



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-304895-19

### Development

- (i) The demolition of an existing single storey detached building,
- (ii) The construction of a new part two storey part three storey detached residential building including 9 residential units, and
- (iii) A new site entrance at Grange Erin Road to a ground level 15-space car park.

### Location

The former Grange Stores, Grange Road, Grange, Co. Cork.

### Planning Authority

Cork County Council

### Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

18/05886

### Applicant(s)

O'Connor Brothers of Cork Ltd

### Type of Application

Permission

### Planning Authority Decision

Grant, subject to 22 conditions

### Type of Appeal

Third Parties -v- Decision

**Appellant(s)**

Pierce Comerford

Maura Daly

Terence P Connolly

**Observer(s)**

Andrew & Patricia Mulcahy

Thomas Leahy

**Date of Site Inspection**

2<sup>nd</sup> October 2019

**Inspector**

Hugh D. Morrison

# Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description .....	4
2.0 Proposed Development .....	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....	5
3.1. Decision .....	5
3.2. Planning Authority Reports .....	5
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy and Context.....	6
5.1. Development Plan.....	6
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations .....	7
5.3. EIA Screening .....	7
6.0 The Appeal .....	7
6.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	7
6.2. Applicant Response .....	10
6.3. Planning Authority Response .....	11
6.4. Observations.....	11
6.5. Further Responses.....	12
7.0 Assessment.....	13
8.0 Recommendation.....	22
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	22
10.0 Conditions .....	22

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located in the south eastern suburbs of Cork City on the outside of the N40. This site lies within a predominantly residential area, which is composed of housing estates on either side of Grange Road, which forms part of an east/west regional road the R851. It is accessed off the northern side of this Road at a point to the west of the junction between Grange Road and the road which serves Grange Erin Housing Estate. A pelican crossing of Grange Road is sited between this access and this junction and the nearside lane of the carriageway is a bus lane, which operates on week days between 07.30 and 09.30 and 16.30 and 18.30.
- 1.2. The site itself is of regular shape and it extends over an area of 1346.6 sqm. This site accommodates a single storey building, which, in plan view, is “L” shaped. This building is sited on the eastern portion of the site with the point of the “L” defining the north western corner of the junction between Grange Road and the above cited estate road. It is accompanied over its western portion by a car park. The site was last in use as an off-licence, along with a small dwelling.
- 1.3. As it passes the site, Grange Road is the subject of an appreciable downward gradient in an easterly direction. The developed portion of the site is subject to slight downward gradients towards its south easterly corner. An area of landscaping in the north western corner is at a higher level and it is separated from the car park by means of a retaining wall. This wall also retains the western boundary with the residential property known as Glendine. The southern portion of this boundary is further denoted by a hedgerow and a line of conifers, while the northern portion is denoted by a hedgerow and a palisade fence. A concrete wall denotes the northern and eastern boundaries, while the southern boundary is open onto Grange Road. A gateway, sited at the northern end of the eastern wall, affords access into an enclosed yard that lies to the rear of the building on the site. There is a further gateway to this yard from the car park.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposal would entail the following elements:

- The demolition of an existing single storey detached building (293 sqm), formerly part off-licence and part dwelling,
- The construction of a new part two storey part three storey detached residential building (828.5 sqm) including 9 residential units made up of 1 one-bed unit, 3 two-bed units, and 5 three-bed duplex units,
- A new site entrance at Grange Erin Road to a ground level car park with 15 car parking spaces, and
- All associated site works, drainage works and associated landscaping.

2.2. Following a request for clarification of further information, the proposal was amended to show an entrance off Grange Road rather than off the road that serves Grange Erin by means of a two-storey covered access way to the rear car park. This amendment necessitated consequential changes in other aspects of the design of the proposal. At the earlier further information stage, the design of the proposal was modified for aesthetic reasons.

### 3.0 **Planning Authority Decision**

#### 3.1. **Decision**

Following receipt of further information and clarification of this information, planning permission was granted subject to 22 conditions.

#### 3.2. **Planning Authority Reports**

##### 3.2.1. **Planning Reports**

Further information was sought with respect to access and parking arrangements, revisions to and clarifications of the design, contextual elevations, apartment standards table, surface water disposal arrangements, boundary treatments, landscaping, management proposals, and street lighting.

