



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-317931-23

Development	Construction of 6 apartments and all associated ancillary site works.
Location	The Laurels, 209A Pouladuff Road, Ballyphehane, Cork City
Planning Authority	Cork City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2342086
Applicant(s)	Summerhill Construction Limited.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse.
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Summerhill Construction Limited.
Observer(s)	Eight observations, see section 6.3.
Date of Site Inspection	25 th April 2024.
Inspector	Terence McLellan

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site refers to the dwelling and plot located at 209A Pouladuff Road, Ballyphehane, Cork City. The 0.065 hectare plot is rectangular, orientated east/west, and is generally level. The existing dwelling is a detached, two storey property with a single storey side garage and a two storey rear wing. The garage and rear wing are in a significant state of disrepair pending renovation. The site is positioned between two terraces of two storey dwellings that are set well back from the road with generous front gardens and off-street parking. The existing dwelling, constructed prior to the surrounding homes, sits notably proud of the surrounding building line, and is positioned on the back edge of the pavement with a small strip of landscaping at the threshold. Due to the position of the dwelling, the site benefits from a deep rear garden which is currently significantly overgrown and contains several mature trees. The area is residential in nature, characterised by predominantly two storey terraced dwellings.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for the conversion and extension of the existing dwelling to provide 2 no. one bedroom apartments in addition to a three storey apartment block within the rear garden providing 4 no. two bedroom apartments. Works to the existing dwelling would include the demolition of the side garage and rear wing, removal of the front door and replacement with a window, changes to the rear fenestration, provision of a balcony at first floor level, and construction of a two storey flat roofed stairwell extension to provide access to the new flats.
- 2.2. The new apartment block to the rear would be three storeys with a pitched roof incorporating two wall dormers to the front and rear in addition to a single storey rear wing. Balconies would be provided at the rear at first floor level. Proposed materials include slate roof tiles, seamed metal cladding to the dormers and roof of the rear addition, and painted render to all facades.
- 2.3. The space between the apartment block and the existing dwelling is proposed as a communal open space from which all homes would be accessed via a new access to the side where the existing side garage is. This area would also accommodate bins in a covered store and 14 covered cycle parking spaces.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. Notification of the Decision to Refuse Permission was issued by Cork City Council on the 8th August 2023 for the following reason:

1. Having regard to the pattern and character of development in the area, it is considered that the proposed development by reason of its height, design, bulk, scale, site coverage and contextual relationship to the adjoining properties, the proposed development would represent overdevelopment of a small, restricted site, which would be out of character with the surrounding development, would seriously injure the amenities, and depreciate the value of property in the vicinity. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. The Planner's Report was issued on the 3rd August 2023 and contains the following points of note:

- The proposal would equate to 92 units per hectare based on six units on a site area of 0.065ha, this is at the upper end of the target for the area which is 50-100uph. A lower density would be more appropriate.
- The apartment block is just 2.8m from the rear boundary (single storey) and concerns are raised regarding the scale of the development due to impacts on adjacent properties in terms of visual outlook and overshadowing.
- The apartment block would result in overlooking to neighbouring properties and increasing the height of the proposed screening would detract from the design and appear visually imposing.
- The gravel courtyard communal space has not been designed to provide usable open space.

- Amendments to the existing dwelling are acceptable but the site needs to be considered as a whole. There is scope to extend the existing dwelling to provide more units, but this would require a new application.

3.2.2. The Board are advised that various technical reports from other departments in the Council requested Further Information (detailed below), this was not requested due to the substantive reason for refusal.

3.2.3. **Other Technical Reports**

3.2.4. **Contributions:** Grant permission, subject to conditions to secure contributions.

3.2.5. **Drainage:** Further Information required regarding wastewater drainage and surface water, including green and blue infrastructure.

3.2.6. **Environment:** Request Further Information in terms of waste generation and how it would be dealt with. A Construction Waste Management Plan and a Noise Report should be submitted.

3.2.7. **Housing:** The development is exempt from Part V due to site size. An Exemption Certificate has been granted. No objections.

