



Case Reference / Description	164 no. residential units (147 no. houses, 17 no. apartments), creche and associated site works. Courtstown, Little Island, Co. Cork.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	30 th June 2021	Start Time	10:00 am
Location	Remotely via Microsoft Teams	End Time	11:30 am
Chairperson	Rachel Kenny	Executive Officer	Helen Keane

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Rachel Kenny, Director of Planning
Rachel Gleave O'Connor, Planning Inspector
Helen Keane, Executive Officer

Representing Planning Authority

Noel Sheridan, Senior Executive Planner
Kevin O' Regan, Senior Executive Officer
Alan Costello, Senior Executive Scientist
Jonathan Cahil, Executive Engineer, Traffic
Robert O Sullivan, Executive Engineer, Area Office
Sharon O Connell, Executive Planner
Greg Collins, Senior Executive Architect
Anthony Callery, Assistant Engineer, Traffic

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Brian McCutcheon, McCutcheon Halley Planning Consultants
John Deane, Ruden Homes Ltd. (Applicant)

Sean Hennessy, Ruden Homes Ltd.
David Bosonnet, Brady Shipman Martin
Ken Manley, MHL Consulting Engineers
Paul Matson, MMOS Engineers

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 once the Opinion has issued,
- ABP received a submission from the PA on 3rd June 2021 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 7th May 2021 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. Zoning and planning context (including ecology)**
- 2. Transport**
- 3. Design (including layout, connectivity, boundary treatments, elevational appearance and impacts / quality of accommodation)**
- 4. Car parking (quantity and appearance)**
- 5. Mix**
- 6. Any Other Matters**

1. Zoning and planning context (including ecology)

ABP Comments:

- The subject site is formed of part of a single field area, which is grassland in the current condition as confirmed during a visit to the site.
- The subject site is situated in the western portion of the field and has residential development zoning, the eastern portion of the field which outside of the redline boundary, has an industrial zoning.
- The eastern portion of the field has been identified by the planning authority as an important feeding site for birds associated with the SPA at Cork Harbour.
- The onus is on the applicant to prove that there is no similar relationship with the SPA on the western portion of the field that forms the subject site.
- Objective LI-X-02 does not require a master plan.
- ABP notes that the proposed density is increased in the proposed development to address the reason for refusal on the previous application.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- The site is not considered a particularly sensitive location from an ecology point of view.
- Advises the prospective applicant to liaise with the ecology unit of the planning authority regarding the feeding site.
- Little Island is a strategic employment center.
- The planning authority accepts that the Board has taken a view that the proposed density in the previous application was not in keeping with national legislation.
- The density of the proposed development is appropriate having regard to national legislation.
- It would be desirable to have cooperation with the two landowners in helping resolve the connection points with the view to developing the lands in a coordinated manner.
- There has not been any coordination with the landowners at this point.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- The prospective applicant is familiar with the site for the past 20 years, it has always been used for tillage, not grassland.
- The feeding and rooster areas for birds on the field are located in grassland areas.
- The prospective applicant has been in touch with representatives for one of the local landowners, the Scally family.
- The objective to deliver up to 250 units of housing was made in 2017 and this should be taken into account when considering the context of delivering this development.
- The prospective applicant has addressed the various issues.
- The proposed development is an opportunity to deliver housing in an area close to where people work.
- There is an urgent need to deliver housing in this area.

2. Transport

ABP Comments:

- The information submitted in the pre-application documentation is very light.
- It is noted that the prospective applicant is undertaking a full traffic assessment, but detailed information was not in the pre-application documentation.
- Further information required on the relationship of the proposed development to the wider lands under the same zoning and adjacent development areas.
- Providing information at application stage, on how the proposal will fit in with more comprehensive development of the lands in future, would be a robust approach.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- Part 8 development is highly relevant to the proposed development.
- Confident that the National Transport Authority will be providing funding.
- There will be good bus connectivity.
- Traffic lights at proposed development would be required.
- Stormwater and connectivity have been considered by the prospective applicant.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- The prospective applicant has been in touch with the traffic department of the planning authority.
- Will liaise with the traffic and transport department regarding the Ballytrasna Road junction.
- The proposed future transport works have been considered.
- The level of modal shift will be agreed upon.
- Will seek feedback from the traffic and transport department.

3. Design (including layout, connectivity, boundary treatments, elevational appearance, and impacts / quality of accommodation)

ABP Comments:

- The planning authority have made comments on the visual impact of the design.
- Further clarification needed on relationship of buildings to the main road.
- The open space appears largely surrounded by internal road networks.
- Provide clarification if the proposed development is in keeping with the Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines.
- Have regard to the Design Manual for Urban Roads & Streets (DMURS), there are a number of cul-de-sacs in the proposed development.
- Clarification on apartment block design required.
- Provide the rationale for the proposed design at application stage.
- Daylight/sunlight assessment required.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- The central area of the development site is lacking in decent, public, open space.
- There are no real linkages between the open spaces.

- There should be as many connection roads as possible.
- The separation distances between some of the houses are very tight.
- Some gables of houses are presenting out onto the main road.
- Address the relationship of the car parking with the shared spaces, there is a potential conflict with pedestrians.
- Address the lack of urban edge on the main road through the site.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- The proposed development is conscious of the local market and the design layout reflects this.
- There is an ESB cable traversing the site.
- The proposed development is a standalone application.

4. Car parking (quantum and appearance)

ABP Comments:

- The planning authority have suggested that a reduction in car parking should be considered.
- Any reduction in carparking should be considered in the context of the overall design.
- Clarification is needed at application stage regarding the points raised.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- The prospective applicant is proposing 13 visitor car parking spaces, however, there is no requirement for this.
- The car parking proposed for the childcare facility is in excess of what is required.
- Given that the proposed development is in an area of employment, the above should be addressed.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- The traffic and transport assessment will include consideration of the above.
- The train station is a 25-minute walk.
- There are other amenities near the site.
- The pedestrian and cycle connections to other green infrastructure in the area is very good.

5. Mix

ABP Comments:

- The proposed unit mix is heavily weighted toward large housing units.
- Address how the proposed development is responding to the housing need in the area.
- The market does not dictate housing need for the area and it is important to ensure that there is consideration of future need.

- How the proposed mix responds to the Council's view of housing need in the area, should be included in the application documentation.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- Would like to see a more diverse mix of units given the location of the proposed development.
- Seeks to create quality, sustainable and multi-generational communities and the design should consider the future needs of the area.
- The proposed development should cater more to single people and not just provide the standard 3/4 bed semi-detached house.
- There is little quality in terms of design in the proposed development.
- Have regard for creating a sustainable housing development that takes the needs of children into consideration.

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- There is currently an issue regarding housing supply and affordability.
- The proposed development site is in a peripheral location.
- The proposed development site is 200 to 300 metres from the shoreline and has amenity areas that other developments cannot provide.

6. Any Other Matters

ABP Comments:

- Refer to recent legal judgements regarding EIAR screenings.
- The proposed development is a standalone application and should be as robust as possible.

Planning Authority's Comments:

- No further comments

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- No further comments

- **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 **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
September, 2021