Clarification of this further information was subsequently sought with respect to access arrangements, consequential changes to the proposed building, apartment standards table, street lighting, and landscaping.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Irish Water: No objection, standard advice cited.
- Cork County Council:
  - Public Lighting: Following receipt of clarification of further information, requested information still not fully submitted.
  - Area Engineer: Following receipt of clarification of further information, no objection, subject to conditions.
  - Estates: Following receipt of clarification of further information, no objection, subject to conditions.
  - Architects: Further information requested, no subsequent comments made.

## 4.0 Planning History

- Part V Exemption Certificate to shadow current proposal applied for.
- A pre-application consultation occurred on 30<sup>th</sup> January 2018.
- 17/5067: Change of use of building from a dwelling and off-licence to a funeral home and ancillary accommodation, including additional car parking: Withdrawn.

## 5.0 Policy and Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

Under the Ballincollig – Carrigaline Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017 (LAP), the site is shown as lying within the development boundary and in an “existing built up area.” Section 14.3.2 addresses development within such areas.

Under the Cork County Development Plan 2014 – 2020 (CDP), Objectives HOU 3-1 & 3-2 address sustainable residential communities and urban design, respectively, and Objective TM 3-3 addresses vehicular accesses, while Appendix D sets out car and cycle parking standards.

Under the Douglas Land Use and Transportation Strategy, Grange Road (R851) would be extended to the east to meet Carrigaline Road (R855) and Grange Road itself would be laid out to have cycle lanes in either direction.

## 5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- Cork Harbour SPA (site code 004030)
- Great Island Channel SAC (site code 001058)

## 5.3. EIA Screening

Under Items 10(b)(i) & (iv) of Part 2 of Schedule 5 to Article 93 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001 – 2019, where more than 500 dwelling units would be constructed and where 10 hectare-urban sites would be developed, the need for a mandatory EIA arises. The proposal is for the development of a 0.1346-hectare site to provide 9 dwelling units. Accordingly, it does not attract the need for a mandatory EIA. Furthermore, as this proposal would fall below the relevant thresholds, I conclude that, based on its nature, size, and location, there is no real likelihood of significant effects upon the environment and so the preparation of an EIAR is not required.

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

(a) Pierce Comerford of 46 Grange Erin

- The proposal would exhibit an excessive density, i.e. greater than the high density of 35 dwellings per hectare cited in Section 3.4.17 of the CDP.
- The application is not accompanied by a design statement (Section 3.3.11 of the CDP) and no explanation for the proposed mix of units is provided.
- The question of a management company for the operational phase of the proposal remains unaddressed.

- Grange Road does not have three storey residential buildings and so the scale of the proposal would be excessive within this context (Section 13.6.11 of the CDP).
- Parking on Grange Erin is already at a premium. The absence of proposed spaces for visitors would exacerbate this situation. The absence of motor bike parking spaces is also an issue and there is a lack of clarity with respect to provision for electric cars (Notes 8 & 9 of Table 1a Appendix D to the CDP).
- That the proposal would generate 1 two-way trip per peak hour is questioned, as is the comparison with a baseline of 12 such trips. The former off-licence did not open until 10.30 and so it did not coincide with the morning peak. Furthermore, it was busiest between 19.00 and 22.00 and so after the evening peak.

Traffic on Grange Road is heaviest between 07.00 and 09.15, as a result in part of local schools. Refuse collections add to congestion and the difficulties of accessing the site in this respect, especially if reversing manoeuvres feature, are flagged up. Furthermore, the swept path depicted makes the unwarranted assumption that all HGVs in attendance would have rear steer axle fitted.

- Concern is expressed that future residents would be transitory, and that noise could be an issue. Residential amenity would be adversely affected as a result of overlooking and overshadowing and the proposal would be visually obtrusive. Property values would also be adversely affected.

(b) Maura Daly of 1 Grange Erin

- Parking on Grange Erin is already at a premium. The absence of proposed spaces for visitors would exacerbate this situation.
- Grange Road does not have three storey residential buildings and so the scale of the proposal would be excessive within this context.
- The question of a management company for the operational phase of the proposal remains unaddressed.



(c) Terence P. Connolly of 50 Grange Erin

- Overlooking of the front elevation of the appellant's dwelling house and his front garden would result from, in particular, the use of the proposed second floor balcony on the northernmost elevation of the proposal.