3.2.8. **Traffic Regulation and Safety:** Construction Traffic Management Plan and public lighting can be dealt with by condition. The site is on a proposed Bus Connects Corridor and it is advised that the applicant should liaise with Cork City Infrastructure Design Team to ensure that there are no issues. No car parking is being provided, which is acceptable, but recommend Further Information to secure a Mobility Management Plan. Cycle parking should be provided in line with the Apartment Guidelines and cycle parking details should be resubmitted as Further Information.

3.2.9. **Urban Roads and Streets:** No objections.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.3.1. **Inland Fisheries Ireland:** Request that Irish Water or Cork County Council indicate that there is sufficient capacity in the public sewer to ensure there would be no overloading or polluting matter entering waterways.

3.3.2. **Uisce Éireann:** No objections. A Connection Agreement would be required in addition to compliance with Uisce Éireann observations.

3.4. Third Party Observations

- 3.4.1. A total of 21 observations were received by Cork City Council in response to the planning application, including a petition and an observation from Councillor Mick Finn. Copies of the observations are on file for the Board's information. The main points raised are similar to the observations on the appeal which are set out in section 6.3 below.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1.1. There is no planning history available for the subject site. Adjacent sites have no planning history of immediate relevance to the appeal.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028

- 5.1.1. The appeal site is categorised as Zone ZO 1: Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods, the primary objective of which is to protect and provide for residential uses and amenities, local services and community, institutional, educational, and civic uses. The CDP also notes that development in this zone should generally respect the character and scale of the neighbourhood in which it is situated.
- 5.1.2. Chapter 2: Core Strategy, seeks to deliver Strategic Objective 1 of the CDP, Compact Liveable Growth, with the aim of improving quality of the life in the city. The relevant objectives of this chapter are:
- Objective 2.31: Compact Growth
 - Objective 2.32: Housing Supply
- 5.1.3. Chapter 3 of the CDP sets out the policies for achieving Strategic Objective 2, Delivering Homes and Communities, with the aim of delivering housing and creating and maintaining sustainable neighbourhoods and the community infrastructure needed to ensure that diverse communities all benefit from a good quality of life. The relevant objectives of this chapter are:

- Objective 3.4: Compact Growth
- Objective 3.3: New Housing Supply
- Objective 3.5: Residential Density
- Objective 3.9: Adaptation of Existing Homes, Infill Development, and Conversion of Upper Floors.

5.1.4. Chapter 11 includes the policies aimed at delivering Strategic Objective 9, Placemaking and Managing Development. This chapter sets out the Council's guidance and priorities for development proposals. Of primary importance is securing development of the highest architectural and urban design quality that is people-centric and resilient to climate change and other challenges. The relevant objectives and sections of this chapter are:

- Objective 11.1 Sustainable Residential Development
- Objective 11.3: Housing Quality and Standards
- Objective 11.4: Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing
- Objective 11.5: Private Amenity Space
- Section 11.67: Design Quality
- Section 11.69: Residential Density
- Section 11.91: Quantitative Standards
- Section 11.100: Separation, Overlooking and Overbearance
- Section 11.112: Public Open Space in Housing Developments
- Section 11.139: Infill Development
- Section 11.234: Car and Bicycle Parking

5.2. **Regional Policy**

Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region

5.2.1. This strategy provides a framework for development at regional level. The RSES promotes the regeneration of our cities, towns, and villages by making better use of under-used land and buildings within the existing built-up urban footprint.

5.3. **National Policy**

National Planning Framework – Project Ireland 2040

- 5.3.1. The government published the National Planning Framework (NPF) in February 2018. Objective 3a is to deliver 40% of all new homes nationally, within the built-up footprint of existing settlements. Objective 11 is to prioritise development that can encourage more people to live or work in existing settlements whilst Objective 33 seeks to prioritise the provision of new homes at locations that can support sustainable development and at an appropriate scale of provision relative to location. Objective 35 is to increase residential density in settlements through a range of measures including restrictions in vacancy, re-use of existing buildings, infill development schemes, area or site-based regeneration and increased building heights.

5.4. Ministerial Guidelines

- Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2023).
- Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024).

5.5. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.5.1. None of relevance.

