



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-310676-21

Development	Demolition of existing derelict buildings on 21, 22 & 23 Wickham Street and the construction of a four-storey cultural centre and all associated site services.
Location	20 – 24 Wickham Street, Limerick
Planning Authority	Limerick City & County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	20/1236
Applicant(s)	Dawat E Islami
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant, subject to 13 conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party -v- Decision
Appellant(s)	Eleanor Purcell
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	11 th August 2021
Inspector	Hugh D. Morrison

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
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. National policy.....	7
5.3. Natural Heritage Designations	7
5.4. EIA Screening	7
6.0 The Appeal	7
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	7
6.2. Applicant Response	8
6.3. Planning Authority Response	8
6.4. Observations	8
6.5. Further Responses.....	9
7.0 Assessment.....	9
8.0 Recommendation.....	18
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	18
10.0 Conditions	19

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located in the eastern portion of Limerick City Centre. This site lies within a fork in the street network, which is formed by the junction between Parnell Street/Wickham Street (R858), which run on a roughly north/south axis, and Upper Gerald Griffin Street/Roches Street (R527), which run on a north-east/west axis. This junction is centred on a triangular island to the south of the site, and it is joined by Sexton Street, too, from the east.
- 1.2. The site extends over an area of 0.0245 hectares, and it is “L” shaped in plan-view. This site is bound to the west by Wickham Street, to the south by Sexton Street, which continues to the north of the triangular island, and Upper Gerald Street to the south-east. The site is bound to the north by a pedestrian alleyway between Wickham Street and Upper Gerald Street. The remaining boundaries about the properties at Nos. 17 & 18 Upper Gerald Street and the side elevation of the building at No. 17 Upper Gerald Street.
- 1.3. The site presently accommodates a row of three buildings: A two-storey building at No. 21 Wickham Street and 2 three-storey buildings at Nos. 22 & 23 Wickham Street. These buildings are unoccupied and in a poor state of repair. Parts of this site have been cleared: The northern portion, the southern strip, and the south-eastern portion. The southern face of the site comprises the three-storey gabled end elevation of No. 23 Wickham Street, which has become overgrown with vegetation and which lies behind a solid timber fence. This face is highly visible when the site is approached from the south along Parnell Street.
- 1.4. The surrounding streets are composed of predominantly two and three-storey traditional urban buildings with the occasional four-storey building, too. Modern two and three-storey buildings have been inserted in places and on Roches Street there are examples of five storey older and newer buildings. These buildings are the subject of a wide variety of retail, commercial, residential, educational, and community/ecclesiastical uses. Some ground floor units are vacant, for example, on Wickham Street, and some upper floors are vacant, too.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposal would entail the demolition of the existing 3 buildings on the site. They have a total floor area of 117 sqm.
- 2.2. The proposal would also entail the construction of a four-storey cultural centre with a total floor area of 513.63 sqm. This centre would be a mosque with an associated office and a one-bed apartment for the imam. Its modernist design would have a minimalistic external appearance, while the specification of discrete apertures would illuminate the interior. The finishing material would be solid brick with panels of perforated brick, too, and aluminium framed triple glazed screens would be inserted in window openings. The pedestrian entrance way from Wickham Street would be recessed and the front door would be finished in perforated Corten steel.
- 2.3. Internally, the mosque would be laid out in the southern portion of the centre in essentially the equivalent of a four-storey space. Worshippers would be accommodated on the ground and first floors and ancillary facilities would be available in the central and northern portions of the centre on these floors. The associated office and apartment would be laid out on the second and third floors, respectively, in the central and northern portions of the centre. Circulation spaces would likewise be accommodated in these portions of the centre.
- 2.4. Under further information, the applicant stated that the hours of opening for the centre would be as follows:
 - Before sunrise for 30 minutes,
 - In the afternoon for 30 minutes,
 - In the evening after sunset for between 1 to 2 hours, and
 - During religious festival days on 12th May and 19th July between 07.00 and 08.00.
- 2.5. Under clarification of further information, the second and third floors were recessed along their central portions and the accompanying glazing was set behind a meshwork of brick.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Following receipt of further information and its clarification, permission was granted subject to 13 conditions, including ones with respect to the submission of record drawings and a photographic survey of the building, which is an entry on the NIAH, the submission of details of signage, agreement on exact brick and mortar to be used, and a prohibition of external amplified sound/music system.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The following further information was requested:

- The scale and mass of the proposal to be revised with respect to the adjoining residential properties.
- Hours of opening to the public to be outlined.
- Details of proposed bricks to be submitted.
- NIAH entry on the site: Building to be the subject of record drawings and photographic survey. Historic development and morphology of the locality to be analysed as an input to revisions to the proposal and statement of justification to be prepared.
- A Refurbishment Demolition Asbestos Survey to be carried out.
- A Construction and Demolition Management Plan to be submitted.

Clarification of the applicant's response to the first and fourth bullet points was subsequently requested.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht: No comments received.
- HSE Environmental Health: No comments.
- Irish Water: No objection: Detailed advisory commentary provided.

- An Taisce: Supports the proposal.
- Limerick City & County Council:
 - Conservation Officer: Further information requested, on receipt no further response forthcoming.
 - Environmental Services: Further information requested, following receipt of which no objection raised, subject to a waste management condition.
 - Central Roads: No objection, subject to conditions.
 - Contributions: No levy required.

4.0 Planning History

- 00/770362: Convert an 8m x 3m static advertising panel to a 6m x 3m prismatic advertising panel: Refused.
- Enforcement DC404-18: Re. unauthorised sign.
- Pre-application consultation held on 22nd June 2020.

5.0 Policy and Context

5.1. Development Plan

Under the Limerick City Development Plan 2010 – 2016 (as extended), the site is zoned city centre, and it lies just within the city centre retail area. The corresponding zoning objectives (ZO.1 and ZO.1(A)) are as follows:

To support the retention and expansion of a wide range of commercial, cultural, leisure and residential uses in the city centre as defined in the 2030 Economic and Spatial Plan.

To provide for the protection, upgrading and expansion of higher order retailing, in particular comparison retailing, and a range of other supporting uses in the city centre retail area.

The accompanying commentary to ZO.1(A) states that “Retailing is prioritised in this area but not to the exclusion of other land use types. Other uses such as residential, hotel, office, and cultural and leisure facilities, etc. which complement the retail function of the city centre retail area and promote vibrancy in the city centre are also

permitted, subject to the policies promoting city centre retailing.” Churches and places of worship are deemed to be “open for consideration” under ZO.1(A).

The site lies within Zone 1 for parking purposes.

5.2. National policy

NIAH identifies 21 Wickham Street under ref. no. 21518050.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- Lower River Shannon SAC (002165)
- River Shannon & River Fergus Estuaries SPA (004077)

5.4. EIA Screening

Under Items 10(b)(iv) of Part 2 of Schedule 5 to Article 93 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001 – 2021, where urban development would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district the need for a mandatory EIA arises. The proposal is for the development of four-storey cultural centre on a site with an area of 0.0245 hectares. Accordingly, it does not attract the need for a mandatory EIA. Furthermore, as this proposal would fall below the relevant threshold, 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

Eleanor Purcell of 47 Wickham Street on behalf of Wickham Street Traders:

- The proposal would be overbearing and out of character with the locality.
- The proposal would disregard the historic pattern of the streetscape, which is fine grained.

