



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-321945-25

Development

Construction of primary care centre, retail unit and 2 GP practices together with all associated site works. A Natura Impact Statement (NIS) has been prepared and will be submitted to the planning authority with the application

Location

Riverstown, Glanmire, Cork

Planning Authority

Cork City Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2443164

Applicant(s)

Infrastructure Investment Fund ICAV - Valley Healthca

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Refuse Permission

Type of Appeal

First Party

Appellant(s)

Infrastructure Investment Fund ICAV - Valley Healthca.

Observer(s)

Barry Coleman

Date of Site Inspection

27th May 2025

Inspector

Ronan O'Connor

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| 1.0 Site Location and Description | 5 |
| 2.0 Proposed Development | 5 |
| 3.0 Planning Authority Decision | 6 |
| 3.1. Decision | 6 |
| 3.2. Planning Authority Reports | 6 |
| 3.3. Prescribed Bodies | 16 |
| 3.4. Third Party Observations | 16 |
| 4.0 Planning History | 16 |
| 5.0 Policy Context | 17 |
| 5.1. Development Plan | 17 |
| 5.2. National Planning Policy | 22 |
| 5.3. Section 28 Guidelines | 24 |
| 5.4. Regional Policy | 25 |
| 5.5. Natural Heritage Designations | 25 |
| 5.6. EIA Screening | 25 |
| 6.0 The Appeal | 26 |
| 6.1. Grounds of Appeal | 26 |
| 6.2. Planning Authority Response | 29 |
| 6.3. Observations | 30 |
| 7.0 Assessment | 31 |
| 8.0 AA Screening | 50 |
| 9.0 Recommendation | 52 |
| 10.0 Reasons and Considerations | 52 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 11.0 Conditions | 52 |
| Appendix 1 - Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening | 61 |
| Appendix Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination | 63 |
| Appendix 3: Appropriate Assessment Screening/Appropriate Assessment | 67 |
| Appendix 4 WFD Stage 1 Screening /WFD Stage 2 Assessment | 83 |

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site is located in Riverstown, Glanmire, Cork. The stated site area is c1 Ha and is part of a larger landholding of 2.25 ha which includes areas to the south and west of the site. The site is the location of the former John Barleycorn Hotel which is no longer in place. The hardstanding related to same remains on site. The site slopes from south to north and west to east with the highest point of +9.5m AOD to the north-east of the site and the lowest point +7.4m AOD to the south of the site.
- 1.2. The site is located to the south and the west of the existing built up/streetscape of the village where there are existing shops and other retail outlets in place. There are two existing accesses to the site, to the north from the L3010 road (which appears to be closed off) and from the east off East Cliff Road.
- 1.3. The Glashaboy River Runs along the southern boundary of the wider landholding. The confluence of the Glashaboy and the Butlerstown Rivers is to the south-east of the wider landholding.
- 1.4. There is an existing mature treeline to the north-west of the site, parallel to the L3010 road, with a number of other mature trees within the site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Construction of primary care centre, retail unit and 2 GP practices together with all associated site works. A Natura Impact Statement (NIS) has been prepared and will be submitted to the planning authority with the application.
- 2.2. The development will consist of the following elements:
 - A three-story primary health care facility (G.F.A 3,313 m²)
 - Retail unit (G.F.A. 97 m²)
 - 2 no. GP Units (G.F.A. 224 m² and 258 m² respectively)
 - 74 no. on site car parking spaces
 - 40. no cycle spaces
 - Vehicular access is via the L3010 Road.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. On 27th January 2025 Cork City Council decided to Refuse permission for 2 no. reasons as per below:

1. The proposed development is located within Flood Zones A and B. The applicant has not demonstrated to satisfaction of the Planning Authority that the proposal will not be subject to flooding or displace flood waters, as the Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment does not address recent flooding on site. On the basis of information submitted, the development as proposed would be contrary to the *Planning System and Flood Risk Management – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2009)* and is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. The proposed development if permitted would be located in an area which is at risk of flooding given the sites location proximate to the flood plain of Glashaboy River. The development as proposed would not accord with Objectives 9.8 and 9.10 of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028 and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planner's Report [dated 30/09/24] is summarised below:

- Notes that the site is partially located within flood zone/adjacent to the Glashaboy River.
- Part of the site, including areas proposed for development, are located within Flood Zones A and B.
- Development should not be permitted within the floodplain of the Glashaboy River (which includes Flood Zones A and B) as per Objectives 9.8 and 9.10 of the Development Plan 2022 - 2028.

- Under 9.8, the objective is to protect the city's floodplains/to permit the proposed development would not protect the floodplain which is subject to frequent flooding.
- Glashaboy River Drainage Scheme is currently under construction by the OPW, which likely relies on the floodplain storage currently available on this site.
- Reference made to Objective 9.10(a)/Section 9.13 of the CDP.
- As outlined in the Guidelines, the first step in the sequential approach is "Avoid – choose lower risk flood zones for new development".
- "Cork City Council will adopt a precautionary approach, namely to avoid development in floodplains, wetlands and coastal areas prone to flooding and so preserve these natural defences that hold excess water until it can be released slowly back into river systems, the sea or seep into the ground."
- The proposed development in this area is car/vehicle parking. To develop within a floodplain (Flood Zones A and B) for the provision of car parking would not constitute essential infrastructure.
- Refers to the Flood Risk Assessment as submitted by the applicant.

Principle of Development

- Notes that the Site is zoned ZO 6 – Urban Town Centre.
- Considered that the principle of the proposed development is acceptable and in accordance with the zoning of the site subject to all site - specific issues being addressed.
- Reference is made to the provisions of Para 11.159 of the CDP (proposed community facility developments).
- Reference is made to Section 3.82 of the CDP re Slaintecare.
- Reference is made to Section 10.70 Glanmire Town Centre Framework Plan.
- Notes that no alternative locations that were considered are highlighted in the Planning Statement.

- States that the site has significant challenges in terms of flooding and future possible flood risks events, given its close proximity to the adjacent Glashaboy River.
- Also challenges in relation to increased traffic generation, vehicular access via existing roadways and via the use of existing busy road network to the north of the site.
- FI required in relation to selection process.

Flood Risk

- Proposed car parking area lies within Flood Zone B/Building itself is not within Flood Zone.
- Portion of site will be modified to provide an additional area of flood plain.
- Notes concerns of internal departmental reports (see below).
- Require that all development proposed is located outside the mapped flood risk zone.
- Proposed development does not satisfy the sequential approach to avoid development in areas at risk of flooding.

Site Location/Design/Scale/Layout

- FI required in relation to design aspects.

Residential Amenity

- Hours of operation not set out/number of employees on site

Roads

- Concerns re flooding/FI required in relation to a second proposed vehicle entrance onto the site and other issues.

Drainage

- Main issue of concerns relate to flooding/Does not comply with Objectives 9.8 and 9.10 of the CDP.

Environment

- Notes contents of internal reports (see below)/Noise Impact Assessment required.

Water/Wastewater

- No correspondence from Uisce Eireann has been received.
- FI was recommended

3.2.2. The Report of the Senior Executive Planner also recommends FI. (dated 30/09/2024).

3.2.3. I note that a subsequent report from the Senior Executive Planner (dated 01/10/2024) also recommends FI and it is stated that this accounts for the requirements of the Traffic and Transport section.

3.2.4. Further Information was requested on the 01/10/2024 in relation to the following issues:

1. Choice of Location
2. Flooding – show all proposed development removed from the mapped flood risk zone
3. Design Issues
4. Engineering Report
5. Infrastructure
6. Urban Roads and Street Design
7. Traffic and Transport
8. Environment Report
9. Irish Water
10. Public Lighting

3.2.5. Further Information was received on 20/12/2024. This included the following documentation.

- Cover Letter
- Architectural Drawings

- Updated Landscape Drawings
- Construction Traffic Management Plan
- Mobility Management Plan
- Traffic and Transport Assessment
- Noise Impact Assessment
- RFI Response (IBA Consulting Engineers)
- Engineering Drawings
- RFI Response (Horgan Lynch Consulting Engineers)
- Storm Water Management Plan
- Confirmation of Feasibility (Uisce Eireann)
- Public Lighting Report and Drawings
- Energy Statement
- Waste Management Strategy

3.2.6. Further Information was also received (which appears to be unsolicited) on 21st January 2025 which consisted of:

- Outdoor Lighting Report (dated 20th January 2025) and associated drawing.

3.2.7. The Executive Planner's Report (dated 23/01/2025) is summarised below:

Point 1 – Choice of Location

- Satisfied with the response received.

Point 2 - Flooding

- Refers to report of the Senior Executive Engineer (Drainage Division) –see below.
- Continue to raise serious concerns in relation to flooding.
- Applicant is not considered to have adequately addressed flood risk concerns.

Point 3 – Design

- Revised proposals are considered to be acceptable/reference is made to the report of the Acting Senior Executive Architect. (I would note that this report is not on file – See discussion below).

Points 4 to 10 - Engineering Aspects

- Number of issues have been adequately addressed/remainder can be address by way of condition.
- Area Engineer continues to raise concerns in relation to flooding (see report below).

Point 11 – Infrastructure Development

- Notes revised plans have been submitted/No report has been received from Infrastructure Dept (as of 23/01/24).

Point 12 – Urban Roads and Street Design

- Refers to report form Urban Roads and Street Design (21/01/2025)/a number of matters remain outstanding/applicant should be asked to address these by way of clarification.

Points 13 to 18 – Traffic and Transport

- Revised plans noted/No report from Traffic and Transport (as of 23/01/25).

Points 19 to 21- Environment

- Refers to Environment Report (see below)/Issue has been adequately addressed.

Point 22 – Irish Water

- Response acceptable.

Point 23 – Public Lighting

- Response acceptable.

Point 24 – Biodiversity

- Notes that the applicant does not appear to have responded.
- Refusal is recommended for 2 no. reasons related to flooding.

- 3.2.8. The Report of the Senior Executive Planner (dated 27/01/2025) also refers to flooding concerns, and the relevant internal reports (see below). Refusal was recommended for 2 no. reasons.
- 3.2.9. The Report of the Senior Planner (27/01/25) concurs with the recommendation to refuse permission.
- 3.2.10. Other Technical Reports

Contributions Report

- No objections- recommends condition [23/08/2024]

Senior Executive Engineer (Infrastructure Development) (10/09/2024)

- Refers to the Cork Metropolitan Area Transport Strategy (CMATS) and the Glashaboy River (Glanmire/Sallybrook) Drainage Scheme.
- Notes the lands are partly within Flood Zones A and B (corresponding to the 1% AEP and the 0.1% AEP) and the scheme does not include any protective measures for the site.
- Notes that there are 2 no. areas within the site boundary which are required for the construction of the Glanmire to Riverstown Greenway and the L3010/Riverstown Junction Upgrade Works which are included in the Glanmire Roads Improvement Scheme/Areas have been CPO'd.
- Notes that Part 8 was granted in 2019 for the implementation of the Glanmire Roads Improvements and Sustainable Transport Works.
- Construction on the greenway and junction upgrade expected to start Q4 2024.
- TTA Report needs to consider impact of the proposed development on the L3010/Riverstown Junction after it is signalised/also needs to include a number of other interventions.
- Unclear If applicant proposes to construct the section of greenway within the site boundary/paved area appears to encroach into the proposed greenway.
- Potential pedestrian conflicts identified.
- Impacts on Temporary CPO area.
- Construction sequence required to ensure compatibility with greenway.

- Amended drawings showing omission of a footpath is required.
- No development should be constructed within Flood Zone B.
- Concern development could interfere with the confirmed scheme
- Concern re surface water outfall point.

Environmental Report (10/09/2024)

- Noise Report to be submitted.

Drainage Report (11/09/2024)

- Notes part of the site are within Flood Zones A and B.
- Development should not be permitted within the floodplain of the Glashaboy River as per Objectives 9.8 and 9.10/as per Flood Risk Guidelines.
- Proposed development does not satisfy the sequential approach to avoid development in areas at risk of flooding.
- Revised proposals required showing all development removed from the floodplain.

Area Engineer's Report (11/09/2024)

- Require detail of second entrance to the north-west boundary to be closed off.
- Revised Arboriculture Report required.
- Construction Management Plan required.
- Details of surface water management required.
- Flooding – during Storm Babey the majority of the site was flooded from the Glashaboy and Butlerstown Rivers.
- Site was inaccessible at the time of flooding, flood extents for the 1% AEP and 0.1% AEP were under flood water.
- FI recommended in relation to the above issues.

Environment Report [16/09/24]

- Noise Report/Construction Waste Management Plan Operational Waste Management Plan to be submitted.

Contributions Report [16/09/24]

- No objections- recommends condition.

Urban Roads & Street Design [18/09/2024]

- Line marking/dropped kerbs/tactile paving details are required.
- Applicant should adhere to DMURS and TSM Guidance for the uncontrolled pedestrian crossing facility.
- Require an uncontrolled crossing on the East Cliff Road.
- Taking charge details required.
- FI recommended in relation to the above.

Traffic: Regulation & Safety Report [30/09/2024]

- Bike parking details required.
- Need to demonstrate that road safety issues have been considered/recommendations implemented.
- Consideration should be given to increasing the number of setdown spaces.
- Amended TTA/MMP/Construction Traffic Management Plan required.

Architect's Report (dated 24th September 2024) – This report is referenced in the Planner's Report. However, it is not on file.

Internal Reports Received After Submission of Further Information

Environment Report [16/01/25]

- No objection to grant of permission subject to conditions.

Drainage Report [23/01/25]

- Recommends refusal of permission.
- Does not accord with Objectives 9.8 and 9.10 of the Development Plan.
- Notes provisions of the Flood Risk Guidelines – Sequential approach to development.
- Provision of car parking within the flood plain does not meet the objectives of the Guidelines/CDP.

- Notes the proposed drainage infrastructure and SuDS measures (attenuation tank and permeably paving) are also at risk of flooding.

Area Engineer's Report [22/01/2025]

- Notes the second entrance is to be closed off with a composite timber fence.
- Notes submission of an Outline Construction Traffic Plan.
- Notes comments in relation to trees.
- Notes updated Storm Water layout including an Aco drain at the main site entrance/2 new road gullies on the blocked off northwest entrance.
- Notes that the site drainage system is located within an area of the site subject to flooding.
- Applicant has not stated where parking will be provided when parking is not possible in the onsite car parks.
- Sets out that the majority of site was flooded during Storm Babet (18/10/2023).
- Flooding was witnessed from Glytown Bridge 80m south of the site (Photograph and superimposed map included in the report indicated flooding extents).
- Recommends refusal. Conditions recommended in the event of a grant.

Senior Executive Engineer (Infrastructure Development) [23/01/25]

- Unsatisfactory responses to issue of Greenway/Temporary CPO area/Flood Risk/Updated TTA.
- Lighting plan satisfactory.
- Clarification of Further Information requested.

Traffic: Regulation & Safety (24/01/25)

- No objection subject to conditions.

Contributions Report (24/01/25)

- No objection subject to condition.
- Urban Roads and Street Design Report (21/01/2025)

- Clarification of FI is recommended in relation to kerbs/tactile paving/uncontrolled pedestrian crossing/crossing on East Cliff Road

Architect's Report (dated 22nd January 2025) – This report is referenced in the Planner's Report. However, it is not on file. (see discussion of same in Section 7.6 below).

