



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-308043-20

Case Reference / Description	Demolition of existing structures, construction of 265 no. student bed spaces and associated site works. Wilton Road, Victoria Cross, Bishopstown, Cork.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	19 th November 2020	Start Time	09:35 a.m.
Location	Via Microsoft Teams	End Time	10:58 a.m.
Chairperson	Rachel Kenny	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Rachel Kenny, Director of Planning
Daire McDevitt, Senior Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Brian Murphy, MHL Consulting Engineers
Seamus Kelleher, Applicant
Paul Butler, Butler Cammoranesi Architects
Terry O'Neil, JODA Consulting Engineers
Tom Halley, McCutcheon Halley
Cora Savage, McCutcheon Halley

Representing Planning Authority

Gwen Jordan, Senior Executive Planner (Planner)
Tony Duggan, City Architect (Parks)
Valerie Fenton, Senior Executive Engineer (Roads)
Simon Lyons, Senior Executive Engineer (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 24th September 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 28th August 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 Strategy (layout, interface with adjoining developments and interface with public realm).**
- 2. Visual Impact Assessment (Protected Views & Prospects)**
- 3. CMATS and Issues raised by Transportation Division (contained in the Planning Authority Opinion received on 23rd September 2020).**
- 4. Flooding and Issues raised by Drainage Division (contained in the Planning Authority Opinion received on 23rd September 2020).**
- 5. Any Other Business.**

1. Design Strategy (layout, interface with adjoining developments and interface with public realm).

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Overall layout.
- Interface with public realm and road.
- Interface with the existing student accommodation to the north east of the site,
- Interface with the river and housing scheme to the southeast.
- Public realm interface
- Height
- relationship with adjoining restaurant.
- Justification/rationale for the overall design approach.
- Impact on amenities of adjoining properties.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Site is 0.2 hectares
- Concerned with the overall site coverage and relationship with adjoining buildings to the north
- There needs to be enough space for set back from the boundaries to the east.
- Overall the design is good
- There needs to be a strong urban core and public realm
- Serial views showing the progression of the development would be beneficial at application stage

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The restaurant will not form part of this site. It is in separate ownership.
- Units are being broken into a series of blocks
- Height is concentrated to the north
- The blocks step down from 10 – 7 storeys
- There is stepping down to 5 storeys along the river
- A future connection will allow linkages from the river to UCC
- Set back is 9 metres between the blocks and 3 meters from the boundary with the existing student accommodation.
- Conscious of windows overlooking and this will be addressed at application stage.

Further ABP comments:

- Need to clarify at application stage the relationship with the existing restaurant, implications arising from the loss of parking, revised access arrangements, parking strategy, right of way, etc. Outline in the documentation the circumstances of the restaurant site
- Address any potential overlooking and overshadowing.
- In the drawings show the auto-track analysis and landscaping feature
- Address potential conflict between pedestrian. Cyclist and vehicles.

- Lack of communal open space at ground level, at present circulation areas and these should not be included as communal amenity areas.
- Detail ramps, local street views and the interface with the public realm
- Address the relationship with the river
- Need to submit a justification/rationale for the height and density of development.
- Detail the elevational treatment
- Include views from the opposite side of the river
- Justification/rationale for design approach
- Outline access proposals

2. Visual Impact Assessment (Protected Views & Prospects)

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Potential impacts on protected views and prospects
- Localised views.
- Issues raised in the Planning Authority's report

Planning Authority's response:

- 5 protected views are impacted
- View D impacts on local views
- Seek to introduce a height hierarchy
- The tallest element could be reduced to address visual impact.
- View F is a major change
- Ensure a 30-metre separation distance
- P, J and K are protected views but there is not a significant impact
- View N is RP10 and the aspect is more northerly
- Suggest submitting a height hierarchy at local level
- Have regard to the visual impact and local views

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Views from the Crows nest site will be taken into account
- There is an emerging new character in this area
- The graduation of height is important and will be justified
- Adequate separation distance is being maintained

Further ABP comments:

- Address views highlighted by the Planning Authority.
- Localised impact also needs to be considered.

3. CMATS and Issues raised by Transportation Division (contained in the Planning Authority Opinion received on 23rd September 2020).

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- CMATS

- Issues raised by the Transportation Division.

Planning Authority's response:

- There needs to be 22 meters allowed for a footpath, cycle lane, road, bus lane and light rail
- Drawing 19087 shows a pinch point of 17 meters
- Avoid conflict with future emerging proposals
- Examine the existing bus stop

Prospective Applicant's response:

- 22 meters can be accommodated
- There is a 4.3 meter set back distance from Victoria Road Cross
- There will be alignment with future emerging transport proposals
- Existing bus stop plans will be examined

Further ABP comments:

- Show interface with road and the urban edge noting the sets backs, where required, to address implications of CMATS.
- Address the strip of public realm running along the front of the site.
- Mobility Management Plan.
- Set down areas and implications arising from CMATS

4. Flooding and Issues raised by Drainage Division (contained in the Planning Authority Opinion received on 23rd September 2020).

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Drainage
- Flooding
- Issues raised by the Planning Authority.

Planning Authority's response:

- The proposed management plan for the 1% annual exceedance of the river. This is higher than the street scape
- Concerns that surcharging could occur. It needs to be outlined where this would go
- Consider defence flooding around the site
- Need to justify approach.
- There could be attenuation to allow for storage if the storm line is confirmed as a combined sewer
- A wayleave from Irish Water is needed

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Outstanding issues will be addressed
- Set back for a wayleave could be accommodated
- There is potential for a small amount of flooding but this can be managed

Further ABP comments:

- Address outstanding issues as no provision for further information at application stage.

5. AOB

Planning Authority's comments:

- Justify density
- Communal space both internal/external needs to be detailed

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Communal space will be outlined

Further ABP comments:

- Liaise with CCC Transportation Division regarding issues raised in the Planning Authority opinion.
- Liaise with CCC Drainage regarding issues raised in the Planning Authority opinion.
- If Material Contravention arises, this needs to be addressed in the documentation submitted with the application in the form of a Material Contravention Statement and referred to in the Public Notices.
- Technical issues highlighted need to be fully addressed at application stage as there is no provision for further information under SHD.
- Ensure all documentation is submitted and correlates as no provision for further information under SHD.

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
December, 2020