



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Record of Meeting ABP-306442-20

<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	Demolition of an existing dwelling, construction of 216 no. student bedspaces and associated site works. San Paula, Orchard Road, Cork.		
<b>Case Type</b>	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
<b>Date:</b>	6 <sup>th</sup> May 2020	<b>Start Time</b>	14:30 p.m.
<b>Location</b>	Via Microsoft Teams	<b>End Time</b>	15:40 p.m.
<b>Chairperson</b>	Tom Rabbette	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Ciaran Hand

### Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Ronan O' Connor, Senior Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

### Representing Prospective Applicant:

Tom Halley, McCutcheon Halley
Cheryl O'Connor, McCutcheon Halley
Conor Kinsella, O'Mahony Pike Architects
Denise O'Brien, Denis O'Brien Developments
David Laphorne, Malachy Walsh

### Representing Planning Authority

Kevin O' Connor, Senior Planner
Tony Duggan, City Architect
Simon Lyons, Drainage
James Culhane, Transport
Kevin McGill, Environment

## 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 14<sup>th</sup> February 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 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 20<sup>th</sup> January 2020 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. **Justification for location/Demand for Student Accommodation**
2. **Urban Design, including height and layout/ open spaces**
3. **Design Standards including amenity for occupants/Management of the facility**
4. **Impact on Surrounding Residential Amenity (daylight/sunlight/overshadowing/overlooking/visual impact/noise)**
5. **Transport (accessibility/parking/required infrastructure if any)**
6. **Site Services (Foul, Surface, Water supply/required infrastructure)/Flood Risk**
7. **Appropriate Assessment Screening**
8. **Any other matters**

## **1. Justification for location/Demand for Student Accommodation**

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

- Student accommodation demand/concentration of student accommodation.

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

- The zoning supports this development.
- It is close to UCC.
- The area is a mixed-use area.
- There is a shortfall of student accommodation.
- Density is 73 units per hectare which is acceptable for this location.
- There should be a balance between residential and student accommodation.

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

- The applicant is an existing operator of student accommodation and has experience in managing such developments and ensuring that they are well run with no impact on surrounding residents. Management plan will be put in place as per other developments.
- There will be no delay between permission if granted and construction.

### **Further ABP comments:**

- Ensure that the Student Demand Report is up to date.
- Provide evidence in relation to the concentration of student accommodation in the area.

## **2. Urban Design, including height and layout/ open spaces**

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

- Height.
- Layout of courtyards.
- Visual impact.

### **Planning Authority's response:**

- No concern with the proposed heights.
- Massing concentrates height to the northern boundary.
- Overshadowing and overlooking impacts are detailed in the pre-application.
- The design of the southwest facing courtyard is reasonable.
- Proposed design of the entrance and overall massing are good.
- Windows are well-proportioned.
- Graduating from 3 up to 5 storeys is good.
- This is a suitable urban setting.

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

- Heights are graduated.
- Conscious of the residential environment.
- There are sufficient separation distances.
- Southern boundary is 3-storeys in height.

- All student accommodation in the area is either the same height of this development or higher.
- The northern and eastern side of the site has tree cover.

**Further ABP comments:**

- More CGI's are required detailing visual impact from Brookfield.

**3. Design Standards including amenity for occupants/Management of the facility**

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

- Internal amenities – lounge, cinema and meeting rooms/quantum of same that is provided.
- Management of the accommodation.

**Planning Authority's response:**

- Management of the scheme needs to be clearly explained.

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- The scale of amenities for this accommodation is appropriate.
- There are a number of other amenities in close proximity to the site.
- There will be a dedicated manager for the scheme and 24 hours on call security.
- The leisure centre at Brookfield can be used by students at a discounted rate.

**Further ABP comments:**

- Outline what has been provided in other student accommodation schemes completed by the developer/Justify what is being proposed in terms of internal amenity.

**4. Impact on Surrounding Residential Amenity (daylight / sunlight / overshadowing / overlooking / visual impact / noise)**

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

- Potential sunlight/daylight/overlooking impacts.
- Potential noise impacts.

**Planning Authority's response:**

- Overlooking is addressed in the documents.
- Need to examine any noise impact and submit a noise impact assessment.
- Construction and demolition management plans should be submitted.

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Daylight and sunlight analysis has been carried out.
- There is a negligible impact on residential houses to the south.
- Impact on student accommodation to the east and north is minor.
- CGI's focused on localised views from the public realm.
- This is a well screened site.
- There is set back on the southern edge.
- No roof terraces are proposed and all amenities are all at ground level.

**Further ABP comments:**

- Detail impacts on sunlight/daylight and in relation to overlooking.
- More views from 'The Grove' and from the dwelling house to the south would be helpful.

**5. Transport (accessibility/parking/required infrastructure (if any))**

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

- The issue of sight lines.
- Footpaths and infrastructure.
- Possible pedestrian connections.

**Planning Authority's response:**

- Sight lines was an issue on a previous application. However, there is only minimal traffic movement expected with this proposal.
- No issues with the proposed changes to entrance.
- Pedestrian entrance is via the courtyard.
- Ensure it is pedestrian only.
- There should be a raised table at the entrance.

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- There are two possible pedestrian connections shown.
- The north eastern connection would be the easiest to deliver as it links to the hard surface on the adjoining site.
- The south eastern connection is difficult as there is no existing connection to the adjoining property.
- Both connections dependant on agreement with Brookfield which may be difficult.
- Brookfield is gated and managed and has its own access point.
- In relation to the distance from UCC, the medical campus is close - Approximately 400 meters/not much of a saving in relation to distance would occur should the pedestrian links be provided/the provision of same ca be examined further.
- A road safety audit has been carried out.
- A raised table could cause a safety issue.
- The internal layout of curbs, shared surfaces will be detailed.
- The entrance is to be upgraded and widened.
- There will be better sight lines.
- 45 metres in each direction with a 2-metre set back.
- 4 parking spaces and 108 bicycle spaces will be provided.

**Further ABP comments:**

- Detail the connections to Brookfield.
- Explain why future connections might not happen.

**6. Site Services (Foul, Surface, Water supply/required infrastructure)/Flood Risk**

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

- Water supply upgrade.
- Site services.

- Flood risk.

**Planning Authority's response:**

- Outline and address SUD's measures.
- Site is outside the flood zone.
- Foul water has been addressed.
- An extension to the storm sewer is standard.
- Show extension of storm water sewer to the north-west.
- Irish water would prefer a upgrade connection to the College Road
- The waste connection point on the footpath needs clarification.

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- SUD's measures will be shown.
- Flood risk is minimal.
- Connection to Wilton Road would be preferable however will continue discussions in relation to this.
- In relation to the waste collection – will be collected from the complex and fobs will be used.

**Further ABP comments:**

- Show SUD's measures.
- Detail the proposed connections.
- Be aware that there is no further information sought at application stage therefore all necessary information required for a full assessment should be submitted at application stage.

## **7. Appropriate Assessment Screening**

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

- Appropriate Assessment Screening.

**Planning Authority's response:**

- No further comments

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Envisage a stage 1 screening.
- Discharge will go through the interceptors.

**Further ABP comments:**

- A rationale and clarity will be required.

## **8. Any other matters**

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- No further comments

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- No further comments

**Further ABP comments:**

- No further comments

**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)

---

Tom Rabbette  
Assistant Director of Planning  
May, 2020