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- 3.3.1. Inland Fisheries Ireland (03/09/2024) – requests that Irish Water/Cork City Council signifies that there is sufficient WWTP capacity.

3.4. Third Party Observations

- 3.4.1. None.

4.0 Planning History

ABP Ref 233398 [PA Ref 086897]

Refuse Permission to Demolish existing structures, construct retail foodstore, leisureplex, underground car park, hotel, Gaelscoil. [decision date 26/11/2009] - 1st Party Appeal/3rd Party Appeals V the PA's decision to refuse the Gaelscoil and Condition 4 of the Grant (PA's decision was a split decision).

ABP Refused for 3 no. reasons related to (1) overdevelopment and traffic impacts, (2) flood risk and (3) design.

07/8941 Permission refused for Construction of temporary Gaelscoil to include 4 no. classrooms, multipurpose hall, ancillary accommodation and palisade fencing [decision date 17/08/2007]

03/1643 Permission granted for demolition of hotel and construction of 58 bedroom hotel, with leisure centre, car parking and revised entrance [decision date 04/09/2003]

Other Relevant Plans/Projects

Glashaboy Flood Relief Scheme – Includes the construction of direct flood defences and conveyance improvements measures along the Glashaboy River and its

tributaries. Was confirmed in January 2021 by the Minister for Public Expenditure and Reform under the Arterial Drainage Acts 1945 to 1995. Works on the project commenced in July 2023 with the scheme to be completed within 2 and a half years.

Glanmire Road Improvements and Sustainable Transport Works – Includes a number of projects to improve the connectivity of Glanmire – Most relevant is Project No. 6 ‘Signalised Junction Riverstown Road/East Cliff Road’ which will provide for a portion of greenway cycle path through the lands south-east of the proposed development.

Of note is that a portion of the lands to the south-east of the site have been compulsory purchased by the Council, in addition to a portion of the eastern boundary of the site which have temporarily acquired to facilitate the greenway and road upgrades proposed and post construction, will form part of the greenway footpath/cycle path and landscaping associated with the proposed development.

In addition, the East Cliff Road/Old Court Road junction will be upgraded to include new pedestrian crossings.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The relevant Development Plan is the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028 (as Varied).

I would note that Variation No. 1 of the Development Plan sets out revised car parking standards (as per Table 11.3).

Zoning

Land - Use Zoning: ZO 6 Urban Town Centre

Zoning Objective 6: To consolidate and provide for the development and enhancement of urban town centres as primary locations for mixed use retail, economic and residential growth which also act as a focus for a range of services

ZO 6.1 This zone applies to the central areas of the major urban towns of Ballincollig, Blarney and Glanmire. These areas each have distinct characters and cultures and have great potential to contribute to the sustainable compact growth of

Cork City. Chapter 7 Economy and Employment sets out further objectives for Urban Town Centres.

ZO 6.2 The primary purpose of this zone is to consolidate and develop the existing urban town centre areas as primary locations for retail, economic, residential, cultural, community, leisure, civic and other related uses. The primary retail areas will form the main focus and preferred location for new retail development, appropriate to the scale and function of each centre. Residential development will be encouraged particularly in mixed use developments.

ZO 6.3 Development proposals in this zone must demonstrate how the proposal would respect, reflect or contribute to the character and vibrancy of the particular urban town centre, commensurate with the nature and scale of the development. Developments must deliver a quality urban environment and public realm with a focus on accessibility and permeability.

Chapter 2 – District Centres and Urban Town Centres. Three urban town centres are identified to further deliver an appropriate mix of uses to meet local need. (Glanmire, Ballingcollig and Blarney).

Section 2.29 states that inter alia that Planning for Liveable Walkable Neighbourhoods requires the integration of a range of house types and tenures, jobs, recreation, green space, local shops, medical centres, small businesses and more.

Chapter 3 – Delivering Homes and Communities

Section 3.82 - Within Cork City, healthcare facilities are managed by a range of public, private and voluntary bodies. The Health Service Executive (HSE) is the primary organisation responsible for healthcare infrastructure in the City and is responsible for providing public health and social services. The public healthcare system is undergoing strategic change as part of the 'Sláintecare' ten-year programme. In addition to a range of investment proposals and care improvements, one of the key outputs of Sláintecare in terms of spatial planning implications is a strategy of transitioning towards a primary and community-based care system rather than the current hospital-centric model of health care.

Section 11.159 Community Facilities

Medical Related Practices Section 11.172 -- Currently premises for general practice and medical related consultants include a wide variety of building types ranging from adaptations of domestic premises for single practitioners to purpose built premises for larger group practices. Cork City Council will support the provision of health care facilities in the City Centre, Urban Town Centres, District Centres and Neighbourhood and Local Centres.

11.73 In assessing applications for medical related practices, the following will be considered (not an exhaustive list):

1. Contribution to placemaking and to the 15-minute city and walkable neighbourhood concepts;
2. An audit by the applicant of existing facilities in the vicinity;
3. Impacts on the amenity of the area and privacy of adjacent neighbouring properties;
4. Proximity to public transport;
5. Adequate traffic management, including safe access, parking and drop-off;
6. Traffic generation;
7. Hours of operation;
8. Proposed signage

Car Parking Standards

Table 11.13 Maximum Car Parking Standards – Zone 3

Medical Clinics/Primary Health Care Centres – 1 per consulting room

Convenience Retail – 1 per 20 sq. m. GFA

Sections 9.10 – 9.12 Flood Risk

Objective 9.8

Flood Protection To protect, enhance and manage the City's floodplains, wetlands and coastal habitat areas that are subject to flooding as vital 'green infrastructure' which provides space for storage and conveyance of floodwater, enabling flood risk to be more effectively managed and reduce the need to provide flood defence infrastructures. Cork City Council will also require that all proposed flood protection

or alleviation works will be subject to Appropriate Assessment to ensure there are no likely significant effects on the integrity, defined by the structure and function, of any European Sites and that the requirements of Article 6 of the EU Habitats Directive are met.

Objective 9.10 Development in Flood Risk Areas

- a. To restrict development in identified flood risk areas, in particular flood plains. All new development proposals should comply with the requirements of the Planning System and Flood Risk Management – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2009) and Department of Environment, Community and Local Government Circular PL2/2014, in particular through the application of the sequential approach and the Development Management Justification Test.
- b. All significant proposals for development identified as being vulnerable to flooding will be required to provide a site specific Flood Risk Assessment to identify potential loss of floodplain storage and proposals for the storage or attenuation (e.g. SUDS) of run-off discharges (including foul drains) to ensure development does not increase the flood risk in the relevant catchment.
- c. Adopt a river catchment approach to rivers entering the City, practicing natural flood management wherever practical and appropriate.

Section 12.21 Land Uses and Flooding 12.21 Flood Risk Zones A and B have been identified by the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. These zones may impact new development, but facilitate existing development uses that may require small scale development such as small extensions. Development proposals within these zones shall be accompanied by a detailed Flood Risk Assessment, carried out in accordance with The Planning System and Flood Risk Assessment Guidelines and Circular PL 2/2014 (or as updated), which shall assess the risks of flooding associated with the proposed development.

Proposals shall only be considered favourably where it is demonstrated to the satisfaction of Cork City Council that they would not have adverse impacts or impede access to a watercourse, floodplain or flood protection and management facilities, or increase the risk of flooding to other locations and be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

The nature and design of structural and non-structural flood risk management measures required for development in such areas will also be required to be demonstrated, to ensure that flood hazard and risk will not be increased. Measures proposed will follow best practice in the management of health and safety for users and residents of the development.

Objective 12.1 Land Uses and Flooding To facilitate the appropriate management and sustainable use of Flood Zones A & B identified by the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Other Relevant Objectives/Provisions.

Strategic Objective 3 Transport and Mobility

Strategic Objective 6 Employment and Economy

Objective 3.27 Health Infrastructure

Objective 3. 28 Sustainable Transport for Hospitals and Healthcare Facilities

Objective 3.32 Inclusive Design

Objective 4.1 CMATS

Objective 4.4 Active Travel

Objective 6.5 Trees & Urban Woodland

Objective 6.6 Rivers, Waterway and Wetlands

Objective 6.11 Landscape and Development

Objective 7.30 Blarney and Glanmire Town Centres

Objective 9.1 Irish Water

Objective 9.2 Waste Water

Objective 9.4 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS)

Objective 9.6 Storm Water

Objective 9.8 Flood Protection

Objective 9.9 Flood Protection Schemes

Objective 9.10 Development in Flood Risk Areas

Objective 9.12 Waste Management

Objective 9.13 Energy

Objective 9.15 Renewable Energy

Objective 10.70 Glanmire Town Centre Framework Plan

Sections 3.80 - 3.85 Health

Section 3.86 Recreation and Amenity

Section 3.92 - 3.94 Age - Friendly City

Section 3.95 An Inclusive, Equitable and Safe City

Section 3.96 - 3.97 Social Inclusion

Section 7.59 Health and Education

Sections 9.13 Assessment of Development in Areas of Flood Risk

Section 11.1 Urban Design

Section 11.5 Overarching Development Principles

Sections 11.6 – 11.12 Placemaking

Sections 11.219 - 11.221 Development Adjoining Watercourse Corridors

Section 11.246 Cycle to Work Facilities

Section 11.231 - 11.233 Travel Plans

Section 11.257 Surface Water

Section 11.258 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS)

5.2. National Planning Policy

National Planning Framework – First Revision (April 2025)

The National Planning Framework (NPF) is the Government's high-level strategic plan for shaping the future growth and development of our country out to the year 2040. This Framework is revised and updated to take account of changes that have occurred since the publication of the National Planning Framework in 2018 and to build on the framework that is in place.

Relevant Provisions include the following:

Section 6.2 Healthy Communities - Sláintecare and a universal health and social care system is the overarching vision and policy direction for Ireland's healthcare system. The objective is that everyone has access to "the right care, in the right place and at the right time"

NP0 36 National Policy Objective 36 Support the objectives of public health policy including the Healthy Ireland Framework and the National Physical Activity Plan, though integrating such policies, where appropriate and at the applicable scale, with planning policy.

NSO 10 – Access to Quality Childcare, Education and Health Services - The development of new healthcare facilities requires that consideration be given to the location, number, profile and needs of the population to ensure access to the most appropriate care, while also ensuring quality of care, particularly in relation to more complex acute hospital services. The ongoing implementation of Sláintecare and the Strategic Healthcare Investment Framework will have an important influence on the type and scale of regional healthcare services...

Expanding Community and Primary Care is at the heart of the Sláintecare vision. The development of Primary Care Centres (PCCs) is an important part of this vision. This will include the appropriate provision of PCCs and accommodation based on local service and population needs. Expansion of primary care will involve refurbishments of existing buildings and where necessary new builds.

National Biodiversity Action Plan 2023-2030

The NBAP includes five strategic objectives aimed at addressing existing challenges and new and emerging issues associated with biodiversity loss. Section 59B(1) of the Wildlife (Amendment) Act 2000 (as amended) requires the Board, as a public body, to have regard to the objectives and targets of the NBAP in the performance of its functions, to the extent that they may affect or relate to the functions of the Board. The impact of development on biodiversity, including species and habitats, can be assessed at a European, National and Local level and is taken into account in our decision-making having regard to the Habitats and Birds Directives, Environmental Impact Assessment Directive, Water Framework Directive and Marine Strategy

Framework Directive, and other relevant legislation, strategy and policy where applicable.

Climate Action Plan, 2025 [CAP25]

It is noted within CAP25 that Key targets to further reduce transport emissions include a 20% reduction in total vehicle kilometres travelled relative to business-as-usual, a 50% reduction in fuel usage, and significant increases to sustainable transport trips and modal share.

In relation to buildings, it is noted that operational emissions in the built environment sector have decreased by 21% since 2018, and achievement of the first sectoral emissions ceilings is within reach. In 2025 it is proposed to transpose the Energy Performance of Buildings Directive, publish a roadmap to phase out fossil fuel boilers, and increase the numbers of building energy rating (BER) assessors, One-Stop-Shops, and Sustainable Energy Communities.

It is stated within the Plan that, CAP25 is to be read in conjunction with CAP24, and as such I have set out a summary of same below.

Climate Action Plan, 2024. [CAP24]

Implements carbon budgets and sectoral emissions ceilings and sets a roadmap for taking decisive action to halve our emissions by 2030 and reach net zero no later than 2050. By 2030, the plan calls for a 40% reduction in emissions from residential buildings and a 50% reduction in transport emissions. The reduction in transport emissions includes a 20% reduction in total vehicle kilometres, a reduction in fuel usage, significant increases in sustainable transport trips, and improved modal share.

5.3. Section 28 Guidelines

Having considered the nature of the appeal, the receiving environment, and the documentation on file, I am of the opinion that the directly relevant Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines are:

- The Planning System and Flood Risk Management – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (November 2009) and related Circular PL 2/2014 (August 2014)

5.4. Regional Policy

Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy for the Southern Region 2020-2032 (RSES)

This is a strategic regional development framework which establishes a broad framework for the way in which society, environment, economy, and the use of land should evolve.

Section 7.1.2 Healthy Communities

RPO 117 Childcare, Education, and Health Services - It is an objective to improve access to quality childcare, education, and health services through initiatives and projects under the National Development Plan, alignment with Healthy Ireland and support development of outreach and community services for an expanding and ageing population.

RPO 118 - Universal Health Services It is an objective to seek the delivery of better universal health services including mental health, at all levels of service delivery, including provision of 24 Hour Accident and Emergency Services and implementation of Sláintecare for an expanding and ageing population across the Region.

5.5. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.5.1. The site is located c1.3km north of the Glanmire Wood pNHA (site code 001054), c1.4km north of the Cork Harbour SPA (site code 004030) and c3.7km northwest of the Great Island Channel SAC (001058).

5.6. EIA Screening

- 5.6.1. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices 1 and 2 of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. A first-party appeal against the decision of the PA to refuse permission was submitted on 24th February 2025. The grounds of appeal are summarised below.

- Site is the only undeveloped site within the defined Town Centre Zoning.
- Alterations made to address the Council's concerns including a redesign of elevation addressing East Cliff Road, updates to the boundary treatments, updated engineering proposals to overcome concerns regarding flooding and infrastructure.
- In relation to flood risk, the applicant's prepared an additional briefing note as part of the RFI request, and an additional briefing note is submitted with the appeal to address the internal reports of the PA, and the reasons for refusal.
- Flooding on the site caused by Storm Babet created a 'design exceedance event' that is likely to have been in excess of the 1 in 100 year (1% AEP) event.
- The proposed footprint of the Primary Care Centre was unaffected by Storm Babet.
- Has a freeboard of 0.985m above the 0.1% AEP event, as provided by the Glashaboy Flood Relief Scheme (Glashaboy FRS) model.
- The proposed car park will be affected by 1 in 100 year events caused by overland flow originating from upstream of the Riverstown Bridge during a 0.1% AEP event.
- RFI did not request that the applicant submit an updated FRA which considered the flood event caused by Storm Babet.
- Applicants could have demonstrated that the consideration of Storm Babet would not have amended the conclusions of the FRA.
- The FRA highlights that there is a 145m³ increase in flood plain storage through the site, ensuring no increase in flood risk to surrounding land and the design of the Glashaboy FRS is not compromised.