- The proposal would be over development, which would adversely affect residential amenity in terms of disturbance, loss of light, and overshadowing.
- The proposal would provide neither parking nor a set down area.
- Traffic generated by the proposal would create a hazard to road users and it would be in conflict with the proposed pedestrian/cyclist link between Colbert Station, the Milk Market/city centre, and onwards to the University.
- The CDP zoning objective encourages vibrancy on the street, whereas the proposal would entail the provision of an enclosed space for prayer.
- The Planning Authority may control part of the site and so have an interest in the proposal for it.
- Any proposal for the site, which is in a pivotal location, should reflect the following objectives:
 - Be aesthetically pleasing and in sympathy with the character of the area.
 - Be neighbourly.
 - Make a positive contribution to the streetscape by specifying active frontages.
 - Avoid creating pedestrian/cyclist hazards.
 - Reflect the vision of Wickham Street Traders.

6.2. Applicant Response

The applicant's response was received outside the statutory time period and so it was returned to him.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

None

6.4. Observations

Two observations were received outside the statutory time period and so they were returned to them.

6.5. Further Responses

None

7.0 Assessment

7.1. I have reviewed the proposal in the light of the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH), the Limerick City Development Plan 2010 – 2016 (as extended), relevant planning history, and the submissions of the parties. Accordingly, I consider that this application/appeal should be assessed under the following headings:

- (i) The Planning Authority,
- (ii) Land use,
- (iii) Conservation,
- (iv) Streetscape,
- (v) Amenity,
- (vi) Traffic, access, and parking,
- (vii) Water, and
- (viii) Appropriate Assessment.

(i) The Planning Authority

7.2. The appellant draws attention to the fact that the Planning Authority may have an interest in the progression of the proposal, as it controls part of the site.

7.3. The completed application forms state that Limerick City & County Council (LCCC) do own at least part of the site, and an accompanying letter of consent to make this application describes the land in question as being at the Junction of Wickham Street and Gerald Griffin Street. This letter goes on to state that “This consent to apply for planning permission shall not be construed as an acknowledgement that planning permission will in due course be granted. It is a matter for the applicant to satisfy the relevant planning requirements of LCCC and/or An Bord Pleanala.” It, therefore, signals that the planning process is discrete from any sale of land to the applicant that may ensue.

7.4. I conclude that the appellant's concern relates to circumstances that are not exceptional insofar as applications are made from time-to-time on land in the ownership of planning authorities. I conclude, too, that the current application has been made in an open and transparent manner in this respect.

(ii) Land use

7.5. Under the CDP, the site is zoned city centre (ZO.1), wherein the objective is "To support the retention and expansion of a wide range of commercial, cultural, leisure and residential uses..." The site is also zoned city centre retail area (ZO.1(A)), wherein the objective is "To provide for the protection, upgrading and expansion of higher order retailing, in particular comparison retailing, and a range of other supporting uses..." The accompanying commentary to ZO.1(A) states that "Retailing is prioritised in this area but not to the exclusion of other land use types. Other uses such as residential, hotel, office, and cultural and leisure facilities, etc. which complement the retail function of the city centre retail area and promote vibrancy in the city centre are also permitted, subject to the policies promoting city centre retailing."

7.6. Churches and places of worship are deemed to be "open for consideration" under ZO.1(A). The proposal is for a cultural centre, which would function essentially as a mosque. Accordingly, from a land use perspective, this proposal would be "open for consideration".

7.7. The appellant expresses concern that the proposal would fail to promote vibrancy within the city centre. The applicant has set out the hours of opening, which would be before sunrise and after sunset and briefly in the afternoon. Additionally, on annual religious festival days, it would be open in the early morning. In the light of these hours, overlap with "the working day" for businesses in the area would be limited, although in the winter months it would increase with the shorter hours of daylight.

7.8. During my site visit, I observed that the site has been partially cleared and that the remaining buildings upon it are vacant and in a poor state of repair. The applicant's conservation consultant advises that these buildings were formerly in use as shops on their ground floors with No. 22 Wickham Street functioning as a carpenter's workshop until 2000. Clearly, for a considerable number of years now, the site has not generated footfall or contributed to vibrancy.

