visualise how the private amenity area would work.
- Consideration should be given to winter gardens.
- Examine the roof garden in relation to use.
- Detail the public realm/highlight permeability.

4. Conservation (Impact on ACA/Impact on Protected Structures)

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Impact on the ACA and protected structures
- Justification for the demolition of the Sextant Public House – was noted that it was on the NIAH list.

Planning Authority's response:

- The height of the tower is a concern in relation to the ACA
- The re-use of the Protected Structure is welcomed
- The demolition of the Sexton pub is regrettable however there is no procedural Issue.
- Key issue is the impact on the existing buildings on the Custom House site which are Protected and of importance.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- There are 3 protected structures on the site, including the Albert Road post box.
- The aim is to retain buildings to keep the character - focus was on the retention and reuse of the two former railway buildings on the site.
- This is a mixed character area.
- The remaining buildings have undergone change and the Sexton pub is compromised as a result of extensive alterations.

Further ABP comments:

- Detail the impact on ACA and protected structure/justification for demolition of the Sextant public house.

5. Transport (including car parking/cycle parking, transport links, required infrastructure upgrades)

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Number of car parking spaces
- Proposed car clubs
- Cycle parking
- Electric charge points

Planning Authority's response:

- This is an area with public transport
- Address the car parking levels
- Satisfied with no car parking spaces

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Car parking is at the minimum
- Its 0.3 per unit
- Cycle provision has increased
- Electric car points will be proposed

Further ABP comments:

- Justify the quantum of car parking spaces
- Examine the use of electric charge points

6. Infrastructure (water, wastewater etc)

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Water and wastewater constraints

Planning Authority's response:

- There is a sewer at the front and it has sufficient capacity
- Discharge from the basement will be to waste and not to storm water

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The site is well serviced on water and wastewater
- There can be discharge from the basement to waste and not storm water

Further ABP comments:

- If there are any outstanding issues, ensure clarity prior to lodgement of an application

7. Flood Risk

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Flooding risk on flood zone B and partially flood zone A

Planning Authority's response:

- Storm water drainage is close to the De Valera bridge
- Consultation should take place with our drainage department

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Justification test has been carried out.
- Full soil testing has been done and the construction management plan will address

Further ABP comments:

- Submit the justification tests and detail any flood risks.

8. Any other Matters

Further ABP comments:

- A second escape stair may need to be provided in line with the Fire Officer's comments.
- Submit sunlight, daylight and wind reports.

Planning Authority's comments:

- A building of 90 metres falls into the category of a district landmark.
- A rationale will be required.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- A second escape stair can be accommodated.

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
September, 2019