- Risk to the car park will be managed through a flood warning management plan as outlined in the submitted FRA.
- Visits are appointment based/will have the ability to cancel appointments in the event of a weather warning.
- Supporting reports demonstrate that Storm Babet would not have caused flood water to enter the proposed Primary Care Centre or restrict access to the site but the car parking area would have been affected as per the FRA.
- Principle issue is to consider if the associated car parking is a less vulnerable use suitable within Flood Zone B, in accordance with the Flood Risk Guidelines.
- Site is brownfield site which previously accommodated the former John Barleycorn Hotel.
- Site has been vacant for almost 20 years.
- Redevelopment of the site has been a long-held objective for the PA/previous LAP.
- Site retains a Town Centre zoning objective in the current CDP.
- Notes a portion of the site has been CPO'd to facilitate the development of the Glanmire & Riverstown Greenway – development makes provision for this development.
- Provision of a community use is listed as a 'Primary Use' within the zoning objective.
- Provision of a primary care centre, GP uses and a retail use is in line with the zoning objective.
- Will ensure that existing and future residents of the area will have access to healthcare facilities closer to their homes in line with HSE's Slaintecare Strategy.
- Noted that Cork City Council (CCC) have no objection to principle of development.
- Note that in zoning the lands, the PA would have had full regard to the Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines.

- Refer to the relevant provisions of the Development Plan in relation to flooding, including Section 4.4 of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, and Sections 12.20 to 12.22, as well as Objectives 9.8 and 9.10.
- Within the town centre, the subject site is the only undeveloped site which has the capacity to accommodate a Primary Care Centre.
- Delivery of same is in accordance with Slaintecare/national policy to deliver Primary Care Centres using the rental model where possible.
- Applicant responded to HSE expressions of interest request for the development of a Primary Care Centre in Glanmire.
- HSE considered the application site was more appropriate given the zoning, proximity to town centre sites, and pedestrian and transport links.
- The impact of Storm Babet was considered in the Midleton Flood Relief Scheme by Cork City/County Council/Was found that the impact led to an increase in the 1% and 0.1% AEP event flows by 5%.
- This allowance is provided for within the FRA provided prepared for the proposed development , and was used in determining the finished floor level of the proposed building (FFL).
- FFL includes generous freeboard above the 1% AEP design flood level and incorporates a 20% uplift for climate change.
- Flood levels for 1% + climate change (HEFS) at the closed point to the site (4GLA_3259) are 8.0m OD at the river centre node and c8.4mOD at the edge of the floodplain. The FFL of the proposed Primary Care Centre is 9.225mOD, which provides a total freeboard of 1.23 above the 1%+ Climate Change in channel level and 825mm above the flood levels at the edge of the floodplain.
- Against the 0.1% AEP flood level of 8.24mOD there is a 0.985m freeboard to the FFL.
- Proposed carpark is within Flood Zone B/affected by overland flow originating from upstream of Riverstown Bridge during a 0.1% AEP event.

- Based on evidence from the Area Engineers Report the flooding on site caused by Storm Babet created a 'design exceedance event' that is likely to have been in excess of the 1 in 100 yr (1% AEP event).
- Based on evidence of the City Council and as illustrated in the appeal submission (Fig 2 and 3 of same), a significant proportion of the site, included the area where the proposed Primary Care Centre was unaffected.
- JBA have concluded that the extent of flooding caused by Storm Babet did not exceed that of the 1% and 0.1% AEP events.
- Overall increase of 145m³ of floodplain storage.
- Development will provide medical services to meet a growing population.
- Redevelopment of the site is essential to facilitate regeneration and expansion of the Riverstown Village node.
- Site has been unused and vacant for approximately 20 years/just one of 3 no, locations within Glanmire zoned for urban town centre uses.
- Vulnerable development is located in Flood Zone C/less vulnerable development in Flood Zone B in accordance with the Flood Risk Management Guidelines.
- Satisfies the criteria of Box 5.1 (Justification Test) of the Guidelines.
- Refers to precedent case Cork City Council Reg. Ref. 23/42501.
- Car park granted permission/located within Flood Zones A and B.
- Section 12.20 'Climate Resilience' states that there will be a presumption in favour of the development of Brownfield Sites/echoed in the Flood Risk Management Guidelines.

6.1.2. Attached: Flood Risk Assessment (June 2024) prepared by JBA Consulting; Briefing Note (November 2024) prepared by JBA Consulting; Briefing Note (February 2025) prepared by JBA Consulting.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

6.2.1. None received.

6.3. Observations

6.3.1. 1 no. observation has been received from Barry Coleman, Clyda Eco Homes Ltd.

This is summarised below:

- Wish to affirm support for the proposed development.
- Provision of Primary Care Centre has long been advocated for and has been confirmed as a priority at Government Level.
- Proposal is welcomed by the community.
- Glanmire has an increasing population 14.1% growth over 2016-2022.
- Development Plan has set a target of 16,076 persons by 2028 which represents an increase of 42% from the 2022 figures.
- Need to be met with provision of public infrastructure.
- Technical data supported with the application demonstrate beyond doubt that the proposed development is suitable for the subject site.
- Crux of the PA's refusal relates to the proposed provision of ancillary car parking within Flood Zone B.
- Primary care centre is located entirely within Flood Zone C.
- Increase in floodplain storage.
- Note the conclusions of JBA in relation to the impact of Storm Babet.
- Proposal aligns in full with the Objectives 9.8 and 9.10 of the City Development Plan/with the provisions of the Flood Risk Management Guidelines.
- Grant of permission is appropriate and warranted in this instance.
- Observer is the landowner, has a through understanding of the site.
- Inaccuracies in the PA assessment of the case.
- Refers to the content of Engineer's Report dated 27th January 2025/this states the site was 'inaccessible'/photograph taken by Engineers formed the basis for the superimposed map prepared by the Engineer.

- Photograph was taken at a distance of 80m from the site boundary/does not give a true perspective of the proposed development on site to the north and north-west/northern views from this location are limited and obscured by trees and vegetation (Fig 1, 2 and 3 of submission refer).
- Client was not requested to provide access to the site on the day of Storm Babet.
- Superimposed map is not supported by measurements/notwithstanding map shows the Primary Care Centre Building Footprint is located out the 'flood area' as indicated by the Council.
- Client was on site on 18th September 2023, the day of the storm, and has provided photographic evidence/site was not inaccessible.
- Access was available from the entrance on East Cliff Road along the site's eastern boundary.
- An observation from this gate would have shown that the proposed development area was not flooded.
- Client was able to undertake a detailed walkthrough and more accurately measure the flood line extent.
- Map has been produced indicating extent of Storm Babet Flood extent based on these measurements.
- The photographic evidence is at variance with the flood extent map included in the PA Engineer's report, and contrary to the conclusion drawn by the Council.
- Submit that the images and map annotation verify that the lands within the red line boundary were not flooded during storm Babet.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. I consider the main planning issues in relation to this appeal are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Flood Risk
- Biodiversity (Bats/Birds) – New Issue
- PA Conditions

- Other Issues

7.2. Principle of Development

- 7.2.1. The proposed development is for a Primary Health Care Centre (3,313m², 2 no. GP practices (224 m² and 258 m² respectively) and a retail unit (94 m²). The site is zoned 'Z06 Urban Town Centre', with a zoning objective to 'consolidate and provide for the development and enhancement of urban town centres as primary locations for mixed use retail, economic and residential growth which also act as a focus for a range of services'. Glanmire is one of three such centres within the Cork City Administrative Area and is set out within the Plan that such centres have the potential to contribute to the sustainable compact growth of the city. There is no land use zoning matrix within the Plan, however it is set out that such centres will be the primary locations for economic, residential, cultural, community, leisure, civic and other related uses. While medical or retail uses are not explicitly stated in Section ZO6.2 of the CDP, I am of the view that such uses are encompassed by both economic (in relation to the retail unit) and community uses (in relation to the Primary Health Care Centre and 2 no. GP practices), which are referred to in this section of the Plan. This view is supported by Section 11.59 of the Plan which lists 'medical facilities' as a 'community facility'. As such the proposed uses are acceptable in principle. I would also note that this is the view of the Planning Authority, who have not raised an objection in principle to the use at this location (but have raised concerns in relation to Flood Risk, as set out below, which forms the basis of the 2 no. reasons for refusal, as set out in Section 3.1 of this report).
- 7.2.2. I would also note that the provision of the uses proposed at this location would be in line with Section 2.29 of the Plan which states that the provision of such medical centres allows for the delivery of walkable neighbourhoods. The uses proposed would also be in line with Objective 7.27(d) which seeks to promote the vitality and viability of Urban Town Centres, and which seeks to provide a variety of uses to serve the surrounding communities, and would be in line with Objective 7.30 Blarney and Glanmire Town Centres, given the development would provide additional local shopping and provide essential day to day services such as the medical facilities proposed here.

- 7.2.3. I would note that Section 11.59 of the Plan sets out various criteria to be applied when assessing applications for community facilities, such as the medical facilities proposed here, and these relate to need, co-location, accessibility and contribution to the 15-minute city and walkable neighbourhood concept. In addition, Section 11.73 refers explicitly to medical related practices, and sets out a number of criteria to be considered when assessing applications for same, and these criteria include those referred to in Section 11.59 as well the provision of an audit of existing facilities, impact on amenity, traffic management, traffic generation and signage.
- 7.2.4. In relation to need, the need for the medical facilities is not in dispute, with the provision of such Primary Care Centres, and GP practices within local communities a key goal of the Government's Slaintecare programme, as set out in the applicant's grounds of appeal, and as supported by the Revised NPF (April 2025) and by the RSES for the Southern Region, as well as by Section 3.82 of the CDP. In relation to co-location, I would note the GP practices proposed, which are co-located within the development, as the Primary Care Centre, and hence this criteria is fulfilled. There is potential for a pharmacy use within the retail unit, which would further fulfil this criteria. In relation to accessibility and the principles of the 15-minute city, the site is located within a local town centre, and the site itself incorporates and is adjacent to the proposed walking and cycling routes that run through John O'Callaghan Park and along East Cliff Road, being delivered as part of the Glanmire Road Improvements and Sustainable Transport Works, and is also well served by public transport routes (as set out in the Mobility Management Plan, dated July 2024), with existing bus stops located approximately a 4 min walk northwest of the development entrance, serving routes 214 and 245, linking the site to Cork City and Clonmel.

7.3. Flood Risk

- 7.3.1. The PA's 2 no. reasons for refusal both relate to flood risk. Reason No. 1 refers to the flood risk to the proposed development itself, and the potential displacement of flood waters, and notes specifically that the FRA has not considered recent flooding on the site. Reason No. 2 relates to the location of the development proximate to the flood plain of the Glashaboy River, and non-compliance with Objectives 9.8 and 9.10 of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028 ("The CDP").

- 7.3.2. Objective 9.8 of the CDP refers the protecting, enhancing and managing the City's floodplains. Objective 9.10 refers to restricting development in flood risk areas, in particular flood plains, and requires compliance with the Planning System and Flood Risk Management – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2009).
- 7.3.3. I would note that an Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been submitted at application stage (submitted to the PA on 7th August 2024), and a follow up Briefing Note submitted at Further Information (FI) stage (submitted to the PA on 20th December 2024), which responds to the Council's FI request. A further Briefing Note was submitted at appeal stage (submitted to the Board on 24th February 2025) , which responds specifically to the issues raised within the Council's internal reports.
- 7.3.4. The FRA as submitted (June 2024) notes that the site is bounded by the River Glashaboy, which lies a short distance from the southern boundary. This river joins the River Lee at Dunkettle. The Glashaboy River joins the Butlerstown River near the southeastern corner of the site (Fig. 2.1 of the FRA refers). It is noted that the site is generally flat with a fall from north to south, falling generally towards the watercourses in the area. The site has a high point of 9.25m at the north-east of the site, and a low point of 7.6m OD at the south-east of the site.
- 7.3.5. Reference is made to historic flood events referred to on Floodinfo.ie, and of note is historic flooding close to the site. Reference is made to recent flooding caused by Storm Babet but the FRA states that searches were not clear if the site itself was flooded, although nearby areas that were flooded include Riverstown FC (600m to the south), Sarsfield GAA pitch (75m to the east) and the Lidl Store (23m to the east).
- 7.3.6. Reference is also made to previous predictive mapping and flood modelling studies, including OPW CFRAM Mapping for the Lee Catchment Flood Risk Assessment and Management Study (which is that mapping available on the OPW Flood Info website) and that for the Glashaboy Flood Relief Scheme. These studies indicate that the extents of Fluvial Flood Zones A and B encroach into the site, with the proposed footprint of the building itself within Flood Zone C. It is noted that, in relation to the Glashaboy Flood Relief Scheme, the proposed works will not fully protect the site, with flood extents not changing significantly. Proposed works relating to same are illustrated in Figure 3.4 of the FRA. It is noted within the FRA that the Glasaboy

Flood Relief Scheme mapping involved more detailed modelling than the CFRAM mapping and is seen as a more accurate representation of design flood events.

- 7.3.7. I would note that mapping included within the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment of the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028 indicates that the site lies within Flood Zone C. The FRA notes that this mapping is now superseded, by the studies referred to above.
- 7.3.8. Impacts of climate change are considered in the FRA, with modelling indicating that water levels will rise by up to 0.15m in the OPW's high end future scenario (HEFS), with HEFS depths for a 0.1% AEP event, within the proposed car parking area, described as 'significant'. These depths are illustrated in Figure 3.5 of the FRA.
- 7.3.9. The FRA concludes that Fluvial Flooding is the dominant source of flooding on the site, with no other sources identified.
- 7.3.10. In relation to the proposed development, the risk of flooding arises in the area of the proposed car parking, with the main building on site lying outside any identified or mapped Flood Risk Zones A or B, including that for climate change events. It is noted that, with reference to the Glashaboy FRS mapping, flood levels for 1%+Climate Change (HEFS) at the closest point to the site (4GLA_3259) are 8.0m OD at the river centre node, and c8.4m OD at the edge of the floodplain. The proposed FFL of the building is 9.225m OD which leaves a total freeboard of 1.23m above the 1%+Climate change in channel level and 825mm above the flood levels at the edge of the floodplain.
- 7.3.11. The FRA notes that the car parking area will be impacted by overland flooding, originating from upstream of the Riverstown Bridge during a 0.1% AEP event. The 0.1% AEP flood levels at this point (4GLA_3547) are 9.86m OD, and for 1%+ climate change (HEFS) are 9.80m OD.
- 7.3.12. It is noted that raising ground levels at this point would result in loss of floodplain and increase risk elsewhere. It is noted that the western section of the car park will be partially within Flood Zone B (1 in 1000 year) extent. Site levels will be lowered on the west side of the car park, as illustrated in Figure 4.2¹. It is estimated, from an analysis of flood depth rasters, that the total volume of inundation at the site is

¹ And as illustrated in Drg. No, RY03-V1-XXX-DR-HLCE-CE-0006 Typical Road and Car Park Sections.

estimated to be to 855.3m³ during a 1 in 1000 year event. With site levels lowered in the west section of the car park, the resulting volume capacity is 997m³ giving an increased volume of 144.82m³. It is concluded that the development will not increase risk elsewhere through loss of floodplain and there is no disruption to conveyance routes. Post development depths are outlined in Figures 4.3 and 4.4 of the FRA.