- 7.9. During my site visit, I also observed that the surrounding area, especially to the south along Parnell Street, comprises an increasing number of businesses that reflect the changing ethnic composition of the population, e.g. eateries and food shops, amongst other businesses. Within this context, the proposal would represent a complementary use that would in a limited way add to the emerging vibrancy of the area.
- 7.10. I conclude that, under the zoning of the site, the proposal would be “open for consideration”, and that, within the context of the changing surrounding area, it would be a complementary use that would contribute in a limited way to vibrancy.

(iii) Conservation

- 7.11. Under the CDP, the site does not lie within an Architectural Heritage Area and the buildings upon it are not protected structures. One building, No. 21 Wickham Street, is however identified in the NIAH under ref. no. 21518050. The description of this building, which dates from 23rd November 2006, draws attention to its “original timber shop front with fascia board and pilasters”. It states that the building dates from c. 1850 and it is deemed to be of architectural/artistic interest and regional importance. The accompanying appraisal states that “This house has a particularly fine and intact shop front. The windows in the window surrounds are unusual within the city and the ensemble merits protection.”
- 7.12. During my site visit, I observed that the shop window and upper floor windows in the front elevation of No. 21 Wickham Street are boarded up. I also observed that the shop front, insofar as it formerly comprised a timber fascia board and pilasters, has been removed, as has the accompanying shop door, door posts, and fanlight. The empty doorway to the shop front has been plastered over and painted. The front door to the upper floor and the fanlight above it have been replaced by a new door, which is itself in a state of disrepair and partially boarded over at present.
- 7.13. While the applicant’s conservation consultant was able to inspect the interior of Nos. 22 & 23 Wickham Street, she was unable to do so in the case of No. 21 Wickham Street, due to its unsafe condition. Her commentary on this building is thus confined to its exterior.
- 7.14. The Planning Authority consulted conservation bodies on this application: The Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht did not comment, An Taisce

expressed its support, and the in-house Conservation Officer requested that record drawings be made of No. 21 Wickham Street and that an archival standard photographic study be made of all three buildings on the site. This request prompted Condition No. 2 of the Planning Authority's subsequent permission.

7.15. I note that, under the CDP, the Planning Authority undertakes to add to its Record of Protected Structures (RPS) during the lifetime of this Plan buildings identified in the NIAH where this is "considered appropriate and as resources permit". I note, too, that the CDP has been extended and is about to be replaced and No. 21 Wickham Street has not been added to the RPS.

7.16. In the light of the above considerations and in particular the current state of No. 21 Wickham Street, the absence of objection to its demolition by conservation bodies, and its non-inclusion in the RPS, I do not consider that objection to the current proposal could be sustained on the basis that this building would be lost.

7.17. I conclude that objection to the proposal on conservation grounds is not warranted.

(iv) Streetscape

7.18. The appellant expresses concern that the proposal would be overbearing.

7.19. The applicant has submitted an architectural design statement for the proposal. This statement elucidates the influences that have informed the design approach adopted. Foremost amongst these is the site's prominent location adjoining an important junction with the city centre's street network. On approach from the south along Parnell Street the site is seen progressively as one that could accommodate a landmark building. Allied to this observation, the statement addresses the scale/height of the proposal within its streetscape context. Contiguous elevations of the eastern sides of Wickham Street/Parnell Street and the western sides of Upper Gerald Griffin Street/Parnell Street illustrate that the proposal would exceed the scale/height of the existing buildings on the site and that of the buildings within its immediate vicinity, although some within its wider vicinity would be of similar scale. Thus, its size would cause it to stand out, although, given its location, this is viewed as being appropriate.

7.20. The appellant expresses concern that the proposal would be out of character as it would disregard the fine-grained pattern of the streetscape.

