



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-306166-20

Case Reference / Description	1,100 no. apartments, childcare facilities and associated site works. The former Ford Distribution Site, Centre Park Road, Cork.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	7 th February, 2020	Start Time	11.30 am
Location	Offices of Cork City Council	End Time	1.00 pm
Chairperson	Rachel Kenny	Executive Officer	Cora Cunningham

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Rachel Kenny, Director of Planning
Daire McDevitt, Planning Inspector
Cora Cunningham, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Jason Van Hout, Glenveagh
Susan Dawson, O'Mahony Pike
Conor Kinsella, O'Mahony Pike
Ilsa Rutgers, Ilsa Rutgers Landscape Architect
James Duggan, Arup
John Hynes, Arup
Ken Leahy, Arup
Clifford Killeen, Arup
Tom Halley, McCutcheon Halley
Sue Cullen, McCutcheon Halley
Cora Savage, McCutcheon Halley

Representing Planning Authority

Jeremy Ward, Planning Policy
James Culhane, Transportation
Simon Lyons, Drainage
John Stapleton, Roads Design
Tony Duggan, City Architect
Lucy Teehan, Planner
Eoin Cullinane, Planner
Kevin O'Connor, Senior Planner
Liam Casey, Parks
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 21st January, 2020 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 December, 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. **Development Strategy with particular regard to overall site layout and architectural approach, density, design, including heights, massing and materials, connections and permeability, open space strategy and overall Masterplan.**
2. **Residential Amenities.**
3. **City Docks Area Based Transport Assessment (ABTA).**
4. **South Docks Level Strategy.**
5. **Visual Impact Assessment, interaction with the public realm along Centre Park Road, Marquee Road and the Monaghan Road extension.**
6. **Flooding.**
7. **Any Other Business.**

The prospective applicant was informed that an Opinion may not issue on the proposed development and a further meeting may be required.

1. **Development Strategy with particular regard to overall site layout and architectural approach, density, design, including heights, massing and materials, connections and permeability, open space strategy and overall Masterplan.**

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Overall site layout and architectural approach, density, design, including heights, massing and materials, connections and permeability, open space strategy and overall Masterplan

Prospective Applicant's response:

- 3 urban blocks proposed with 2 interlinked, each block treated differently having regard to the context of its location, tried not to have generic blocks
- Height guidelines give flexibility to site, proposed heights similar to Parc Ui Chaoimh
- Place makers proposed throughout site
- Generous separation distances across public realm, intimate areas proposed opening onto larger public realm areas
- Consultation submitted early to ABP in order to get guidance on architectural approach
- Do not propose to single material use across propose site, not development detailed architectural approach
- High density but in the context of Dublin Docklands height
- Density comfortable where scheme is at, provides required public and communal open space
- Proposed development at proposed Luas line stop
- Proposed Marina Park adjacent to proposed development
- Different treatment proposed on Monahan's Road
- EIAR prepared for entire site, residential element separate, hotel will be applied for in a later phase, will be separate but included in EIA
- Open space provision will be clear in application
- Horgan's Quay an example of higher heights along quays
- Proposed development will be only site that fronts onto Marina Park

- Neighbourhood centre proposed within site, 2 schools proposed on adjoining sites

Planning Authority's comments:

- PA positive with proposed development, number of section 247 meetings held with prospective applicant
- Issues raised in PA Opinion relate to items from section 247 meetings that were not resolved
- PA have concerns in relation to density, proposed site sets marker and raises issues relating to infrastructure
- Lower heights might assist in lowering density, further discussions required
- Further discussions required in relation to treatment of streets
- Drainage issues relating to podium height
- Building heights modulated
- PA concerns in relation to views south to ridge
- Issues relating to daylight/sunlight
- Initial concerns over breakaway from public block, as development has been worked up this has led to view through
- Urban scheme gives texture, content of city
- City Architect satisfied with proposed height
- Architectural language has good architectural intent, expect propose development to be of high standard
- Further clarification required in relation to open space
- Generous car parking proposed, could have negative impact on site
- Marina Park part of LIHAF

Further ABP comments:

- Have regard to interface with pedestrian areas
- Details lacking in relation to elevations and materials
- Show how hotel will fit in with Masterplan for the proposed site
- Ensure all documents correlate in application
- Set out rationale/justification in relation to heights
- Generic design statement submitted, ensure design statement is relevant and site specific
- Address how proposed development will impact on social and physical infrastructure including backing from PA
- Address how phasing will work into the future, including parking provision.
- Show how school site can accommodate numbers and connections to the proposed site
- No enough information submitted to give Opinion
- Need to include GoCar and car sharing in proposed development

2. Residential Amenities.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Residential amenity

Prospective Applicant's response:

- 2 staggered blocks proposed
- Proposed development passes residential amenity requirements
- Full details to be submitted at application stage
- Internal spaces, components can be expanded
- 2 creches proposed, medical centre, flexibility to where they will be located
- Proposed to have different play areas for different age groups, small MUGA's not very attractive
- Sunlight/daylight assessment has been carried out