No daylight/sunlight analysis accompanied the application and yet overshadowing from the proposed three storey building would affect the southern boundary of the appellant's residential property.

Noise resulting from the use of the proposed car park, which would be at a lower level than the appellant's residential property would be an issue, too.

- The proposal would be three storeys in height and of bulky form and contemporary design. Consequently, it would be out of scale and character with existing development in the area.
- The proposal would not provide any communal open space. Whereas the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments (SUHDSNA) Guidelines, state that such provision can be relaxed, the applicant has offered no justification for doing so in this case.
- Car parking provision would be inadequate and so pressure for overspill on-street parking on the already congested Grange Erin Estate would result.
- Cycle provision would be inadequate, at only 9 spaces, whereas, under the SUHDSNA Guidelines, 25 spaces should be provided. Likewise, the standard of provision would be unsatisfactory, e.g. they would be uncovered, under these Guidelines.
- Traffic generated by the proposal would be likely to add to congestion on Grange Road, especially from vehicles turning right into the site.

Landscaping along the site frontage would obscure sightlines and conceal vehicles emerging from the site.

The entrance to the site would be of insufficient width to allow two cars to pass one another. When the car park is full, manoeuvres by refuse collection vehicles would be difficult/hazardous.

- The boundary treatment along the southern edge of the appellant's residential property should be strengthened by means of additional planting and a consistently high wall.

## 6.2. Applicant Response

The applicant begins by citing extracts from the National Planning Framework (NPF), the CDP and the LAP, which support the principle of the proposal, i.e. it would entail the redevelopment of an urban infill and brownfield site, which is on the No. 206 bus route that operates every 15-minutes. It then responds to the above cited grounds of appeal as follows:

- Residential amenity
  - Attention is drawn to the case planner's view that the proposal would not unduly impact upon residential amenities.
  - With respect to appellant (a), attention is drawn to the open nature of his front garden onto Grange Erin. The "L" shaped layout of the proposal would ensure that the separation distance between it and the northern boundary of the site with the appellant's residential property would be sufficient to safeguard residential amenity. In this respect, the higher ground level of this property would mean that the ridge height of his two-storey dwelling house would be 700 mm higher than the parapet height of the northern arm to the proposal.
  - Appellant (c)'s residential property would be at some remove to the north west of the site and so its amenities would be unaffected by the proposal. His request that a daylight/sunlight analysis be submitted is set aside as being unnecessary. Given that neighbouring properties to the north and to the west are on higher ground than the site, the applicant considers that their dwelling houses would not be overshadowed by the proposal.
  - With respect to noise the view is expressed that any resumption of the retail use of the site would be likely to be noisier than that which is now proposed.

- Layout, scale, and design
  - Critiques of the proposal’s layout, scale, and design are set aside in the light of its location beside a public transport corridor and the importance of maximising the potential of the site under a redevelopment scenario.
- Parking
  - The level of car parking proposed would accord with CDP standards and is appropriate to the site’s aforementioned location.
  - Likewise, the level of cycle parking proposed would, at 9 spaces, exceed CDP standards.
- Traffic
  - Attention is drawn to the reasons for revising the proposed access arrangements to the site and to the Area Engineer’s support for the same. Advice set out in the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS) would thereby be complied with and an overall reduction in traffic generation would ensue.
- Management Company
  - None of the units on the site would be taken in charge.

### 6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

No further comments received.

### 6.4. **Observations**

(d) Andrew & Patricia Mulcahy of 31 Grange Erin

- The proposal would be too dense.
- Seventeen car parking spaces were sought and yet only 15 would be provided.
- The draft conditions do not refer to cycle parking.
- The proposed third storey would be out of keeping with the area and it would lead to overlooking.

- The revised access is a fundamental change to the proposal, upon which local residents were not consulted. Right hand turning movements into this access would be hazardous, while the originally proposed access would be accompanied by inadequate sightlines.
- Reversing manoeuvres from Grange Road by refuse collection vehicles would be neigh on impossible during the morning peak.
- The proposed finishes are critiqued and, again, they are not referred to in the draft conditions.
- The proposal would fail to provide communal open space.