5.6. EIA Screening

- 5.6.1. See completed Form 2 on file. Having regard to the nature, size and location of the proposed development and to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations I have concluded at preliminary examination that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. EIA, therefore, is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1.1. A First Party appeal against the decision of Cork City Council to refuse permission for the proposed development has been submitted by McCutcheon Halley Planning

Consultants for and on behalf of the applicant, Summerhill Construction Limited. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

Height, Scale, and Massing

- The Council consider the proposal to be overdevelopment due to its height, scale, and massing, which would be out of character with the surrounding area but no references to policies or policy objectives are provided.
- The CDP advocates densities between 50-100uph and heights between 3-4 storeys and new development should meet a minimum target of three storeys. The decision of the Council is contrary to this. The Building Height Guidelines also advocate increased height and density and discourage generic limits.
- There are examples of other permissions in the wider area on comparable sites that have increased height and density. There is inconsistency in how the Council is dealing with density, potentially influenced by submissions despite there being a supportive policy and relevant precedents.
- The three storey element is in line with the building line of properties to the north and south with only a marginal difference in ridge height.
- Final site layout was informed by pre-application discussions with Cork City Council and the overall footprint was reduced.
- The scale is acceptable having regard to the policies and objectives of the development plan and the precedent examples of permitted development.

Design, Overlooking and Overshadowing

- The rear three storey element is positioned in line with the dwellings to the north and the south to reduce impacts on outlook for these dwellings. No windows are proposed to the north and south gables in order to protect privacy.
- Windows on the rear elevation do not seriously injure the privacy and amenity of neighbouring dwellings. The windows are 10m from the boundary which is an adequate distance from the properties to the west.
- Balconies provide an essential amenity space and maintain an adequate separation from the rear boundary which together with the metal railing, would reduce overlooking impacts.
- There is no evidence to support the claim that the development would depreciate property values.

- The development would not injure amenity in terms of overlooking or overshadowing, the Council could have requested Further Information and the development would make a positive contribution to the area and streetscape.

Private and Communal Open Spaces

- The development has changed significantly from pre-application stage and the central open space offers a significant amount of communal open space with entrances to all units and an opportunity for social interaction.
- 16.4% of the site area is provided as open space which is above minimum standards.
- Communal open space requirements can be relaxed on urban infill schemes as per the CDP.
- Council concerns could have been dealt with by FI.
- The site is close to The Lough which is a high quality public open space.
- Sufficient private amenity spaces are provided in accordance with the apartment standards.
- There are precedent examples where development has been permitted and no communal open space is provided.

Conclusions

- The provision of six units will contribute to housing supply.
- The housing mix caters for a range of housing needs as well as catering for smaller household sizes.
- The proposal would facilitate the development of an underutilised infill site within the City, providing compact development on a suitable site for housing where high density has been established in the area.
- The site is well located for walking and public transport and the density/height are in line with the CDP.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

6.2.1. No response.

6.3. Observations

6.3.1. Eight observations have been received from the following third parties:

- Bridie Bracken, 3 Ardmanning Lawn, The Lough, Cork City.
- Billy Allen 5 Ardmanning Lawn, The Lough, Cork City
- Dennis McCarthy, 6 Lower Pouladuff Road, Cork City.
- Gerard McCarthy, 7 Lower Pouladuff Road, Cork City.
- Pat and Sharon Barry, 204 Pouladuff Road, Cork City.
- Siobhan O'Regan, 210 Laurel Mews, Pouladuff Road, Cork City.
- Dennis Moloney, 212 Pouladuff Road, Cork City.
- Keith Jackson, St Malos, Lower Pouladuff Road, Cork City

6.3.2. The main points raised in the observations include:

- This is an intrusive, overdominant, and cramped form of development which is out of character with the established pattern of development in the area and would represent overdevelopment.
- Existing properties are well set back from the road, new development should be situated in line with the existing pattern of development and be set back from the road also.
- The development is not in keeping with the surrounding character, is excessive in scale, and the architecture is poor.
- The development would be overbearing on adjacent properties and there would be impacts on privacy, overlooking, daylight/sunlight, obstruction of views, reduction in property values, and noise.
- This is a backland development with insufficient access which is narrow and does not comply with DMURS.
- There would be an increase in traffic/vehicles and potential for obstructions that could impact on residents being able to safely access their driveways/Pouladuff Road as well as leading lead to obstructions for cyclists, road users, bus service, emergency services, utility services, and pedestrians.
- Parking provision is insufficient and would result in parking problems.

- Vehicular access will be required for emergency services, and this cannot be achieved due to width and obstructions.
- The existing house and garden are a historic part of Pouladuff Road.
- Development should be family based as short term and student accommodation can create a lot of anti-social behaviour.
- The development would fail to provide adequate standards of residential amenity for future occupiers.
- The many trees located on the site must be kept.

6.4. Further Responses

6.4.1. None.

7.0 Assessment

7.1.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the report/s of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Design and Density
- Residential Amenity
- Quality of Accommodation and Open Space
- Transport

7.2. Design and Density

7.2.1. Central to the Council's refusal of permission is the view that the proposal would represent overdevelopment due to its height, scale, massing, and site coverage which is considered to be out of character with the surrounding area. This opinion is shared by observers on the appeal who consider the proposal to be a cramped form of development that would be overbearing. The applicant considers that the height and density are in line with the CDP and that national guidance advocates increased height and density, discouraging generic limits. It is further stated that there are examples of

other permissions in the wider area on comparable sites that have increased height and density, and that the Planning Authority have been inconsistent on this basis, in light of policy support.

- 7.2.2. I accept that national guidance does indeed support increased heights and densities, where appropriate. The CDP also encourages higher densities in line with the Cork City Density Strategy, with a target of between 50-100 dwellings per hectare and a target height of three to four storeys in this area. Section 11.33 caveats this somewhat by stating that building height will respond to the proposed density of development, the character of an area, and site coverage.
- 7.2.3. The applicant states the site area as 0.065ha and based on the provision of six flatted dwellings, the Planning Authority consider the proposed density to be 92dph. The site area is based on the red line plan which extends to the centre line of the carriageway on Pouladuff Road and I do not consider this to be reasonable for the purposes of calculating density as it increases the site area and artificially lowers the density of the development. The site area of the appeal site without relying on the substantial section of public road and pavement is approximately 0.052ha which would indicate a density of circa 115dph which in my view would be excessive for this site.
- 7.2.4. The applicant considers the height of the proposal to be in accordance with the CDP and that the proposed apartment block would align with the building line of properties to the north and south with only a marginal difference in ridge height. The apartment block would align with the dwellings to the north and south in terms of building line, however, its scale and bulk fail to give due consideration to the presence of the existing dwelling which sits proud of this building line and just 10m from the main façade of apartment block.
- 7.2.5. The apartment block would rise well above the existing dwelling (c.3.2m) as well as rising above the rooflines of the adjacent dwellings to the north and south (c.2.2m). This height, together with the massing of the apartment block, its close proximity to the existing dwelling, and its relationship to the adjacent dwellings, would result in an overly intensive form of development when viewed from the street and I consider that it would be a cramped form of development that would be overbearing, particularly on the existing dwelling. Having regard to height, scale, massing, site coverage, and density, I am of the opinion that the proposal would be overdevelopment.

7.3. Residential Amenity

- 7.3.1. Concerns regarding impacts on amenity have been raised by both the Planning Authority and observers with issues raised including that the development would impact on privacy, overlooking, daylight/sunlight, obstruction of views, reduction in property values, and noise.
- 7.3.2. I note that a daylight and sunlight assessment has not been provided. Given the orientation of the site and the positioning of buildings, potential impacts on daylight and sunlight would be limited to the properties/garden ground at 209 Pouladuff Road (to the north) and 5 Ardmanning Lawn (to the west). In my opinion, the daylight/overshadowing impacts would not be significant, being restricted largely to the mornings, after which the proposed apartment block would have no significant adverse effect on overshadowing. It is my view that the overshadowing impacts would be typical of the domestic relationship between terraced dwellings and would not be significantly injurious to residential amenity.
- 7.3.3. Regarding overlooking, I do not consider that there would be any significant overlooking from the ground floor single storey return that extends to within c. 3 metres of the boundary with 5 Ardmanning Lawn. There would be overlooking from the west facing upper level windows to the surrounding properties and I acknowledge that this would be new overlooking, given the absence of any building on this part of the site. However, in my view, as the building aligns with the existing terraced building line, this overlooking would generally reflect the typical relationship between terraced properties/urban housing and would not be disproportionate given the surrounding context. The first floor balconies on the apartment block are located a sufficient distance from the boundary with Ardmanning Lawn to ensure there would be no significant adverse overlooking of the rear garden ground, and the separation distance to the nearest windows would be well in excess of the 16m set out in the Compact Settlement Guidelines. Overlooking would be possible from the balconies to the rear garden ground of the neighbouring properties immediately to the north and south, however, I am satisfied that this could be overcome by a condition requiring additional screening, should the Board be minded to grant permission.
- 7.3.4. I note the concern raised in observations on the appeal that the development would obstruct views. Whilst I accept that the apartment block would be a significant

townscape change, I do not consider that it would materially harm outlook from any adjacent properties. I accept that the upper floor gable windows on the neighbouring properties to the north and south would have a much altered outlook but from my site inspection it appears that these windows serve a circulation space as opposed to a habitable room and on balance, the impact would be acceptable.

7.3.5. Concerns have been raised that the development would result in noise impacts for neighbouring dwellings. I acknowledge that there would be a degree of disturbance during the demolition and construction phase, but in my view these short term and temporary impacts could be appropriately mitigated by securing a Construction Management Plan by condition. Once the development is completed and occupied, I do not consider that there would be a significant increase in noise beyond that typical of urban housing environments.

7.3.6. I note the concerns raised in the grounds of appeal in respect of the devaluation of neighbouring property. However, having regard to the assessment and conclusion set out above, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area to such an extent that would adversely affect the value of property in the vicinity.

7.4. Quality of Accommodation and Open Space

7.4.1. The Planning Authority consider that the gravel courtyard communal space has not been designed to provide usable open space. An additional concern raised by observers is that the development would provide a poor standard of accommodation. The applicant considers the quantum and quality of open space to be acceptable, noting the proximity of The Lough and the fact that communal open space requirements can be relaxed on urban infill schemes as per the CDP.

7.4.2. In my opinion, the layout of the individual units in the apartment block are generally acceptable. I have concerns regarding the converted units in the existing dwelling whereby the only bathroom/toilet would be the ensuite accessed from within the bedrooms. However, this could be suitably addressed by a condition requiring the internal layout of these units to be reconfigured to provide a more accessible bathroom/toilet.

7.4.3. In terms of the courtyard, conditions could be imposed to secure a landscaping scheme to make this a more attractive space, but this would not overcome my

concerns relating to the lack of defensible space around the ground floor bedrooms in the apartment block that would directly bound this space and would be subjected to a lack of privacy, overlooking, and disturbance from users of the courtyard. I also have concerns regarding the proximity of the apartment block to the converted units in the existing dwelling. The separation distance between opposing windows would be just under 10m (or 7m when measured from the balconies) and would lead to overlooking for future occupiers of both blocks, exacerbated somewhat by the size of the windows on the apartment block which are full height. In my view this would represent a poor standard of amenity for future residents and is symptomatic of the overly intensive form of development proposed on this site.

7.5. Transport

- 7.5.1. Observers on the appeal raise significant concerns regarding the lack of parking and the impacts this would have on the local road, together with traffic generation, in terms of obstructions for all road users and pedestrians.
- 7.5.2. The general thrust of national guidance seeks to significantly reduce parking in urban areas, particularly on well-connected and accessible urban sites. The site is approximately 50m from the nearest bus stop on Pouladuff Road that is served by two services to Cork City centre, and 350m from the nearest bus stop on Togher Road which also offers a service to Cork City centre. There are also various shops and services in the local area as would be expected in an urban location. On that basis I am satisfied that the principle of a car free development would be acceptable in this location.
- 7.5.3. Pouladuff Road is a relatively wide road, and two way traffic can pass even when cars are parked on both sides of the street, as I noted during my inspection. I also note that most of the dwellings on this section of Pouladuff Road have off street car parking, in many cases with space for multiple cars, and at the time of my site inspection there was ample off street parking. I am therefore of the opinion that the development would not result in any significant impact on parking availability or the local road network and that the provision of car free development is entirely acceptable in this location. In terms of traffic generation, the provision of six flatted dwellings would not, in my view, have any measurable adverse impact on traffic or the operational capacity of the road

and surrounding junctions nor would there be any significant impact on access, egress of pedestrian/vehicular safety.

- 7.5.4. Concerns raised regarding the lack of a vehicular access to the apartment block are unfounded in my opinion, having regard to the scale of the development and the layout/width of the side access which is sufficient.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1.1. I have considered the proposed development of the site at 209A Pouladuff Road in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located in Ballyphehane, Cork City, approximately 3.2km west of the Cork Harbour SPA which is the nearest European Site.
- 8.1.2. The proposed development comprises the conversion of the existing dwelling and provision of a three storey apartment block, together providing six flatted dwellings. I note that no nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 8.1.3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The limited scale of the proposed development and its location on serviced urban lands.
 - The location of the development being approximately 3.2km from the nearest European Site and the absence of any direct hydrological connection. The development would be served by the existing municipal sewer network.
 - The Planning Authority Screening Determination which concluded that Appropriate Assessment would not be required.
- 8.1.4. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

9.0 Recommendation

- 9.1.1. I recommend that the Board uphold the decision of Cork City Council and refuse planning permission.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. It is considered that the proposed scale, layout and design of the development would produce a cramped and substandard form of development at an excessive density and, by reason of the constraints of the site and the surrounding townscape character, would result in overdevelopment of the site and a poor standard of amenity for future occupiers. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Terence McLellan
Senior Planning Inspector

13th May 2024

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-317931-23		
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of 6 apartments and all associated ancillary site works.		
Development Address	The Laurels, 209A Pouladuff Road, Ballyphehane, Cork City		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	X
		No	No further action required
2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?			
Yes			EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	X		Proceed to Q.3
3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?			
		Threshold	Comment (if relevant)
No		N/A	
Yes	X	Class 10 (b) (i), threshold >500 dwellings.	Proceed to Q.4
			Conclusion
			No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No	X	Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

Appendix 2

Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-317931-23	
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of 6 apartments and all associated ancillary site works.	
Development Address	The Laurels, 209A Pouladuff Road, Ballyphehane, Cork City	
<p>The Board carries out a preliminary examination [Ref. Art. 109(2)(a), Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)] of, at least, the nature, size or location of the proposed development having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations.</p>		
	Examination	Yes/No/ Uncertain
<p>Nature of the Development</p> <p>Is the nature of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment?</p> <p>Will the development result in the production of any significant waste, emissions or pollutants?</p>	<p>The proposed development is for residential, in an area that is largely characterised by residential use. The proposed development would therefore not be exceptional in the context of the existing environment in terms of its nature.</p> <p>The development would not result in the production of any significant waste, emissions or pollutants.</p>	No.
<p>Size of the Development</p> <p>Is the size of the proposed development exceptional in the</p>	<p>The size of the development would not be exceptional in the context of the existing environment.</p>	No.

<p>context of the existing environment?</p> <p>Are there significant cumulative considerations having regard to other existing and/or permitted projects?</p>	<p>There would be no significant cumulative considerations with regards to existing and permitted projects/developments.</p>	
<p>Location of the Development</p> <p>Is the proposed development located on, in, adjoining or does it have the potential to significantly impact on an ecologically sensitive site or location?</p> <p>Does the proposed development have the potential to significantly affect other significant environmental sensitivities in the area?</p>	<p>The development would be located in a serviced residential area and would not have the potential to significantly impact on an ecologically sensitive site or location. There is no hydrological connection present such as would give rise to significant impacts on nearby water courses (whether linked to any European site or other sensitive receptors). The proposed development would not give rise to waste, pollution or nuisances that differ significantly from that arising from other urban developments.</p> <p>Given the nature of the development and the site/surroundings, it would not have the potential to significantly affect other significant environmental sensitivities in the area. It is noted that the site is not designated for the protection of the landscape or natural heritage and is not within an Architectural Conservation Area.</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>Conclusion</p>		
<p>There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>EIA not required.</p>		

Inspector: _____

Date: _____