- 7.21. The applicant's conservation consultant has undertaken a photographic survey of Wickham Street and adjacent Streets, which illustrates the fine-grained pattern of much of the historic streetscape. The relative neglect of these Streets has led to a situation where, in the absence of large-scale projects, this pattern has largely survived.
- 7.22. During my site visit, I observed the pattern thus referred to. I also observed that on Parnell Street and Roches Street there are examples of large-scale buildings, too. Nevertheless, within the site's immediate context, the proposal would represent a departure from this pattern. Such departure prompts the question as to whether the proposal would be an appropriate addition to the streetscape aesthetically.
- 7.23. The proposal would be a large building relative to the buildings within its immediate context and yet its apparent bulk and mass would be eased by the sub-division of its overall form into different elements that would be distinguishable by their arrangement in relation to one another, for example, through projecting/recessing/tilting, and their varied finishes, with solid and perforated brickwork being specified. Light would be admitted through aluminium framed glazed openings set largely within the apertures in the buildings overall form.
- 7.24. Clearly, the design of the proposal responds to the challenge posed by the shape and size of the site, the built context of the site, and the prominent location of the site. Its size and modernist architecture would contrast with the traditional scale and design of buildings within its immediate vicinity. Such contrast would be analogous to the tradition of readily distinguishable cultural/institutional/ecclesiastical buildings in the city centre. Furthermore, the nuanced handling of its form would ease the perception of its size and so I consider that it would be an appropriate addition to the streetscape aesthetically.
- 7.25. I conclude that the proposal would expand the visual amenities of the streetscape.

(v) Amenity

- 7.26. As discussed above the site is located within a mixed-use area of the city centre, within which residential content tends to occur on upper floors, apart from on Sexton Street where terraced dwelling houses predominate on the northern side of this Street. The impact of the proposal on residential amenity therefore needs to be assessed.

- 7.27. As discussed above the proposal is essentially for a mosque. The applicant's architectural design statement refers to the question of a minaret only to set it aside as not been likely to be needed within the context of Limerick and so none is proposed.
- 7.28. The Planning Authority attached Condition No. 4 to its permission, which states that "No external amplified sound/music system shall be installed or operated on the site." The reason given for this Condition is "To protect the residential amenities of the area..." I consider that it is a reasonable one and so should be replicated in any permission the Board may be minded to grant.
- 7.29. The site adjoins two properties to the east, which appear to have residential content on their upper floors. No. 17 Upper Gerald Griffin Street is a three-storey building with a single storey rear extension and No. 18 Upper Gerald Griffin Street is a two-storey building with two-storey rear extensions.
- The exposed rear elevation of No. 17 lies between 2.2m and 2.8m from the rear elevation of No. 21 Wickham Street, a two-storey building. The former rear elevation has three second floor windows and the latter rear elevation has two first floor windows. There is some correspondence between these windows.
 - The rear elevations of the extensions to No. 18 are immediately adjacent to the retained rear wall of a building that has otherwise been cleared from the site at No. 20 Wickham Street. It is unclear whether these elevations contain windows. If they do, then their amenity value would be extremely limited, due to the proximity and height of the wall.
- 7.30. Returning to No. 17, the rear elevation of this building faces west north-west. Under further information, the applicant submitted a revised architectural statement, which addresses the relationship between this elevation and the proposal. This statement draws attention to the limited sun lighting of the elevation at present. It also draws attention to the second-floor window in the exposed southern side elevation of No. 17, which, due to the design of the proposal, would continue to receive sunlight.
- 7.31. The applicant's revised architectural statement discusses the above cited correspondence between the windows in the rear elevations of No. 17 and No. 21. Under the proposal, this correspondence would cease, although as originally

proposed, windows would be installed at second and third floor levels. Under clarification of further information, these floors were recessed by 0.9m along their interface with the rear elevation of No. 17 and meshed blockwork was specified for the windows to these floors. Any risk of overlooking/loss of neighbour privacy from the proposal would thereby be negated.

- 7.32. With respect to the second-floor windows in the rear elevation of No. 17, the gap between this elevation and the corresponding rear elevation to No. 21 functions as a light well. Under the proposal this gap would continue to function as such, albeit its effectiveness would be reduced. This reduction can be gauged by considering the middle of the three windows. At present the centre of this window aligns with the eaves level of No. 21 and it would effectively align with the recessed second floor level of the proposal, i.e. the separation distance would increase from 2.5m to 3.4m. However, the eaves serve a pitched roof with a ridge height of 7.2m, whereas the second and third floors would rise vertically to a parapet height of 11.6m. Consequently, the skylight available to this window would tighten from being available above an c. 15-degree angle to being available above an c. 59-degree angle. (Without the recess this angle would be c. 67 degrees). Dimming of the window would thus ensue.
- 7.33. In taking a view on the acceptability or otherwise of the impact upon residential amenity of the proposal, I recognise that, under Paragraph 1.10 of the Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines, at least six storeys are considered to be the default objective for new buildings in Limerick city centre, whereas the proposal is for four storeys. I recognise, too, the easing of the potential loss of lighting that has been secured by the recessing of the second and third floors of the proposal. Ultimately, residential amenity is affected by a combination of factors. Under the proposal, the potential for overlooking/loss of neighbour privacy at No. 17 Upper Gerald Griffin Street would be negated, while the lighting of its second floor would be reduced.
- 7.34. I conclude that the proposal would be compatible with the residential amenities of the area.

(vi) Traffic, access, and parking

- 7.35. The appellant expresses concern that the proposal would generate traffic, which would be in conflict with the proposed pedestrian/cyclist link between Colbert Station, the Milk Market/city centre, and onwards to the University, and which would, as it would provide neither parking nor a set down area, be hazardous to other road users.
- 7.36. During my site visit, I observed that Wickham Street is the subject of a one-way system, whereby it is open to north-bound traffic only. The carriageway has been sub-divided to provide a single lane for vehicles and a cycleway, which is segregated by means of bollards, on its western side for cyclists. Public footways accompany either side of this carriageway. The southern end of Wickham Street adjacent to the site is the subject of a pelican crossing and cycle stands are available immediately to the south of the site.
- 7.37. Under the Transport Map to the draft Limerick City Development Plan 2022 – 2018, Wickham Street is identified as a proposed cycleway/walkway. Given the above cited cyclist and pedestrian facilities that exist within the vicinity of the site, I do not consider that the proposal would be in conflict with this proposed cycleway/walkway.
- 7.38. The applicant's engineer has submitted a report in which he addresses parking. He states that an estimated 5 – 10 people would be present in the proposed cultural centre daily between Saturday and Thursday. On Fridays, 25 – 40 people would be present. While no off-street parking is proposed, he draws attention to the prevalence of city centre car parks, which are conveniently placed for the site.
- 7.39. Under Map 6 of the CDP, the site is shown as lying within Parking Zone 1. Places of worship should have as a maximum of 1 off-street car parking space for every 25 seats and 1 cycle-space for every 50 seats. The former standard can be waved "Where public car parking is available in the vicinity of the development which is adequate to serve both the development and to perform its original purpose..." In the light of the above cited report, such availability is in place, and so the waiver is applicable. With respect to cycle parking spaces, the proposal would effectively entail 100% site coverage and so the opportunity to provide such spaces on the site would not arise without a radical redesign of the proposal. However, as noted above,

cycle stands have recently been installed immediately to the south of the site and so the opportunity for such parking already exists.

7.40. I conclude that the proposal would not give rise to traffic, access, or parking issues.

(vii) Water

7.41. The applicant's engineer has submitted a report in which he addresses water. Under the proposal, the cultural centre would be connected to the public water mains and the combined foul and stormwater sewer under Wickham Street. Neither Irish Water or Limerick City & County Council have raised any objection to the principle of such connections.

7.42. The report calculates the likely demand that would be placed upon Irish Water's infrastructure. It outlines water saving measures such as dual flush toilets and it sets out how green roofs would be specified in order to improve water quality, reduce the quantity of water that would discharge from the site, and promote biodiversity.