(e) Thomas Leahy of “Glendine” Grange Road

- Attention is drawn to the proposed second floor balcony on the western elevation. This balcony would overlook the front garden to Glendine, which, as it is south facing, is well used.
- Three storeys would be at odds with two storey buildings in the area.
- Clarity over the siting of any bin storage area is needed.
- Access to and egress from the site during the morning and evening peaks would add to the congestion on Grange Road.
- The western boundary treatment to the site would be inadequate to safeguard the residential amenity of Glendine.

## 6.5. Further Responses

The applicant has responded to observer (e)’s submission as follows:

- Attention is drawn to the revised plans of the proposal submitted as clarification of further information. These plans show the balcony in question as being enclosed to the north and west by a 2m high brick wall and so any overlooking of Glendine would thereby be obviated.
- Attention is drawn to the higher ground level of Glendine. Consequently, the ridge height of the observer’s two storey dwelling house would be 2.65m higher than the parapet of the proposal.

- The revised bin storage site would be adjacent to the northern rather than the western boundary of the site.
- Traffic generated by the proposal would be less than under a resumed retail use of the site.
- The boundary treatments, as proposed, would be sufficient to safeguard the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.

Appellant (a) supports observer (e)'s submission and, in particular, its reference to the need for a solid wall to the western boundary of the site.

## 7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. I have reviewed the proposal in the light of national planning guidelines, the CDP and LAP, relevant planning history, the submissions of the parties, and my own site visit. Accordingly, I consider that this application/appeal should be assessed under the following headings:

- (i) Land use, density, and height,
- (ii) Visual and residential amenity,
- (iii) Development standards,
- (iv) Traffic, access, and parking,
- (v) Water, and
- (vi) Stage 1 Screening for AA.

### **(i) Land use, density, and height**

7.2. Under the LAP, the site is shown as lying within an existing built up area within which residential use predominates. Under the proposal, this site would be redeveloped for a wholly residential after-use. Accordingly, there is no, in principle, land use objection to this proposal.

7.3. Under the proposal the site, which has an area of 1346.6 sqm would be redeveloped to provide 9 dwellings. This level of provision would be equivalent to c. 67 dwellings per hectare. Appellants and observers draw attention to this density, which would be markedly greater than that exhibited by existing housing estates in the area, such as

Grange Erin, and almost twice the 35 dwellings per hectare cited in the CDP as being “high density”.

- 7.4. The applicant has responded to the question of density by citing national and local planning policies that favour the redevelopment of brownfield urban sites, beside transport corridors, to high densities. The subject site fits this description insofar as it is developed, although presently vacant, and it lies within an urban area beside Grange Road, which forms a QBC that is served by the No. 206 route between Grange and the South Mall at 15-minute intervals. Bus stops for this route exist on either side of Grange Road a short distance to the west of the site and a pelican crossing beside this site facilitates the crossing of this Road.
- 7.5. The Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas (SRDUA) Guidelines advise that sites on public transport corridors, where, in the case of buses, stops are within 500m walking distance, should have a minimum net density of 50 dwellings per hectare, subject to appropriate design and amenity standards. The proposal would comply with this advice and so there is no, in principle, objection to its density.
- 7.6. The proposal would be part two storey and part three storey in height. Appellants and observers draw attention to the context of the site, which is composed of single storey and two storey dwelling houses and so they contend that this proposal would be out of character with the area.
- 7.7. The Urban Development and Building Heights (UDBH) Guidelines address building height in suburban/edge locations. These Guidelines insist that “development proposals must move away from a two-storey, cul-de-sac dominated approach, returning to traditional compact urban forms”. The accompanying Specific Planning Policy Requirement (SPPR 4) states that Planning Authorities must secure (i) the relevant minimum densities set out in the SRDUA Guidelines, (ii) a greater mix of building heights and typologies, and (iii) avoid mono-type building typologies (e.g. two-storey or own-door houses only).
- 7.8. In the light of the aforementioned advice, there is no, in principle, objection to the height of the proposal.
- 7.9. I conclude that, under the LAP, the proposed residential use of the site would be appropriate, and, under relevant national planning guidelines, the density and height of the proposal would, in principle, be appropriate.