Planning Authority's comments:

- Accessing Marina Park will have to be addressed
- Sunlight/daylight issues in south/western courtyard
- Ensure SPPR4 met in relation to dual aspect, consider providing higher percentage of dual aspect units
- Less structured play areas may be used more than structured areas

Further ABP comments:

- Residential amenity should be dealt with in detail at application stage
- Have regard to phasing play areas
- Further discussions required offline regarding access to Marina Park and linkages
- May need to be a compromise between parties relating to MUGA and play area, matter should be addressed prior to application

3. City Docks Area Based Transport Assessment (ABTA).**4. South Docks Level Strategy.****Items 3 and 4 discussed together****ABP comments:**

- PA Opinion stated that proposed development is premature pending the outcome of these
- Issues relating to attenuation
- Further discussions required offline
- Levels link with flooding
- ABTA due end of January and will impact on proposed development
- Levels Strategy due end of February

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Objective to keep levels as close to street levels
- Application will not be lodged before outcome of ABTA and Level Strategy
- Tolerance to alter proposed development pending outcome
- Attenuation can be incorporated into proposed development
- Propose development working toward likely widths etc.
- Wide corridors being provided for having regard to infrastructure following conclusion of ABTA report, draft report was used for design but has been increased
- EIA to be factored into propose development

Planning Authority's comments:

- Level Strategy due by end February, will have implications for proposed site
- PA hope to talk to OPW to have some comfort in proposals/outcomes
- PA have interim recommendation, more work to be done, know direction in which strategy is going, can share caveats of confidence
- Interim recommendation will have knock on issues for proposed development
- Attenuation to be included in proposed development
- Consultants currently concluding CMATS, hope to publish by end of February
- LIHAF funding underway for Monaghan's Road
- Funding under regeneration expected this year for Centre Park Road
- Confident the proposed development will work

Further ABP Comments

- Given the implications for the proposed development, a second meeting may be required after the publication of the SDLS and CDABTA (by the end of March).
- A lot more detail is required for a full opinion and discussions with the PA should to take place off line.

5. Visual Impact Assessment, interaction with the public realm along Centre Park Road, Marquee Road and the Monaghan Road extension.**ABP comments:**

- Long view to be submitted with application
- Photomontages not clear due to use of white blocks
- Survey walkway as it appears to be underused
- Show linkages of proposed development across road
- Air and noise quality to be addressed
- Have regard to materials and their maintenance used in the proposed development
- Parking quantum to be clearly set out, have regard to quantum proposed in other SHD applications
- Consider providing GoCar and car sharing in proposed development
- Car parking strategy to be included in application to show management of same
- Information submitted is broadly academic and lacking in detail.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Landscape and visual impact assessment not fully developed
- Long range views identified, more detail to be worked up
- 3 accesses to be provided to parks
- Linear park to be provided as buffer to Monahan's Road
- Parking provision of 0.5 at lower end for commercial viability
- Prospective applicant hopes to reduce parking quantum further in later phases when infrastructure is in place

Planning Authority's comments:

- Details of interaction of public realm within site required
- Interaction of proposed development with Monaghan's Road
- Walkway to be decommissioned

- New roadway will come in at higher level, extend height into Docklands and graduate down
- Park will sweep under bridge
- 2 traffic and 2 bus lanes proposed on Monahan's Road
- Further discussion required in relation to car parking and phasing
- PA Opinion reference reduction of podium level height
- Drainage Strategy proposes raising road on Centre Park Road
- Drainage level will have to be raised – discharge level of proposed development

6. Flooding.

ABP comments:

- Address issues raised in the PA opinion

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Drainage issues can be resolved
- Podium conflicts with flooding
- Previous LAP pre-dated Flood Risk Guidelines
- Standard of defence along estuary
- Not practical to raise entire area
- Site does not usually flood but may do in future having regard to climate change
- Considered in existing and future case
- Residual breach
- Less vulnerable uses at lower level below podium
- Want ground level slightly above road levels
- Proposed development consistent with Level Strategy

Planning Authority's comments:

- Further discussions required with PA in relation to drainage and proposed podium

ABP further comments:

- Further discussions with the PA required. Matters to be addressed prior to application.

7. Any other matters

ABP comments:

- Ensure all documents correlate
- NIS may be required due to scale of proposed development
- Phasing and extent of permission (10years) will need to be advertised
- Have regard to Linear Park ownership and address
- 2nd meeting may be required, outline issues may need to be resolved, 2nd meeting to be held by the end of March, 2020

Applicants Comments

- NIS may be required, currently carrying out AA screening
- Monahan's Road being included in redline
- Linear Park being completed by prospective applicant, letters of consent to be included in application

- Prospective applicant has tried to ensure consistency between proposed development and Part 8

Planning Authority's comments:

- PA carrying out works on Monahan's Road
- Previous approval on Monahan's Road, prospective applicant will have to respond to that following outcome of Level Strategy
- Prospective applicant will need to engage in further discussions with PA

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
February, 2020