7.3.13. The FRA recommended that an Emergency Flood Response Plan is prepared for the section of the car parking that is subject to flooding, and details the types of measures to be included within same. The FRA also set out a Development Management Justification Test, and it is concluded that it complies with same.

7.3.14. I would note that a Briefing Note (dated November 2024), prepared by JBA, was submitted as part of the FI request, sets out that the building footprint is within Zone C, and additional floodplain storage is provided, and that the proposed development is in accordance with Objectives 9.8 and 9.10. A Further Briefing note (dated February 2025) was submitted with the first-party appeal, and this responds to the PA's 2 no. reasons for refusal. It is noted within same that the car park element of the proposed development encroaches into Flood Zone B only, with Flood Zone A avoided entirely. It is also set out that there is no increase in flood risk, with no impact on the Glashaboy FRS. The residual (exceedance risk) of an extreme storm, such as Storm Babet is managed by a high level of freeboard included within the design.

7.3.15. The February 2025 Briefing Note (as submitted with the appeal) specifically considers the impact of Storm Babet and the flooding concerns raised by the PA's internal reports (namely the reports of the Area Engineer and the Drainage Reports, as referred to in Section 3.4 above). With reference to the Area Engineer's internal reports (dated 11/09/2024 and 23/01/2025) the Briefing Note contends that, although the Area Engineer suggests that a substantial portion of the site was flooded, this flooding did not extend to the high ground of the site where the PCC centre is located. It is further noted that the claimed flood extents by Cork City Council exceed that of the 1% and 0.1% Flood extents, as set out in the Glashaboy FRS mapping, and it is noted that there are no active river level gauges on the Glashaboy or Butlerstown Rivers on which to base any comparison of local water levels of gauged flows from the Storm Babet events. It is set out that Storm Babet was a 'design exceedance event' likely to be in excess of the 1% AEP event. This then is an event

which surpasses the normal design standard that is applied in the Flood Risk Guidelines, and which is also applied by OPW and Cork City Council and Cork County Councils. The impacts of such flooding events are managed by the application of freeboard in the site-specific design. It is further noted that Cork City Council has responded to Storm Babet by reviewing the Midleton FRS (but not the Glanmire FRS). In Midleton the impact on the 1% and 0.1% event flows was to increase them by 5%. It is set out that this error margin is accounted for by the freeboard proposed here, and as described in the FRA.

- 7.3.16. In relation to the above, it is clear that the wider landholding and the site itself is subject to flooding, with the southern sections of the site falling within Flood Zones A and B, as defined by previous mapping and modelling, carried out by the OPW, and as part of the Glashaboy FRS (see Figures 3.2 and 3.3 of the FRA). The proposed Primary Care Centre (PCC) itself does not fall within the defined extent of Flood Zones A and B. A section of the car parking falls within the defined extent of Flood Zone B. No part of the development falls within Flood Zone A.
- 7.3.17. The PA's first reason for refusal, and the internal PA reports, raise concerns in relation to the impact of recent flooding on the site, which relates to Storm Babet. The Area Engineer's Report (dated 22nd January 2025) includes an indicative map which is an approximation of the flood extent on the day of the storm (18/10/2023), based on a visual view of the site from Glytown Bridge, 80m South of the site's southern boundary. There is an accompanying photograph enclosed in this report, and with the direction stated as being in a northerly direction. The view would appear to correspond to a similar view I was able to gain during my site visit from the Glytown Bridge. This does indeed appear to show that the area to the south of the site at least was flooded. The superimposed map, included with the Area Engineer's Report, is less than definitive, however, with the map itself questioning the extent of the flooding (by virtue of the label stating 'Flooding During Storm Babet?').
- 7.3.18. The applicant is of the view that this storm was a design exceedance event, and therefore risk from same is not required to be designed out (having regard to the Flood Risk Management Guidelines). Notwithstanding, the applicant contends that the extent of flooding, as shown in the Area Engineer's Report of 22nd January, does not include the main PCC building.

- 7.3.19. The accuracy of the Area Engineer's map is questioned by an observer on the appeal, who is also the landowner. It is stated that the report author did not have a view of the entire application site itself, or at least did not reference same. The observer submission includes photographs on the site taken on the day of the storm, which indicates the extent of flooding on the site. A map is included with the observer submission that utilises the location of the photographs to define the flood extent on the day of Storm Babet.
- 7.3.20. I would note the following in relation to both maps. The map produced by the PA, which based on visual evidence, is not based on a view over the entire application site and is an approximation of flood extents. Indeed, I would concur with the view of the observer that a view of the entire application site is not possible from the vantage point of the Glytown Bridge. However, the Area Engineers Report acknowledges that the view is 80m from the southern boundary of the site, and that views from the site itself were not possible on the day of the storm, and it also would appear to acknowledge that the superimposed map is not definitive. I would note said map is not supported by any measurements made on site. However, I acknowledge that the report is produced by the PA's technical expert on such matters.
- 7.3.21. The map produced by the observer is based on visual evidence and photographic evidence from the site itself but is not produced by a technical expert nor is it based on actual measurements of flood depths (or if it is, this is not stated).
- 7.3.22. As such, both maps have limitations. I would accept that the report of the Area Engineer would point towards significant flooding on or near the site but the photographs provided by the observer would also carry some weight in determining the extent of flooding on the day of Storm Babet. Given the totality of information on file, I would conclude that there is no definitive mapping showing the extent of flooding caused by Storm Babet.
- 7.3.23. However, I am of the view that the definitive flood mapping available in relation to the site, is that technical mapping that is available is that mapping available from the OPW (CFRAM Mapping) and from the PA (produced for the Glasaboy FRS, that define the extents of Flood Zones A and B).
- 7.3.24. I would accept, however, and having regard to the evidence gleaned from the PA internal reports, from that submitted by the observer and from that submitted by the

applicant, that the Storm Babet flooding could be defined as an 'exceedance event', that goes beyond the mapped extents of the flood zones, and I would accept that this is a residual risk that would require management through appropriate design measures.

7.3.25. In this instance, the applicant and the observer have stated that, even if the Area Engineer's Map were relied upon, it is shown that the flood extents of Storm Babet did not incorporate footprint of the PCC. I am not of the view that is the case, with a small area of the south of the PCC appearing to encroach into the flood extents as shown on the said map. The PCC is outside the flood extents as indicated on the observer's map. However, with reference to the discussion above, I am of the view that it cannot be definitively determined that the proposed footprint of the PCC was within the flood extents on the day of Storm Babet, given the limitations with both maps.

7.3.26. Notwithstanding, and in relation to the PCC building itself, the proposal has included a freeboard of 1.23m above the 1%+Climate change mid-channel flood level and 825mm above the flood levels at the edge of the floodplain. The FRA sets out that that, even with an event similar to that of Storm Babet (where it has been estimated that water flows were c5% greater than previously estimated), the freeboard would have been sufficient. As such, I am satisfied that the residual risk of flooding of the PCC building itself has been sufficient mitigated in this instance.

7.3.27. With reference to the provisions of the Flood Risk Management – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2009) [Flood Risk Management Guidelines], the FRA has defined the development as a whole has a 'Highly Vulnerable Use', and given that the development (the car park element) is partially located in Flood Zone B, the Justification Test has been applied. I have considered same in further detail below, as well as the more general provisions of the Flood Risk Management Guidelines.

7.3.28. The Flood Risk Management Guidelines set out the key principles in relation to avoiding or minimising flood risk, and these are as follows:

- Avoid development in areas at risk of flooding.
- If this is not possible, consider substituting a land use that is less vulnerable to flooding. Only when both avoidance and substitution cannot take place should consideration be given to mitigation and management of risks.

- Inappropriate types of development that would create unacceptable risks from flooding should not be planned for or permitted.
- Exceptions to the restriction of development due to potential flood risks are provided for through the use of a Justification Test, where the planning need and the sustainable management of flood risk to an acceptable level must be demonstrated.

7.3.29. As such in the first instance, development on sites subject to flooding should be avoided. However, as noted above, the site is zoned for development, and as such the Planning Authority has accepted that some form of development is appropriate on this site. The uses proposed are acceptable in principle of this site, which is zoned for town centre uses, as discussed in Section 7.2 above. As set out in the appellant's appeal submission, this site is the only undeveloped site within the defined Town Centre Zoning. As such, I am of the view that avoiding development entirely on this site would not be in accordance with proper planning and development, noting that development on same is envisaged within the Development Plan, and is a key site in Glanmire that would make a contribution to the vitality and viability of same, as well as provided vital services to the local and wider community.

7.3.30. I would note also that the applicant has sought to keep the 'highly vulnerable' elements (see discussion of this definition below) of the development away from the defined extents of Flood Zones A and B, and have ensured that the 'less vulnerable' elements are within the defined extents of Flood Zone B, with development in Flood Zone A avoided entirely. Mitigation and management of risk have been considered within the FRA and I have considered same in this section of the report. I am not of the view that the nature of the development proposed here is an inappropriate form of development, given considerations set out above, and I am satisfied that the proposal would not give rise to unacceptable risk of flooding (see discussion above, and below, in relation to the 'Justification Test').

7.3.31. In relation to the Justification Test, Figure 3.2 of the Flood Risk Management Guidelines, sets out where this is required to be applied. I would note that for 'Highly Vulnerable' development within Flood Zone B, a Justification Test is required. For 'Less Vulnerable' uses within Flood Zone B, this is not required. I would note that in this instance, there is no development within Flood Zone A. Having regard to the

definitions within the Flood Risk Management Guidelines (Table 3.1 refers), it is a matter for debate as to whether the proposal here can be defined as a 'Highly Vulnerable' use, notwithstanding the contention of the FRA. Table 3.1 defines the types of development that would be considered 'Highly Vulnerable' and these include uses such as hospitals and residential uses. The uses proposed here are not such uses, and there is no residential aspect to same, nor is there any aspect of the development that would involve any long term or overnight stay in the building. The are elements of the proposal that a more akin to a 'non-residential institution', which is defined within the guidelines as a 'less vulnerable use'. However, given that there are potentially more vulnerable visitors to the PCC, and the GP services, and applying the precautionary principle, I would conclude that the PCC use itself could then be defined as a 'Highly Vulnerable Use', notwithstanding there is no explicit reference to same within the Flood Risk Management Guidelines. Should the Board not concur with same, and consider the proposal to be a 'less vulnerable' use, I would note that the Justification Test is not required to be applied.

7.3.32. I have considered the requirements of the 'Justification Test' below.

Part 1 The subject lands have been zoned or otherwise designated for the particular use or form of development in an operative development plan, which has been adopted or varied taking account of these Guidelines

7.3.33. As set out in Section 7.2 of this report, the land is zoned for development of this nature in the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028. The Development Plan itself has been prepared taking account of the Guidelines, noting the contents of Appendix 1 'Statement of Conformity: Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines' of the Development Plan, which states that the guidelines have been implemented in the relevant provisions of the Development Plan (i.e. within Chapter 9 Environmental Infrastructure and Management, Chapter 11 Placemaking and Managing Development and Appendix 4 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment). Section 11.262 of the Plan sets out that the Flood Zones identified by the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment should be used in line with the requirements provided for by the Flood Guidelines for land uses in Flood Zones A and B. I would note that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment contains mapping that places the site outside of Flood Zones A and B (as illustrated in Figure 3.7 of the FRA, and with reference to Page 31 of Appendix II 'SFRA Mapping' of the SFRA). As noted above, mapping prepared

as part of OPW CFRAM mapping and as part of the Glasaboy FRS, would indicate that part of the site is within Flood Zones A and B . Notwithstanding, the PA have not sought to vary the Plan to take account of any updated mapping, and I am satisfied that the updated mapping provides the most accurate mapping available for the site, and the proposed development has taken account of same.

7.3.34. In relation to the criteria as set out in Part 2 of the Justification Test, I would note the following:

Part 2 (i) The development proposed will not increase flood risk elsewhere and, if practicable, will reduce overall flood risk.

7.3.35. In relation to same, I would note that both of the PA's 2 no. reasons for refusal relate to the possibility of the proposed development increasing flood risk elsewhere, as a result of displacement of flood waters, and as a result of the site's location within floodplain of the Glashaboy River. I would note that Objective 9.8 seeks to protect, enhance and manage the City's floodplain. I would note also that Objective 9.10 seeks to restrict development in flood risk areas, in particular flood plains. This objective also seeks to ensure that development is in compliance with the Flood Risk Management Guidelines.

7.3.36. The applicant's FRA, and subsequent briefing notes, set out that the western section of the car park will be partially within Flood Zone B (1 in 1000 year) extent, and as such a small area of floodplain will be impacted upon. This is illustrated in Figure 4.2 of the FRA. In the eastern section of the car park, levels will be raised within minor infill within Flood Zone B. Site levels will be lowered on the west side of the car park. It is estimated, from an analysis of flood depth rasters, that the total volume of inundation at the site is estimated to be to 855.3m³ during a 1 in 1000 year event. With site levels lowered in the west section of the car park, the resulting volume capacity is 997m³ giving an increased volume of 144.82m³. It is concluded that the development will not increase risk elsewhere through loss of floodplain and there is no disruption to conveyance routes. Post development depths are outlines in Figures 4.3 and 4.4 of the FRA, with the FRA noting that there is an increase in dry areas (as compared to HEFS depths for the 0.1% AEP event, illustrated in Figure 3.5 of the FRS).

7.3.37. In relation to the above, and while I accept that there is an element of development lying within a small area floodplain, I am satisfied that the measures as proposed by the applicant will ensure that there is not an increased risk of flooding either upstream or downstream of the site, as the volume of floodwater previously accommodated by the site, will still be accommodated post-development. As such, I am satisfied that Objective 9.8 is not contravened in this instance, as the flood risk has not been increased, and the floodplain has been sufficiently managed. In relation to Objective 9.10, there is some development located within the Floodplain. However, the risks associated with same have been managed in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Risk Management Guidelines, and as such I am not of the view that the proposal is contrary to the provisions of Objective 9.10, notwithstanding the view of the Planning Authority in relation to same.

Part 2 (i) The development proposal includes measures to minimise flood risk to people, property, the economy and the environment as far as reasonably possible.

Part 2 (ii) The development proposed includes measures to ensure that residual risks to the area and/or development can be managed to an acceptable level as regards the adequacy of existing flood protection measures or the design, implementation and funding of any future flood risk management measures and provisions for emergency services access;

7.3.38. As noted above, the proposed development locates the main building outside of the defined flood zones, and in this manner, risk to both property and people are minimised. The location of same also reduces the economic risk related to flooding.