## **(ii) Visual and residential amenity**

- 7.10. The appellants and observers take exception to the scale, mass, and design of the proposal insofar as it would be out of character with the surrounding residential area. The applicant has responded by drawing attention to the relevant provisions of national planning guidelines that support the proposal.
- 7.11. Turning to the site within its context, I note that it is surrounded on its eastern and southern boundaries by roads and that its remaining western and northern boundaries rise towards the north western corner and are heavily landscaped. I note, too, that the adjacent dwelling houses to the west and north of the site are on higher ground. The applicant has submitted contextual elevations of the proposal in conjunction with these dwelling houses, which illustrate that, notwithstanding its partly three-storey form and their two-storey form, the parapet height of the former would not exceed the ridge height of the latter.
- 7.12. The streetscape to the west of the site on the northern side of Grange Road is enclosed by high walls and mature landscaping, and to the east by a line of trees between the said Road and a parallel estate road to the north. The resultant streetscape is not strongly composed of buildings.
- 7.13. The streetscape on the western side of the road which serves Grange Erin comprises the existing single storey building on the site and beyond a heavily landscaped common boundary the first of several two-storey gable fronted dwelling houses. This road progresses through an entrance to the housing estate that aligns with the said common boundary. Thus, at present, the site is visually separate from the housing estate and it accommodates a visually distinctive building from the adjacent dwelling houses on this estate.
- 7.14. In the light of the foregoing paragraphs, I consider that from the two streetscape perspectives cited there is scope for the introduction of novelty in terms of the scale, mass, and design of any new building on the site. I consider, too, that the current proposal, especially as it has been fine tuned under further information and clarification of such information, would be an unmistakably contemporary addition to the streetscape that would add visual interest to the same and thus enhance the visual amenities of the area.

- 7.15. The appellants and observers express concern that the proposal would adversely affect the residential amenities of adjoining and nearby residential properties, in terms of overshadowing, overlooking, overbearing, and the potential for noise nuisance. The residents of the adjoining residential properties at Glendine to the west and No. 50 Grange Erin to the north express particular concern that the proposed boundary treatments would be insufficient to safeguard their residential amenities.
- 7.16. The applicant has responded by drawing attention to the siting of the proposed building, which would be across the southern and eastern portions of the site and thus away from the nearest dwelling houses to the west and north. They consider that the resulting separation distances from the said dwelling houses, their higher levels, and the retention and augmentation of existing boundary treatments would ensure that residential amenity would be safeguarded.
- 7.17. More specifically, the applicant draws attention to the two-storey portion of the building that would be sited adjacent to the western boundary and to the enclosed private terrace above this portion, which would, thereby, avoid any views into Glendine. It also draws attention to the stepped form of the northern end of the building adjacent to No. 50, which would ensure that the second floor private terrace is set well back from the northern boundary of the site and that the sense of the building's presence is eased.
- 7.18. With respect to boundary treatments, the applicant assumes that landscaping on the existing residents' sides of the western and northern boundaries would be retained. On the site side of these boundaries, especially in the north western corner, the clearance of existing landscaping would open up these boundaries from within the site. Thus, a palisade fence and a concrete wall would become visible at raised levels. The former would be viewed against the backdrop of a substantial shed and the latter would be viewed in conjunction with trees and shrubs. The visual impact of these boundary treatments could be eased by means of planting a mix of evergreen shrubs. Such additional planting could be conditioned.
- 7.19. Under the applicant's landscaping scheme, additional tree planting would be undertaken along the western boundary, where there is a gap on the Glendine side of this boundary, and along the northern boundary in the vicinity of the northern end



of the proposed building. Likewise, tree planting would be undertaken at intervals along the road frontages of the site and beside the internal car park.

- 7.20. I note that the above cited two adjacent dwelling houses have attached garages on those elevations that present to the site. The garage attached to the western dwelling house, Glendine, remains in use as a garage and so the separation distance between the said dwelling house and the proposal would, in practise, be extended accordingly. I also note that the above cited details of boundary treatments to the north and to the south. In the light of these observations and the proposed siting and nuanced design of the building, I concur with the applicant's view that it would be compatible with the safeguarding of residential amenity.
- 7.21. On the specific question of increased noise risk, the applicant has drawn attention to the last use of the site as an off-licence and it has contended that any such resumed usage would be likely to generate more noise than under its proposal. I note that, on the one hand, the proposed car park would be sited closer to the western and northern boundaries than the existing one and, on the other hand, it is reasonable to suggest that a residents' car park would tend to operate in a quieter manner than a customers' one.
- 7.22. I conclude that the proposal would be compatible with the visual and residential amenities of the area.

