



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Record of Meeting ABP-308980-20

<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	189 no. residential units (124 no. houses, 65 no. apartments) creche and associated site works. Coolflugh, Cloghroe, Tower, Cork.		
<b>Case Type</b>	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
<b>Date:</b>	5 <sup>th</sup> March 2021	<b>Start Time</b>	10:00 am
<b>Location</b>	Via Microsoft Teams	<b>End Time</b>	11:40 am
<b>Chairperson</b>	Rachel Kenny	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Hannah Cullen

### Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Rachel Kenny, Director of Planning
Sarah Moran, Senior Planning Inspector
Hannah Cullen, Executive Officer

### Representing Prospective Applicant:

Eamonn Gahan, Deady Gahan Architects
Liam Murphy, Deady Gahan Architects
Harry Walsh, HW Planning
John O'Brien, HW Planning
Ken Manley, MHL Consulting Engineers
Mike Waldvogel, Forestbird Design
Keith Looney, Cloghroe Development Limited

### Representing Planning Authority

Eoin Cullinane, Planner
Simon Lyons, Senior Executive Engineer
Valerie Fenton, Senior Executive Engineer
Ronan McKernan, Senior Executive Planner

### Introduction

The representatives of An Bord Pleanála (ABP) welcomed the prospective applicant, Planning Authority (PA) via Microsoft Teams having regard to the Covid-19 restrictions 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 once the Opinion has issued,
- ABP received a submission from the PA's on **29<sup>th</sup> January, 2021** providing the records of consultations held pursuant to section 247 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 as amended 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 **21<sup>st</sup> December, 2020** formally requesting pre-application consultations with ABP. The prospective applicant advised of the need to comply with definition of SHD as set out in the (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 2016, in relation to thresholds of development. The representatives of ABP advised that the Inspector dealing with the pre-application consultation request would be different to the Inspector who would deal with the application when it was submitted. Recording of the meeting is prohibited.

### **Agenda**

1. Quantum of development in the context of the Blarney Macroom Municipal District LAP 2017.
2. Surface Water Drainage and Flood Risk
3. Biodiversity and Management of Riparian Zone
4. Design and Layout of Development Including Provision of Public Open Space.
5. Roads, Traffic and Transportation Issues. Pedestrian and Cycle Connections.
6. Retail Development
7. Any Other Business

## **1. Quantum of development in the context of the Blarney Macroom Municipal District LAP 2017.**

### **ABP Comments:**

- Any potential material contravention of the Local Area Plan (LAP) should be addressed in any application made to the Board.
- A strong rationale for the proposed quantum of development and residential density will need to be addressed further with regard to national and regional planning policy.
- Clarification around the current status of the Development Plan review by the PA.
- The Board will be bound by the development plan in place at the time the application is made but may consider draft plans on an indicative basis.
- Further information should be provided on the proposed development in the context of the overall development of the settlement of Tower.

### **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- Tower has been designated as a key village in the settlement hierarchy, this does not reflect recent development in Tower.
- All comments made by the Board and PA have been noted.

### **Planning Authority's Comments:**

- The members draft of the Development Plan is to be started in April, the draft is then to go on display then in June.
- There is uncertainty around the delivery of Bus Connects objectives in Cork Metropolitan Area Transport Strategy (CMATS).
- The adjacent bus service is currently not up to standard, the applicant will need to ensure connectivity to the north can be achieved.
- The site is not suitable for increased density on the basis of public transport connections.
- Density at 31 units/ha is the maximum sought for this area, if a figure of 35 units/ha was to be accepted a phasing process would need to be considered.
- Possible scope to introduce higher units into the centre of the site which may help the density figure.

## **2. Surface Water Drainage and Flood Risk**

### **ABP Comments:**

- It is noted from the documentation that there is a river to the south of the site with flood zones A and B, as well as a tributary river at the development site.
- Flag potential AEP flood zones at 0.1% and surface water management issues.
- Applicant should provide details of all surface water management measures, to reduce outfall to the river to the south of the site.
- Will need to consider downstream impacts in the Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment.

### **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- The site can be looked at in a broader context to ensure that there are minimal impacts, however the plan would be to reduce any downstream effects, proposals will be detailed at application stage regarding a drainage strategy.

**Planning Authority's Comments:**

- To highlight further from the report submitted to the Board the fluvial flood risk in the village at the junction will need to be further addressed.
- There is a stream located between the proposed site and the adjacent site to the west, where recent applications were refused by the Board due to flooding issues.
- The treatment of the stream without possible extensive impactful works to the channel should be detailed within an application to the Board.
- The PA will continue to liaise further with the applicant and encourages further discussions regarding the issue of drainage and flooding.
- The development should be able to demonstrate either improvement or no impact to downstream flooding.