7.3.39. In relation to residual risks, as noted above, these risks relate to flooding of the car park, which is expected in 0.1% AEP events, as well as risks associated with 'exceedance events', such as Storm Babet, which are flood events that see flood water go beyond the defined flood extents of Flood Zones A and B, and as such risks associated with same are required to be managed accordingly. The FRA (Section 4.2.3 refers), and the application documentation, sets out emergency response measures and these include appropriate signage for the car parking area, evacuation of the development as a whole prior to any flood event, triggers for which are linked to either Met Eireann Rainfall warnings, or any specific flood warnings for the Glashaboy River, as well as agreed evacuation routes. Also as set out in the appellant's grounds of appeal, the PCC will operate on an appointment only basis,

and as such, in the event of flood warning, these can be cancelled in advance, minimising the numbers of people who would be on site on these occasions. Similar considerations would apply to the GP practices on site. The retail use would only accommodate very limited numbers on site, and could be also subject to similar emergency procedures as the PCC and the GP units. I would note that access and egress to the site is outside the extent of any defined flood zones, and as such the risk that emergency services could not access the site is therefore minimised.

7.3.40. In relation to the implementation and funding of any future flood risk management measures, I would note that the PA have raised concerns in relation to the potential impact of the proposed development on the implementation of the Glashaboy FRS. These concerns would appear to relate to the potential of the development itself flooding, and the potential for increased flood risk outside of the site. I have considered both of these issues above. There are no other aspects of the Glashaboy FRS that would appear to be impacted by this proposed development, noting that the infrastructural aspects of the FRA are being implemented elsewhere, upstream and downstream of the site, as illustrated in Fig. 3.4 of the FRA.

7.3.41. I would note also that the PA have also raised concerns in relation to some elements of the proposed surface water infrastructure being located within the defined flood risk area. In relation to same, I accept that additional details of flood protection measures in relation to same are required. However, I am of the view that these details can be required by way of condition. This is in line with Section 5.20 of the Flood Risk Management Guidelines which state that conditions should deal with any residual risk, and with Section 5.22 of said guidelines which state that, in most cases, conditions will be required to amend, clarify or further detail flood mitigation measures.

The development proposed addresses the above in a manner that is also compatible with the achievement of wider planning objectives in relation to development of good urban design and vibrant and active streetscapes.

7.3.42. I would note that an Architectural Design Report has been submitted with the application, and this illustrates the overall nature and extent of the proposed development. That the proposal will result in a new streetscape and public realm improvements. I would note that minor to changes to the elevations were made at FI

stage, and shown on Dwgs submitted at FI stage, with the resulting design being acceptable to the PA. Along East Cliff Road, the 3-storey element provides a definitive streetscape which adds to the vitality and vibrancy of the town centre. As such I am of the view that this element of the Justification Test has been met.

7.4. Biodiversity – Bats and Breeding Birds (New Issue)

- 7.4.1. I would note that the Biodiversity Report on file (which is undated) recommended that FI was requested in relation to a full bat survey, and a breeding bird survey, as well as the provision of suitable fencing to accommodate wildlife movements. In relation to same I would note that the PA's FI request of 1st October 2024 did not request the above information. However, the Executive Planner's Report (dated 23rd January 2025) refers to an FI request in relation to the above information, and notes the applicant has not responded to same. As such, from the information on file, it may have been intended to request this information as part of an FI request, but this was not, in fact, requested (as there is no reference to same on the copy of the FI request on file, dated 1st October 2024). The applicant was not then given the opportunity to reply to same. I would note that the lack of the above information did not form part of a reason for refusal on the file, and as the issue is not considered in the grounds of appeal. As such the issue of Biodiversity (bats and breeding birds) would constitute a new issue, in my view.
- 7.4.2. In relation to the information that is on file, I would note that an Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) has been submitted with the application, with site surveys being carried out on 5th April and 9th July 2024. In relation to bats, a preliminary roost assessment (PRF) of mature and semi-mature was carried out, following best practice guidelines,² and in relation to birds, all species recorded present during the site surveys were recorded.
- 7.4.3. In relation to habitats on the site, Fig 6 'Habitats Map' illustrates same. There are small areas of woodlands to the north with a small area of tress and parklands in the centre of the site.

Bats

² Collins, 2023

- 7.4.4. In relation to bats, the PRF did not indicate any signs of roosting bats within any of the trees on site but the presence of occasional roosting bats was not ruled out. It is noted within the report that one mature Oak tree which is earmarked for removal has deep fissures and a large hole, and was considered to provide moderate potential for roosting bats. All other trees were considered to be of low to negligible potential for roosting bats. It was further considered that potential foraging roosting habitat is likely to be present along the northern boundary of the site, along the woodland habitat. It is noted that the value of this woodland is likely to be reduced due to the proximity to existing lighting from the adjoining roads and buildings. The treelines along the river and the river channel itself were likely to provide high value foraging and commuting habitats for local bat populations.
- 7.4.5. In relation to potential impacts on same, the EcIA sets out that that 3 no. mature trees are to be removed from the site, include the tree referred to above. The presence of occasional roosting within other trees, while low to negligible potential, cannot be ruled out also. It is stated that, as mitigation, bat boxes will be installed on mature trees to the north of the site. Other potential impacts include impacts from lighting at construction, and at operational stage. At construction stage it is noted that works will be largely confined to daylight hours, and as such there will be no impacts on foraging bats. At operation stage, it is stated that, where possible, lighting has been designed in line with Bat conservation guidelines, and Section 10.4 of the EcIA sets out details of same, with lighting confined to paths and roads within the site. It is also noted that woodland at the site will be retained, and additional planting is proposed. The EcIA states that the overall impact will be localised and is unlikely to significantly impact on overall bat populations. However, it is concluded that the impact on local bat populations will be negative and moderate in the short-term, reducing to negative slight in the long-term at local level as the site landscaping matures. No significant potential or residual impacts on bats are identified within the EcIA. Section 10.8 of same includes specific mitigation measures that relate to bats, and includes adherence to best practice measures during construction, as well as a pre-felling survey of the mature Oak tree, referred to above, carried out by a bat specialist. It is noted that should bats be recorded no works will proceed without a relevant derogation licence from the NPWS. This section also contains measures relating to lighting.

Birds

- 7.4.6. In relation to breeding birds, the EclA notes that no Annex I species were recorded onsite. No species associated with the Cork Harbour SPA were noted (see AA Screening in Appendix 3 below). It is noted that the Annex I species Kingfisher has been recorded within the Glashaboy River. However, it is noted that the proposed development is located approximately 40m from the river, and is screened from the river by existing treeline and scrub habitats, and no signs of Kingfisher were recorded during the survey. It is concluded that the habitats on site are of local value for terrestrial bird species that are relatively common in the Irish countryside.
- 7.4.7. In terms of potential impacts on same, the EclA notes that there will a loss of common bird breeding and foraging and nesting habitat within the proposed development site, within the recolonising bare ground and grassland/scrub. The proposed development involves the removal of same. However, it is also set out that the landscaping plan includes the retention of the woodland habitat along the boundaries of the site, as well as new planting which will provide alternative foraging and nesting habitat as the landscaping matures.
- 7.4.8. No significant impacts on birds within or adjoining the site are highlighted with the EclA, with impacts on fauna concluded as being slight to moderate, in the short-term reducing to negative slight in the long term as the site matures.

Conclusion

- 7.4.9. In relation to bats, I would note that the preliminary roost assessment (PRF) did not identify any bat roosts on site. I would further note that only 3 no. mature trees are to be removed, with only one of these having moderate potential for roosting bats, with the remaining trees having low to negligible potential. However, should the Board be minded to grant, I would recommend a condition be imposed which seeks a pre-felling bat survey of trees to be carried out by a bat specialist. In relation to potential lighting impacts, I would concur that impacts at construction stage would be minimal, with most works carried out during daylight hours. A condition can be imposed in relation to same, should the Board be minded to grant. In relation to operational lighting impacts, I would note that lighting has been designed to best practice guidelines, and I would recommend a condition be imposed requiring additional detail of same to be submitted to the PA , should the Board be minded to grant. I

would also note that the retention of the woodland, as well as the additional planting proposed would further mitigate any potential impacts on bats, and I would concur that there will be no impacts on the existing riparian corridor, as a result of lighting, subject to these mitigation measures and subject to conditions.

7.4.10. In relation to breeding birds, the EclA did not identify any potential significant impacts on same. Notwithstanding, the EclA sets out general mitigation measures, that relate to birds *inter alia* lighting, protection existing habitats including roosting bird habitat, noise control measures and biodiversity enhancement measures.

7.4.11. As such, and notwithstanding the concerns of the Biodiversity Report as contained on file, I am satisfied that, with the proposed mitigation measures in place, and subject to appropriate conditions, there will not be any significant impact on bats or breeding birds as a result of the proposed development.

7.5. PA Conditions

7.5.1. While the PA have refused the proposed development for 2 no. reasons as noted above, a number of internal reports have recommended conditions, and I have considered same below.

7.5.2. Contributions Report (dates 28/08/2024, 16/09/2024 and 24/01/2025). Recommends a contribution in relation to the General Development Contribution Scheme. No special contributions are recommended. This is reflected in recommended condition No. 20. below.

7.5.3. Environment Report [16/01/25] – Recommends 9 no. conditions in total, relating to relation to impacts of construction, waste, trees, impacts to the river and surface water as well as noise impacts. The requirement of these conditions are reflected in Recommended Conditions 1, 2, 16 and 19, noting that noise management measures are set out in the Noise Impact Assessment, and other environmental measures are set out in the Ecological Impact Assessment, the Natura Impact Assessment and other documentation submitted with the application.

7.5.4. Senior Executive Engineer (Infrastructure Development) [23/01/25] - The report recommends a Clarification of FI in relation to the provision and interface with the proposed Glanmire and Riverstown Greenway project, as well as evidence of consultation with the OPW in relation to works within Flood Zone B along a

watercourse. Other issues related to the provision of an updated TTA, and an updated Road Safety Audit to be provided, as well as an amended site boundary.

- 7.5.5. In relation to same, I would note that the applicant's response to the FI request (as per cover letter dated 20th December 2024) states that the section of the Glanmire and Riverstown Greenway will be constructed as part of the development, should the development commence before work on the permitted Greenway. In addition, revised plans were submitted to ensure that there was no conflict between both projects. It is also confirmed that the temporary CPO area will be unaffected. Notwithstanding, I would note that a Condition can be imposed ensuring the proposed development is compatible with the Greenway project. I would note that a condition relating to an updated Road Safety Audit is not necessarily required as the interface between the Greenway and the proposed development has been considered with the Road Safety Audit submitted at FI stage. Notwithstanding it is appropriate to require a Stage 3 Road Safety Audit. The above requirements are reflected in Recommended Condition 6 below.
- 7.5.6. Traffic: Regulation & Safety (24/01/25) – Recommends a total of 6 no. conditions. The requirements of same are reflected in conditions 1, 6 and 16 below.
- 7.5.7. Urban Roads and Street Design Report (21/01/2025) – This report recommends clarification of further information in relation to a number of items related to details of dropped kerbs/paving, adherence to DMURS and TSM Guidance for the pedestrian crossing facility and tie in to the pedestrian network, as well as the provision of an uncontrolled crossing on the East Cliff Road. I am satisfied that the requirements of same can be met through an appropriate condition which is reflected in Condition 6 below.
- 7.5.8. Area Engineer's Report (dated 22/01/2025) – The report recommends refusal on flood risk grounds. However, in the event of a grant of permission, conditions are recommended. There are 17 no. conditions in total and relate to surface water drainage/flood risk prevention, sight distances, servicing arrangements, details of infrastructure provision, protection of surrounding roads and amenity, provision of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and the provision of an Arboricultural Assessment. I would note that an Arboricultural Assessment was submitted with the

application. The requirements of the remaining conditions are reflected in Conditions 1, 4, 6 and 16 below.

7.6. Other Issues

- 7.6.1. Drawings on File – The Board will note that the drawings on file labelled as ‘Maps/drawings received by the PA as part of further information 20th December 2024’ would appear to be the drawings as submitted with the original application on 7th August 2024, notwithstanding that they are dated stamped 24th July 2024, which is a date prior to the submission of the application. I would note that the ‘Document Issue Sheet’ as submitted by the applicant on 7th August 2024 as part of the application submission corresponds to these drawings and I am satisfied that these drawings then are the original application drawings. Drawings received as part of the FI request are on file (received by ABP on 4th June 2025).
- 7.6.2. Architect’s Reports - The Board will note that references are made within the Executive Planner’s reports to the 2 no. Architects reports, dated 24th September 2024 (Pre FI) and 22nd January 2025 (Post FI) respectively. These have been requested on 2 no. occasions from the PA. However, at the time of discharge of my report (6th June 2025) these have not been received. I would note the PA have stated that there is no ‘Post FI’ Architect report. Notwithstanding, the contents of both reports are reproduced to a large degree in the Executive Planner’s reports, and I would note, in particular, that, following the submission of revised drawings at Further Information Stage, the Architect’s Report did appear not raise any fundamental issues with the overall design or other aspects of the proposal. I have not had sight of any recommended conditions that the ‘Post FI’ report has recommended, however I am satisfied that a general condition requiring materials and other details to be agreed with the PA will suffice in this instance, and this requirement is reflected in Condition No. 3 below.

8.0 AA Screening

8.1. Screening Determination

Significant effects cannot be excluded

8.1.1. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that it is not possible to exclude that the proposed development alone will give rise to significant effects on the Cork Harbour SPA and the Great Island Channel SAC European Sites in view of the sites conservation objectives.

8.1.2. It is therefore determined that Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) [under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000] of the proposed development is required.

8.2. Appropriate Assessment Conclusion: Integrity Test

8.2.1. In screening the need for Appropriate Assessment, it was determined that the proposed development could result in significant effects on the Great Island Channel SAC, and Cork Harbour SPA in view of the conservation objectives of those sites and that Appropriate Assessment under the provisions of S177U was required.

8.2.2. Following an examination, analysis and evaluation of the NIS all associated material submitted and taking into account observations of third parties, I consider that adverse effects on site integrity of the Great Island Channel SAC and the Cork Harbour SPA can be excluded in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and that no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of such effects.

8.2.3. My conclusion is based on the following:

Detailed assessment of construction and operational impacts.

- To maintain the special conservation status of existing bird species and extent of habitat.
- Effectiveness of mitigation measures proposed including standard practice construction mitigation measures and best practice operational surface water management measures.
- Application of planning conditions to ensure these measures.
- The proposed development will not affect the attainment of conservation objectives for the Great Island Channel SAC or the Cork Harbour SPA.

8.3. Please refer to the attached appendices for detailed Stage 1 and 2 Appropriate Assessment.

9.0 Recommendation

Having regard to the above assessment, and based on the following reasons and considerations, it is recommended that permission be granted subject to conditions.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the Z06 Urban Town Centre zoning objective, and having regard to; the need provide sufficient healthcare services, including the provision of a Primary Care Centres serving local populations, in line with the Government's Slaintecare Programme, as supported by the provisions of the National Planning Framework: First Revision (April, 2025) and the provisions of the Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy for the Southern Region 2020-2032 (RSES); the provisions of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028; the provisions of the Flood Risk Management - Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2019) and having regard to the flood risk mitigation measures as set out in the applicant's Flood Risk Assessment, including the preservation and enhancement of floodplain capacity; and the scale and nature of the proposed development,

it is considered that the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity, would not be prejudicial to public health and would be acceptable in terms of flood risk, traffic and pedestrian safety and visual amenity. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 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 received by the planning authority on the 20th day of December 2024, 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.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. All works shall be implemented in accordance with mitigation measures specified in the Natura Impact Statement received by the Planning Authority on the 7th day of August 2024 and as updated by conditions of planning herein.