### **(iii) Development standards**

- 7.23. The proposal would lead to the provision of 9 dwellings, i.e. 1 one-bed unit, 3 two-bed units, and 5 three-bed duplex units. Thus, a good mix of sizes would be made available.
- 7.24. Quantitatively, the applicant has submitted a schedule of accommodation dated 16<sup>th</sup> May 2019, which demonstrates that the proposed dwellings would meet the required minimum floor area and standards set out in Appendix 1 of the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments (SUHDSNA) Guidelines.
- 7.25. Qualitatively, the proposed dwellings would be orientated on either north/south or east/west axes and they would all be at least dual aspect. The provision of private open space would be consistently above the minimum required by Appendix 1 of the SUHDSNA Guidelines and, in the vast majority of cases, considerably above this minimum.

- 7.26. Appellants and observers have drawn attention to the absence of communal open space from the proposal. Under Appendix 1 of the SUHDSNA Guidelines, a total of 77 sqm of such open space would be required as a minimum. However, under Paragraph 4.12 of these Guidelines, the requirement to provide communal amenity space on sites of up to 0.25 hectares proposed for urban infill schemes can be waved. The proposal would fit this description.
- 7.27. I would comment further that, as already noted, the provision of private open space within the proposal would, under Appendix 1 of the SUHDSNA Guidelines, be generous. I note, too, there would be some incidental communal open space between the northern arm of the proposed building and the car park. In these circumstances, I raise no objection to this proposal on the grounds of inadequate provision of communal open space.
- 7.28. As originally submitted, the bin store for the proposal would have been sited adjacent to the western boundary of the site, whereas, under revisions to the same, it would now be sited adjacent to the northern boundary. The adequacy of the size of this store has not been demonstrated and so, if the Board is minded to grant permission, then this matter should be conditioned.
- 7.29. The applicant has applied for and been granted a Part V Exemption Certificate and it has stated that no part of the proposal would be taken in charge. Instead, its operational phase would be overseen by a management company.
- 7.30. I conclude that the proposal would be capable of affording an acceptable standard of amenity to future residents.

**(iv) Traffic, access, and parking**

- 7.31. Appellants and observers express concern that the proposal would be likely to add to traffic congestion on Grange Road during the busy morning peak. They also state that the former off-licence use of the site would not have generated traffic during this peak.
- 7.32. The applicant has stated that there would be an overall reduction in traffic generated by the site, as a result of the replacement of the former off-licence use by the current proposal. Thus, it states that, whereas a retail convenience use would be expected to generate 12 in/out traffic movements per peak hour, each apartment would be expected to generate 1 in/out movement per peak hour, i.e. 9 in total.

- 7.33. In the light of the foregoing submissions, I acknowledge that while in overall terms traffic generated by the proposal would be likely to be less than under the previous use of the site, during the morning peak it would be likely to increase. That said the additional traffic movements would not be significant in terms of the numbers of vehicles on Grange Road and access to/egress from the site would be facilitated by the adjacent operations of a pelican crossing. If, in time, such movements were nonetheless proving difficult, then the Planning Authority could consider other measures, e.g. the specification of a yellow box. In the future, under the Douglas Land Use Transportation Strategy, traffic on Grange Road (R851) would be affected by its proposed extension eastwards to join Carrigaline Road (R855) and the incorporation of cycle lanes within this Road.
- 7.34. As originally submitted, vehicular and pedestrian accesses to the site would have been, in the former case, off Grange Erin and, in the latter case, off Grange Road. Under revised plans, these arrangements have been swapped over, as the originally proposed vehicular access would have suffered from an inadequate northerly sightline. To facilitate the re-siting of this access off Grange Road, the proposed building has been redesigned to incorporate a covered, double storey height, opening, which would form a means of access into the car park beyond.
- 7.35. The width of the proposed means of access would be 4.5m. Section 4.4.1 and Figure 4.55 of the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS) envisage a carriageway width not exceeding 4.8m for local roads, if cars travelling in opposite directions are to pass safely. I, therefore, consider that 4.5m over the short distance of the covered means of access would be adequate. The requisite sightlines, under DMURS, of 2.4m x 50m would be available at the accompanying access point from Grange Road, provided the accompanying front garden walls are no more than 1m in height. This height restriction could be conditioned.
- 7.36. The applicant has submitted an autotrack of a refuse truck turning right into the proposed access and undertaking a turning movement within the proposed car park, thereby demonstrating that the site could be accessed and egressed by such a truck in forward gear. Appellant (a) has critiqued this autotrack on the basis that it makes the unwarranted assumption that refuse trucks would always have a rear steer axle fitted. The applicant has not responded to this critique. I anticipated that its choice of

truck type is realistic, and, in this respect, I note that none of the Planning Authority's engineering consultees questioned this choice.

- 7.37. The proposal would be served by a 15-space car park and a 9-stand cycle park. The SUHDSNA Guidelines advise that in intermediate urban locations, e.g. suburban locations served by public transport, "planning authorities must consider a reduced overall car parking standard". They also advise that a general minimum of 1 cycle stand per bedroom be applied and 1 cycle stand per two apartments for visitors, although the application of these standards is at the discretion of the Planning Authority.
- 7.38. Under the CDP, the apartments should be accompanied by 1.25 car parking spaces and dwellings should be accompanied by 2 car parking spaces. Likewise, one/two-bed apartments should be accompanied by 0.5 cycle stands and three-bed apartments should be accompanied by 1 cycle stand.
- 7.39. Under the proposal, 15 car parking spaces and 9 cycle stands would be provided. If duplexes are regarded as dwellings, then the former level of provision would be appropriate under the CDP and the latter level of provision would be in excess, by 2 cycle stands.
- 7.40. The appellants and observers express concern that the level of car parking provision would be inadequate, and it would risk on-street overspill car parking on the Grange Erin Estate. They draw attention to the Planning Authority's earlier request that 2 additional spaces be provided for visitors and they question why this was not pursued.
- 7.41. I consider that in the light of the SUHDSNA Guidelines, there are no grounds for requiring any more car parking spaces. Under these Guidelines, 29 cycle stands would be required, i.e. 24 for residents and 5 for visitors. I consider that, on the one hand, this level of provision would be excessive for the suburban location of the site, which is also at an elevated level in relation to the city centre, and, on the other hand, the proposed provision of 9 cycle stands would be, too, low. In these circumstances, I consider that 1 cycle stand for each of the one/two-bed apartments would be appropriate, and 2 cycle stands for each of the three-bed duplexes would be appropriate. Thus, 14 cycle stands should be provided, and these should be under cover. These matters could be conditioned.

- 7.42. Appellants and observers also express concern over the omission of any motor bike parking spaces and the absence of any details on the provision of electric car parking spaces. Under Appendix D, the CDP states that 1 motor bike parking space should accompany every 10 car parking spaces and all car parking spaces “should be constructed to be capable of accommodating future charging points as required. I, therefore, consider that 1 motor bike parking space should be provided, and all the car parking spaces should have the stated capability for charging.
- 7.43. I conclude that the traffic generated by the proposal would be capable of being accommodate on Grange Road and the proposed means of access to the site would be satisfactory. I also conclude that the proposed level of car parking spaces would be appropriate and that they should all be capable of providing charging facilities, but that the proposed level of cycle stands should be increased by 5, placed under cover, and augmented by 1 motor bike parking space.

**(v) Water**

- 7.44. The site is served by the public water mains and the public sewerage system. Existing connections in these respects would be maintained and Irish Water raises no objection to the same.
- 7.45. The OPW’s flood maps website shows the site as not being the subject of any identified flood risk.
- 7.46. The proposal would comprise a stormwater drainage system with a petrol interceptor and an attenuation tank that would be capable of handling 1:100-year floods, while limiting the discharge from the site to the pre-development outflow rate of 1.43 litres/second.
- 7.47. The proposed water supply and drainage arrangements for the site would be satisfactory.