**3. Biodiversity and Management of Riparian Zone****ABP Comments:**

- Further information is required in relation to the stream and wetlands at the site, including any surface water management measures and roadworks proposed in that area.
- As much detail as possible to be provided regarding the existing topography of the site, including levels in the vicinity of the watercourse and wetland area.
- Flagging that tree removal/loss of trees can be a major cause concern raised within 3<sup>rd</sup> party submissions, further details should be provided in relation to the approach taken to retention of the trees, their health and any removal processes that are proposed to ensure the best approach is being taken.
- The interrelationship of the stream and biodiversity issues will need to be further addressed within any application to the Board.

**Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- There is a field drain at the site, this creates a wetland area due to there currently being no designated drainage area.
- The area where the site level changes is due to part infill and part excavation.
- The scheme is designed to retain existing hedgerows at the site.
- It is proposed to remove 75% of the sycamore woodland at area A located at the road frontage, this will evolve into a native woodland area with the aim to create a habitat for wildlife and providing natural play, this would act as a public gain to the area.

**Planning Authority's Comments:**

- A list of species of flora and fauna within the site should be included containing the retention plans and treatments at application stage.

**4. Design and Layout of Development Including Provision of Public Open Space.****ABP Comments:**

- The quantum, usability and functionality of the proposed open space should be demonstrated in the application.
- The applicant should clarify the area of 'usable' open space with regard to gradient and wetland areas.

- Further demonstrate how the levels will work on the site in relation to the open spaces and roads.
- Potential impact on adjoining residential properties will need to be fully addressed at a higher level of detail.

**Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- The points raised by the PA and the Board have been noted, the different open space areas will be classified, and further details will be provided to ensure all aspects are addressed.
- The proposed development would be in excess of the minimum standards for open space, there is 14% of the site area deemed usable open space.
- Various cross sections as requested will be included with the application to the Board.
- Cork City Architects comments have been noted and will be explored further.

**Planning Authority's Comments:**

- The site layout has evolved since previous discussions with the applicant, the PA are satisfied with the proposals submitted.
- Comments have been included by the City Architect, they should be noted by the applicant, possible scope to increase the density within the scheme.

**5. Roads, Traffic and Transportation Issues. Pedestrian and Cycle Connections.**

**ABP Comments:**

- Compliance with DMURS should be demonstrated on individual roads and in character areas.
- The interaction of the frontage of the development with the R617 requires further consideration.
- Works to the R617 should be included in the red line site boundary if possible. The Board will require clarity as to when / how road works will be carried out.
- Any outstanding letters of consent from landowners are to be included with the application documentation.
- Further information to be provided in relation to pedestrian connectivity and how it ties into the existing area, including pedestrian crossings at the R617.
- Applicant to consider CMATS objectives regarding cycle connectivity.

**Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- All comments have been noted there is further work to be done in relation to a movement strategy and design.
- Scope to allow for a possible bus lane in the future which will provide a connection to the bus stop on the R167.
- By building out into the public realm this can act as a traffic calming measure for the R167.
- A CPO would be required to deliver connectivity on both sides of the R617.
- Will seek further discussion with the PA to arrive at the most desirable solution.

**Planning Authority's Comments:**

- The PA would request the avoidance of straight roads within the development, introduction of vertical alignment through vegetation to be considered.
- Welcome discussions on proposals in relation to the road frontage.
- Pedestrian connectivity to the north with inclusion of a crossing facility which will be appropriate to the road would be sought by the PA.
- Traffic volumes and pedestrian activity will increase due to the development therefore the current crossing would not be suitable.

**6. Retail Development****ABP Comments:**

- Queries why applicant does not consider including retail element under a separate application, given the uncertainty around retail policy in the area.
- If retail is being pursued a strong rationale will need to be included at application stage.
- Applicant to address consistency with the definition of Strategic Housing Development (SHD) with regard to 'other uses'.
- Car parking provisions will need to be fully detailed in relation to retail along with management and allocation.

**Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- Retail Impact Assessment has been carried out which demonstrates there is a requirement for such a retail development in the area.
- It is proposed that the retail element will be included within the SHD application.
- Comments made by the Board and the PA have been noted and will be addressed at application stage.

**Planning Authority's Comments:**

- In relation to retail policy the PA would have serious concerns with the proposals as there is not much capacity for convenience stores in the area.

**7. Any Other Business****ABP Comments:**

- Opportunity given to raise any further issues not addressed within the PA report or the agenda items.

**Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- Nothing further to add all comments noted and will be addressed when an application is lodged.

**Planning Authority's Comments:**

- Nothing further to add.

**Conclusion:**

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)

---

Rachel Kenny  
Director of Planning  
March, 2021