Reason: To ensure there will be no adverse effects on the integrity of any Natura 2000 site.

3. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed buildings and boundaries shall be as submitted with the application, unless otherwise agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

4. Drainage arrangements including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the relevant Section of the Council for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health and surface water management.

5. The applicant shall submit to the Planning Authority for written agreement details of additional flood protection measures for the proposed surface water infrastructure located within Flood Zone B, including measures as relates to the proposed attenuation tank.

Reason: In the interest of flood risk management.

5. The developer shall enter into water and wastewater connection agreements with Uisce Éireann, prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interests of clarity and public health.

6. The following requirements in terms of traffic, transportation and mobility shall be incorporated into the development and where required, revised plans and particulars demonstrating compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development:

- (a) the applicant shall liaise with Cork City Council to ensure the provision of an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing is provided on East Cliff Road;
- (b) the applicant shall liaise with Cork City Council in relation to the future delivery of that section of Greenway that traverses the applicant's wider landholding and to ensure that the development hereby permitted is compatible with the delivery of same;
- (c) details and the extent of all road markings and signage requirements on surrounding roads, shall be submitted to the Planning Authority for approval prior to the commencement of development;
- (d) the roads and traffic arrangements serving the site (including arrangements for maintenance of sightlines, servicing of the site, and details of signage) shall be in accordance with the detailed requirements of the planning authority for such works and shall be carried out at the developer's expense;
- (e) the proposed uncontrolled pedestrian crossing along the development frontage on the L3010, and the internal road network serving the proposed development including turning bays, junctions, parking areas, footpaths, cycle paths and kerbs, pedestrian crossings and car parking bays, shall comply with the requirements of the Design Manual for Roads and Streets, the Cycle Design Manual (CDM) prepared by the National Transport Authority (NTA) 2023 and with any requirements of the planning authority for such road works;
- (f) the materials used on roads and footpaths shall comply with the detailed standards of the planning authority for such road works;
- (g) the developer shall carry out a Stage 3 Road Safety Audit of the constructed development on completion of the works and submit to the planning authority for approval and shall carry out and cover all costs of all agreed recommendations contained in the audit;
- (h) all car parking spaces are reserved for the sole use of patrons and staff of the approved buildings;

In default of agreement on any of these requirements, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.

Reason: In the interests of traffic, cyclist and pedestrian safety and sustainable travel.

7. Prior to the opening of the development, an updated Mobility Management Plan (MMP) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority. This shall provide for incentives to encourage the use of public transport, cycling and walking by residents/occupants/staff employed in the development. The mobility strategy shall be prepared and implemented by the management company for all units within the development.

Reason: In the interest of encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport.

8. A minimum of 10% of the proposed car parking spaces shall be provided with electrical connection points, to allow for functional electric vehicle charging. The remaining car parking spaces shall be fitted with ducting for electric connection points to allow for future fitout of charging points. Details of how it is proposed to comply with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of sustainable transport.

9. All external shopfronts and signage shall be in accordance with details which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to the provision of such shopfronts and signage. Where agreement cannot be reached between the applicant/developer and the local authority the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination. The signage shall be lit by external illumination only.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

10. Construction operations during the hours of darkness shall be kept to a minimum. If construction lighting is required during the bat activity period (April to September), lighting shall be directed away from all woodland habitat. Lighting at construction and operational stages shall be implemented in line the recommendations of the Ecological Impact Assessment as submitted to the Planning Authority on 7th day of August 2024.

Reason: To minimise disturbance to bats.

11. Public lighting shall be provided in accordance with a scheme which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development. The scheme shall include lighting along pedestrian routes through open spaces. The lighting scheme shall be designed in accordance the recommendations of the Ecological Impact Assessment as submitted to the Planning Authority on 7th day of August 2024.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and public safety and to minimise disturbance to bats.

12. Trees with bat roosting potential shall be identified by a bat specialist prior the commencement of felling and shall only be felled following examination by and under the supervision of a bat specialist.

Reason: In the interest of ensuring the protection of bats.

13. All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground. The cables shall avoid roots of trees and hedgerows to be retained in the site. Ducting shall be provided by the developer to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

14. A plan containing details for the management of waste within the development, including the provision of facilities for the storage, separation and collection of the waste and, in particular, recyclable materials shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, the waste shall be managed in accordance with the agreed plan.

Reason: To provide for the appropriate management of waste and, in particular recyclable materials, in the interest of protecting the environment.

15. 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.

Reason: In the interest of sustainable waste management.

16. The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction and Traffic 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:

- (a) Location of the site and materials compound(s) including area(s) identified for the storage of construction refuse;
- (b) Location of areas for construction site offices and staff facilities;
- (c) Details of site security fencing and hoardings;
- (d) Details of on-site car parking facilities for site workers during the course of construction;
- (e) Details of the timing and routing of construction traffic to and from the construction site and associated directional signage, to include proposals to facilitate the delivery of abnormal loads to the site;
- (f) Measures to obviate queuing of construction traffic on the adjoining road network;
- (g) Measures to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble or other debris on the public road network;
- (h) Alternative arrangements to be put in place for pedestrians and vehicles in the case of the closure of any public road or footpath during the course of site development works;
- (i) Details of appropriate mitigation measures for noise, dust and vibration, and monitoring of such levels;

(j) Containment of all construction-related fuel and oil within specially constructed bunds to ensure that fuel spillages are fully contained. Such bunds shall be roofed to exclude rainwater;

(k) Off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste and details of how it is proposed to manage excavated soil;

(l) Means to ensure that surface water run-off is controlled such that no silt or other pollutants enter local surface water sewers or drains.

(m) A record of daily checks that the works are being undertaken in accordance with the Construction Management Plan shall be available for inspection by the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of amenities, public health and safety and environmental protection.

17. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Saturdays inclusive, and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.

18. Proposals for a development name, office/commercial unit identification and numbering scheme and associated signage shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Thereafter, all such names and numbering shall be provided in accordance with the agreed scheme.

Reason: In the interest of urban legibility.

18. The landscaping scheme, as submitted to the planning authority on the 7th day of August 2024, and as amended by details submitted on 20th December 2024, shall be carried out within the first planting season following substantial completion of external construction works.

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 [or until the development is taken

in charge by the local authority, whichever is the sooner], shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of biodiversity and visual amenity.

19. Prior to the commencement of development activity, protective fencing in accordance with BS 5837, shall be installed to protect all trees identified to be retained. The fencing shall be installed in such a manner as to provide protection to the critical root zone of trees to be protected and it shall be retained on site until all construction works are completed. No soil, spoil, construction material or waste will be stored or tipped within the fenced off area and no construction plant or vehicles will be parked within the spread of trees/hedgerows identified to be retained. The fencing shall be retained until such time as works are completed.

Reason: To protect biodiversity.

20. Trees identified for removal in the tree survey shall be marked prior to the commencement of works. Only those outlined in the Arboricultural Tree Survey, as submitted to the planning authority on the 7th day of August 2024, shall be felled.

Reason: To ensure the protection of trees.

21. The management and maintenance of the proposed development, following completion, shall be the responsibility of a legally constituted management company, which shall be established by the developer. A management scheme, providing adequate measures for the future maintenance of the development; including the external fabric of the buildings, internal common areas, landscaping, roads, paths, parking areas, lighting, waste storage facilities and sanitary services, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority, before the proposed development and any of the commercial units are made available for occupation.

Reason: To provide for the future maintenance of this private development in the interest of visual amenity.

19. 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 and maintenance until taken in charge by the local authority of roads, footpaths, watermains, drains, public 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 or maintenance 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.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory completion and maintenance of the development until taken in charge.

20. 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 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.

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.

Ronan O'Connor
Senior Planning Inspector

10th June 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Case Reference | ABP- 321945-25 |
| Proposed Development Summary | Construction of primary care centre, retail unit and 2 GP practices together with all associated site works. |

| | |
|---|--|
| Development Address | Riverstown, Glanmire, Cork |
| | In all cases check box /or leave blank |
| 1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required. |
| 2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)? | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP. | State the Class here |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3 | |
| 3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds? | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required. | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required | State the Class and state the relevant threshold |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required) | State the Class and state the relevant threshold Class (10)(b) of Schedule 5 Part 2 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended): • Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 ha in the case of a business district, 10 ha in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 ha elsewhere. (In this paragraph, “business district” means a district within a city or town in which the predominant land use is retail or commercial use. The site has an overall area of c1 Ha and is located within an existing built up area but not in a business district. The site area is therefore well below the applicable threshold of 10 ha. |

| 4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)? | |
|---|---|
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3) |

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Appendix Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

| Case Reference | ABP- 321945-25 |
|------------------------------|--|
| Proposed Development Summary | Construction of primary care centre, retail unit and 2 GP practices together with all associated site works. |

| | |
|--|---|
| Development Address | Riverstown, Glanmire, Cork |
| This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith. | |
| Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health). | <p>At operational stage, the proposed development will connect to the existing wastewater network. I would note that as per the original application as submitted to the Planning Authority, limited infiltration to ground was proposed to the west of the site, and the remaining stormwater was proposed to discharge storm water to the adjacent watercourse. However, as per the revised details submitted at Further Information Stage ³, it is proposed to have limited infiltration to the west of the site with remaining surface water discharging to the adjacent public storm drainage system on East Cliff Road to the east of the site. Water supply will be via the mains water network. Uisce Eireann have not cited any capacity constraints (in relation to wastewater treatment) or cited any constraints in relation to water supply.</p> <p>The site lies within the settlement boundary of Glanmire and surrounding land uses are mainly residential and community uses. It is not considered that any significant cumulative environmental impacts will result when considered in cumulation with existing developments.</p> <p>There are no demolition works involved, and there is no identified risks of accidents or disasters, nor is there any obvious risks to human health that result from the proposed development.</p> <p>The proposed development will not give rise to the production of significant waste, emissions or pollutants.</p> |
| Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of | <p>The site is not located within any designated site. The closest Natura 2000 sites are Cork Harbour SPA (site code 004030), located 1.4km to the south, and the Great Island Channel SAC (001058), located 3.7km to the south-east.</p> |

³ Revised Storm Water Management Report and Drg. No. RY03-V1-XXX-DR-HLCE-CE-0003 Rev 1 Proposed Storm Water Layout

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).</p> | <p>In relation to Natura 2000 sites, I refer to the conclusions of the Appropriate Assessment, where I have concluded that adverse effects on site integrity of the Cork Harbour SPA (site code 004030) and the Great Island Channel SAC (001058) can be excluded in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and that no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of such effects.</p> <p>While there will be some loss of trees and habitats on site, there is no evidence on file that the site is of particular ecological value, nor is there evidence that the site of particular ecological value for any species, and I am satisfied that there will be no significant effects on biodiversity. Particularly in relation to bats, I would note that no potentially significant effects on bats were identified in the submitted Ecological Impact Assessment Report and I concur with the conclusions of same.</p> <p>The site has not been identified as of particular historic, cultural or archaeological significance.</p> |
| <p>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</p> <p>(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).</p> | <p>During the construction phase noise, dust and vibration emissions are likely. However, any impacts would be local and temporary in nature and the implementation of standard construction practice measures would satisfactorily mitigate potential impacts. Impacts on the surrounding road network at construction stage can be mitigated by way of adherence to a Construction Management Plan.</p> <p>No significant impacts on the surrounding road network are considered likely at operational stage</p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Conclusion</p> | |
| <p>Likelihood of Significant Effects</p> | <p>Conclusion in respect of EIA</p> |
| <p>There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p> | <p>EIA is not required.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
| | |

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

DP/ADP: _____ **Date:** _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

Appendix 3: Appropriate Assessment Screening/Appropriate Assessment

| Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects | |
|--|---|
| Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics | |
| Brief description of project | Construction of primary care centre, retail unit and 2 GP practices together with all associated site works. A Natura Impact Statement (NIS) has been prepared and will be submitted to the planning authority with the application. |
| Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms | <p>A detailed description of the site, surrounding area and proposed development is provided in Sections 1.0 and 2.0 of this report and detailed specifications of the proposal are provided in the AA Screening Report/NIS and other planning documents submitted by the applicant.</p> <p>In summary, the proposed development is for the construction of a mixed-use development including a primary care centre, GP practices and retail unit, car parking, landscaping and associated works.</p> <p>I would note that as per the original application as submitted to the Planning Authority it was a limited amount of infiltration was proposed to the west of the site and it was proposed to discharge the remaining storm water to the adjacent watercourse. However, as per the revised details submitted at Further Information Stage ⁴, the limited infiltration to the west of the site remains while the remainder of the collected surface water will now discharge to the adjacent public storm drainage system on East Cliff Road to the east of the site, via an attenuation tank and a hydrobrake flow control system/ While not explicitly stated within the application documentation, it is likely that the public storm drainage system would itself discharge to a watercourse in the vicinity of the site.</p> <p>The Revised Storm Water Management Report incorporates sustainable design systems (SuDS) which includes permeable paving in the parking areas and a green roof system. On site attenuation will also be provided</p> |

⁴ Revised Storm Water Management Report and Drg. No. RY03-V1-XXX-DR-HLCE-CE-0003 Rev 1 Proposed Storm Water Layout

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| | <p>Foul water will be discharged to the existing combined sewer which will then be treated at Carrigrennan WWTP, which ultimately discharges to Cork Harbour SPA at Lough Mahon.</p> <p>The Cork Harbour SPA is located 1.3km south of the site and Great Island Channel SAC is located approximately 3.7km south-east of the site.</p> <p>The proposed development is located in proximity to the Glashaboy River and Butlerstown Rivers, which eventually drains into the Glashaboy Estuary c1.9km downstream (as indicated in Fig. 4 of the AA Screening Report). The Glashaboy Estuary forms part of the Cork Harbour SPA, which is hydraulically connected to Great Channel Island SAC.</p> <p>Potential impacts that could arise during construction include surface water impacts, ex-situ impacts on foraging habitats for bird species and the spread of invasive species. At operational stage, potential impacts relate to surface water and wastewater impact, as set out in more detail below.</p> |
| Screening report | Yes, screening report provided by the applicant, prepared by Dixon Brosnan Environmental Consultants. |
| Natura Impact Statement | Yes, NIS submitted by the applicant and prepared by Dixon Brosnan Environmental Consultants. |
| Relevant submissions | No relevant submissions at appeal stage. At planning application stage I note that the submission from Inland Fisheries Ireland requests that Irish Water/Cork City Council ensures that there is sufficient WWTP capacity to accommodate the proposed development. I have considered WWTP capacity below. |

Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model

Two European sites were identified as being located within a potential zone of influence of the proposed development as detailed in Table 1 below. The applicant considered other Natura 2000 sites within a wider sphere of influence (as set out on Table 1 of the AA Screening Report) and it was found that no further European Site were necessary for consideration and I agree with this conclusion.