**(vi) Stage 1 Screening for AA**

- 7.48. The site is neither in nor near to any Natura 2000 sites. It is a serviced urban site that, under the proposal, would be redeveloped.
- 7.49. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposal and the nature of the receiving environment, no Appropriate Assessment issues arise, and it is not considered that

the proposal would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

## 8.0 Recommendation

8.1. That permission be granted.

## 9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the Cork County Development Plan 2014 – 2020, the Ballincollig-Carrigaline District Local Area Plan 2017, the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas Guidelines, the Sustainable Urban Housing: Development Standards for New Apartments Guidelines, the Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines, and the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets, it is considered that, subject to conditions, the proposed redevelopment of the site for a residential after use would be appropriate in terms of land use, density, and height. The proposal would be compatible with the visual and residential amenities of the area and it would afford an acceptable standard of amenity to future residents. Traffic generated by the proposal would be capable of being accommodated on the road network and access arrangements would be satisfactory. Car parking and cycle parking, subject to an increase in the number of cycle stands, would be adequate. Water supply and drainage arrangements would be satisfactory. No flooding, EIA, or AA issues would arise. The proposal would thus accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 10.0 Conditions

1.	The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application [as amended by the further plans and particulars submitted on the 7 <sup>th</sup> day of February 2019 and by the clarification of these plans and particulars submitted on the 21 <sup>st</sup> day of May 2019, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in
----	---

	<p>writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The proposed development shall be amended as follows:</p> <p>(a) The siting, size, layout, and design of the proposed bin store shall be revised, as appropriate, to be demonstrably appropriate to the size of the proposed development.</p> <p>(b) The number of bike racks shall be increased to 14 and all of the racks shall be placed under cover.</p> <p>(c) One motor bike parking space shall be provided.</p> <p>(d) All the car parking spaces shall be designed to be capable of providing charging points.</p> <p>(e) The front garden walls to Grange Road shall be no more than 1 metre in height.</p> <p>Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of residential amenity, in order to promote sustainable modes of transport and comply with national and local planning standards, and in order to ensure adequate visibility, in the interest of road safety.</p>
3.	<p>Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed building shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
4.	<p>Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.</p>

	<p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of public health.</p>
5.	<p>The access road and car park serving the proposed development shall comply with the detailed standards of the planning authority for such road works.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of amenity and of traffic and pedestrian safety.</p>
6.	<p>Public lighting shall be provided in accordance with a scheme, details of which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Such lighting shall be provided prior to the making available for occupation of any dwelling.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interests of amenity and public safety.</p>
7.	<p>Proposals for a name, dwelling numbering scheme and associated signage shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, all signs and dwelling numbers, shall be provided in accordance with the agreed scheme. No advertisements/marketing signage relating to the name of the development shall be erected until the developer has obtained the planning authority's written agreement to the proposed name.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of urban legibility.</p>
8.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays.</p> <p>Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>
9.	<p>Construction and demolition waste shall be managed in accordance with a construction waste and demolition management plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to</p>



	<p>commencement of development. This plan shall be prepared in accordance with the “Best Practice Guidelines on the Preparation of Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects”, published by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government in July 2006.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of sustainable waste management.</p>
10.	<p>The management and maintenance of the proposed development following its completion shall be the responsibility of a legally constituted management company. A management scheme providing adequate measures for the future maintenance of the access road, car park, and communal areas shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> To provide for the satisfactory future maintenance of this development in the interest of residential amenity.</p>
11.	<p>The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interests of public safety and residential amenity.</p>
12.	<p>Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed construction traffic management plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of good traffic management.</p>
13.	<p>The landscaping scheme shown on drg. no. 4000, revision 3, as submitted to the planning authority on the 21<sup>st</sup> day of May, 2019, shall be carried out within the first planting season following substantial completion of external construction works.</p>

	<p>In addition to the proposals in the submitted scheme, the following shall be carried out:</p> <p>A mix of evergreen shrub planting along the western and northern boundaries to the site to correspond with the exposed palisade fence and concrete wall.</p> <p>All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of five years from the completion of the development, shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of residential and visual amenity.</p>
14.	<p>Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company, or other security to secure the provision and satisfactory completion of roads, footpaths, watermains, drains, open space and other services required in connection with the development, coupled with an agreement empowering the local authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory completion of any part of the development. The form and amount of the security shall be as agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of agreement, shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> To ensure the satisfactory completion of the development.</p>
15.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable</p>

indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

**Reason:** It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

---

Hugh D. Morrison  
Planning Inspector

11<sup>th</sup> October 2019