



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-306625-20

Case Reference / Description	Modifications to a previously permitted Cork City Council ref: 17/37406 increasing student accommodation from 242 no. bed spaces to 292 no. bed spaces and associated site works. The Former Square Deal Premises, Washington Street West, Cork City.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	23 rd April 2020	Start Time	09:30 a.m.
Location	Via Microsoft Teams	End Time	11:00 a.m.
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	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:

Susan Cullen, McCutcheon Halley Planning Consultants
Conor Kinsella, O'Mahony Pike Architects
David Laphorne, Engineer
John Cronin, Conservation
Cheryl O' Connor, McCutcheon Halley Planning Consultants
Soláne Vermont, O'Mahony Pike Architects

Representing Planning Authority

Gwen Jordan, Senior Executive Planner
Ciara O' Flynn, Conservation
Kevin O' Connor, Senior Planner
Colm O' Connor, Drainage

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 10th March 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 12th February 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. Design Issues including massing/height/elevational treatment**
- 2. Impacts on views/ Conservation Issues**
- 3. Impacts on adjoining residential amenity**
- 4. Standard of Accommodation**
- 5. Concentration of Student Accommodation/Demand**
- 6. Site Services/Flood Risk**
- 7. Any Other Matters**

1. Design Issues including massing/height/elevational treatment

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Changes to the previously permitted scheme.
- Height and massing particularly in relation to the corner of Woods Street/Washington Street and along Lynch's Street.
- Elevational treatment at Lynch's street
- Treatment of side elevations when viewed from Hanover Street and Washington Street.
- Materials, design issues and window proportions

Planning Authority's comments:

- Washington Street is a 19th century street containing 3-4 storey buildings.
- Concerned with integration, design and the roof plan of the south west corner.
- There needs to be visual integration.
- Examine the impact on views from Grenville place which is to the north of the site.
- Overbearing and massing in relation to the north of the site should be reconsidered.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- A different approach is being taken to the previously permitted scheme.
- CGIs/Modelling of the permitted scheme will be submitted showing Lynch's Street elevation.
- There is an increase in height from the previous scheme.
- The permitted scheme was before the new height guidelines.
- The surrounding area can take height.
- Impact will be moderate.
- Massing will be considered.
- In relation to materials- brick pilasters will be used on Washington street
- Materials and design will be contemporary.
- There is depth in the façade.
- More detail regarding height, massing and elevational treatment will be provided.

Further ABP comments:

- Show modelling for Lynch Street.
- More detailing needed in relation to Lynch's Street elevation.
- Examine the blank elevations on Washington Street and Hanover Street.
- Detail the relationship between the two streets.

2. Impacts on views/ Conservation Issues

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Impact of the proposed new building on views and the protected structure.

Planning Authority's response:

- This site is within ACA.
- 3 storey buildings are predominant in this area.
- Frontage onto Washington Street is a concern.
- View towards St Finbarr's cathedral is very significant.

- Cast iron columns and windows should be re-used.
- There needs to be preservation and full recording where possible.
- A set back would be inconsistent with the streetscape.
- A wider footpath would be a concern.
- Therefore, set back was discounted.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- All impacts on views will be examined.
- The glazing and roof covering is modern.
- Cast iron will be salvaged and recorded.

Further ABP comments:

- Further detail required in relation to impacts on Protected Views at application stage.

3. Impacts on adjoining residential amenity

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Surrounding residential amenities.
- Daylight/sunlight analysis.
- Noise impacts.

Planning Authority's response:

- This is a transition area.
- There are a lot of residential units
- There is a concentration of student accommodation - both rental and purpose built.
- Proposed roof terraces need to be re-examined.
- Noise impacts need to be addressed.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- There is an existing permission on site.
- An additional 50 bed spaces are being proposed.
- Noise will be addressed in the student management plan.

Further ABP comments:

- Detail impacts on residential amenity at application stage.
- Show daylight and sunlight analysis for courtyards and the internal building.

4. Standard of Accommodation

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Level of communal amenity space provided.

Planning Authority's response:

- The proposed communal space provision of 4.8 sq. per bedspace is below the standard of 5-7 sq. meters
- A café is included, however this is not private communal space
- Reduced no of student bedspaces could achieve the adequate communal space.
- Quality is also important.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The café is open to all
- Communal spaces will be examined

Further ABP comments:

- Detail and justification will be needed for proposed communal areas.

5. Concentration of Student Accommodation/Demand

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Student accommodation demand in the local area/Concentration of student accommodation in the area.

Planning Authority's response:

- The applicant should refer to the National Student Accommodation strategy.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- There is to be a shortfall of student accommodation in the coming years.

Further ABP comments:

- Set out the student demand in the local area/Provide evidence in relation to concentration of student accommodation in the area.

6. Site Services/Flood Risk

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Flood risk.
- Status and timescale of the proposed Cork flood risk relief scheme.

Planning Authority's response:

- Satisfied with storm water and foul drainage.
- In relation to flooding, the issue is the residential ground floor level.
- A minimum of 4.28 meters needs to be built into the floor level.
- The flood defence scheme is not yet permitted.
- The applicant should not rely on this scheme as a solution.
- The proposed development should stand on its own merits.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The levels being proposed are 3.43m OD/above the 1% flood level requirement.
- Levels are above the previously permitted scheme.
- A worst case scenario had been considered.
- There are flood resilient materials to a level of 4.32 meters.
- The ESB sub-station is at 4.62 meters.
- There will be a flood defence scheme in the long-term.

Further ABP comments:

- More detail is required regarding flood risk.
- Detail the background to the flood protection scheme.

8. Any Other Matters

Planning Authority's comments:

- Doors and their width could be considered in the context of a 19th century design and suited to a city centre location.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- This can be addressed.

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 **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

Tom Rabbette
Assistant Director of Planning
May, 2020