7.43. The report also addresses flood risk. In this respect, the OPW's flood maps indicate that the site is not the subject of any identified flood risk.

7.44. I conclude that the proposal would not give rise to any water issues.

(viii) Appropriate Assessment

7.45. The site is an urban one and the proposal is for its redevelopment to provide a four-storey cultural centre. This site is neither in nor beside a European site. The nearest such sites are the Lower River Shannon SAC (002165) and the River Shannon & River Fergus Estuaries SPA (004077).

7.46. During the construction phase of the proposal, standard construction management methodologies would be employed, and during the operational phase of the proposal, it would be connected to the combined foul and stormwater sewer under Wickham Street. This proposal would incorporate a green roof, which would reduce the quantity and improve the quality of surface water run-off into this sewer. This sewer is part of the public sewerage system that is connected to the Bunlicky WWTP, which discharges into the River Shannon. I am not aware of any issues relating to the ultimate discharge of water from this WWTP.

7.47. Having regard to the nature, scale and location of the proposal, the nature of the receiving environment, and the proximity of the site to the nearest European Sites, it

is concluded that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise as the proposal would not be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

8.0 Recommendation

That permission be granted.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH) and the Limerick City Development Plan 2010 – 2016 (as extended), it is considered that the proposed use of the site would be “open for consideration” under its ZO.1(A) city centre zoning. Within the context of the emerging pattern of land uses in the surrounding area, this use would, subject to conditions, be complementary and so it would be an appropriate use under this zoning. While the building at No. 21 Wickham Street is identified in the NIAH, since its inclusion in this Inventory, it has not been added to the Record of Protected Structures in the Development Plan and in the intervening period of time external features of interest have been lost. Provided that this building is properly recorded, no objection is raised to its demolition. While the proposal would be a large building within its immediate context, its nuanced design would ensure its compatibility with the streetscape and the visual amenities of the area. Likewise, revisions to this proposal would ensure that it is compatible with the residential amenities of the area. No traffic, access, or parking issues would arise, and no water or Appropriate Assessment issues would arise. The proposal would, thus, accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1.	<p>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 15th day of March 2021 and 5th day of May 2021, 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 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>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>A full architectural survey of buildings proposed for demolition shall be carried out, and shall be submitted to the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Archive standard drawings and a photographic survey shall be prepared in accordance with the requirements of the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In order to facilitate the conservation, preservation and/or recording of the architectural heritage of the site.</p>
3.	<p>Samples of the bricks and mortar with which the building is to be finished shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
4.	<p>(a) Prior to the installation of any signage upon the new building, a scheme providing full details of any signage to be installed shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Planning Authority. Thereafter, only the signage in the agreed scheme shall be installed.</p> <p>(b) Any plant, services or equipment installed upon the roof of the new building shall only be installed within the plant area/zone as shown on drawings numbered 240 and 224 revision A and no plant, services or</p>

	<p>equipment shall protrude above the parapet surrounding this area/zone. No plant, services or equipment shall be installed elsewhere on the roof.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
5.	<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>Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>
6.	<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 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. The plan shall include details of waste to be generated during site clearance and construction phases, and details of the methods and locations to be employed for the prevention, minimisation, recovery and disposal of this material in accordance with the provision of the Waste Management Plan for the Region in which the site is situated.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of sustainable waste management.</p>
7.	<p>The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management and Delivery 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>

	Reason: In the interests of public safety and residential amenity.
8.	Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall enter into water and/or waste water connection agreement(s) with Irish Water. Reason: In the interest of public health.
9.	Stormwater drainage arrangements shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Reason: In the interest of public health.
10.	No external amplified sound or music system shall be installed or operated at the site. Reason: To protect the residential amenities of the area.

Hugh D. Morrison
Planning Inspector

26th October 2021