Table 1:

| European Site (code) | Qualifying interests ¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date) | Distance from proposed development (km) | Ecological connections ² | Consider further in screening ³ Y/N |
|----------------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|---|
|----------------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|---|

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|--|---|
| Cork Harbour SPA (004030) | <p>Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140]</p> <p>Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritimae) [1130]</p> <p>Cork Harbour SPA National Parks & Wildlife Service</p> | 1.3km south | Yes, proximity and potential surface water run off to the Glashaboy and Butlerstown Rivers that are hydrologically connected to the Cork Harbour SPA. | Y |
| Great Island Channel SAC (001058) | <p>Bird of Special Conservation Interest (SCI):</p> <p>Little Grebe (Tachybaptus ruficollis) [A004]</p> <p>Great Crested Grebe (Podiceps cristatus) [A005]</p> <p>Cormorant (Phalacrocorax carbo) [A017]</p> <p>Grey Heron (Ardea cinerea) [A028]</p> <p>Shelduck (Tadorna tadorna) [A048]</p> <p>Wigeon (Anas penelope) [A050]</p> <p>Teal (Anas crecca) [A052]</p> <p>Pintail (Anas acuta) [A054]</p> <p>Shoveler (Anas clypeata) [A056]</p> <p>Red-breasted Merganser (Mergus serrator) [A069]</p> <p>Oystercatcher (Haematopus ostralegus) [A130]</p> <p>Golden Plover (Pluvialis apricaria) [A140]</p> <p>Grey Plover (Pluvialis squatarola) [A141]</p> <p>Lapwing (Vanellus vanellus) [A142]</p> <p>Dunlin (Calidris alpina) [A149]</p> | 3.7km south | Yes, proximity and potential surface water run off to the Glashaboy and Butlerstown Rivers that are hydrologically connected to the Great Island Channel SAC | Y |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | Black-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa limosa</i>) [A156] Bar-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa lapponica</i>) [A157] Curlew (<i>Numenius arquata</i>) [A160] Redshank (<i>Tringa totanus</i>) [A162] Black-headed Gull (<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>) [A179] Common Gull (<i>Larus canus</i>) [A182] Lesser Black-backed Gull (<i>Larus fuscus</i>) [A183] Common Tern (<i>Sterna hirundo</i>) [A193] Wetland and Waterbirds [A999] Great Island Channel SAC National Parks & Wildlife Service | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|

Given the hydrological connection to Great Island Channel SAC and Cork Harbour SPA potential effects could occur due to impacts on water quality from surface water runoff during the construction phase. Noting that it is proposed to discharge storm water to public storm water drainage system, which is likely to discharge to local surface waters, such impacts could also occur at operational stage. The AA Screening Report also sets out that increased in hardstanding could result in flood risk off site, in the absence of mitigation.

In relation to foul water, it is noted that the proposed development would increase the current Cork Harbour WWTP load from 235,720 PE to 235,854 PE which is well within the P.E. Design Capacity. Given the limited scale of the proposed development and the ability of the WWTP to cater for the proposed development, no impact is expected as the impacts from the proposed development will be negligible given the current operating conditions at the WWTP.

It is noted within the AA Screening Report that there is no suitable amenity grassland within the proposed development that could potentially be used as ex-situ foraging grounds for SCI waders for the Cork Harbour SPA such as Golden Plover and Curlew. It is further noted that the grassland on site is too overgrown and the site is too closed in to be used by foraging wading birds and/or waterfowl.

The presence of a number of invasive species on the site is noted within the AA Screening Report. However, no third schedule invasive species were recorded within the proposed development site. While other invasive species were recorded i.e. Cherry Laurel, Buddleia, Wild Clematis and Snowberry, it is set out that these species pose a lower risk to surrounding habitats and have a limited ability to spread over large distances. Given the relatively low risk posed by

these species to surrounding habitats and the distance to Natura 2000 sites, no pathway for impact has been identified.

Step 3. Describe the likely effects of the project (if any, alone or in combination) on European Sites

The proposed development will not result in any direct effects on either the Great Island Channel SAC or Cork Harbour SPA. However, due to the size, scale and proximity of the proposed development to Cork Harbour and Great Island Channel, indirect impacts generated by the construction and operation of the proposed development require consideration.

Sources of impact and likely significant effects are detailed in the table below.

AA Screening matrix

| Site name Qualifying interests | Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site* | |
|--|---|---|
| | Impacts | Effects |
| Site 1: Great Island Channel SAC (001058) QI list: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1140 Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide 1330 Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritima) | Direct: No direct impacts within the SAC. Indirect: Given the hydrological connection of Great Island Channel SAC and Cork Harbour SPA potential effects could occur due to impacts on water quality from surface water runoff during the construction phase. Noting that it is proposed to the public storm water system, which is likely to discharge to local surface waters such impacts could also occur at operational stage. The AA Screening Report also sets out that increased in hardstanding could result in flood risk off site, in the absence of mitigation. While not explicitly stated in the Screening Report this could impact on the flood regime within the Great Island Channel SAC. | Qualifying species and habitats within the Great Island Channel SAC could potentially be impacted as a result of the proposed development by reductions in water quality (i.e. surface water) and changes to the flood regime. Possibility of significant effects cannot be ruled out without further analysis and assessment. |
| | Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): Y | |
| | If No, is there a likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? N/A | |

| | Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site* | |
|--|--|---|
| | Impacts | Effects |
| Site 2: Cork Harbour SPA (004030) QI list: Little Grebe (Tachybaptus ruficollis) [A004] Great Crested Grebe (Podiceps cristatus) [A005] Cormorant (Phalacrocorax carbo) [A017] Grey Heron (Ardea cinerea) [A028] Shelduck (Tadorna tadorna) [A048] Wigeon (Anas penelope) [A050] Teal (Anas crecca) [A052] Pintail (Anas acuta) [A054] Shoveler (Anas clypeata) [A056] Red-breasted Merganser (Mergus serrator) [A069] Oystercatcher (Haematopus ostralegus) [A130] Golden Plover (Pluvialis apricaria) [A140] Grey Plover (Pluvialis squatarola) [A141] Lapwing (Vanellus vanellus) [A142] Dunlin (Calidris alpina) [A149] Black-tailed Godwit (Limosa limosa) [A156] Bar-tailed Godwit (Limosa lapponica) [A157] Curlew (Numenius arquata) [A160] Redshank (Tringa 19irsute) [A162] | As above | Qualifying species and habitats within the Cork Harbour SPA could potentially be impacted as a result of the proposed development by reductions in water quality (i.e. surface water) and changes to the flood regime. The possibility of significant effects cannot be ruled out without further analysis and assessment. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Black-headed Gull (Chroicocephalus ridibundus) [A179] Common Gull (Larus canus) [A182] Lesser Black-backed Gull (Larus fuscus) [A183] Common Tern (Sterna hirundo) [A193] Wetland and Waterbirds [A999] | | |
| | Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): Y | |
| | If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? N/A | |
| Step 4 Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site | | |
| <p>It is not possible to exclude the possibility that proposed development alone would result in significant effects on the Cork Harbour SPA and the Great Island Channel SAC from effects as described above.</p> <p>An appropriate assessment is required on the basis of the possible effects of the project ‘alone’. Further assessment in-combination with other plans and projects is not required at screening stage.</p> <p>Proceed to AA Stage II.</p> | | |

Screening Determination

Significant effects cannot be excluded

In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that it is not possible to exclude that the proposed development alone will give rise to significant effects on the Cork Harbour SPA and the Great Island Channel SAC European Sites in view of the sites conservation objectives.

It is therefore determined that Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) [under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000] of the proposed development is required.

AA and AA Determination

Appropriate Assessment

The requirements of Article 6(3) as they relate to appropriate assessment of a project under part XAB, sections 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) are considered fully in this section.

Taking account of the preceding screening determination, the following is an Appropriate Assessment of the implications of the proposed development of a primary care centre, retail unit and 2 GP practices together with all associated site works at Riverstown, Glanmire, Cork. in view of the relevant conservation objectives of Cork Harbour SPA (Site Code: 004030) and Great Island Channel SAC (Site Code: 001058) based on scientific information provided by the applicant.

The information relied upon includes the following:

- Natura Impact Statement prepared by Dixon Brosnan Environmental Consultants (July 2024)
- NPWS Website.
- Project Environmental Plan (July 2024)
- Flood Risk Assessment (July 2024)
- Ecological Impact Assessment (July 2024)
- Engineering Report (July 2024)
- Storm Water Management Report [as amended at FI – Rev 2 13/12/2024]

I am satisfied that the information provided is adequate to allow for Appropriate Assessment. I am satisfied that all aspects of the project which could result in significant effects are considered and assessed in the NIS and submitted documentation and mitigation measures designed to avoid or reduce any adverse effects on site integrity are included and assessed for effectiveness.

Submissions/observations

No relevant submissions at appeal stage. At planning application stage I note that the submission from Inland Fisheries Ireland requests that Irish Water/Cork City Council ensures that there is sufficient WWTP capacity to accommodate the proposed development. I have considered WWTP capacity in the AA Screening above and I refer the Board to same.

Cork Harbour SPA (Site Code 004031)

Summary of Key issues that could give rise to adverse effects (from screening stage):

- Release of pollutants at construction stage such as sediment, dust, accidental spill of fuels, oils, chemicals effecting water quality and marine natural environment
- Release of pollutants at operational stage via surface water discharge.
- Increased flood risk impacting on the flood regime, at operational stage.

See Table 11 of the NIS

| Qualifying Interest features likely to be affected | Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary-inserted) | Potential adverse effects | Mitigation measures (summary) NIS SECTION 6 |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>Bird of Special Conservation Interest (SCI):</p> <p>Little Grebe (Tachybaptus ruficollis) [A004]</p> <p>Great Crested Grebe (Podiceps cristatus) [A005]</p> <p>Cormorant (Phalacrocorax carbo) [A017]</p> <p>Grey Heron (Ardea cinerea) [A028]</p> <p>Shelduck (Tadorna tadorna) [A048]</p> <p>Wigeon (Anas penelope) [A050]</p> <p>Teal (Anas crecca) [A052]</p> <p>Pintail (Anas acuta) [A054]</p> <p>Shoveler (Anas clypeata) [A056]</p> <p>Red-breasted Merganser (Mergus serrator) [A069]</p> | <p>To maintain favourable conservation condition as defined by long term population trend being stable or increasing.</p> <p>No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by the SCI birds other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.</p> <p>To maintain favourable conservation condition as defined by: No increase in barriers, No significant decline in breeding population, productivity rate, prey biomass Human activities at levels that do not adversely affect the population.</p> <p>To maintain permanent extent of Habitat area.</p> | <p>Section 5.3.1 of the NIS identifies potential sources of impact include pollution to Cork Harbour SPA from surface water run-off.</p> <p>In the absence of mitigation, silt or hazardous substances could enter the Glashaboy River and subsequently the Cork Harbour SPA. Changes in PH which are associated with cement runoff has the potential to impact on the invertebrate communities within the mud complexes downstream, which provide key foraging habitat for large numbers of birds within Cork Harbour SPA. A reduction in water quality can also affect fish, plant life and macroinvertebrates by altering pH levels of the water. This could potentially impact on the intensity of fuse of areas of foraging habitat by SCI birds.</p> <p>The presence of fuels, lubricants and other chemicals from construction</p> | <p>Water quality control measures are proposed in Section 6.0 of the NIS that include adherence to construction best practice guidelines and the preparation of a detailed environmental management plan. Other measures include appropriate management of storm water during construction, buffer zones from the Glasahboy River, erection of a silt fence and appropriate site and material management and concrete control measures.</p> <p>Operation Stage measures include the SuDS measures referred to in the NIS and which are set out in more detail in the Revised Storm Water Management Report and permeable paving in the parking areas and a green roof system. On site attenuation will also be provided with the rate</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| <p>Oystercatcher (<i>Haematopus ostralegus</i>) [A130]</p> <p>Golden Plover (<i>Pluvialis apricaria</i>) [A140]</p> <p>Grey Plover (<i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>) [A141]</p> <p>Lapwing (<i>Vanellus vanellus</i>) [A142]</p> <p>Dunlin (<i>Calidris alpina</i>) [A149]</p> <p>Black-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa limosa</i>) [A156]</p> <p>Bar-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa lapponica</i>) [A157]</p> <p>Curlew (<i>Numenius arquata</i>) [A160]</p> <p>Redshank (<i>Tringa totanus</i>) [A162]</p> <p>Black-headed Gull (<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>) [A179]</p> <p>Common Gull (<i>Larus canus</i>) [A182]</p> <p>Lesser Black-backed Gull (<i>Larus fuscus</i>) [A183]</p> <p>Common Tern (<i>Sterna hirundo</i>) [A193]</p> <p>Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]</p> | | <p>activities also have the potential to impact water quality within the Glashaboy Estuary and therefore Cork Harbour SPA.</p> <p>The NIS also refers to potential flood risk off site, in the absence of mitigation. While not explicitly stated in the NIS this could impact on the flood regime within the Cork Harbour SPA.</p> | <p>of discharge limited via a hydrobrake.</p> <p>In relation to increased flood risk, the NIS refers to those measures which are also set out in the Flood Risk Assessment and include the creation of additional volume capacity within Flood Zone B, so as to ensure no increased flood risk off-site (see Section 7.3 of this report for additional discussion of same).</p> | |
| <p>Assessment of issues that could give rise to adverse effects in view of conservation objectives:</p> <p>(i) Water quality degradation</p> <p>During the construction phase there are potential sources of pollution to Cork Harbour SPA and Great Island Channel SAC resulting from surface water runoff and erosion from site earthworks and temporary stockpiles. The presence of fuels, lubricants and other chemicals from construction activities also have the potential to impact water quality within Cork Harbour SPA and Great Island Channel SAC.</p> | | | | |

Changes in pH which are potentially associated with cement runoff can cause localised die off among invertebrate communities within the mud complexes downstream as well as an associated change in the community distribution within transitional habitats. Mudflats and sandflats provide key foraging habitat for large numbers of birds within Cork Harbour SPA. A degradation in water quality caused by the runoff of hydrocarbons, cement or other chemical can also affect fish, plant life and macroinvertebrates by altering pH levels of the water. This could potentially impact on the intensity of use of areas of foraging habitat by SCI birds.

Inadvertent spillages of hydrocarbon and/or other chemical substances could introduce toxic chemicals into the aquatic environment via surface water run-off. Aquatic plant communities may also be affected by increased siltation. Submerged plants may be stunted and photosynthesis may be reduced. Significant impacts on fish stocks or invertebrate prey could potentially impact the foraging range and intensity for SCI species.

Mitigation measures and conditions

Proposed mitigation measures include:

- Good practice, standard construction methodologies to reduce surface water run-off during construction
- Appropriate management of chemical storage including spillage procedures, bunded storage areas, security, management of refuelling practices, leakages.
- Management of sediment and silt levels within the site.
- Appropriate surface water management practices including SuDS measures and measures to prevent increased flood risk off-site.

I am satisfied that the preventative measures which are aimed at interrupting the source-pathway-receptor are targeted at the key threats to protected bird species and by arresting these pathways or reducing possible effects to a non-significant level, adverse effects can be avoided. Mitigation measures can be included by way of condition if appropriate.

In-combination effects

I am satisfied that in-combination effects have been assessed adequately in the NIS. The applicant has demonstrated satisfactorily that no significant residual effects will remain post the application of mitigation measures and there is therefore no potential for in-combination effects.

The following plans/projects were considered in Table 10 of the NIS in relation to in-combination effects:

- River Basin Management Plan 2022-2027
- Inland Fisheries Ireland Corporate Plan 2021-2025

- Irish Water Capital Investment Plan 2020-2024
- Water Services Strategic Plan (WSSP, 2015)
- WWTP Discharges in the area
- Glashaboy Flood Relief Scheme
- Glanmire Road Improvements Scheme

Findings and conclusions

The applicant determined that following the implementation of mitigation measures the construction and operation of the proposed development alone, **or in combination with other plans and projects**, will not adversely affect the integrity of this European site.

Based on the information provided, I am satisfied that adverse effects arising from aspects of the proposed development can be excluded for the European sites considered in the appropriate Assessment. No direct impacts are predicted. Indirect impacts would be temporary in nature and mitigation measures are described to prevent ingress of silt laden surface water, sedimentation, management of dust from loading operations and mitigation of noise levels. Monitoring measures are also proposed to ensure compliance and effective management of measures. I am satisfied that the mitigation measures proposed to prevent adverse effects have been assessed as effective and can be implemented. In combination effects have also been reasonably assessed and there is no potential for in-combination effects.

Reasonable scientific doubt

I am satisfied that no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of adverse effects.

Site Integrity

The proposed development will not affect the attainment of the Conservation objectives of the Cork Harbour SPA. Adverse effects on site integrity can be excluded and no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of such effects.

Great Island SAC (Site Code 001058)

Summary of Key issues that could give rise to adverse effects (from screening stage):

- Release of pollutants at construction stage such as sediment, dust, accidental spill of fuels, oils, chemicals effecting water quality and marine natural environment
- Release of pollutants at operational stage via surface water discharge.
- Increased flood risk impacting on the flood regime, at operational stage.

| Qualifying Interest features likely to be affected | Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary-inserted) | Potential adverse effects | Mitigation measures (summary) NIS SECTION 6 |
|--|---|--|---|
| Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide, [1140] Atlantic Salt meadows [1330] | Permanent habitat is stable/increasing Conserve following community types in natural condition: mixed sediment to sandy mud with polychaetes and oligochaetes community complex. Intertidal sandy mud community complex; and Intertidal sand community complex. | Section 5.3.1 of the NIS identifies potential sources of impact include pollution to Great Island Channel SAC from surface water run-off. The presence of fuels, lubricants and other chemicals from construction activities also have the potential to impact water quality within Great Island Channel. A degradation in water quality caused by the runoff of hydrocarbons, cement or other chemical can also affect fish, plant life and macroinvertebrates by altering pH levels of the water. This could potentially impact on the intensity of use of areas of foraging habitat by SCI birds. | Water quality control measures are proposed in Section 6.0 of the NIS that include adherence to construction best practice guidelines and the preparation of a detailed environmental management plan. Other measures include appropriate management of storm water during construction, buffer zones from the Glasahboy River, erection of a silt fence and appropriate site and material management and concrete control measures. Operation Stage measures include the SuDS measures referred to in the NIS and which are set out in more detail in the Revised Storm Water Management Report and permeable paving in the parking areas and a green roof system. On site attenuation will also be provided with the rate of |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Inadvertent spillages of hydrocarbon and/or other chemical substances could introduce toxic chemicals into the aquatic environment via surface water run-off. Aquatic plant communities may also be affected by increased siltation. Submerged plants may be stunted and photosynthesis may be reduced. Significant impacts on fish stocks or invertebrate prey could potentially impact the foraging range and intensity for SCI species.</p> <p>The NIS also refers to potential flood risk off site, in the absence of mitigation. While not explicitly stated in the NIS this could impact on the flood regime within the Great Island Channel SAC.</p> | <p>discharge limited via a hydrobrake.</p> <p>In relation to increased flood risk, the NIS refers to those measures which are also set out in the Flood Risk Assessment and include the creation of additional volume capacity within Flood Zone B, so as to ensure no increased flood risk off-site (see Section 7.3 of this report for additional discussion of same).</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

Assessment of issues that could give rise to adverse effects in view of conservation objectives:

(i) Water quality degradation

During the construction phase there are potential sources of pollution to Cork Harbour SPA and Great Island Channel SAC resulting from surface water runoff and erosion from site earthworks and temporary stockpiles. The presence of fuels, lubricants and other chemicals from construction activities also have the potential to impact water quality within Lough Mahon and therefore Cork Harbour SPA and Great Island Channel SAC.

Changes in pH which are potentially associated with cement runoff into Lough Mahon can cause localised die off among invertebrate communities within the mud complexes downstream as well as an associated change in the community distribution within transitional habitats. Mudflats and sandflats provide key foraging habitat for large numbers of birds within Cork Harbour SPA. A degradation in water quality caused by the runoff of hydrocarbons, cement or other chemical can also affect fish, plant life and macroinvertebrates by altering pH levels of the water. This could potentially impact on the intensity of use of areas of foraging habitat by SCI birds.

Inadvertent spillages of hydrocarbon and/or other chemical substances could introduce toxic chemicals into the aquatic environment via surface water run-off. Aquatic plant communities may also be affected by increased siltation. Submerged plants may be stunted and photosynthesis may be reduced. Significant impacts on fish stocks or invertebrate prey could potentially impact the foraging range and intensity for SCI species.

Mitigation measures and conditions

Proposed mitigation measures include:

- Good practice, standard construction methodologies to reduce surface water run-off during construction
- Appropriate management of chemical storage including spillage procedures, bunded storage areas, security, management of refuelling practices, leakages.
- Management of sediment and silt levels within the site.
- Appropriate surface water management practices including SuDS measures and measures to prevent increased flood risk off-site.

I am satisfied that the preventative measures which are aimed at interrupting the source-pathway-receptor are targeted at the key threats to protected bird species and by arresting these pathways or reducing possible effects to a non-significant level, adverse effects can be avoided. Mitigation measures can be included by way of condition if appropriate.

In-combination effects

I am satisfied that in-combination effects has been assessed adequately in the NIS. The applicant has demonstrated satisfactorily that no significant residual effects will remain post the application of mitigation measures and there is therefore no potential for in-combination effects (as per discussion of Cork Harbour SPA above).

Findings and conclusions

The applicant determined that following the implementation of mitigation measures the construction and operation of the proposed development alone, **or in combination with other plans and projects**, will not adversely affect the integrity of this European site.

Based on the information provided, I am satisfied that adverse effects arising from aspects of the proposed development can be excluded for the European sites considered in the Appropriate Assessment. No direct impacts are predicted. Indirect impacts would be temporary in nature and mitigation measures are described to prevent ingress of silt laden surface water, sedimentation, management of dust from loading operations and mitigation of noise levels. Monitoring measures are also proposed to ensure compliance and effective management of measures. I am satisfied that the mitigation measures proposed to prevent adverse effects have been assessed as effective and can be implemented. In combination

effects have also been reasonably assessed and there is no potential for in-combination effects.

Reasonable scientific doubt

I am satisfied that no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of adverse effects.

Site Integrity

The proposed development will not affect the attainment of the Conservation objectives of the Great Island Channel SAC. Adverse effects on site integrity can be excluded and no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of such effects.

Appropriate Assessment Conclusion: Integrity Test

In screening the need for Appropriate Assessment, it was determined that the proposed development could result in significant effects on the Great Island Channel SAC, and Cork Harbour SPA in view of the conservation objectives of those sites and that Appropriate Assessment under the provisions of S177U was required.

Following an examination, analysis and evaluation of the NIS all associated material submitted and taking into account observations of third parties, I consider that adverse effects on site integrity of the Great Island Channel SAC and the Cork Harbour SPA can be excluded in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and that no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of such effects.

My conclusion is based on the following:

- Detailed assessment of construction and operational impacts.
- To maintain the special conservation status of existing bird species and extent of habitat.
- Effectiveness of mitigation measures proposed including standard practice construction mitigation measures.
- Application of planning conditions to ensure these measures.
- The proposed development will not affect the attainment of conservation objectives for the Great Island Channel SAC or the Cork Harbour SPA.

Appendix 4 WFD Stage 1 Screening /WFD Stage 2 Assessment

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING

Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality

| | | | |
|--|----------------------|--|----------------------------|
| An Bord Pleanála ref. no. | ABP-321945-25 | Townland, address | Riverstown, Glanmire, Cork |
| Description of project | | Construction of primary care centre, retail unit and 2 GP practices together with all associated site works. | |
| Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening, | | <p>The subject site is located in Riverstown, Glanmire, Cork. The site is located to the south and the west of the existing built up/streetscape of the village where there are existing shops and other retail outlets in place. To the south and the southwest of the site there is an existing area of undeveloped, open fields which runs parallel to the adjacent Glashaboy River. The site for the most part is flat and level with the surrounding land on all sides. The brownfield site is bounded by an existing stone wall along its eastern boundary and two storey buildings along its northern boundary. The proposed development is located in proximity to the Glashaboy River and Butlerstown Rivers, which eventually drains into the Glashaboy Estuary c1.9km downstream. The Glashaboy Estuary forms part of the Cork Harbour SPA, which is hydraulically connected to Great Channel Island SAC.</p> | |
| Proposed surface water details | | SUDs system proposed with attenuation discharging to the public storm sewer. Limited infiltration to ground on the west of the site. | |
| Proposed water supply source & available capacity | | Uisce Eireann mains water connection | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
| Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues | | | Uisce Eireann Wastewater connection. Plant operating at within capacity (adequate available capacity) and complying with License authorisation conditions. This discharges to the Lough Mahon. This water body has a status of ‘At Risk’ (WFD 3 rd Cycle) | | | |
| Others? | | | | | | |
| Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection | | | | | | |
| Identified water body | Distance to (m) | Water body name(s) (code) | WFD Status | Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk | Identified pressures on that water body ⁵ | Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater) |
| River Waterbody | Adjacent to site | Glashaboy (Lough Mahon)_030 | Good | Not at risk | Urban Waste Water | Yes – Surface Water discharge to watercourse. |
| Groundwater Waterbody | Underlying site | Ballinhassig East IE_SW_G_004 | Good | Not at risk | Anthropogenic Pressures | Yes – Site is underlain by silty/clayey sand with |

⁵ Data - Catchments.ie - Catchments.ie

| | | | | | | | moderate permeability – Limited infiltration of stormwater proposed |
|---|-----------|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| Transitional Waterbody | c 0.85km | Glashaboy Estuary IE_SW_060_080 0 | Bad | At Risk | Urban Run Off | | Yes via surface water hydrological linkage |
| Step 4: Detailed description of any component of the development or activity that may cause a risk of not achieving the WFD Objectives having regard to the S-P-R linkage. | | | | | | | |
| CONSTRUCTION PHASE | | | | | | | |
| No. | Component | Waterbody receptor (EPA Code) | Pathway (existing and new) | Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact | Screening Stage Mitigation Measure* | Residual Risk (yes/no) Detail | Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2. |
| 1. | Surface | Glashaboy (Lough Mahon)_030 | Yes proximity to watercourse/potentially | Siltation, pH (Concrete), | Standard construction practice | Yes – proximity to watercourse | Screened in |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|---------------|--|-------------|
| | | | temporary drainage features. | hydrocarbon spillages | CEMP | warrants additional assessment. | |
| 2. | Ground | Ballinhassig East IE_SW_G_004 | Yes pathway exists via moderate drainage characteristics | Spillages | As above | Yes – drainage characteristics warrants further assessment. | Screened in |
| 3. | Transitional | Glashaboy Estuary IE_SW_060_0800 | Yes via surface water hydrological linkage | Siltation, pH (Concrete), hydrocarbon spillages | As above | Yes – proximity to watercourse warrants additional assessment. | Screened in |
| OPERATIONAL PHASE | | | | | | | |
| 3. | Surface | Glashaboy (Lough Mahon)_030 | Yes proximity to watercourse. Surface water discharge. | Hydrocarbon spillages | SUDs features | Yes – proximity to watercourse and surface water discharge to same warrants additional assessment. | Screened in |
| 4. | Ground | Ballinhassig East IE_SW_G_004 | Yes pathway exists via moderate drainage characteristics | Spillages | As above | Yes – drainage characteristics | Screened in |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|-------------|
| | | | | | | warrants further assessment. | |
| | Transitional | Glashaboy Estuary IE_SW_060_0800 | Yes via surface water hydrological linkage | Siltation, pH (Concrete), hydrocarbon spillages | As above | Yes – proximity to watercourse warrants additional assessment. | Screened in |
| DECOMMISSIONING PHASE | | | | | | | |
| 5. | NA | | | | | | |
| STAGE 2: ASSESSMENT | | | | | | | |
| Details of Mitigation Required to Comply with WFD Objectives – Template | | | | | | | |
| Surface Water | | | | | | | |
| Development/Activity e.g. culvert, bridge, other crossing, diversion, outfall, etc | <u>Objective 1:Surface Water</u> Prevent deterioration of the status of all bodies of surface water | <u>Objective 2:Surface Water</u> Protect, enhance and restore all bodies of surface water with aim of achieving good status | <u>Objective 3:Surface Water</u> Protect and enhance all artificial and heavily modified bodies of water with aim of achieving good ecological potential and good surface water chemical status | <u>Objective 4: Surface Water</u> Progressively reduce pollution from priority substances and cease or phase out emission, discharges and losses of priority substances | Does this component comply with WFD Objectives 1, 2, 3 & 4? (if answer is no, a development cannot proceed without a derogation under art. 4.7) | | |

| | Describe mitigation required to meet objective 1: | Describe mitigation required to meet objective 2: | Describe mitigation required to meet objective 3: | Describe mitigation required to meet objective 4: | |
|--------------------|--|---|--|--|-----|
| Construction works | <p>Site specific construction mitigation methods including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good practice, standard construction methodologies to reduce surface water run-off during construction • Appropriate management of chemical storage including spillage procedures, bunded storage areas, security, management of refuelling practices, leakages. • Management of sediment and silt levels within the site. | Site specific construction mitigation methods as described. | Site specific construction mitigation methods as described | Site specific construction mitigation methods as described | YES |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|----------------------------|---|
| Stormwater drainage | Adequately designed SUDs features, permeable paving and attenuation. | SUDs features as described. | SUDs features as described | SUDs features as described | YES |
| Details of Mitigation Required to Comply with WFD Objectives – Template | | | | | |
| Groundwater | | | | | |
| Development/Activity e.g. abstraction, outfall, etc. | <u>Objective 1: Groundwater</u> Prevent or limit the input of pollutants into groundwater and to prevent the deterioration of the status of all bodies of groundwater | <u>Objective 2 : Groundwater</u> Protect, enhance and restore all bodies of groundwater, ensure a balance between abstraction and recharge, with the aim of achieving good status* | <u>Objective 3:Groundwater</u> Reverse any significant and sustained upward trend in the concentration of any pollutant resulting from the impact of human activity | | Does this component comply with WFD Objectives 1, 2, 3 & 4? (if answer is no, a development cannot proceed without a derogation under art. 4.7) |
| Construction works | Site specific construction mitigation methods including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate management of chemical storage including spillage procedures, bunded storage areas, security, management | Site specific construction mitigation methods as described. | Site specific construction mitigation methods as described | | Yes |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|
| | of refuelling practices, leakages. | | | |
| Development Activity 1 : | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Development Activity 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |