



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-321949-25

Development	Construction of 164 residential units, childcare facility and all associated site works.
Location	Lands at Ardarostig and Ballinaspig More, Waterfall Road, Bishopstown, Cork
Planning Authority	Cork City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	24/43209
Applicant(s)	Dwellings Development Bishopstown Limited
Type of Application	Largescale Residential Development
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party vs Decision
Appellant(s)	Dwellings Development Bishopstown Limited
Observer(s)	John and Teresa Hogan Pat Coveney
Date of Site Inspection	6 th May 2025
Inspector	Phillippa Joyce

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Opinion	9
4.0 Planning Authority Decision	10
5.0 Planning History.....	15
6.0 Policy Context.....	16
7.0 The Appeal	30
8.0 Planning Assessment	35
9.0 Appropriate Assessment.....	56
10.0 Environmental Impact Assessment	56
11.0 Water Status Impact Assessment.....	58
12.0 Recommendation	59
13.0 Recommended Draft Board Order.....	59
Appendix 1: Appropriate Assessment – Screening Determination	77
Appendix 2: Environmental Impact Assessment – Pre Screening Form	83
Appendix 3: Environmental Impact Assessment – Screening Determination Form..	84
Appendix 4: Water Status Impact Assessment – Screening Form	102

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located on lands at Ardarostig and Ballinaspig More, c.1.4km to the southwest of Bishopstown. The site is located in a semi-rural/ outer suburban area of southwest Cork City, which has been subject to developmental changes in recent years.
- 1.2. The site is greenfield in nature and comprises a large field in tillage at the time of site inspection. The site is primarily rectangular in configuration (with linear extensions at the northeast and northwest corners for proposed paths/ services) and indicated as measuring c.3.86ha.
- 1.3. The site is bound to the north by South Ring Road (N40 dual carriageway) and to the south by Waterfall Road (L2230), a local tertiary road. Adjacent to the east and west of the site are detached residential properties which front onto Waterfall Road. The Two Pot River flows to the west of the site and defines its northwestern boundary.
- 1.4. The site is accessed via an existing agricultural entrance from Waterfall Road. The road in this location is narrow and without dedicated foot/ cycle paths. An ESB 38kv line (with a mast near the site's entrance) extends through the site on a north-south alignment. The site features well-defined boundaries with treelines, hedgerows, ditches, and stone walls.
- 1.5. The topographical and hydrological context of the site are notable. The site is located between two watercourses, Two Pot River is adjacent to the west while further to the east is the Glasheen River. Ground levels across the site decrease steadily in northerly and northeasterly directions from Waterfall Road (c.33m OD) to South Ring Road (c.23m OD) and more steeply in a westerly direction towards the Two Pot River (c.17.5m OD). The majority of the site (centre, east) drains towards the Glasheen River, while the remainder (west) drains to the Two Pot River.
- 1.6. Established land uses surrounding the site include low density residential developments (several detached residences to the east, west and south), Marymount University Hospital and Hospice to the west, and Irish Oxygen (a Seveso site) to the southwest. Opposite the site, on the southern side of Waterfall Road, is Waterfall Heights, a new residential scheme at an advanced stage of construction and occupation.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the construction of 164 residential units, a childcare facility, vehicular and pedestrian/ cycle entrances onto Waterfall Road, improvement works on Waterfall Road (a traffic calming gateway, two-way cycle track, pedestrian footpath, toucan crossing), internal roads and paths (including a pedestrian/ cycle pathway extending to the edge of the Two Pot River at the northwestern boundary), an ESB mast, an acoustic noise barrier along the northern boundary with the South Ring Road, and all associated site works.
- 2.2. The residential units include of 64 houses arranged in semi-detached pairings and terraced rows in the centre/ northern portion of the site, 54 apartments in two blocks 4-5 storeys in height, and 46 duplexes in four terraced buildings 3-4 storeys in height. The apartment blocks and duplex buildings are aligned along the southern boundary of the site, addressing Waterfall Road. The childcare facility is a single storey unit located at the lower ground floor level of Duplex Building 04, the eastern-most duplex building.
- 2.3. During the assessment of the application, Further Information (FI) was requested by the planning authority (see section 4.0 below for details). In response to the FI request (RFI), the applicant revised the proposed development. Key revisions include:
- Amendments to the housing mix whereby 16 3-bedroom houses were redesigned as 4-bedroom houses (House Types C1, D1, and D2).
 - Bin stores (three bins per unit) were provided to the front (northern elevation) of Duplex Buildings 01-03, of a design and finish to match same.
 - Details are provided of the bicycle stores for Duplex Buildings 01-03 (western gables).
 - Amendments made to Duplex Building 04 (increased principal width and internal floor plans of certain duplex units) to achieve compliance for required storage spaces.

- Clarity provided on and/ or revision to the private and communal open spaces (quantum, extent, boundaries) for the residents of the apartments and duplex units.
- Revisions made to the main entrances and the eastern gables of Apartment Blocks 01 and 02, inserting east facing windows to kitchens/ living rooms/ bedrooms so that 16 apartments are revised from north-facing single aspect units to dual aspect units.
- Identification of proposed Part V units in the scheme (houses, duplexes, apartments).
- Addition of two ESB substations (sited in the northeast and northwest corners of scheme).
- Details of traffic calming transitional zones and gateways (inner and outer) proposed on Waterfall Road.
- Details of sightlines, access, signage, road markings, tactile paving, and surface water drainage arrangements on public and internal road layouts road.
- Amendments to the public lighting scheme (height, design, siting of columns).
- Amendments to the landscape proposals in respect of drainage (insertion of filter drains), hard landscaping (removal of quarry stone seating), and tree planting (increased sizes).
- Several initial drawings and reports were amended to reflect the revisions outlined above. These are identified in the applicant's RFI Cover Letter (pgs. 1-2), and relate to architectural design, housing quality assessments (HQAs), landscaping, transportation design and safety, and public lighting.
- Additionally, several reports expand on and/ or clarify information as initially submitted but do not revise the proposed development. These are also identified in the applicant's RFI Cover Letter (pgs. 1-2). These relate to ecology, appropriate assessment, noise, air quality, traffic generation, distribution and impact, mobility management, and pedestrian access.

- 2.4. I consider there to be planning merit in the revisions made to the proposed development at RFI stage and recommend to the Board that regard is had to same in the assessment of this appeal.
- 2.4.1. The following tables present a summary of the key statistics and characteristics of the proposed scheme, where relevant, as revised by the RFI. These are extrapolated from the key plans and particulars as initially lodged with the application and subsequently submitted in the RFI (where provided/ available).
- 2.4.2. In the interests of clarity for the Board, I highlight there are some errors on/ discrepancies in the RFI plans/ particulars (e.g. the HQA for houses does not identify the 4-bedroom units, the Part V Layout plan does not identify that two houses are 4-bedroom units, different quantum provided for car parking spaces in the Planning RFI Submission (246 spaces) and Traffic and Transport Assessment).
- 2.4.3. I have been able to identify same from a review of the relevant plans/ other documents. These discrepancies are not material and have not prevented me from assessing the appeal case.

Table 1: Key Statistics

Site Area	Total Area: 3.86ha Net Developable Area: 3.64ha
Floor Areas (gross floor spaces)	Total Floor Area: c.16,199sqm* (*from initial application form) Residential: c.14,866sqm* Childcare facility: c.236sqm
Residential component	Total: 164 residential units 64 houses (39%) 46 duplexes (28%) 54 apartments (33%)
Net Density	c.45dph
Building Height	Houses: 2-3 storeys Duplexes: 3-4 storeys

	Apartments: 4-5 storeys
Aspect (duplexes, apts)	Dual Aspect: 100 (100%)
Open Space	Public: c.5,593sqm (P01: c.1,676sqm, P02: 3,433sqm, P03: 484sqm) Communal (Semi Public): c.716sqm (SP01: c.334sqm, SP02: c.142sqm, SP03: 240sqm) Private: gardens, terraces, balconies (various sqm)
Part V provision	Total: 33 units (c.20%) 6 houses, 12 duplexes, and 15 apartments
Car Parking	Total: 246* spaces (*from application and appeal information) Residential: 228 spaces (Houses: 128 spaces, duplexes/ apartments: 101 spaces) Other (childcare, visitor, accessible): 17 spaces
Bicycle Parking	Total: 235 spaces Residential: 235 spaces for duplexes/ apartments above ground floor level Other (childcare, visitor): None provided

Table 2(a): Summary of Residential Unit Mix

Houses (64 units, 39% of the scheme)					
Unit Type	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	Total
Total	-	-	48	16	64
% of Total	-	-	75%	25%	100%
Duplexes (46 units, 28% of the scheme)					
Unit Type	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	Total

Total	-	23	23	-	46
% of Total	-	50%	50%	-	100%
Apartments (54 units, 33% of the scheme)					
Unit Type	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	Total
Total	30	24	-	-	54
% of Total	56%	44%	-	-	100%
Overall Unit Mix as % of Total					
	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	Total
	30	47	71	16	164
	18%	29%	43%	10%	100%

Table 2(b): Summary of Unit Types and Bedspaces

Unit Type Bed/P	1 bed/ 2P	2 bed/ 4P	3 bed/ 5P	4 bed/ 8P	Total
Houses			48	16	64
Duplexes		23	23		46
Apartments	30	24			54
Unit Type Total	30	47	71	16	164
Total Bedspaces	60	188	355	128	731

- 2.5. In the interest of clarity for the Board, I confirm that my assessment (as contained in sections 8.0-11.0 of this report below) has had regard to the initially lodged plans and particulars and, as relevant, the amending documents and/ or reports associated with the RFI outlined above. For example, references to the Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) and Appropriate Assessment Screening Report (AASR), are to be understood as incorporating the information provided in the Ecological Technical Note submitted in the RFI.

3.0 Planning Authority Opinion

- 3.1. Pre-application meetings under section 247 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended (2000 Act) are indicated to have taken place between the applicant and the planning authority on 6th June and 12th July 2023.
- 3.2. A pre-application LRD meeting in accordance with section 32C of the 2000 Act took place on 31st January 2024. The planning authority issued its LRD Opinion on 27th February 2024.
- 3.3. The Opinion indicates that the documentation, submitted under section 32B of the 2000 Act as part of the pre-application consultations, requires further consideration and amendments to constitute a reasonable basis for an application for permission for the proposed LRD.
- 3.4. The applicant was notified that the following issues would need to be addressed and/or information on the following items would be required to be submitted as part of an LRD application. These are grouped under the following headings (in summary, I have removed any repetition in the sequence):
 - Density
 - Access
 - Architectural/ Urban Design, Height and Internal Layout
 - Surface Water Management
 - Noise and Air Quality
 - Drainage and Flood Risk
 - Housing Mix
 - Statement of Consistency
 - Consent for Lodgement
 - Traffic Regulation and Safety
 - Strategic Transport Planning
 - Urban Roads and Street Design
 - Infrastructure Development

- Parks and Recreation
- Environment
- Part V Housing
- Public Lighting
- Biodiversity
- Irish Aviation Authority
- Transport Infrastructure Ireland
- Cork City Childcare
- Uisce Eireann
- Archaeology
- Statement of Response

3.5. The application includes a Statement of Response from the applicant on the LRD Opinion which includes specific responses to the points of information requested by the planning authority.

3.6. For the Board's clarity, signed copies of the minutes of the pre-planning meetings and the planning authority's LRD Opinion are available on the case file/ planning authority's planning register.

4.0 Planning Authority Decision

4.1. Summary of Decision

4.1.1. On 27th January 2025, the planning authority issued a Notification of Decision to Refuse Permission for one reason, as follows:

1. *Having regard to the location of the site, the scale and density of development proposed and the lack of pedestrian infrastructure and linkages to public transport facilities in the area, it is considered that the proposed development would be excessively car dependent contrary to objectives contained within the Cork City Development Plan 2022 - 2028 including Strategic Objectives SO1 'Compact Liveable Growth' , SO2 'Delivering Homes and Communities', SO3*

‘Transport and Mobility’, and SO9 ‘Placemaking and Managing Development’ as well as their supporting objectives including Objective 2.10 ‘The 15 Minute City’, Objective 2.14 ‘Walkable Neighbourhoods’, Objective 3.1 ‘Planning for Sustainable Neighbourhoods’, Objective 4.4 ‘Active Travel’, Objective 4.5 ‘Permeability’ and Objective 11.1 Sustainable Residential Development’.

Furthermore, in the absence of pedestrian infrastructure connecting the development site with available public transport facilities, the proposed development would endanger pedestrian safety by reason of traffic hazard.

The development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

4.2. Planning Authority Reports

4.2.1. Planner’s Report

Initial Assessment

The planner’s report includes an assessment of the proposed development under the following headed items:

- Environmental Assessments – Appropriate Assessment, Environmental Impact Assessment, Ecological Impact Assessment, Flood Risk Assessment
- Principle of Development
- Density and Building Heights
- Architectural/ Urban Design
- Drainage, Flood Risk and Surface Water Management
- Noise and Air Quality
- Sustainable Travel, Active Travel, Connectivity, Future Proofing Travel
- Parks and Recreation – Open Space Provision
- Biodiversity
- Built Heritage – Archaeology
- Childcare Pre-School Facility
- SEVESO Consultation Zone

- Part V Housing
- Development Contributions

The initial assessment concludes with a recommendation that FI be requested from the applicant.

Further Information

On 21st October 2024, FI was requested in respect of the following headed items:

- Appropriate Assessment
- Noise Impact
- Air Quality Impact
- Sustainable and Active Travel/ Traffic Safety
- Public Lighting
- Parks and Recreation
- Housing/ Apartment Standards and Mix
- Childcare Facility
- Architectural/ Urban Design

The FI response was submitted to the planning authority on 20th December 2024.

Recommendation

The planning authority concluded that the proposed development was acceptable in terms of principle, density, building height, unit mix, residential amenity, water and drainage services, flood risk, noise and air quality, public lighting, open space, biodiversity, and archaeology.

However, issues relating to active travel, permeability and future proofing travel remained unresolved. The RFI report of the Strategic Transport Planning section found the proposal did not include a critical link to the closest public bus stop serving the 208 Bus Route (west of the site) at Marymount University Hospital and Hospice. Instead, the proposal was relying on the delivery of public infrastructure associated with ABP 310272 (to the east). The proposal is described as being relatively isolated from local services (refers to employment locations, schools, and a district centre). It

is concluded that the proposal will result in an over reliance on private cars for local trips and errands, negatively impacting on the delivery of compact growth in the area. Further, in relation to accessing public transport (i.e., 208 Bus Route), it is concluded that the proposal will create a traffic hazard on Waterfall Road with the potential for accidents as pedestrians will choose to travel westwards to access the bus terminal in Marymount Hospice (8-12 mins walk from the site) compared to travelling to an alternative stop further to the east on Curraheen Road (16-20 mins walk). Refusal of permission is recommended for these reasons.

The requirement for the proposal to include a pedestrian access to the bus terminal in Marymount Hospice is supported in the RFI reports of the Traffic – Regulation and Safety section and the Urban Roads & Street Design section. Refusal of permission is recommended by both sections due to the absence of same.

The planning authority recommended that permission be refused for the proposed development for one reason, as cited above previously.

The planning authority acknowledged the Cork Childcare Committee's dissatisfaction with the capacity of the proposed childcare facility, however, this was not cited as a refusal reason.

4.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Strategic Transport Planning: FI requested. Subsequent report, permission be refused.

Traffic – Regulation and Safety: FI requested. Subsequent report, permission be refused.

Urban Roads & Street Design: FI requested. Subsequent report, permission be refused.

Biodiversity Officer: FI requested. Subsequent report, no objection subject to condition.

Infrastructure Development: FI requested. Subsequent report, no objection subject to condition.

City Architects: FI requested. Subsequent report, no objection subject to condition.

Environment: No objection subject to condition.

Archaeologist: No objection subject to condition.

Area Engineer: FI requested. Subsequent report, no objection subject to condition.

Parks and Recreation: FI requested. Subsequent report, no objection subject to condition.

Drainage Division: No objection subject to condition.

Housing: No objection subject to condition.

Contributions: No objection subject to condition.

4.3. Prescribed Bodies Submissions

Transport Infrastructure Ireland: requires clarification and/ or prior to commencement conditions relating to the nature and extent of works adjacent to the N40/ South Ring Road (pathways, drainage, noise attenuation, landscaping, boundary treatments). Subsequent report, no further comment.

Inland Fisheries Ireland: requires indication from Uisce Eireann/ planning authority that there is sufficient capacity in the public wastewater system to cater for the proposal, and if granted, that a condition be attached preventing any interference with, bridging, draining, and/ or culverting of the adjacent Two Pot River, its banks or bankside vegetation without the prior approval of the IFI.

Cork Childcare Committee: identifies a shortage of childcare spaces in the wider area, states the facility as proposed with a capacity for 32 children does not satisfy the minimum requirement (estimated as c.36 children), and recommends a larger childcare facility with increased capacity for 64 children offering care for a broader range of age groups.

Uisce Eireann: identifies that verification of the connection to the Waterfall Road Wastewater Pumping Station is necessary and can be completed through survey as part of any future connection application process. Localised upsizing of sewers may be required to facilitate same, and the extent, if any, can be determined at connection application stage. No objection in terms of capacity and requires the applicant enters into the necessary agreements and recommends standard conditions.

Health and Safety Authority: no objection to the proposal in the context of major accidents hazards.

Dublin Airport Authority: No comment.

4.4. Third Party Observations

- 4.4.1. The planning authority indicates submissions were received from four third-parties during the assessment of the application, and summarises the key issues raised.
- 4.4.2. I have reviewed the submissions on the case file and confirm several of the issues raised therein continue to form the basis of the third-party observation (in opposition to the proposal) on the appeal case, which are outlined in detail in section 7.0 below.

5.0 Planning History

Appeal Site

No planning history.

Adjacent Lands to the South

ABP 316899-23, PA Ref. CRK-RZLT-40

On 1st November 2023, the Board confirmed the determination of the planning authority, as appealed by Ardstone Residential Partners Fund, to include lands at Ardarostig, Waterfall, Road, Bishopstown on the Residential Zoned Land Tax Final Map.

ABP 310274-21 (SHD Application)

On 6th September 2021, permission was granted to Ardstone Homes Limited for 275 no. residential units, a childcare facility, a café and associated site works on lands at Ardostig and Waterfall Road, Bishopstown.

Infrastructural works in the scheme included the provision of new vehicular and pedestrian entrances onto Waterfall Road, a cycle track and pedestrian footpath along Waterfall Road (site frontage) and through the scheme, upgrades to existing

shared surface pathways on Waterfall Road (extend path, provide cycle track/ footpaths), and pedestrian crossings on Waterfall Road at The Rise (c.445m to the northeast), and at the Audi Cork/ Heiton Buckley entrance junction adjacent to the South Ring Road flyover (c.370m to the northeast).

The development is at an advanced stage of construction and the estate is named Waterfall Heights.

6.0 Policy Context

6.1. National Policy Context

- 6.1.1. The national policy context guiding future growth in Cork City is determined by frameworks, plans and guidelines including the National Planning Framework (First Revision, April 2025), Housing for All, Climate Action Plans, National Biodiversity Plan, and several section 28 Ministerial Guidelines.

National Planning Framework, First Revision, Project Ireland 2040 (NPF)

- 6.1.2. Several national policy objectives (NPOs) are applicable to the proposed development, a new residential scheme within Cork City and suburbs. These include NPO 4, NPO 7, NPO 8, NPO 16, NPO 42, NPO 43 which support the provision of new homes and targeted population growth in Cork City and suburbs, and NPO 22, NPO 37, NPO 45, NPO 78, NPO 79, NPO 85 and NPO 87 which seek the delivery of well-designed urban schemes that incorporate sustainable modes of transport and water management systems, whilst protecting local biodiversity and the environment.

Housing for All 2021

- 6.1.3. Specifies four pillars by which universal access to quality housing options is to be achieved. Of relevance to the proposed development is the achievement of Pillar 1, increasing new housing supply.

Climate Action Plans 2024 and 2025

- 6.1.4. The Climate Action Plans, to be read in conjunction, outline measures and actions by which the national climate objective of transitioning to a climate resilient, biodiversity rich, environmentally sustainable and climate neutral economy by 2050 is to be achieved. These include the delivery of carbon budgets and the reduction of

emissions across sectors of the economy. Of relevance to the proposed development, is that of the built environment sector. The Board must be consistent with the Plan in its decision making.

National Biodiversity Plan 2023-2030

- 6.1.5. Includes five objectives by which the current national biodiversity agenda is to be set and the transformative changes required to ensure nature is valued and protection is delivered. Of relevance to the proposed development, are the targets and actions associated with Objective 2 on achieving the conservation and restoration needs of environmental designations. Section 59B(1) of the Wildlife (Amendment) Act 2000, as amended, requires the Board to have regard to the objectives and targets of the Plan in the performance of its functions.

Section 28 Ministerial Planning Guidelines

- 6.1.6. Several national planning guidelines are applicable to the proposed development (consolidated compact growth, increased residential densities with a greater mix of building heights and typologies in suburban locations, achievement of necessary standards for residential developments).
- 6.1.7. Several of the guidelines include Specific Planning Policy Requirements (SPPRs), the application of which is mandatory in the design and assessment of residential schemes.
- 6.1.8. The relevant guidelines include the following (my abbreviation in brackets):
- Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2024, (Compact Settlement Guidelines). Applicable policy for the proposed development includes:
 - Section 3.3: requires that densities in the range of 40dph-80dph should be applied for sites in 'City – Suburban/ Urban Extension' locations of Cork City and suburbs.
 - Section 3.4: outlines a two-step density refining process, based firstly on a determination of accessibility to public transport options and secondly on five site-specific criteria (impacts on character, historic environment, protected habitats and species, daylight/ sunlight of residential properties, and water services capacity).

- Policy and Objective 3.1 requires that the recommended density ranges are applied and that, where appropriate, these density ranges are refined further using the site-specific criteria.
- Policy and Objective 4.1 requires the implementation of principles, approaches and standards in the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets, 2013, including updates (DMURS).
- Section 5.3: requires the achievement of residential standards:
 - SPPR 1 – Separation Distances requires a minimum of 16m between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses and duplexes above ground floor level.
 - SPPR 2 – Minimum Private Open Space specifies new standards for houses (3 bed 40sqm, 4 bed+ 50sqm), and private open space for duplexes and apartments remains as per the Apartment Guidelines (see below).
 - Policy and Objective 5.1 recommends a public open space provision of between 10%-15% of net site area.
 - SPPR 3 – Car Parking specifies the maximum allowable rate of car parking provision based on types of locations (e.g., 2 no. spaces per dwelling for intermediate/ peripheral locations).
 - SPPR 4 – Cycle Parking and Storage requires a general minimum standard of 1 no. cycle storage space per bedroom (plus visitor spaces), a mix of cycle parking types, and cycle storage facilities in a dedicated facility of permanent construction (within or adjoining the residences).
 - Section 5.3.7 – Daylight indicates that a detailed technical assessment is not required in all cases, regard should be had to standards in the BRE 209 2022, a balance is required between poor performance and wider planning gains, and compensatory design solutions are not required.

- Sustainable Urban Housing, Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2023 (Apartment Guidelines). Applicable policy for the proposed development (i.e., apartments and duplexes) includes:
 - Section 3.0: Apartment Design Standards includes several SPPRs and design criteria for apartment and duplex units as follows:
 - SPPR 3 (minimum floor areas and, by reference to Appendix 1, minimum storage, private open space areas for 1 to 3 bedroom units), SPPR 4 (50% to be dual aspect units in intermediate/ suburban areas), SPPR 5 (minimum 2.7m requirement for ground level floor to ceiling height), and SPPR 6 (maximum of 12 apartments per floor level per core).
 - Private amenity space for ground floor units shall incorporate appropriate boundary treatment to ensure privacy and security.
 - Private amenity space should be located to optimise solar orientation and designed to minimise overshadowing and overlooking.
 - Ground floor apartments located adjoining the back of a public footpath or other public area, should be provided with a 'privacy strip' (c.1.5m in depth).
 - Section 4.0: Communal Facilities in Apartments includes applicable guidance on refuse storage, communal amenity space, children's play areas, car parking, and bicycle parking with storage (the two latter items are superseded by SPPR 3 and SPPR 4 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines).
 - Refuse storage areas should be of sufficient size to satisfy the three-bin system, not present any safety risks to users, be well-lit, not on the public street, visible to or accessible by the general public. Appropriate visual screening should be provided.
 - Communal amenity space, which is well-designed and maintained, will contribute to meeting the amenity needs of residents.

- Accessible, secure and usable outdoor space is a high priority for families with young children and for less mobile older people.
 - Appendix 1 indicates the minimum required areas for public communal amenity space (1 bed as 5sqm, 2 bed as 7sqm, 3 bed as 9sqm).
 - In general, a clear distinction with an appropriate boundary treatment and/ or a 'privacy strip' should be between private and communal amenity space.
- Urban Development and Building Heights, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, December 2018 (Building Height Guidelines). Applicable policy for the proposed development includes:
 - SPPR 4 requires new residential development on greenfield sites in suburban locations to achieve the minimum density in the applicable section 28 Ministerial Guidelines, a greater mix of building heights and residential typologies, and the avoidance of mono-type building typologies (e.g. two storey or own-door houses only), particularly in developments of 100 units or more.
 - Childcare Facilities, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2001 (Childcare Guidelines). Applicable policy for the proposed development includes:
 - Appendix 2 recommends the provision of a childcare facility with a capacity of 20 childcare spaces per 75 dwellings units.
 - Section 2.4 outlines the scale and/ or requirement for childcare facilities may depend on the nature of the proposed development (reiterated in Section 4.7 of the Apartment Guidelines which allows 1 and 2 bedroom units to be discounted from childcare demand calculations).
 - The Planning System and Flood Risk Management, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2009 (Flood Risk Guidelines). Applicable policy for the proposed development includes:
 - Table 3.1 which provides a classification of vulnerability of different types of development (e.g., residential as highly vulnerable, local transport

infrastructure as less vulnerable, amenity open spaces as water compatible).

- Regulation of Commercial Institutional Investment in Housing, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2021, updated 2023 (Commercial Institutional Investment Guidelines).
 - Section 3 requires restrictions on the first occupation of houses and duplexes to individual purchasers or persons eligible for social and/ or affordable housing, excludes corporate entities.
- Development Management, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2007 (Development Management Guidelines).
 - Section 7.3 outlines the criteria for planning conditions.

6.2. Regional Policy Context

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

- 6.2.1. The RSES provides a development framework for the region, including a specific Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan (MASP) covering Cork City and suburbs, which the appeal site is located within.
- 6.2.2. A number of regional policy objectives are applicable to the proposed development, including:
- RPO 10: Compact Growth in Metropolitan Areas includes:
 - a. Prioritise housing and employment in locations within and contiguous to existing city footprints where it can be served by public transport, walking and cycling.
 - b. Identify initiatives for the MASP areas, which will achieve the compact growth targets on brownfield and infill sites at a minimum and achieve the growth targets identified in each MASP.
 - Cork MASP Policy Objective 1 includes:
 - b. To promote the Cork Metropolitan Area as a cohesive metropolitan employment and property market where population and employment growth is integrated with: (i) the city centre as the primary location at the heart of the metropolitan area and region reinforced by; (ii) the continued regeneration,

consolidation and infrastructure led growth of the city centre, Cork City Docklands, Tivoli and suburban areas, (iii) active land management initiatives to enable future infrastructure led expansion of the city and suburbs.

6.3. Local Policy Context

Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028

- 6.3.1. The applicable development plan for the appeal case is the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028 (CDP). The CDP has been subject to Variation 1 (relating to maximum car parking standards) in May 2023. For the Board's clarity, Draft Variation 2 (relating to the Docklands) is on public consultation at the time of assessment and not applicable to the appeal.
- 6.3.2. The CDP contains map-based designations and policy in several chapters which establish the context for the proposed development (a residential scheme comprised of houses, duplexes and apartments, with a childcare facility, on a greenfield site at an outer suburban location adjacent to a river, in an area of archaeological potential).
- 6.3.3. The relevant CDP map-based/ mapped designations include:
- The site is zoned as ZO 01 'Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods' which seeks 'To protect and provide for residential uses and amenities, local services and community, institutional, educational and civic uses' (Vol 2, Map 8: Southwestern Suburbs).
 - The site is a 'Tier 1' level in the Zoning Tiers in the Growth Strategy Map (Vol 1, Chapter 2, Figure 2.21).
 - The site is located within the 'Outer Suburbs' in respect of Density and Building Heights map (Vol 2, Map 8: Southwestern Suburbs).
 - The site is located within Car Parking Zone 3 (Vol 2, Car Parking Zones).
 - The site is located to the south and west of two designated 'Walkways and Cycleways' routes on Curraheen Road (c.215m) and at the South Ring Road/ Bandon Road roundabout (c.850m) (as measured at closest proximities) (Vol 1, Chapter 4, Fig. 4.3; Vol 2, Map 8: Southwestern Suburbs).

- The site is located to the southeast of the Bus Connects CBC 7 route on Curraheen Road (Vol 1, Chapter 4, Fig. 4.4).
 - Note: CDP information is to be read in conjunction with the most up to date information on www.busconnects.ie/cork/. The third round of consultation (November 2023) identifies the preferred routes for 11 Sustainable Transport Corridors (STCs). Of relevance to the proposal is STC F: Bishopstown to City, which is located to the northeast of the site. The indicative route includes bus stops and commences at the junction of Melbourn Road and Curraheen Road. Using Google mapping, I calculate a separation distance of c.1.3km (walking time c.14-19mins) from the entrance of the proposed development to the closest bus stop on the route of the STC F at the junction of Hawke's Road and Curraheen Road.
- The site is located to the south of the indicative Light Rail Transit (LRT) route (Vol 1, Chapter 4, Fig. 4.7).
 - Note: CDP information is to be read in conjunction with the most up to date information on www.luascork.ie. At the time of this assessment, the 'Emerging Preferred Route Map' (April 2025) is subject to a period of public consultation. Books 1-4 indicate the route map, including the locations of 24 Luas stops. Of relevance to the proposal is the Curraheen Road Luas Stop (Book 2: Cork City West Area, Map 22) at the junction of Melbourn Road and Curraheen Road, located to the northeast of the site. Using Google mapping, I calculate a separation distance of c.1.5km (walking time c.15-20mins) from the entrance of the proposed development to the closest bus stop on the route of the STC F at the junction of Hawke's Road and Curraheen Road.
- The northwestern corner of the site is adjacent to the Two Pot River and the adjacent lands are located within the associated Flood Zones A and B (Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Map 8, pg.88).
- The site is proximate to several recorded archaeological monuments including (closest) CO073-069 Ringfort, CO073-111 Fulacht Fia, CO073-112 Fulacht Fia, CO073-113 Pit Burial, CO073-114 Building, CO073-115 Structure, CO074-128 Burnt Mound, and CO086-134 Enclosure.

- The site is not subject to any other architectural heritage designations, landscape protections, strategic linear views, or other environmental designations.

6.3.4. I identify the most relevant CDP objectives to be as follows (note: for the Board's ease of reference, the 10 objectives included in the planning authority's refusal reason are cited here in full):

- Chapter 1 Introduction:
 - SO1 Compact Liveable Growth – Deliver compact growth that achieves a sustainable 15 minute city of scale providing integrated communities and walkable neighbourhoods, dockland and brownfield regeneration, infill development and strategic greenfield expansion adjacent to the existing city.
 - SO2 Delivering Homes and Communities – Provide densities that create liveable, integrated communities by using a mix of house types, tenures and sizes linked to active and public transport. Provide amenities, services and community and cultural uses to enable inclusive, diverse and culturally rich neighbourhoods.
 - SO3 Transport and Mobility – Integrate land-use and transportation planning to increase active travel (walking and cycling) and public transport usage. Enable the key transport projects in the Cork Metropolitan Area Transport Strategy (CMATS) delivering multi-modal usage and smart mobility, accessible for all.
 - SO9 Placemaking and Managing Development – Develop a compact liveable city based on attractive, diverse and accessible urban spaces and places. Focus on enhancing walkable neighbourhoods that promote healthy living, wellbeing and active lifestyles, where placemaking is at the heart. Follow a design-led approach with innovative architecture, landscape and urban design that respects the character of the city and neighbourhood.
- Chapter 2 Core Strategy:

- Objective 2.10 The 15 Minute City – To support the delivery of a 15-Minute City that supports Compact Liveable Growth by creating vibrant local communities that can access all necessary amenities within a 10-minute walk/cycle and access workplaces and other neighbourhoods with a 15-minute public transport journey. Implementation will include walkable neighbourhoods, towns and communities with mix of uses, house types and tenure that foster a diverse, resilient, socially inclusive and responsive city. This includes support for public and active travel infrastructure projects and services and enhanced neighbourhood permeability. Strategic infrastructure and large-scale developments shall demonstrate how they contribute to a 15-minute city and enhance Cork City’s liveability and accessibility.
- Objective 2.14 Walkable Neighbourhoods – New development shall be designed to make positive additions to their neighbourhoods, towns and communities by:
 - a. Delivering the right mix of uses at a scale and design that creates high quality buildings and spaces.
 - b. Creating attractive, safe and vibrant places designed at a human scale (i.e. places that relate to people, streetscapes and local character) with active streets and avoiding the creation of “dead” spaces.
 - c. Ensuring a child friendly and age friendly environment applying Universal Design principles with a mix of household types.
 - d. Designing a safe place that enables access for all.
 - e. Creating a healthy neighbourhood with increased urban greening and direct access to high quality parks and public spaces, schools, shops and local services.
 - f. Being well-connected with easy access to public transport and active travel.
 - g. Providing enhanced permeability for walking and cycling.

- Objective 2.30 Implementing the Core Strategy – implement and support the delivery of the Core Strategy in accordance with the Core Strategy Map, the Growth Strategy Map, and the Objectives for City Growth.
- Objective 2.31 Compact Growth – target the delivery of 65% of all new homes on lands within the existing built footprint of the City.
- Chapter 3 Delivering Homes and Communities:
 - Objective 3.1 Planning for Sustainable Neighbourhoods – Cork City Council will seek to:
 - a. Utilise the Urban Towns, Hinterland Villages and City Neighbourhoods as spatial units to develop sustainable neighbourhoods, employing the 15-Minute City concept;
 - b. Require development proposals to put placemaking at the heart of their design concept and clearly demonstrate how neighbourhood integration, health and wellbeing and enhancement is central to this;
 - c. Plan for communities in accordance with the aims, objectives and principles of ‘Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas’ and the accompanying ‘Urban Design Manual – A Best Practice Guide’, Universal Design principles and any updates;
 - d. Ensure that an appropriate level of supporting neighbourhood infrastructure is provided in conjunction with, and as an integral component of, residential development in New Sustainable Neighbourhoods;
 - e. Undertake a Cork City Neighbourhoods Strategy during the lifetime of the Plan to identify strategic gaps in the provision of services / infrastructure / resources within existing and proposed neighbourhoods;
 - f. Create healthy and attractive places to live consistent with NPO 4 of the NPF and Goal 3: Sustainable Place Framework of the RSES.
 - Objective 3.5 Residential Density – higher densities to be achieved in accordance with the Cork City Density Strategy, Building Height and Tall Building Study whilst ensuring a balance between protecting the established character of the surrounding area and existing residential

amenities, creating successful integrated neighbourhoods, and achieving high quality architectural, urban and public realm design.

- Objective 3.21 Childcare Facilities – a) to require purpose built childcare facilities as part of proposals for new residential developments of more than 75 dwelling units. However, where it can be clearly established that existing facilities are sufficient, alternative arrangements will be considered.

- Chapter 4 Transport and Mobility:

- Objective 4.4 Active Travel – To actively promote walking and cycling as efficient, healthy, and environmentally friendly modes of transport by securing the development of a network of direct, comfortable, convenient, and safe cycle routes and footpaths across the city.

To support the 15-minute city concept and walkable neighbourhoods with adequate walking and cycling infrastructure connected to high-quality public realm elements, including wayfinding and supporting amenities (benches, water fountains, bike stands).

To support the expansion of the Cork Bikes scheme. To accommodate other innovations such as electric bikes, public car hire, and other solutions that will encourage active travel. To support the rollout of the NTA 5 Year Cycle Plan. To support and engage with the Safe Routes to School programme.

- Objective 4.5 Permeability – a. All new development, particularly alongside the possible routes identified for public transport improvements, shall include permeability for pedestrians, cyclists, and public transport so as to maximise its accessibility.
- b. To maximise permeability, safety, security and connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists by creating direct links to adjacent roads and public transport networks in accordance with the provisions of statutory guidance as prescribed.
- c. Prepare a permeability strategy for areas throughout the city.

- Chapter 9 Environmental Infrastructure:

- Objective 9.10 Development in Flood Risk Areas – restrict development in flood risk areas, required to comply with national planning guidelines, and provide a site-specific flood risk assessment.
- Chapter 11 Placemaking and Managing Development:
 - Cityscape and Building Height:
 - Building Height, Section 11.28 – building height strategy contained in Table 11.1 and will be applied in assessing development proposals (appeal site is in Outer Suburbs with target heights of 2-4 storeys applicable).
 - Residential Development:
 - Objective 11.1 Sustainable Residential Development – Residential developments shall be sustainable and create high quality places which:
 - a. Contribute to placemaking and to the 15-minute city and walkable neighbourhood concepts by planning for vibrant communities, with active streets, urban greening, versatile and creative use of spaces avoiding “dead” spaces;
 - b. Prioritise walking, cycling and public transport, and minimise the need to use cars;
 - c. Deliver a quality of life which residents and visitors are entitled to expect, in terms of amenity, safety and convenience;
 - d. Provide a good range of community and support facilities, where and when they are needed and that are easily accessible;
 - e. Present an attractive, well-maintained appearance, with a distinct sense of place and a quality public realm that is easily maintained;
 - f. Are easy to access for all and to find one’s way around, with a focus on permeability within sites and integration and connectivity into the surrounding urban environment to enable short trips by walking and cycling;

- g. Promote the efficient use of land and of energy, and minimise greenhouse gas emissions;
 - h. Provide a mix of land uses to minimise transport demand;
 - i. Promote social integration and provide accommodation for a diverse range of household types and age groups;
 - j. Enhance and protect green and blue infrastructure and biodiversity;
 - k. Enhance and protect the built and natural heritage.
- Residential Density, Section 11.72 – Table 11.2 indicates density targets across the city, including a density range of 40-60dph for Outer Suburbs (applicable to the appeal site).
 - Dwelling Size Mix, Section 11.76 and Objective 11.2 – all developments in excess of 50 units to comply with target dwelling size mix (appeal site is located in City Suburbs, Table 11.8 applies). Where a clear justification can be provided on the basis of market evidence that demand/ need for a specific dwelling size is lower than the target then flexibility will be provided according to the ranges specified.
 - Sections 11.87 – 11.124 list various quantitative and qualitative standards required to comply with range of national planning guidelines and achieve acceptable levels of future residential amenity.
 - Childcare Facilities, Sections 11.162 – 11.166 outline the requirement for, preferred location, optimum design, and assessment process for childcare facilities.
 - Section 11.245 Electric Vehicle Parking – a minimum of one EV equipped parking space per five car parking spaces, with all other parking spaces developed with appropriate infrastructure (ducting) that enables future installation of a charging point for EVs.
 - Section 11.247 Motorcycle Parking – one motorcycle parking bay per 10 car parking spaces provided for apartment developments.

- Section 11.248 Cycle Parking – 0.5 cycle parking spaces per residential unit in suburb locations.

- Chapter 12 Land Use Zoning Objectives:

- Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods ZO 1.1 – The vision for sustainable residential development in Cork City is one of sustainable residential neighbourhoods where a range of residential accommodation, open space, local services and community facilities are available within easy reach of residents.
- Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods ZO 1.3 – Primary uses in this zone include residential uses, crèches, schools, home-based economic activity, open space and places of public worship.

6.4. Natural Heritage Designations

6.4.1. The appeal site is not located in or immediately adjacent to a European Site, a Natural Heritage Area (NHA) or a proposed NHA (pNHA).

6.4.2. The pNHA designations in proximity to the appeal site include:

- Lee Valley pNHA (000094) is c.2.57km to the north.
- Cork Lough pNHA (001081) is c.3.18km to the northeast.
- Douglas River Estuary pNHA (001046) is c.6.5km to the east.

6.4.3. The European site designations in proximity to the appeal site include (measured at closest proximity):

- Cork Harbour SPA (004030) is c.6.46km to the east.
- Great Island Channel SAC (001058) is c.13.2km to the east.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1. This is a first party appeal against the decision of the planning authority to refuse permission for the proposed development. The appeal grounds include the following items:

Access to the 208 Bus Route

- Evident from the internal reports that the real basis for the refusal reason is the non-provision of a pedestrian connection from the site to the 208 bus service at Marymount Hospice.
- Marymount Hospice is a private entity, the 208 bus stop is located on private property, the siting of the public bus stop on private grounds is described as unusual/ unique.
- Connection to the 208 bus stop through the site was discussed in pre-planning consultations, identified as desirable, but not guaranteed as consent for same would be required from Marymount Hospice.
- Applicant engaged with Marymount Hospice in June 2023 and October 2024.
- The Hospice confirmed it would not consent to the creation of a direct active travel link between the subject site and the 208 bus stop (November 2024, correspondence on case file, reasons listed, indicates willingness to consult with the planning authority directly).
- Applicant willing to support the delivery of a future connection through the subject site to Marymount Hospice if consent is secured.
- Design and layout of the proposal makes provision for pedestrian/ cycle path connection to the point of the Two Pot River.
- Applicant's failure to secure consent from Marymount Hospice to deliver a pedestrian connection to the existing bus stop is not a reasonable basis to preclude a grant of planning permission.
- The siting of the 208 bus stop terminal (on private lands with restricted public access) is a legacy issue which can only be resolved between the National Transport Authority, Cork City Council and the private landowner.
- Alternative options include re-routing the 208 bus service to use the permitted and proposed bus stops on Waterfall Road or relocating the 208 bus terminal to the western corner of the appeal site (as per 'Route Options Map' in the appeal).

Links to Public Transport and Services

- Rejects that there is a lack of pedestrian infrastructure and linkages to public transport facilities in the area as stated in the refusal reason.
- Identifies a 208 bus stop located on Curraheen Road to the northeast of the site as an alternative to the bus stop in Marymount Hospice.
- Indicates the walking times of two routes to that bus stop as 13 minutes (c.1km) and 15 minutes (c.1.2km) (GIS-based connectivity context map, as per 'Accessibility Map' in the appeal).
- Disputes the longer walking times cited in the Strategic Transport Section's report of 16-20 minutes.
- Identifies desire lines to the local neighbourhood centre, Bishopstown Court Shopping Centre, located to the east of the site. Indicates the walking time to the centre is 11 minutes (c.0.9km) via the direct pedestrian and cycle routes along Waterfall Road provided through the SHD application.
- Alternatives access options exist to the wider area than just that of the pedestrian connection to the 208 bus service at Marymount Hospice (as per 'Emerging Neighbourhood Centre Map' in the appeal).

Car Dependence

- Rejects that the proposal will be excessively car dependent due to the nature and extent of the links to public transport and services as outlined.
- Proposal has been designed to maximise the potential for active travel (e.g., cycle track provided to the Two Pot River which intersects with the indicated route for the CycleConnects Cork objective, as per 'Emerging Neighbourhood Centre Map' in the appeal).
- Approach to car parking (less than the CDP maximum requirement for residences) and cycle parking (in excess of) provision also encourages active travel.
- Proposal cannot be reasonably described as car-dependent.

Endanger Public Safety

- Proposal endangering pedestrian safety by reason of traffic hazard cannot be reasonably applied.

- Finding of traffic hazard arises from the non-provision of a pedestrian connection west of Waterfall Road to the 208 bus stop at Marymount Hospice as this may result in people walking along the public road to access the bus stop.
- An alternative option to access the 208 bus service has been identified via a safe footpath connection to the bus stop on Curraheen Road.
- Concerns regarding unsafe conditions for pedestrians on Waterfall Road reflects knowledge of an existing safety issue associated with the 208 bus stop being located in Marymount Hospice.
- Solutions (re-routing bus service, relocating terminal bus stop) should be progressed by those responsible for the coordination and delivery of public transport in Cork City.
- Design of the footpath and cycle path in the southwestern corner of the scheme are intentionally terminated short of the site boundary, and routed north and then west.
- Proposal will not give rise to any traffic hazard on Waterfall Road, as future residents are not encouraged to enter the public carriageway and walk westwards towards Marymount Hospice on the public road.
- The Road Safety Audit prepared for the proposal demonstrates that the scheme is safe from a design perspective.
- The Mobility Management Plan for the scheme prioritises active travel links to the north and west of the subject site reflecting the quality nature of the pedestrian and cycle network.

Compliance with Development Plan Policy

- Highlights the refusal reason makes only general reference to a number of different policy objectives in the CDP.
- Submits that on review of same, the proposed development will not be contrary to any of the objectives.

- Quotes the ten objectives referred to in the refusal reason and outlines how the proposed development complies with same. Traffic and transport related responses are reiterated from the four headed items (as summarised above).

7.2. Planning Authority Response

7.2.1. No response has been received from the planning authority on the appeal.

7.3. Observations

7.3.1. Two observations have been made on the first party appeal. The first observation, from an observer (J. and T. Hogan) with an address in the vicinity of the appeal site, is in opposition to the proposed development (initial submission to the planning authority included). The second observation, made by the landowner of the appeal site (P. Coveney), is in support.

7.3.2. Key issues raised in the observations include the following:

Opposition

- Exacerbate an existing traffic nightmare.
- Currently only access to Bishopstown area is via a flyover bridge.
- Undue burden being placed on Waterfall Road (new development Waterfall Heights, junction of Waterfall Road and R849 already congested).
- Detrimental impact on local environment through loss of green space, wildlife, habitats.
- Density excessive for the area, especially with recent a development (274 residential units), reduction in amenity of existing residents.
- Lack of adequate consultation, community concerns not being addressed.

Support

- Disputes that the proposed development is contrary to the referenced CDP objectives having regard to their actual wording.
- Regard has not been had to the Tier 1 status of the site (Growth Strategy Map, CDP, pg. 51).

- Consideration has not been had to other potential options which could connect the site with the 208 and 210 bus routes. For example, a potential pedestrian route is indicated extending from the western corner of the site along the southern side of the N40 slip road and intersecting on an arm of the roundabout prior to the entrance of Marymount Hospice (as per 'Fig. 3' of the observation).
- Regard has not been had to the site's strategic location on the cycle network proposed for Cork Metropolitan Area, CycleConnects.
- ABP 310274-21 set a precedent for permitting a higher density residential scheme pending the implementation of local pedestrian and cyclist facilities.
- The refusal of permission for the proposed development would set a negative precedent for other undeveloped residentially zoned lands in the area.

8.0 Planning Assessment

8.1. Introduction

8.1.1. Having reviewed the appeal, examined all other documentation on the case file, inspected the site, and had regard to the relevant national, regional, and local policies and guidance, I consider the main issues in the appeal to be as follows:

- Development Plan Policy
- Residential Density
- Access, Transportation and Traffic
- Design and Layout
- Other Matters

I propose to address each item in turn below.

8.1.2. As outlined in section 2.0 above, I consider there to be planning merit in the proposed development as revised in the RFI, and the following assessment is based on the amended scheme.

8.1.3. In respect of the proposed development, I have carried out a screening determination for appropriate assessment (AA), a pre-screening and a screening

determination for environmental impact assessment (EIA), and a screening determination for water status impact assessment (WSIA). These are presented in sections 9.0, 10.0, and 11.0 below and are to be read in conjunction with Appendices 1-4 of this report.

8.2. Development Plan Policy

- 8.2.1. The planning authority's refusal reason has several component parts which require examination. Arising from concerns regarding the site's location, the scale and density of development, and the lack of supporting transportation infrastructure (pedestrian paths, linkages to public transport), the proposal is considered to be excessively car dependant, found to be contrary to 10 objectives of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028 (CDP), and deemed to be a traffic hazard due to endangering pedestrian safety.
- 8.2.2. For the Board's ease of reference, I have cited the refusal reason in section 4.0 and the objectives in full in section 6.0 above in this report.
- 8.2.3. Because of the nature of the refusal reason (i.e., the number of CDP objectives the proposal is stated as being contrary to) and the opposing appeal grounds, I consider a subsection on development plan policy is necessary. In this subsection, I propose to consider CDP policy as relevant to the site's location (the first concern raised in the refusal reason), and the principle of development.

Zoning Objective

- 8.2.4. The site is located in a semi-rural/ outer suburban area of southwest Cork City. The immediate area surrounding the site comprises several detached residences on large plots. Waterfall Road forms the site's southern boundary and, at this location, is a two-way local tertiary road without dedicated foot/ cycle paths.
- 8.2.5. Notwithstanding the semi-rural/ outer suburban location of the site, I note that the area is in flux and has experienced changes, primarily through the development of the residential estate Waterfall Heights adjacent to the south, and the Bishopstown Court neighbourhood/ services centre on Bandon Road further to the east. On the northern side of South Ring Road are the established residential areas of Curraheen, Halldene, and The Rise.

- 8.2.6. The site is zoned as ZO 01 'Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods' and identified as being within the 'Tier 1' level of the Zoning Tiers on the CDP's Growth Strategy Map (see section 6.0 of this report above). I consider the site's designation as the primary residential zoning objective (i.e., of three residential zonings) and its selection within the first level of zoning tiers (of three), to indicate that the timely and preferential (in terms of sequential) development of the site for new residences is fundamentally supported in the CDP.
- 8.2.7. In respect of zoning objectives of the surrounding lands, I note that the established residential areas to the north of the site/ South Ring Road are also zoned as ZO 01. While the planning authority reports describe the site as being at the very edge of the City and relatively isolated, I consider that the zoning of the site as ZO 01 represents the planned extension, in a southerly direction, of the established residential use towards and of the site due to its being considered wholly appropriate to be developed as such.
- 8.2.8. Conversely, I note that the Waterfall Heights scheme is zoned as ZO 02 'New Residential Neighbourhoods' and identified as within Tier 2. These designations reflect its location further from the established northern residential areas, its being to the south of South Ring Road, on the southern side of Waterfall Road, and adjacent to the ZO 20 'City Hinterland' zoning.
- 8.2.9. The appeal grounds include that granting permission for Waterfall Heights established a precedent that is of relevance to the proposed development. With regard to CDP policy, I concur and find that the positive assessment of these lands for residential purposes was, in terms of sequential development, less preferable than the development of the appeal site is now for the same use.

Principle of Development

- 8.2.10. Further, with regard to the general principle of development, I am satisfied that the proposed development complies with objectives Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods ZO 1.1 and ZO 1.3 (see section 6.0 above) by creating a sustainable accessible residential neighbourhood with use classes that accord with the underlying zoning.

Objectives in the Refusal Reason

- 8.2.11. The planning authority's refusal reason states that the proposed development is contrary to 10 objectives of the CDP. These include four strategic objectives from the introductory Chapter 1, two objectives relating to the Core Strategy, one objective from both Chapter 3 and Chapter 11 relating to residential development, and two objectives from Chapter 4 relating to active travel and permeability.
- 8.2.12. In the first party appeal, the applicant rejects the basis for the refusal reason, highlights that the reason makes only general reference to the different CDP objectives and submits that the proposed development is not contrary to any of the objectives on review of the actual wording of same. The same position is stated in the supporting observation on the appeal.
- 8.2.13. No response has been received from the planning authority on the first party appeal.
- 8.2.14. As relevant to the following subsections, I propose to examine whether the proposed development is contrary to the stated objectives. I highlight to the Board that there is a notable degree of overlap between the objectives due to their number, scope and content.

Conclusion

- 8.2.15. In conclusion, in terms of zoning, sequence, and principle, I consider that the CDP firmly establishes that the development of the site for residential purposes is suitable, preferential, and appropriate. More detailed considerations of the manner by which the proposed development complies with development plan policy, as cited in the refusal reason, are outlined as relevant in the following subsections.

8.3. Residential Density

- 8.3.1. The planning authority's refusal reason cites concerns relating to the scale and density of the proposed development, linking these to excessive car dependency and being contrary to several CDP objectives. In the appeal grounds, the applicant states the proposal has a residential density of 45dph which complies with the requirements of both the Compact Settlement Guidelines and CDP policy.
- 8.3.2. Concern relating to the density of the scheme and the adverse impact on the receiving area (traffic, amenities) are also raised in the third-party observation in opposition to the proposal. Accordingly, an examination of whether the proposed residential density complies with the applicable policy context and a consideration of

the impacts associated with the population increase on the receiving area are required.

Density Range

- 8.3.3. Arising from the Compact Settlement Guidelines (see section 6.0 of this report above), the site is within a 'City – Suburban/ Urban Extension' location. The recommended density for such areas is in the range of 40dph-80dph. The proposed development has a density of 45dph, which, as noted in the planning officer's report, while being at the lower end of the permissible density range, is acceptable.
- 8.3.4. The guidelines require a density refining process based on accessibility to public transport options and site-specific criteria. As is outlined in the following subsection, the site displays accessibility features of both intermediate and peripheral locations. This is due to the availability of existing and planned transport options for future residents but the site being in excess (albeit marginally) of the recommended 1km walking distance to an existing (208 Bus Route) or planned (Bus Connects STC F) high frequency (10 mins) urban bus service (closest bus stop on Curraheen Road).
- 8.3.5. Of the five site-specific criteria (impacts on character, historic environment, protected habitats and species, daylight/ sunlight of residential properties, and water services capacity), I do not consider the site to be overly restricted by these, and certainly not to the extent that a refining process would be necessary. Therefore, on balance, I consider the proposed density of 45dph to be an optimum residential density for the scheme, thereby providing a sustainable quantum of dwellings units at this zoned and serviced site.
- 8.3.6. In this regard, I am satisfied that the proposed development similarly complies with CDP Objectives 2.30 and 2.31 (cited in section 6.0 above) by firstly, supporting the delivery of the planning authority's Core Strategy through implementing the provisions of the Growth Strategy Map, and secondly, by targeting the delivery of a notable number of new homes on lands within the existing built footprint of the City. Further, the proposal complies with CDP policy on residential density in Section 11.72 and Table 11.2 which indicates density targets across the City, including a density range of 40-60dph for Outer Suburbs locations such as the site.
- 8.3.7. Of relevance to residential density, the planning authority's refusal reason cites the proposal as being contrary to SO2 Delivering Homes and Communities. Conversely,

I do not agree, instead finding that the density of the scheme is appropriate for the site, and allows for a mix of residential accommodation, amenities (open spaces, childcare facility), active travel infrastructure (pedestrian, cycle tracks) connected to existing and growing communities to the north, northeast, and south.

Population Increase

- 8.3.8. In considering the impact of the proposal on the receiving area, I have reviewed spatial and population data in the 2022 Census. The site is located within the Local Electoral Area of Cork City South West, the population of which is 51,063 persons (Census website, information is correct as of the date of this report).
- 8.3.9. For the proposal, I estimate there to be a population increase of between c.453-731 persons (c.0.89%-1.43% increase in the Electoral Area's population). This range is based on the 2022 Census average household size for the Electoral Area (c.2.76 persons) and the total number of bedspaces in the scheme (if all bedspaces were to be occupied, see Table 2(b), section 2.0 of this report above).
- 8.3.10. Having regard to the unit mix and the proportion of 1 and 2-bedroom units in the overall scheme (47%), I consider a population increase nearer the Electoral Area's household average to be more likely (i.e., c.453 persons, c.0.89% increase). I consider this proportion of population growth to be well within acceptable parameters for the Electoral Area and this part of Cork City.
- 8.3.11. While I acknowledge concerns expressed in the third party observation, on review of several reports on the case file, including the Statement of Consistency, Childcare Needs Assessment, Traffic and Transport Assessment, Infrastructure Report, and the EIA Screening Report (which consider in combination impacts with adjacent developments), I do not anticipate any undue impacts on the social environment of this area of the City, which offers a wide range of facilities and services.

Conclusion

- 8.3.12. In conclusion, in principle, the proposed development with a density of 45dph and yielding a population increase in the region of c.453 persons, complies with the policy context set at national, regional and local levels (including SO2 Delivering Homes and Communities) for future growth in this southwest suburb of Cork City,

and would not result in any undue or significant negative impact on the receiving environment.

8.4. Access, Transportation and Traffic

- 8.4.1. The issues of access, transportation, and traffic are key in the determination of this appeal case. Dissatisfaction with, and concerns arising from, these issues form the basis of the planning authority's refusal reason of the proposed development.
- 8.4.2. In terms of access, I consider pedestrian (and cycle) access to and from the site, including westwards to the bus terminal in Marymount Hospice, and eastwards via the infrastructure associated with Waterfall Heights to the wider surrounding area. In terms of transportation, I consider the existing and planned public transportation available for future residents, the linkages and distances to different modes of transport, and the CDP policy context for same. While in terms of traffic, are considerations of excessive car dependence, pedestrian safety and traffic hazard.
- 8.4.3. For the Board's clarity, I propose to address each substantive issue in turn, with a determination on compliance with the CDP objectives as relevant. The appeal grounds also raise the issue of precedent, stating that the decision to refuse permission and the reason for same, are inconsistent with the positive assessment of the SHD application, Waterfall Heights, which would have had a similar context.

Access to the West

- 8.4.4. Current access to the site is via an agricultural entrance from Waterfall Road. At this location, the public road serves two-way traffic but is without dedicated foot/ cycle paths. Marymount Hospice grounds are located adjacent to the west of the site and can be accessed from Waterfall Road. The grounds accommodate the bus terminal for the 208 Bus Route, located on the western side of the complex. I calculate a distance of c.730m from the site's entrance to the bus terminal (walking time c.9-12mins).
- 8.4.5. The northwest of the site is bound by the Two Pot River and is adjacent to the grounds of Marymount Hospice. In the proposal, there is a pedestrian/ cycle pathway extending westwards from the proposed residences to the river's edge. The provision of a dedicated pedestrian pathway in the proposal allowing future

residents/ other users safe access to the bus terminal in the Marymount Hospice grounds is a fundamental consideration in this appeal.

- 8.4.6. From a review of the case file, I have tracked the discussions regarding the provision of the pedestrian access in the records of the preplanning consultations, LRD Opinion and Statement of Response, planning authority internal reports, FI request, applicant's RFI including correspondence from Marymount Hospice, alternatively worded refusal reasons, CE order with the final refusal reason, and appeal grounds.
- 8.4.7. I acknowledge the planning authority's position and agree with securing greater permeability in our built environments and achieving increased opportunities for active travel. However, in this instance, the provision of a dedicated pedestrian pathway through the site, over a river, and into private property is simply not as straightforward had the pedestrian pathway been attainable along the public road and the site (thereby requiring only the consent of the planning authority and the applicant).
- 8.4.8. In the appeal grounds, the applicant has outlined the extent of lands under its control, consultation and engagement with Marymount Hospice to try to secure consent for the pedestrian pathway through their lands, and alternative access options to the bus service as consent was not forthcoming (e.g., re-routing the 208 bus service along Waterfall Road using the permitted and proposed bus stops, relocating the bus terminal to the appeal site) (I also note other options from the supporting third-party observation on publicly controlled roads, as per Fig 3 of same).
- 8.4.9. I consider that the applicant has undertaken available actions including reasonable attempts to secure consent from Marymount Hospice for the pedestrian connection to the bus terminal, suggestion of options by other relevant stakeholders, and ensuring that the design and layout of the proposed development incorporates the pathway to the site's boundary with the river and Marymount Hospice grounds to allow for continued access in the future.
- 8.4.10. Unarguably, the provision of a dedicated pedestrian pathway through the scheme to the bus terminal would have been the optimum outcome for the proposed development and emerging neighbourhood. However, I confirm to the Board that there is no CDP designated 'Walkways and Cycleways' applicable to the site and/ or the bus terminal in Marymount Hospice (as identified elsewhere in the area, see

section 6.0 of this report). That being, there is no local policy context/ map-based designation requiring the provision for the pedestrian pathway as an objective of the CDP.

8.4.11. In this regard, I agree with the applicant, and find that the provision of the pathway is desirable, would be advantageous, but is not a prerequisite to the site's development. As such, I do not consider the absence of the fully connected pathway to be a reasonable basis for a refusal of permission. This is especially relevant as I consider there to be an alternative option available to access the site and proposed development from the east.

Access to the East

8.4.12. On the southern side of Waterfall Road, c.30m to the east of the site's existing entrance is Waterfall Heights (measured at the western edge of the estate's street frontage). Waterfall Heights (SHD application, granted under ABP 310274-21) is at an advanced stage of construction and occupation. The existing/ under construction infrastructure incorporated into Waterfall Heights is of relevance to the appeal.

8.4.13. The transportation infrastructure in the permission includes the following:

- A new vehicular access and pedestrian entrances onto Waterfall Road.
- A two-way cycle track and pedestrian footpath along Waterfall Road (site frontage) which continues through the scheme linking to an existing shared surface pathway to the south of South Ring Road.
- Upgrades to this shared surface path to provide two-way cycle track and pedestrian footpath.
- Upgrades to Waterfall Road to extend the existing pedestrian pathway to the scheme.
- A pedestrian crossing on Waterfall Road opposite The Rise/ Halldene Villas junction (c.445m to the northeast).
- A pedestrian crossing at the Audi Cork/ Heiton Buckley entrance junction adjacent to N40 (c.370m to the northeast).

8.4.14. Condition 10 of the permission relates to access, roads, and parking. The condition comprises several sub-items, a number of which require prior to commencement

agreement/ have a phasing effect. Of note include Conditions 10(b) and (g) relating to the pedestrian crossing at Waterfall Road to The Rise and Halldene (location, full details, traffic management, ancillary design measures), Condition 10(c) relating to works on Waterfall Road (transition zones, gateways), and Condition 10(d) relating to full details of cycling infrastructure.

8.4.15. I have reviewed ABP 310274-21 and direct the Board to the following key plans which indicate these infrastructural components: Dwg No. P1004 (Proposed Site Layout Plan Part 1), Dwg No. P1005 (Proposed Site Layout Plan Part 2), Dwg No. P6001 (Proposed Connectivity to Existing Pedestrian Infrastructure), and Dwg No. P6002 (New Footpath to Front of Valhalla).

8.4.16. In respect of the transportation infrastructure associated with Waterfall Heights, at the time of my site inspection, I noted the completion of the footpath from the estate's main entrance (on the southern side of Waterfall Road) in a westerly direction towards the site's entrance (maintained as the location of the entrance of the proposed development), and the advanced stage of construction/ near-completion of the footpath from the estate's entrance (also on the southern side of Waterfall Road) in an easterly direction tying-in with the existing footpath located proximate to the fly-over/ overpass of the South Ring Road.

8.4.17. That being, the provision of a near-continuous pedestrian access from west of the main entrance of Waterfall Heights in an easterly direction to established residential areas of The Rise and Halldene is presently at an advanced stage.

8.4.18. In the planning authority reports, the transportation infrastructure incorporated into Waterfall Heights is acknowledged, however, there are reservations regarding the extent to which the proposed development seeks to rely on same, and the outstanding timelines for the construction, completion and operation of same. As such, the planning authority does not consider the easterly access to transportation links to be an acceptable alternative to the provision of the western pedestrian pathway to the bus terminal in Marymount Hospice.

8.4.19. As outlined above, the sub-items of Condition 10 require prior to commencement agreement on the delivery of these infrastructural components. In the appeal grounds, the applicant refers to the CEMP and highlights that the construction

programme for the proposal relies on the adjoining SHD development being completed, citing an estimated completion date of end 2025.

- 8.4.20. The planning authority has not responded to the appeal, and I have not been able to identify from the planning authority reports whether compliance with conditions has been secured by the developer of Waterfall Heights.
- 8.4.21. I direct the Board to Dwg No. DR-A-010-ZB (Site Layout Plan) from the RFI of the proposed development, which indicates the proposed access arrangements and infrastructure along Waterfall Road (main entrance, pedestrian pathways, cycle track, road paving, pedestrian crossing, and potential bus stop/ shelter). The Site Layout Plan also indicates the transportation infrastructure serving Waterfall Heights and the manner by which the proposed development will link in and connect with same (by way of the pedestrian/ cycle path along the site frontage on Waterfall Road and a toucan crossing). In the event of a grant of permission, to ensure a timely and safe access to the proposal, I recommend these elements are conditioned to be in place prior to the occupation of any residential units.
- 8.4.22. Having regard to the foregoing, I consider that pedestrian access to the proposed development from an easterly direction, relying on and connecting with the infrastructure incorporated into Waterfall Heights, is and will be a viable option which can reasonably be considered in the determination of this appeal. In so finding, I do not consider there to be any impediment to granting permission for the proposed development relating to an absence of or restrictions in access arrangements. Therefore, I do not concur with the basis of the planning authority's refusal reason.
- 8.4.23. Of relevance to access, the planning authority's refusal reason cites the proposal as being contrary to SO3 Transport and Mobility, Objective 4.4 Active Travel, Objective 4.5 Permeability, and Objective 11.1 Sustainable Residential Development. Conversely, I do not agree, instead finding that the proposed development is of a design which includes permeability, promotes walking and cycling, increases active travel, and supports public transport usage. The proposal is part of, served by, and accessible to a wider network of footpaths and cycle routes, thereby using all available and viable options to maximise its accessibility.

Transportation

- 8.4.24. With regard to existing public transport, the principal mode serving the site is the 208 Bus Route. As outlined above, the bus terminal of the service is located to the west of the site in Marymount Hospice.
- 8.4.25. The planning authority reports describe the bus service as being very good, running every 10 minutes. The terminal is acknowledged as the closest bus stop to the proposed development, with an estimated walking time of 8-12 minutes via Waterfall Road. However, the route is described as being particularly unsafe to walk due to the absence of a dedicated footpath and presence of a number of bends. The current use of the public road by pedestrians walking to the bus terminal is acknowledged in the reports.
- 8.4.26. The planning authority considers alternative routes to reach a bus stop further along the 208 Bus Route on Curraheen Road (to the northeast of the site), and estimates walking times of 16-20 minutes (no mapped routes provided). The planning authority concludes that, due to the shorter distances and walking times, future residents will likely choose to walk along Waterfall Road to the bus terminal, thus creating a traffic hazard.
- 8.4.27. In the appeal grounds, the applicant disputes the walking times of the alternative routes as estimated by the planning authority. The applicant, with reference to GIS-based connectivity context mapping, submits that the walking times of the two routes are instead 13 minutes (c.1km) and 15 minutes (c.1.2km) (shown on the 'Accessibility Map' in the appeal). The applicant also identifies other destinations in the wider area, such as the Bishopstown Court Shopping Centre, located to the east of the site. Relying on the same mapping source, the walking time to the neighbourhood centre is 11 minutes (c.0.9km) via the pedestrian routes along Waterfall Road provided through Waterfall Heights.
- 8.4.28. With regard to planned public transport, I have previously identified the infrastructure relevant to the site from the CDP (see section 6.0 above). The supporting infrastructure includes indicative Walkways and Cycleways, Bus Connects and LRT routes planned in the vicinity of Bishopstown and Waterfall Road. I confirm to the Board that I have reviewed the most recent information on these planned public transport modes, which for Bus Connects dates from November 2023 and for Luas is April 2025 (after the first party appeal was lodged).

- 8.4.29. As outlined above, provision of a dedicated footpath from the site to established areas of the City suburbs (Halldene, The Rise, Wilton) and developing areas (Bishopstown Court neighbourhood centre) is at an advanced stage of construction. I consider it reasonable to assume that the permitted pedestrian/ cycle infrastructure associated with Waterfall Heights would be delivered and operational by the time of the earliest occupation of the proposed development.
- 8.4.30. Using Google Earth, I have calculated the approximate distances and walking times from the proposed development's entrance via Waterfall Heights infrastructure to the closest indicated stops on the preferred Bus Connects and Luas routes. These include c.1.3km (walking time c.14-19mins) to the Curraheen Road stop on Bus Connects STC F route and c.1.5km (walking time c.15-20mins) to the Curraheen Road Luas Stop.
- 8.4.31. Of relevance to transportation (separation distances, walking times to existing and proposed modes of public transport), I identify the relevant CDP objectives cited in the refusal reason as being those which are related to the '15-minute City concept'. These are SO1 Compact Liveable Growth, Objective 2.10 The 15 Minute City, Objective 3.1 Planning for Sustainable Neighbourhoods, Objective 4.4 Active Travel, and Objective 11.1 Sustainable Residential Development.
- 8.4.32. I consider that the walking distances I have estimated to the closest stops of the preferred Bus Connects route (c.1.3km, c.14-19mins) and Luas route (c.1.5km, c.15-20mins), and the walking distances indicated in the first party appeal to alternative bus stops (to the terminal at Marymount Hospice) on the existing 208 Bus Route (c.1km, 13mins, and c.1.2km, 15mins) to reasonably come within the scope of the 15-minute City concept.
- 8.4.33. Further, in my opinion, the proposed development constitutes compact growth and strategic greenfield expansion adjacent to the existing City. The scheme will provide walkable, connected, and sustainable neighbourhoods, and is sufficiently close to existing and planned public transport modes to meaningfully support public and active travel infrastructure projects and services.
- 8.4.34. Having regard to the applicant's and my own analysis, I do not find there to be a lack of pedestrian infrastructure (existing, proposed) and/ or linkages to public transport facilities (existing, proposed) in the area as is concluded by the planning authority.

Accordingly, I am satisfied that the proposed development is consistent with strategic CDP policy for the sustainable development of the City suburbs.

Traffic

- 8.4.35. Traffic related considerations in the appeal include the planning authority's overall finding that the proposed development would be excessively car dependent, and its final conclusion that the proposal would endanger pedestrian safety due to traffic hazard.
- 8.4.36. In respect of car dependency, the applicant disagrees with the planning authority's position. The appeal grounds refer to the nature and extent of the links to public transport and local services, the opportunities for active travel which have been designed into the scheme (pedestrian, cycling), and the approach taken to car and cycle parking. Of the latter, the applicant outlines there is a maximum CDP requirement of 292 car parking spaces for the residences, with 228 car spaces being provided. 235 cycle parking spaces are provided for duplex and apartments (without ground floor amenity space), which is in excess of the minimum CDP requirement.
- 8.4.37. I have considered the positions of the planning authority and applicant. As I have outlined previously, I find that there are adequate pedestrian links to different modes of public transport (existing, planned), to local services and amenities, and emerging neighbourhoods which will serve as meaningful alternatives to undertaking private car trips. Similarly, I consider the proposed development has adequately incorporated pedestrian infrastructure and cycle routes into the scheme.
- 8.4.38. The quantum of car parking provided for the residential component of the scheme is consistent with the requirements of the Compact Settlement Guidelines (maximum 2 spaces per unit in intermediate/ peripheral locations) and the CDP (similar standards for zone 3). Further, I consider the quantum, design and layout of car parking within the proposal to be typical of similar mid-scaled, medium density residential schemes, and would not characterise the scheme as excessively car dependent.
- 8.4.39. In respect of pedestrian safety and traffic hazard, I acknowledge the concerns of the planning authority regarding increased risks to public safety associated with additional pedestrian trips along Waterfall Road towards the bus terminal in Marymount Hospice.

- 8.4.40. I travelled this route at the time of my site inspection and, as stated in planning authority reports, the stretch of road has bends which limit visibility in places. The road was relatively busy with vehicles, drivers had to slow to pass me, and I stepped into the grass verge and/ or the recesses of properties (houses, businesses, farms, fields) as necessary.
- 8.4.41. Notwithstanding the current conditions, this is a public road, is accessible, and pedestrians are free to make the choice to use same. Importantly, for the determination of this appeal, as I have outlined above there is/ will be an alternative route to the east of the site connecting future residents safely to public transport and other services.
- 8.4.42. Finally, I note the appeal grounds on the creation of traffic hazard, that the route of the foot/ cycle path (southwest corner) has been designed to discourage residents from entering the road and walking westwards, the Road Safety Audit demonstrates that the scheme is safe from a design perspective, and the Mobility Management Plan prioritises active travel links in alternative directions. Having regard to the above, I do not concur with the planning authority that the proposed development would endanger pedestrian safety due to traffic hazard.

Precedent

- 8.4.43. The appeal grounds include that granting permission for Waterfall Heights established a precedent that is of relevance to the proposed development. Under ABP 310274, the Board, supported by the planning authority, determined that residential development was appropriate at that time and in that location. I consider that the planning authority's decision to refuse permission and the basis of the refusal reason for the proposed development are inconsistent with the assessment of the SHD application.
- 8.4.44. The decision to positively consider the SHD application was made notwithstanding the limited supporting transportation infrastructure in the area at the time, the likely private car use (until the delivery of alternative infrastructure) and the similar potential for pedestrians to travel westwards on Waterfall Road to the 208 bus stop in Marymount Hospice.
- 8.4.45. I concur with the applicant's position (and raised in the supporting third-party observation) and find that the development of these lands for residential purposes

came at a time that was, in terms of availability of, and servicing by transportation infrastructure, less preferable than the appeal site for development.

Conclusion

- 8.4.46. In conclusion, in terms of access, transportation, and traffic, I do not concur with the planning authority that the absence of supporting infrastructure (dedicated pedestrian pathways, linkages to public transport) is such as to give rise to excessive car use in the proposed development and to endanger pedestrian safety through traffic hazard. Notwithstanding that a pedestrian access connecting the proposed development to public transport in the west is not provided, I consider that there is a viable alternative pedestrian access from the proposed development to other transport infrastructure and key locations to the east. The alternative pedestrian access and the links formed to public transport ensure the proposed development complies with seven of the 10 objectives cited in the planning authority's refusal reason.

8.5. Design and Layout

- 8.5.1. In the previous subsection, I have reviewed and assessed in detail the proposal in terms of accessibility and connectivity, about which there is a notable degree of overlap with the core elements of design and layout. Arising from the planning authority's refusal reason, I identify issues of placemaking, appropriate scale and contribution to neighbourhood as outstanding matters to be considered in this subsection.
- 8.5.2. Additionally, from a review of the case file, I identify the issues of dwelling size mix and childcare infrastructure as requiring specific examination.

Placemaking and Neighbourhood

- 8.5.3. Of relevance to design and layout, the planning authority's refusal reason cites the proposal as being contrary to SO9 Placemaking and Managing Development and Objective 2.14 Walkable Neighbourhoods. Conversely, I do not agree, instead finding that, overall, the proposal's layout is compact and legible (the apartment and duplex buildings are arranged in a linear format at the front of the scheme addressing the road, while to the rear, the houses are grouped in compact distinct cells defined by open spaces and roadways), and the design is permeable and

connected (pedestrian/ cycle paths are provided within the scheme, including the dedicated path traversing the south of the site adjacent to the road, which extends westwards to the Two Pot River, and eastwards to link with the infrastructure on the southern side of Waterfall Road, thereby connecting the proposal to the Waterfall Heights estate and in turn to adjoining neighbourhoods located further to the east and northeast).

- 8.5.4. Of the more detailed design, I find that the height, scale and massing of the buildings are appropriate to the configuration of the site and consistent with the character of the emerging neighbourhood being created by Waterfall Heights (the proposed apartment and duplex buildings are similar in scale and height to those in the Waterfall Heights, which are sited along the southern side of Waterfall Road, thereby balancing Waterfall Heights). I consider that the proposed development will be a positive addition to the emerging neighbourhood, incorporating placemaking features and ensuring the neighbourhood area has a distinctive identity.

Dwelling Size Mix

- 8.5.5. Policy in the CDP (see section 6.0 above of this report) requires developments in excess of 50 residential units to comply with dwelling size mix ranges and targets for different locations within the City. The CDP allows flexibility in requiring same where a justification can be provided that demand/ need for a specific dwelling size is lower than the target specified.
- 8.5.6. In the table below, I have extrapolated the dwelling size mix in the proposed development and the applicable CDP requirements.

Table 3: Dwelling Size Mix – Proposed and Required

Proposed Development as % of Total				
Total	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed
164	30	47	71	16
100%	18%	29%	43%	10%
CDP Requirements (extract from Table 11.8 excludes studios as N/A)				
Min	15%	25%	18%	5%

Max	25%	40%	38%	15%
Target	20%	34%	28%	8%

- 8.5.7. As indicated above, the proportions of 1 bed, 2 bed and 4 bed residential units of the proposed development are within the permissible range (i.e., min-max %) included in Table 11.8 of the CDP. However, the proportion of 3 bed units, at 43% of the overall scheme, is in excess of the maximum allowable proportion of 38%.
- 8.5.8. In its assessment of the RFI (FI had been requested to revise the initially proposed proportion of 3 bed units at 53%), the planning authority found the revision of 16 3 bed houses to 4 bed houses and the resultant decrease in the total proportion of 3 bed units to 43% to be acceptable.
- 8.5.9. In considering this issue, I note the justification provided by the applicant (supported by market research) that housing demand in the area had been identified for 1-3 bed units (not larger family houses). Of the remaining 71 3 bed units in the proposed development (as per the RFI), I note that these are 48 houses and 23 duplexes (c.29% and c.14% respectively of the scheme).
- 8.5.10. On balance, I find the dwelling size mix in the proposed development to be acceptable as it is apparent that the area is characterised by large detached family homes. I find that the proportion of 3 bed duplexes will meet demand for larger apartment-style accommodation (i.e., not conventional houses). Finally, I have reviewed the dwelling size mix of the adjacent Waterfall Heights which featured a high proportion of 3 bed houses (c.39% of that scheme). I consider the mix within the proposed development to be more balanced and that the proportion of 1 bed, 2 bed and 4 bed units, and specifically 3 bed duplexes, will contribute to the accommodation offer in the area to meet a greater range of household needs.
- 8.5.11. Finally, in the interests of clarity for the Board, due to the flexibility allowed for in the CDP policy, I do not consider the over provision of 3 bed units in the proposed development to be a material contravention of the CDP.

Childcare Facility

- 8.5.12. A childcare facility (c.236sqm) is proposed at the lower ground floor level of Duplex Building 04, in the east of the site. Due to the topography of the site and design of

the building, the childcare facility has a northern elevation and addresses houses within the scheme (i.e., the facility does not have a southern elevation/ address Waterfall Road). On the western side of the facility is an enclosed area comprising the outdoor play space (c.97sqm), and on the eastern side is the bin store area. An access road, turning head, and dedicated car parking spaces are located adjacent to the north of the facility.

- 8.5.13. The application particulars include a Childcare Needs Assessment (CNA), which analysed eight operations in a 2km radius of the proposal and identified capacity for c.111 childcare spaces. The CNA submits that the proposal generates a requirement for at a minimum of 20 spaces (having regard to the Childcare Guidelines), calculates a requirement of 32 spaces (having regard to the Apartment Guidelines) and states the purpose-built facility, with a capacity for 32 spaces, is compliant with applicable national planning policy.
- 8.5.14. Cork Childcare Committee were consulted on the application as a prescribed body. The Committee identifies a shortage of childcare spaces in the wider area, states the facility as proposed with a capacity for 32 children does not satisfy the minimum requirement (estimated as c.36 children), and recommends that a larger childcare facility with increased capacity for 64 children offering care for a broader range of age groups be provided. The planning authority reports acknowledge the Committee's dissatisfaction with the capacity of the proposed childcare facility, however, this was not cited as a refusal reason.
- 8.5.15. I have reviewed the plans and particulars on the case file, and I calculate the proposal generates a requirement for c.44 childcare spaces in accordance with the Childcare Guidelines. In applying the dispensation allowed for in the Apartment Guidelines by excluding 30 1 bed units from the calculation of childcare demand, I also calculate a requirement for c.36 childcare spaces.
- 8.5.16. I have also reviewed the position of the Committee and acknowledge the details and analysis presented on childcare facilities in the wider area, the need for additional spaces, and for a greater range of care options. However, I do not consider it reasonable to require the applicant to provide a notably larger facility to meet demands greatly in excess (64 spaces) of what the proposed development generates (36 spaces).

8.5.17. With regard to the shortfall in spaces provided for (i.e., 32 spaces instead of 36 spaces), I note that Section 4.7 of the Apartment Guidelines allows 1 and 2 bed units to be discounted from childcare demand calculations. In the proposed development, the number of 1-bed units (30/ 18%) and 2-bed units (47/ 29%) totals 77 dwellings/ 47%. In this context, I do not consider the shortfall in proposed capacity to be material.

8.5.18. I consider that the childcare facility in the proposal satisfies the requirements in terms of scale, location, siting and design of both the Childcare Guidelines and the CDP. I consider the facility is relatively well orientated and accessible. The childcare facility is a positive component of the proposal, and its provision will serve both residents and the community. Final agreement on finishes, signage and operation can be addressed by condition.

Phasing

8.5.19. Finally, in respect of the phased development of the proposal, I note that the applicant indicates the scheme will be constructed in a single phase with delivery of the houses to be likely initially followed by the apartments and duplexes. I have reservations regarding this sequence. To ensure the safety and convenience of road users, to not exacerbate existing shortfalls in childcare care spaces as identified by Cork Childcare Committee, and to protect the amenity of future residents, I recommend that the implementation of the development be conditioned to ensure the delivery of the supporting transportation infrastructure on Waterfall Road, the childcare facility in Duplex Building 04, and public and communal open spaces prior to the occupation of any residential units.

Conclusion

8.5.20. In conclusion, the design and layout of the proposed development is acceptable and will contribute to the creation of a distinctive emerging neighbourhood. The proposal complies with the policy context set at national and local levels (including SO9 Placemaking and Managing Development and Objective 2.14 Walkable Neighbourhoods) for new residential development, provides an appropriate mix of accommodation to meet varying household needs and services to such as childcare facilities to support those future households.

8.6. Other Matters

- 8.6.1. Finally, in the interests of clarity for the Board, in this subsection I collate other matters. These include relevant planning matters that, while not expressly raised in the appeal, I have considered thereby ensuring a comprehensive assessment of the scheme if permission is under consideration.
- 8.6.2. I confirm to the Board that I have reviewed the relevant details in the case documentation, assessed any associated impacts, and found the items listed below to be in order.
- 8.6.3. These include architectural design, building materials and finishes, phasing, construction of development, internal road layout, car and cycle parking provision, DMURS compliance, traffic generation, traffic impacts on the wider network, public and communal open spaces, landscaping and boundary treatments, visual amenity, Part V compliance, management company, existing residential amenity (overlooking, overshadowing, overbearance), future residential amenity (quality and standard of accommodation), ecology, biodiversity and arboriculture, air and noise quality, archaeological heritage, water services, surface water management and flood risk, public lighting, utilities, and waste management.
- 8.6.4. I have reviewed the internal reports of the different sections of the planning authority and the prescribed bodies, note the conditions recommended to be attached in the event of a grant of permission, and consider these to be acceptable in the main.
- 8.6.5. Some recommended conditions cover requirements of other internal section(s)/ prescribed body(ies) (e.g., the mitigation measures in several reports). Otherwise, I am satisfied that equivalent An Bord Pleanála conditions are sufficient in covering/ addressing several matters (construction, operational, procedural, and financial). Some of the recommended conditions are necessarily specific in nature, being bespoke to the proposal (e.g., noise and air quality, archaeology, entrance sightlines, works adjacent to the Two Pot River and South Ring Road/ N40).
- 8.6.6. Further, I direct the Board to sections 9.0, 10.0 and 11.0 of this report below, and in particular to corresponding Appendices 1-4. These screening determinations provide detailed assessments of the impact of the proposed development on several components of the environment.

9.0 Appropriate Assessment

9.1. Stage 1 – Screening Determination for Appropriate Assessment

9.1.1. In accordance with section 177U(4) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended (2000 Act), and on the basis of objective information, I conclude that the proposed development (project) would not have a likely significant effect on any European site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. It is therefore determined that Appropriate Assessment (Stage 2) under section 177V of the 2000 Act is not required (see Appendix 1 of this report below).

9.1.2. This conclusion is based on:

- Objective information presented in the Appropriate Assessment Screening Report.
- Qualifying interests and conservation objectives of the European sites.
- Absence of any meaningful pathways to any European site.
- Distances from European sites.
- Standard pollution controls and project design features that would be employed regardless of proximity to a European site and the effectiveness of same.

9.1.3. No measures intended to avoid or reduce harmful effects on European sites were taken into account in reaching this conclusion.

10.0 Environmental Impact Assessment

10.1. Pre Screening for Environmental Impact Assessment

10.1.1. Part 2 of Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (2001 Regulations), and section 172(1)(a) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended (2000 Act), identify classes of development with specified thresholds for which EIA is required.

10.1.2. I identify the following classes of development in the 2001 Regulations as being of relevance to the proposal:

- Class 10(b) relates to infrastructure projects that involve:

- (i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units,
- (iv) Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere.

10.1.3. The proposed development is sub-threshold in terms of mandatory EIA requirements arising from Class 10(b)(i) and/ or (iv) of the 2001 Regulations. As such, the criteria in Schedule 7 of the 2001 Regulations are relevant to the question as to whether the proposed sub-threshold development would be likely to have significant effects on the environment and should be the subject of EIA (see Appendix 2 of this report below).

10.2. Screening Determination for Environmental Impact Assessment

10.2.1. The applicant has submitted an Environmental Impact Assessment screening report (EIASR) with the application addressing issues which are included for in Schedule 7A of the 2001 Regulations.

10.2.2. Based on the criteria in Schedule 7 of the 2001 Regulations, I have carried out an EIA screening determination of the project (included in Appendix 3 below of this report). In so doing, I have had regard to the following:

1. The criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended, in particular:
 - (a) the nature and scale of the proposed residential development (which is below the mandatory thresholds for Class 10(b)(i) and Class 10(b)(iv) of the 2001 Regulations) and the greenfield nature of the site and its location in an outer suburban area which is served by public services and infrastructure.
 - (b) the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity.
 - (c) the location of the development outside of any sensitive location specified in article 109(4)(a) of the 2001 Regulations.
2. The results of other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment submitted by the applicant and the results of the strategic environmental assessment of Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028 undertaken in accordance with the SEA Directive (2001/42/EC).

3. The features and measures proposed by applicant envisaged to avoid or prevent what might otherwise have been significant effects on the environment.

10.2.3. In conclusion, I am satisfied that by reason of the nature, scale and location of the proposed development, the development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment and that an Environmental Impact Assessment and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Assessment Report is not, therefore, required.

11.0 Water Status Impact Assessment

11.1. Stage 1 – Screening Determination for Water Status Impact Assessment

- 11.1.1. I have assessed the proposed development (project) with regard to, and have considered the objectives as set out in, Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive (WFD). Article 4 seeks to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration.
- 11.1.2. I conclude that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration to any waterbody (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any waterbody in reaching its WFD objectives. Consequently, I conclude that the project can be excluded from further assessment (see Appendix 4 of this report below).
- 11.1.3. This conclusion is based on:
 - Nature of the project, site and receiving environment.
 - Objective information presented in the appeal case documentation (e.g. SSRFA, Infrastructure Report).
 - Hydrological and hydrogeological characteristics of proximate waterbodies.
 - Absence of any meaningful pathways to any waterbody.
 - Standard pollution controls and project design features.

12.0 Recommendation

Following from the above assessment, I recommend that permission is GRANTED for the development as proposed due to the following reasons and considerations, and subject to the conditions set out below.

13.0 Recommended Draft Board Order

Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended

Planning Authority: Cork City Council

Planning Authority Register Reference: 24/43209

Appeal by Dwellings Development Bishopstown Limited against the decision made on the 27th day of January 2025 by Cork City Council to refuse permission to Dwellings Development Bishopstown Limited, c/o of HW Planning, 5 Joyce House, Barrack Square, Ballincollig, Cork.

Proposed Development

Large-scale residential development on lands at Ardarostig and Ballinaspig More, Waterfall Road, Bishopstown, Cork.

Particulars of the development are as follows:

164 no. residential units comprising of

- (i) 64 no. 3-bedroom semi-detached and terraced dwellings served by private open space in the form of private gardens,
- (ii) 54 no. apartments contained within 2 no. part 4, part 5 storey apartment blocks comprising 24 no. 2-bedroom apartments and 30 no. 1-bedroom apartments all served by balconies and/or ground floor terraces and
- (iii) 46 no. duplex units contained within 3 no. 3-storey terraced buildings and 1 no. part 3, part 4 storey terraced building comprised of 23 no. 2-bedroom and 23 no. 3-bedroom units, all served by balconies and/or ground floor terraces.

The proposed development will provide for a new vehicular access and pedestrian/cycle entrances onto Waterfall Road, improvement works on Waterfall Road comprising a traffic calming gateway, a two-way cycle track and pedestrian footpath along the site frontage to Waterfall Road, with a toucan crossing to connect these works to the local active travel network.

The proposed infrastructure development works also include the erection of a steel lattice ESB mast, associated undergrounding of powerlines, wastewater, surface water and water utility services.

The proposed development provides for a creche and associated external play area, outdoor amenity areas, landscaping, acoustic noise barrier along the northern boundary, car parking, bicycle parking, bin stores, ESB substation, public lighting, roof mounted solar panels, green roofs, and all ancillary site development works.

Decision

Grant permission for the above proposed development in accordance with the said plans and particulars based on the following reasons and considerations, and subject to the conditions set out below.

Reasons and Considerations

In coming to its decision, the Board had regard to the following:

- a) Policies and objectives set out in the National Planning Framework 2040 (First Revision, 2025) and the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region 2020-2032.
- b) Policies and objectives set out in the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028, including the location of the site on lands subject to Zoning Objective ZO 1 'Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods' and the permitted uses therein.
- c) Housing for All, A New Housing Plan for Ireland, 2021.
- d) Climate Action Plans 2024 and 2025.
- e) National Biodiversity Plan 2023-2030.

- f) Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2024.
- g) Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2023.
- h) Urban Development and Building Heights, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2018.
- i) Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets, 2013, updated 2019.
- j) Childcare Facilities, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2001.
- k) Planning System and Flood Risk Management, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2009.
- l) Regulation of Commercial Institutional Investment in Housing, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2021, updated 2023.
- m) Development Management, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2007.
- n) The nature, scale, and design of the proposed development.
- o) The availability in the area of a range of social, community, and transport infrastructure.
- p) The pattern of existing and permitted development in the area.
- q) The planning history at the site and within the area.
- r) The reports of the planning authority.
- s) The submissions received by the planning authority from observers and prescribed bodies.
- t) The grounds of appeal and observations on the appeal.
- u) The report and recommendation of the Planning Inspector including the examination, analysis and evaluation undertaken in relation to appropriate assessment, environmental impact assessment, and water status impact assessment.

Appropriate Assessment Screening

The Board completed an Appropriate Assessment screening exercise (Stage 1) in relation to the potential effects of the proposed development on designated European sites, taking into account the nature and scale of the proposed development on serviced lands, the nature of the receiving environment, the distances to the nearest European sites and the absence of any direct hydrological connections, submissions and observations on file, the information and reports submitted as part of the application and appeal, and the Planning Inspector's report.

In completing the screening exercise, the Board adopted the report of the Planning Inspector and concluded that, by itself or in combination with other development, plans and projects in the vicinity, the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect on any European site in view of the conservation objectives of such sites, and that an Appropriate Assessment (Stage 2) and the preparation of a Natura Impact Statement would not, therefore, be required.

Environmental Impact Assessment Screening

The Board completed an Environmental Impact Assessment screening determination of the proposed development, with regard being had to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended, in particular to the nature and scale of the proposed residential development (which is below the mandatory thresholds for Class 10(b)(i) and Class 10(b)(iv) of the 2001 Regulations), the greenfield nature of the site and its location in an outer suburban area which is served by public services and infrastructure, the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity, the location of the development outside of any sensitive location specified in article 109(4)(a) of the 2001 Regulations, the results of other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment submitted by the applicant, the results of the strategic environmental assessment of Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028 undertaken in accordance with the SEA Directive (2001/42/EC), and the features and measures proposed by applicant envisaged to avoid or prevent what might otherwise have been significant effects on the environment.

In completing the screening determination, the Board adopted the report of the Planning Inspector and concluded that by reason of the nature, scale and location of

the proposed development, the development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment and that an Environmental Impact Assessment and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Assessment Report would not, therefore, be required.

Water Status Impact Assessment Screening

The Board completed a Water Status Impact Assessment screening exercise with regard being had to the objectives of Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive, taking into account the nature of the proposed development, site and receiving environment, the hydrological and hydrogeological characteristics of proximate waterbodies, the absence of any meaningful pathways to any waterbody, the standard pollution controls and project design features, the information and reports submitted as part of the application and appeal, and the Planning Inspector's report.

In completing the screening exercise, the Board adopted the report of the Planning Inspector, and concluded that proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration to any waterbody (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any waterbody in reaching its Water Framework Directive objectives, and that a Water Status Impact Assessment would not, therefore, be required.

Conclusion on Proper Planning and Sustainable Development

The Board considers that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would be consistent with the applicable ZO 1 'Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods' zoning objective and other policies and objectives of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028, would result in an appropriate density of residential development, would constitute an acceptable mix and quantum of residential development, would provide acceptable levels of residential amenity for future occupants, would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of property in the vicinity, would not cause adverse impacts on or result in serious pollution to biodiversity, lands, water, or air, would be acceptable in

terms of pedestrian, cyclist and traffic safety and convenience, and would be capable of being adequately served by water supply, wastewater, and surface water networks without risk of flooding. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application to the planning authority, as amended by the further information plans and particulars submitted to 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. Mitigation and monitoring measures outlined in the plans and particulars, including the outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan, Noise Impact Analysis Report, Air Quality Impact Assessment Report, Ecological Impact Assessment, and Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment, submitted with the application shall be carried out in full, except where otherwise required by conditions attached to this permission.

Reason: In the interest of protecting the environment, public health, and clarity.

3. a) Prior to commencement of development the developer shall retain the services of a suitably qualified licensed archaeologist at the developer's expense to advise regarding the archaeological implications of the development site. Notification of these arrangements shall be submitted to

and agreed with the planning authority prior to commencement of any development.

b) The developer shall employ the archaeologist to test the site prior to development. The testing programme will be undertaken as outlined in the Archaeological Assessment (Aug 2024). Facilities such as may be required shall be available to the archaeologist for this purpose.

c) The archaeologist shall submit a report to the planning authority outlining the results of the investigation.

d) If, in the opinion of the planning authority, significant archaeological remains are uncovered, and in so far as these remains are subject to disturbance by foundations for pilecaps, walls, floors, drainage, etc., then archaeological preservation of the site (either in-situ or by record) will be required.

Reason: To ensure the continued preservation (either in situ or by record) of places, caves, sites, features or other objects of archaeological interest.

4. Prior to the commencement of development, a Resource Waste Management Plan (RWMP) as set out in the EPA's 'Best Practice Guidelines for the Preparation of Resource and Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects' (2021) shall be prepared and submitted to the planning authority for written agreement. The RWMP shall include specific proposals as to how the RWMP will be measured and monitored for effectiveness. All records (including for waste and all resources) pursuant to the agreed RWMP shall be made available for inspection at the site office at all times.

Reason: In the interest of proper planning and sustainable development.

5. The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Environmental 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 Environmental Management Plan shall be kept for inspection by the planning authority.

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

6. Prior to commencement of development, proposals for a development name and numbering scheme, and associated signage shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority. Thereafter, all such names and numbering shall be provided in accordance with the agreed scheme. No advertisements/ marketing signage relating to the name(s) of the development shall be erected until the developer has obtained the planning authority's written agreement to the proposed name(s).

Reason: In the interest of urban legibility and to ensure the use for new residential areas.

7. a) Details of the materials, colours, and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed buildings and boundary treatments shall be as submitted with the application, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.
- b) Details of security shuttering, external lighting, and signage for the childcare facility shall be agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development.
- c) Details of a maintenance strategy for all external finishes within the proposed development shall be submitted for the written agreement of the planning authority. In default of agreement the matter(s) in dispute shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

8. a) 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 and shall take account of trees within Landscape Layout Dwg No. LA001, submitted to the planning authority as further information on the 20th day of December 2024.
- b) The design of the lighting scheme shall be approved of by a suitably qualified bat specialist. The details of the lighting scheme, including written

evidence indicating approval by the bat specialist, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development/ installation of lighting.

c) The agreed lighting system shall be fully implemented and operational prior to the making available for occupation of any residential unit .

Reason: In the interests of amenity and public safety.

9. a) The developer shall enter into water and/ or wastewater connection agreement(s) with Uisce Eireann, prior to commencement of development.

b) All development shall be carried out in compliance with Uisce Eireann codes and practices.

c) Where the applicant proposes to build over or divert existing water and/ or wastewater services the applicant shall have received written Confirmation of Feasibility (CoF) of Diversion(s) from Uisce Eireann prior to any works commencing.

Reason: To provide adequate water and wastewater facilities in the interest of public health.

10. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays, 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.

11. The development shall be implemented subject to the following:

a) The occupation of residential units shall be restricted until such time as all access arrangements and transportation infrastructure on Waterfall Road serving the development, as indicated on Dwg No. DR-A-010-ZB (Site Layout

Plan), have been designed, constructed, and finished to the standards required by and to the satisfaction of planning authority.

b) The occupation of residential units shall be restricted until such time as the childcare facility has been constructed, available for use and/ or operational, to the satisfaction of the planning authority.

c) The occupation of residential units shall be restricted until the public and/ or communal open spaces to serve those units has/ have been developed, landscaped, and made available for use, to the satisfaction of the planning authority.

d) Any deviation from the above phasing sequence shall only be permitted where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of orderly development and to ensure the timely provision of amenities and infrastructure for future residents and road users.

12. Drainage arrangements including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

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

13. All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground. 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) The main entrance to the development on Waterfall Road shall be provided in accordance with the standards specified in the Design Manual for Urban Roads for a design speed of 50kph on a bus route (with minimum unobstructed visibility splays of 49m), and to the construction standards of the planning authority for such works.

b) The site frontage along Waterfall Road shall be set back and supporting infrastructure (e.g., pedestrian pathways, cycle track, road paving, pedestrian crossing, and potential bus stop/ shelter) shall be provided in accordance with Dwg No. DR-A-010-ZB (Site Layout Plan), and to the construction standards of the planning authority for such works.

c) All works shall be undertaken at the developer's expense and completed to the satisfaction of the planning authority.

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

15. Prior to commencement of development and/ or occupation of the residential units, as applicable, final Road Safety Audit(s) and/ or Quality Audit(s) of the development, including the main entrance, internal road, pedestrian/ cycle path layouts, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority.

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

16. a) Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit to the planning authority for its written agreement, appropriately scaled drawing(s) with all car, motorcycle, and bicycle parking spaces intended for use by each residential unit, visitor use, and childcare facility use (customers and staff). The spaces shall be clearly identified, numbered, and of a design, construction and finish that is to the satisfaction of the planning authority.

b) The car parking spaces for visitor use shall be assigned permanently for the residential development and shall be reserved solely for that purpose.

c) Prior to the occupation of the development, a Parking Management Plan shall be prepared for the development and shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority. This plan shall indicate how car parking spaces within the development shall be assigned, segregated, and continually managed.

Reason: To ensure that adequate parking facilities are permanently available to serve the residential development.

17. The internal road network serving the proposed development, including carriageway widths, corner radii, turning bays, junctions, set down/ drop off area(s), parking areas, footpaths, kerbs, pedestrian crossings, raised tables, and cycle lanes shall be in accordance with the detailed construction standards of the planning authority for such works, and design standards outlined in the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets and the National Cycle Manual issued by the National Transport Authority. In default of agreement the matter(s) in dispute shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.

Reason: In the interest of traffic and pedestrian safety.

18. A minimum of 20% of all car parking spaces shall be provided with functioning electric vehicle charging stations/ points, and ducting shall be provided for all remaining car parking spaces, facilitating the installation of electric vehicle charging points/ stations at a later date. Where proposals relating to the installation of electric vehicle ducting and charging stations/ points have not been submitted with the application, in accordance with the above noted requirements, such proposals shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the occupation of the development.

Reason: To provide for and/ or future proof the development such as would facilitate the use of electric vehicles.

19. All links/ connections to adjoining lands shall be provided up to the site boundary to facilitate future connections subject to the appropriate consents.

Reason: In the interest of permeability and safety.

20. No interference with, bridging, draining, and/ or culverting of the adjacent Two Pot River, its banks or bankside vegetation shall be undertaken without prior consultation with and written approval from Inland Fisheries Ireland.

Reason: To protect river water quality and the environment.

21. Prior to commencement of development, the applicant shall consult with and secure the written approval of Transport Infrastructure Ireland in respect of works adjacent to/ in the vicinity of the shared boundary along the N40/ South Ring Road.

Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and orderly development.

22. a) The management and maintenance of the development following its completion shall be the responsibility of a legally constituted management company, or by the local authority in the event of the development being so taken in charge.

b) The communal open spaces, hard and soft landscaping, car and cycle parking areas, access ways, refuse/ bin storage, and all areas not intended to be taken in charge by the local authority, shall be maintained by the legally constituted management company.

c) Details of the management company contract, and drawings/ particulars describing the parts of the development for which the company would have responsibility, shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority before any of the residential units are made available for occupation.

Reason: In the interests of orderly development and to provide for the satisfactory future maintenance of this development.

23. a) The areas of communal and public open space in the development shall be reserved for such use, levelled, contoured, soiled, seeded, and landscaped (hard and soft) in accordance with the landscaping plans and particulars as

submitted with the application unless otherwise agreed with the planning authority.

b) Final design, finishes, methods of construction and/ or installation of footpaths, cycle paths, seating, crossing points over ditches/ drains/ SuDS features, and equipment in play areas shall be submitted to the planning authority for its written agreement.

c) The landscaping work shall be undertaken in accordance with the phasing requirements stipulated in Condition 11 and shall be completed before the applicable residential units are made available for occupation, unless otherwise agreed with the planning authority.

d) The landscaping and planting schedule shall be managed and maintained in accordance with the Landscape Design Report submitted with the application, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority. This schedule shall cover a period of at least three years and shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation.

e) The areas of communal and public open space shall be reserved and maintained as such by the developer until taken in charge by the management company or by the local authority.

Reason: In the interest of nature conservation, residential amenity, and to ensure the satisfactory development of the open space areas and their continued use for this purpose.

24. a) No additional development shall take place above roof parapet level of the apartment and/ or duplex blocks including lift motor enclosures, air handling equipment, storage tanks, ducts or other external plant, telecommunication aerials, antennas, or equipment, unless authorised by a further grant of planning permission.

b) Roof areas of the apartment blocks shall be accessed for maintenance purposes only and shall not be used for any amenity or recreational purpose.

Reason: To protect the visual amenities of the area and residential amenities of property in the vicinity.

25. a) An Operational Waste Management Plan (OWMP) containing details for the management of waste within the development, the provision of facilities for the storage, separation, and collection of the waste and for the ongoing operation of these facilities, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority not later than 6 months from the date of commencement of the development. Thereafter, the waste shall be managed in accordance with the agreed OWMP.

b) The OWMP shall provide for screened bin stores for the duplex buildings, apartment blocks, and the childcare facility, the locations, and designs of which shall be as indicated in the plans and particulars lodged within the application unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity, and to ensure the provision of adequate refuse storage for the proposed development.

26. Prior to commencement of development, the applicant or other person with an interest in the land to which the application relates shall enter into an agreement in writing with the planning authority in relation to the provision of housing in accordance with the requirements of section 94(4) and sections 96(2) and (3) (Part V) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, unless an exemption certificate shall have been applied for and been granted under section 97 of the Act, as amended. Where such an agreement is not reached within eight weeks from the date of this order, the matter in dispute (other than a matter to which section 96(7) applies) may be referred by the planning authority or any other prospective party to the agreement to An Bord Pleanála for determination.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Part V of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and of the housing strategy in the development plan of the area.

27. All of the permitted house and duplex units in the development, when completed, shall be first occupied as a place of residence by individual purchasers who are not a corporate entity and/ or by persons who are eligible for the occupation of social or affordable housing, including cost rental housing. Prior to commencement of development, the applicant, or any person with an interest in the land shall enter into a written agreement with the planning authority under section 47 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 to this effect. Such an agreement must specify the number and location of each house or duplex unit.

Reason: To restrict new housing development to use by persons of a particular class or description in order to ensure an adequate choice and supply of housing, including affordable housing, in the common good.

28. 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 and/ or management company 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.

29. 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.

Phillippa Joyce

Senior Planning Inspector

27th May 2025

Appendix 1: Appropriate Assessment – Screening Determination

Step 1: Description of the Project

I have considered the proposed development (project) in light of the requirements of section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

Subject Site

The subject site is located on lands at Ardarostig and Ballinaspig More, Bishopstown, in a semi-rural/ outer suburban area of southwest Cork City. The site measures c.3.86ha, is greenfield in nature, comprising a large agricultural field. The site features well-defined boundaries with treelines, hedgerows, ditches, and stonewalls.

The topographical and hydrological context of the site are notable. The site is located between two watercourses, Two Pot River is adjacent to the northwest while further to the east (c.590m) is the Glasheen River. Ground levels across the site decrease steadily in northerly and northeasterly directions from Waterfall Road (c.33m OD) to South Ring Road (c.23m OD) and more steeply in a westerly direction towards the Two Pot River (c.17.5m OD). The majority of the site (centre, east) drains towards the Glasheen River, while the remainder (west) drains to the Two Pot River.

I have identified those European sites in proximity to the site (see section 6.4 of this report above) to include the coastal SPA and SAC associated with Cork Harbour (c.c.6.5km and c.13.2km respectively to the east).

Project

The project comprises the construction of 164 residential units, a childcare facility, and all associated development works including site clearance, and ground levelling.

Also included are new vehicular, pedestrian, and cyclist access points, internal access roads and footpaths (including a pedestrian/ cycle pathway extending to the edge of the Two Pot River at the northwestern boundary), car and cycle parking spaces, refuse storage facilities, public lighting, electrical services, public and communal open spaces, hard and soft landscaping, boundary treatments, acoustic noise barrier, and all infrastructural works associated with water supply, wastewater drainage, surface water drainage (including connections to the public networks, SuDS features, and on-site attenuation storage).

With regard to water services, the project seeks connections to the public systems for wastewater drainage and surface water drainage. Existing drainage water services networks are located in Waterfall Road (east of the site). Wastewater arising from the project will be collected, drain to the existing foul sewer, discharge by gravity to the public wastewater system, and treated at Cork City (Carrigrennan) WWTP.

A Surface Water Management Strategy (SWMS) has been prepared for the project. The surface water drainage system comprises a single catchment area for the

project. The overall system has been sized to store the runoff from a 1:100-year storm event of critical duration plus a 20% climate change allowance and has been designed in accordance with the requirements of the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study (GDSDS).

Surface water run-off in the project will be collected, attenuated on-site, and discharged by gravity to the public network. The project incorporates SuDS features, including permeable paving, blue/ green roofs, filter drains, tree pits, an attenuation area and hydrocarbon interceptors. The surface water run-off will be discharged by flow control device at greenfield rates to the public network in Waterfall Road (east of site) which in turn discharges to the Glasheen River.

Submissions and Observations

Uisce Eireann indicates the project can be serviced (Confirmations of Feasibility are provided in the applicant's Infrastructure Report for connections to water supply and wastewater), and that there are no capacity constraints in these public systems.

Inland Fisheries Ireland requires confirmation that there is sufficient capacity in the public wastewater system to cater for the project, and if granted, that a condition be attached preventing any interference with, bridging, draining, and/ or culverting of the adjacent Two Pot River, its banks or bankside vegetation without the prior approval of the IFI.

The Drainage Division of the planning authority does not cite any objection to the project. There is confirmed capacity in the public network to cater for surface water discharging from the project.

The planning authority (Biodiversity Officer) completed an appropriate assessment screening of the project (at RFI stage). It concludes that the proposed development is not likely to have a significant effect on any European sites, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

Step 2: Potential Impact Mechanisms from the Project

Site Surveys

Field surveys were undertaken in different months between 2022-2024 to identify habitat types, flora species, bat, mammal and bird species, and aquatic species at the site. No protected habitats, plant species of conservation importance, or terrestrial mammals of conservation importance are noted on site.

The identified habitats on site are described as consisting largely of arable crops (BC1)/ tilled land (BC3), treelines (WL2), hedgerow (WL1), scrub (WS1), and a small strip of riparian woodland (WN5).

Of the bird species recorded (19 species), one is a red listed species and one an amber listed species. Importantly, no Annex I bird species are recorded in the surveys. The bat survey work recorded the presence of two bat species (Common pipistrelle, Soprano pipistrelle) foraging and commuting in the treelines/ hedgerows

along the east and west boundaries at the site (no potential roost features or evidence of roosting are identified).

No habitats or species, which are listed as qualifying interests (QIs) of European sites, are recorded at the site. Nor is any evidence highlighted of any habitats or species with links to European sites, or any habitats which have the potential to support QI species in/ from any European site. The site is confirmed as not being under any wildlife or conservation designation. In conclusion, the site is evaluated as being of 'no value ecologically or low value at the very best'.

European Sites

The AASR identifies two European sites in the zone of influence of the project, with approximate separation distances (pgs. 9-10) as follows:

- Cork Harbour SPA, over-land 9km, via watercourse channel 13km.
- Great Island Channel SAC, over-land 14km, via watercourse channel 20km.

The QIs of the SPA include several bird species, wetland (habitat) and waterbirds, and those of the SAC include mudflat, sandflat and salt meadow habitats.

The AASR (incorporating the Ecological Technical Note submitted in the RFI) identifies a hydrological pathway, via the Two Pot River, from the project to the European sites. In applying the Source-Pathway-Receptor model, the connection is assessed as not being of a nature that 'would convey Likely Significant Effects to the Natura 2000 sites'.

The AASR also considers the nature of the project (a housing development), the siting of buildings in the scheme relative to the Two Pot River (c.120m separation distance), the channel-length separation distances between the project and European sites (13km and 20km), and hydrological context of same (several 1st-6th order watercourses interconnect, the magnitude of dilution present).

Specific mitigations to prevent significant effects from occurring are identified as not being required 'because of the absence of a Pathway for Significant Effects and the low magnitude, probability and risk associated with hydrocarbons and chemicals onsite'.

The AASR concludes that the project 'will not cause adverse impacts or likely significant negative effects on the conservation objectives of any Natura 2000 Site'.

Effect/ Impact Mechanisms

In determining the potential impact mechanisms arising from the project on the relevant European sites, I have had regard to the AASR and all other relevant information on the case file.

I note and find the following:

Overview

- I concur with the identification by the applicant of two European sites, Cork Harbour SPA and Great Island Channel SAC, as being in the project's zone of influence.

- As there are no protected habitats or species identified at the site, I am satisfied that the likelihood of any significant effect of the project on any European site due to loss of habitat and/ or disturbance of species can be reasonably excluded.
- I identify indirect hydrological connections between the project and the European sites through construction phase surface water pathway via the Two Pot River and operational phase surface water pathway via the Glasheen River.
- The separation distances between the project and the European sites via these hydrological connections (channel-length) of at least c.13km, are notable.
- The high levels of dilution, mixing and/ or dissipation of any contaminant in the receiving surface drainage network, river, estuarine and/ or sea waters.
- The low probability of (a) surface water contamination event(s) which would have the potential to negatively affect the QIs of the European sites (e.g., contaminate food sources for seabird species in the SPA, or pollute the mudflat and sandflat habitats of the SAC which is not sensitive to sediment loading).

Construction Phase

- The high probability that a construction phase pollution event at and/ or pollution from the construction site would be minimal in significance and/ or quantity.
- The likelihood that any pollutants, silt laden runoff or dust would be dispersed or diluted to negligible levels prior to reaching the European sites.
- The development works will be managed and implemented in line with the outline CEMP, SWMS, and EclA, which include standardised pollution prevention and surface water control measures.
- The potential risk to the European sites via contamination of the surface water pathway is considered to be extremely low and the effect of same to likely be imperceptible.
- As such, the potential for likely significant effects during the project's construction phase from surface water impacts through the hydrological connection via the Two Pot River can be reasonably excluded.

Operation Phase

- The project incorporates several surface level SuDS features including permeable paving, blue/ green roofs, filter drains, and tree pits which will intercept, convey, and dispose of stormwater.
- The SuDS features will have an attenuating effect, reducing the volume of surface water runoff discharged to the Glasheen River, and flow control devices will reduce the speed of the surface water runoff to greenfield rates.
- The incorporation of SuDS features into the design of the project is required by several policy frameworks (GDSDS, Regional Code of Practice, Flood Risk Guidelines, CDP) and are a standardised embedded mitigation.
- The effects of SuDS have therefore been considered in the undertaking of this AA screening as the primary reason for the use of SuDS has not been to protect a European site.

- As such, the potential for likely significant effects during the project's operation phase from surface water impacts through the hydrological connection via Glasheen River can be reasonably excluded.

Overall Finding

Having regard to the characteristics of the project in terms of the site's features and location, and the project's scale of works, I do not consider there to be any potential impact mechanism which would result in a likely significant effect on any European sites.

Step 3: European Site(s) at Risk

The European sites in proximity to the subject site and in the zone of influence of the project have been identified and discussed previously.

For the reasons I have outlined above, I do not identify any impact mechanisms arising from the project which would have a likely significant effect on either of the identified European sites, or indeed, any European site. As such, there are no European sites at risk of likely significant effect from the project.

Step 4: Likely Significant Effects on the European Site(s) 'Alone'

I conclude that the project would have no likely significant effect 'alone' on the QIs of any European site. In the interests of completeness, further AA screening in combination with other plans and projects is required.

Step 5: Where Relevant, Likely Significant Effects on the European Site(s) 'In-Combination with other Plans and Projects'

I have had regard to the information included in the AASR on plans and projects. I have also reviewed the planning authority's website for applicable appropriate assessment information on relevant plans (CDP), and the planning authority and An Bord Pleanála's planning registers for relevant planning cases (correct as of the date of this assessment). The AASR does not identify any significant in-combination (cumulative) effect.

Following my own review, this is a conclusion with which I concur. I consider that the key plan is the CDP which seeks environmental protection and pollution prevention, and the projects are to be constructed to/ operate within industry standards. I conclude that the project would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on the qualifying features of any European site.

Overall Conclusion – Screening Determination

In accordance with section 177U(4) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and on the basis of objective information, I conclude that the project would not have a likely significant effect on any European site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. It is therefore determined that Appropriate Assessment (Stage 2) under section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, is not required.

This conclusion is based on:

- Objective information presented in the Appropriate Assessment Screening Report.
- Standard pollution controls that would be employed regardless of proximity to a European site and the effectiveness of same.
- Qualifying interests, special conservation interests, and conservation objectives of the European sites.
- Distances from European sites.
- Absence of any meaningful pathways to any European site.

No measures intended to avoid or reduce harmful effects on European sites were taken into account in reaching this conclusion.

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 2: Environmental Impact Assessment – Pre Screening Form

1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a ‘project’ for the purposes of EIA?	
(“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.	
<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.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/ exceeds the threshold.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Proceed to Q4.	Class 10(b)(i) and/ or Class 10(b)(iv) Relevant thresholds arising from Class 10(b): - Class 10(b)(i): more than 500 dwelling units. - Class 10(b)(iv): urban development in an area greater than 10ha.
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)?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Screening Determination required.

Appendix 3: Environmental Impact Assessment – Screening Determination Form

A. CASE DETAILS		
An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP 321949-25	
Development Summary	Construction of 164 residential units, childcare facility, and all associated site works.	
	Yes/ No/ N/A	Comment (if relevant)
1. Was a Screening Determination carried out by the planning authority?	Yes	The planning authority concluded ‘...that the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment and that the preparation and submission of an Environmental Impact Report is not therefore required....’.
2. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?	Yes	An Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Report (EIASR) has been submitted with the application (as supplemented by supporting documents submitted in the FI response) and considers the content of the EIA Directive (2011/92/EU, as amended by 2014/52/EU).
3. Has an AA screening report or NIS been submitted?	Yes	An Appropriate Assessment Screening Report (AASR) has been submitted with the application (as supplemented by supporting documents submitted in the FI response) and considers the content of Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) and the Birds Directive (2009/147/EC).
4. Is an IED/ IPC or Waste Licence (or review of licence) required from the EPA?	No	N/A
5. Have any other relevant assessments of	Yes	- An Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA) considers the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC), Birds Directive (2009/147/EC), and Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC).

the effects on the environment which have a significant bearing on the project been carried out pursuant to other relevant Directives – for example SEA.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment (SSFRA) considers the EU Floods Directive (2007/60/EC). - A Noise Impact Analysis report (NIA) considers the Environmental Noise Directive (2002/49/EC). - A preliminary Construction Resource & Waste Management Plan (CRWMP) considers the Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC). - An Air Quality Impact Analysis report (AQIA) considers the CAFE Directive on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe (2008/50/EC). - A Climate Action and Energy Analysis report (CAEA) considers the Energy Performance in Buildings Directive (2010/31/EU). - SEA was undertaken by the planning authority in respect of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028. 		
B. EXAMINATION		Yes/ No/ Uncertain	Briefly describe the characteristics of impacts (nature and extent) and any mitigation measures (having regard to the probability, magnitude (including population size affected), complexity, duration, frequency, intensity, and reversibility of impact) (where relevant, specify features or measures proposed by the applicant to avoid or prevent a significant effect)	Is this likely to result in significant effects on the environment? Yes/ No/ Uncertain
This screening examination should be read with, and in light of, the rest of the Inspector's report attached herewith				
1. Characteristics of proposed development (including demolition, construction, operation, or decommissioning)				
1.1 Is the project significantly different in character or scale to the existing surrounding or environment?	No	The project comprises the construction of a mid-scaled, medium-density residential scheme on zoned lands. The project does not differ significantly from the surrounding area in terms of character (residential and childcare uses exist in the area, area is in transition from low-rise, low-density), or of scale (use of conventional houses with duplex and apartment buildings, same range of building heights as in Waterfall Heights).		No

<p>1.2 Will construction, operation, decommissioning, or demolition works cause physical changes to the locality (topography, land use, waterbodies)?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The project will cause physical changes to the site during the site development works through clearance works and construction activities.</p> <p>There will be changes to the topography of the site, which slopes in northerly and northeasterly directions from Waterfall Road (c.33m OD) to South Ring Road (c.23m OD) and more steeply in a westerly direction towards the Two Pot River (c.17.5m OD). Top and subsoils will be stripped, reused on site where possible, or removed off-site. The project involves ground alteration and reprofiling to facilitate buildings, roads/ paths, open spaces, and site services.</p> <p>The site is greenfield in nature and most recently agricultural in use. The proposed residential land use will result in physical changes to the built environment at the site. The architectural approach taken for the design and layout of the scheme is consistent with the emerging character of the area being formed by Waterfall Heights.</p> <p>The project will cause physical changes to the site through the removal of some hedgerows and treelines, and the development of a pedestrian/ cycle pathway extending to the edge of the Two Pot River.</p> <p>I direct the Board to the response to Q: 2.1 below in respect of protected water bodies/ ecological designations, and to that of Q: 2.5 in respect of water resources including watercourses, waterbodies and flood risk.</p>	<p>No</p>
--	------------	--	-----------

		Accordingly, I do not consider that the physical changes arising from the project are likely to result in significant effects on the environment in terms of topography, land use, and hydrology/ hydrogeology.	
1.3 Will construction or operation of the project use natural resources such as land, soil, water, materials/ minerals, or energy, especially resources which are non-renewable or in short supply?	No	<p>The project uses standard construction methods, materials and equipment, and the process will be managed through the implementation of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP, with mitigation measures as proposed and/ or with additional measures required by condition).</p> <p>Waste arising from the construction phase will be managed through the implementation of the CRWMP. There is no significant use of natural resources anticipated.</p> <p>While the project uses land, the lands are zoned for development and serviced. In this regard, the project will use land more efficiently and sustainably than at present (agricultural use, intensified through provision of mid-scaled, medium-density residential scheme). Otherwise, the operational phase of the project will not use natural resources in short supply.</p> <p>The project connects to the public water and wastewater services systems which have sufficient capacity to cater for demands arising from the project (Uisce Eireann requires Confirmation of Feasibility agreements, but no objections are raised in relation to public systems' capacity). The project incorporates several SuDS features, which will attenuate storm water run-off on-site prior to discharge at</p>	No

		<p>greenfield rates to the public surface water system. There are no issues raised in respect of capacity in the network.</p> <p>The project includes an energy efficient design (outlined in the CAEAR), several SuDS features, and is located in reasonably close proximity to several amenities and services in the Bishopstown area/ southwest suburbs of Cork City.</p>	
1.4 Will the project involve the use, storage, transport, handling, or production of substance which would be harmful to human health or the environment?	Yes	<p>Construction phase activities require the use of potentially harmful materials, such as fuels and create waste for disposal. The use of such substances is typical of construction sites.</p> <p>Dust emissions during the construction phase of the project will be likely. These works will be managed through implementation of the CEMP.</p> <p>The operational phase of the project will not involve the use, storage, or production of any harmful substance. Conventional waste produced from residential and childcare activity will be managed through the implementation of the OWMP.</p> <p>Accordingly, I do not consider this aspect of the project likely to result in significant effects on the environment in terms of human health or biodiversity.</p>	No
1.5 Will the project produce solid waste, release pollutants or any hazardous/ toxic/ noxious substances?	No	<p>Conventional waste will be produced from site clearance and construction activities, which will be managed through the implementation of the CEMP and/ or CRWMP, as outlined above.</p>	No

		Operational phase of the project (i.e., the occupation of the residential units and the childcare facility) will not produce or release any pollutant or hazardous material. Conventional operational waste will be managed through the implementation of the OWMP to obviate potential environmental impacts.	
1.6 Will the project lead to risks of contamination of land or water from releases of pollutants onto the ground or into surface waters, groundwater, coastal waters or the sea?	Yes	<p>The project involves grounds works due to the site's topography with excavation and reprofiling to facilitate buildings, roads/ paths, open spaces, and site services.</p> <p>Standard construction methods, materials and equipment are to be used, and the process will be managed through the implementation of the CEMP and the CRWMP.</p> <p>I direct the Board to the response to Q: 2.1 below in respect of protected water bodies/ ecological designations, and to that of Q: 2.5 in respect of water resources including watercourses, waterbodies and flood risk.</p> <p>Accordingly, as risks of contamination to water bodies are mitigated and managed, I do not consider this aspect of the project is likely to result in a significant effect on the environment.</p>	No
1.7 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy, or electromagnetic radiation?	Yes	<p>Noise and vibration impacts during the site development works are likely. These works are short term in duration, and impacts arising will be temporary, localised, and be managed through implementation of the CEMP.</p> <p>The operational phase of the project will likely result in noise and light impacts associated with the residential use</p>	No

		<p>and childcare service (increased traffic generation, use of open spaces, operation of the childcare facility) which are considered to be typical of such mid-scaled, medium-density schemes as proposed.</p> <p>Traffic impacts will be mitigated by the implementation of the Mobility Management Plan (MMP), and lighting impacts will be mitigated by the provision of a public lighting plan (designed to comply with industry guidance and provided to the satisfaction of the planning authority).</p> <p>I direct the Board to the response to Q: 2.8 below in respect of the project's effect on sensitive land uses.</p> <p>Accordingly, I do not consider this aspect of the project likely to result in significant effects on the environment in terms of air quality (noise, vibration, light pollution).</p>	
<p>1.8 Will there be any risks to human health, for example due to water contamination or air pollution?</p>	Yes	<p>The potential for water contamination, noise and dust emissions during the construction phase is likely.</p> <p>Construction phase works will be managed through implementation of the CEMP. Site development works are short term in duration, and impacts arising will be temporary, localised, addressed by the mitigation measures.</p> <p>Operational phase of the project will not likely cause risks to human health through water contamination due to the nature (residential, childcare uses) and design (SuDS features) of the scheme, connection to public water</p>	No

		<p>services systems, and scale of residential use/ activities arising.</p> <p>Operational phase risks to human health through noise and air quality due to the project's proximity to South Ring Road/ N40 dual carriageway are subject of the NIA and AQIA. These reports include several mitigation measures to ameliorate potential impacts.</p> <p>Accordingly, in terms of risks to human health, I do not consider this aspect of the project likely to result in a significant effect on the environment.</p>	
1.9 Will there be any risk of major accidents that could affect human health or the environment?	No	<p>There is no risk of major accidents given nature of the project.</p> <p>There is a Seveso site (Irish Oxygen) in proximity to the southwest of the site. The Health and Safety Authority (prescribed body) cited no objection to the proposal in the context of major accidents hazards.</p>	No
1.10 Will the project affect the social environment (population, employment)	Yes	<p>The project will increase localised temporary employment activity at the site during site development works (i.e. site enabling and construction phases). The site development works are short term in duration and impacts arising will be temporary, localised, addressed by the mitigation measures in the CEMP.</p> <p>The operational phase of the project (i.e. the occupation of the residential units) will result in a potential increase of c.453 persons, or a c.0.9% increase in the population of the Local Electoral Area of Cork City South West. Such an</p>	No

		<p>increase is considered to constitute an imperceptible impact in scale of effect. The childcare facility has capacity to cater for c.32 children.</p> <p>The receiving area is a developing suburban location, in relatively close proximity to wider education, amenities, services, public transport, and has the capacity to accommodate the impacts associated with the population increase.</p> <p>Accordingly, I do not consider this aspect of the project likely to result in a significant effect on the social environment of the area.</p>	
<p>1.11 Is the project part of a wider large scale change that could result in cumulative effects on the environment?</p>	Yes	<p>The site is zoned for residential development in the CDP. The zonings at the site and in the vicinity (i.e., existing and proposed residential) effectively serve to phase the development of this southwestern suburb of Cork City.</p> <p>As such, the site is part of a wider large-scale change in the area as envisaged by the planning authority in the CDP for the plan period until 2028. Notwithstanding, the site is serviced, the project is standalone, and not reliant on infrastructure/ services that are yet to be commenced/ provided.</p> <p>I direct the Board to the response to Q: 3.1 below in respect of considerations of cumulative effects of the project.</p>	No

		Within this planned and phased context, I do not consider that cumulative significant effects on the area can be reasonably anticipated.	
2. Location of proposed development			
2.1 Is the proposed development located on, in, adjoining or have the potential to impact on any of the following: a) European site (SAC/ SPA/ pSAC/ pSPA) b) NHA/ pNHA c) Designated Nature Reserve d) Designated refuge for flora or fauna e) Place, site or feature of ecological interest, the preservation/ conservation/ protection of which is an objective of a development plan/ LAP/ draft plan or variation of a plan	Yes	<p>The project is not located in, on, or adjoining any European site, any designated or proposed NHA, or any other listed area of ecological interest or protection.</p> <p>Cork harbour contains two European sites, Cork Harbour SPA, and Great Island Channel SAC. The QIs of the SPA include several bird species, wetland (habitat) and waterbirds, and those of the SAC include mudflat, sandflat and salt meadow habitats.</p> <p>I identify indirect surface water hydrological connections between the project and the European sites. These are at construction phase via the Two Pot River, and at operation phase via the Glasheen River.</p> <p>The AASR, supplemented by information in the EclA, SSFRA, and CEMP, presents information on potential impacts of the project on the European sites. I have undertaken an Appropriate Assessment screening determination (see section 9.0 and Appendix 1 of this report) and concluded that the project will not have a likely significant effect on either of the Cork harbour European sites, alone or in combination with other plans or projects.</p>	No

		<p>The project is not located on, in, adjoining or have the potential to impact on any other ecologically sensitive features.</p> <p>Accordingly, I do not consider this aspect of the project likely to result in a significant effect on the environment in terms of ecological designations or biodiversity.</p>	
<p>2.2 Could any protected, important, or sensitive species of flora or fauna which use areas on or around the site, for example: for breeding, nesting, foraging, resting, over-wintering, or migration, be significantly affected by the project?</p>	Yes	<p>Field surveys were undertaken in different months between 2022-2024 to identify habitat types, flora species, bat, mammal and bird species, and aquatic species at the site.</p> <p>Habitats identified on site consist largely of arable crops (BC1)/ tilled land (BC3), treelines (WL2), hedgerow (WL1), scrub (WS1), and a small strip of riparian woodland (WN5). Of the bird species recorded (19 species), one is a red listed species and one an amber listed species. The bat survey work recorded the presence of two bat species (Common pipistrelle, Soprano pipistrelle) foraging and commuting in the treelines/ hedgerows along the east and west boundaries at the site (no potential roost features or evidence of roosting are identified).</p> <p>No protected habitats, plant species of conservation importance, or terrestrial mammals of conservation importance are noted on site. The site is confirmed as not being under any wildlife or conservation designation. In conclusion, the site is evaluated as being of 'no value ecologically or low value at the very best'. The EclA and CEMP include several mitigation measures to ameliorate potential impacts.</p>	No

		Accordingly, I do not consider this aspect of the project likely to result in a significant effect on the environment in terms of protected flora and/ or fauna species.	
2.3 Are there any other features of landscape, historic, archaeological, or cultural importance that could be affected?	Yes	<p>There are no landscape designations or protected scenic views at the site. There are no protected structures or architectural conservation area designations at the site.</p> <p>An Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) has been prepared for the project. The AIA confirms there no recorded archaeological sites within the site, but geophysical survey results indicate several anomalies. To mitigate the impact of the project on archaeological heritage, the AIA recommends that the anomalies are investigated by a programme of licenced targeted archaeological testing (by way of condition).</p> <p>Accordingly, I do not consider this aspect of the project likely to result in a significant effect on the environment in terms of archaeology and cultural heritage.</p>	No
2.4 Are there any areas on/ around the location which contain important, high quality or scarce resources which could be affected by the project, for example: forestry, agriculture, water/ coastal, fisheries, minerals?	Yes	<p>There are no such resources on or close to the site.</p> <p>The site comprises a large field presently in agricultural use for tillage. The development of the site is not considered to have a significant effect on agriculture/ crop cultivation in the area.</p> <p>Accordingly, I do not consider this aspect of the project likely to result in a significant effect on the environment in terms of impact on natural resources.</p>	No

<p>2.5 Are there any water resources including surface waters, for example: rivers, lakes/ ponds, coastal or groundwaters which could be affected by the project, particularly in terms of their volume and flood risk?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The site is located between two watercourses, Two Pot River is adjacent to the west while further to the east is the Glasheen River. Ground levels across the site decrease steadily in northerly and northeasterly directions from Waterfall Road (c.33m OD) to South Ring Road (c.23m OD) and more steeply in a westerly direction towards the Two Pot River (c.17.5m OD). The majority of the site (centre, east) drains towards the Glasheen River, while the remainder (west) drains to the Two Pot River.</p> <p>A range of mitigation measures are identified in the CEMP and EclA during the construction phase of the project to protect water quality and prevent pollution events.</p> <p>Operation phase impacts are addressed primarily through design. Surface water run-off in the project will be collected, attenuated on-site, and discharged by gravity to the public network in Waterfall Road (east of site) which in turn discharges to the Glasheen River.</p> <p>The project incorporates SuDS features, including permeable paving, blue/ green roofs, filter drains, tree pits, an attenuation area, hydrocarbon interceptors, and run-off will be discharged by flow control device at greenfield rates to the public network. No capacity issues are identified by the Drainage Section of the planning authority.</p> <p>The lands in the northwestern corner of the site, directly adjacent to the Two Pot River, are located within the watercourse's associated Flood Zones A and B (CDP Strategic Flood Risk Assessment). However, I highlight</p>	<p>No</p>
--	------------	--	-----------

		<p>these lands are at a notably lower ground level than the majority of the site.</p> <p>The SSFRA indicates there is no history of flooding at the site. The flood extent of Two Pot River does not extend to vast majority of the site. The SSFRA demonstrates that the project (all buildings and main roads) lies outside of the 0.1% Fluvial AEP event, is therefore located within Flood Zone C, and is not at risk of flooding.</p> <p>I note that the project's attenuation design capacity is for 1-in-100 year storm events plus allowance for climate change with greenfield-discharge rates to the existing public surface water network, thus ensuring the proposal does not increase surface water runoff elsewhere.</p> <p>Based on information in the SSFRA, EcIA, AASR, and Surface Water Management Strategy (SWMS), I have undertaken a Water Status Impact Assessment screening determination (see section 11.0 and Appendix 4 of this report) and concluded that the project will not result in a risk of deterioration to any waterbody (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) or otherwise jeopardise any waterbody in reaching its WFD objectives.</p> <p>Accordingly, I do not consider this aspect of the project likely to result in a significant effect on the environment in terms of watercourses and waterbodies.</p>	
2.6 Is the location susceptible to subsidence, landslides or erosion?	No	There is no evidence identified of these risks.	No

<p>2.7 Are there any key transport routes (e.g. National Primary Roads) on or around the location which are susceptible to congestion, or which cause environmental problems, which could be affected by the project?</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The site is accessed from Waterfall Road (L2230), part of the local road network, and bound to the north by South Ring Road/ N40 dual carriageway. The site is well connected to the national (N40, N71/ Bandon Road) and regional road networks (R849) located c.1km (driving distance) to the northeast of the site.</p> <p>During the site development works, the project will result in an increase in traffic activity (HGVs, workers) as construction equipment, materials, and waste are delivered to/ removed from the site. Site development works will be short term in duration and impacts arising would be temporary, localised, and managed under in the CEMP.</p> <p>The Traffic and Transportation Assessment (TTA) considers operation phase impacts for the project, predicting total vehicle trips (combined arrivals and departures) of 121 trips during the AM peak hour, and 121 trips in the PM peak hour (with allowances made for cumulative trips with other residential consents), assesses six junctions in the surrounding road network (including the junction of Waterfall Road/ R849 (J4) and the N40/ N71 Bandon Road roundabout (J5)) with identification of queue lengths and delays at junctions.</p> <p>Relevant to national roads, the TTA predicts a maximum increase in traffic flows at the Bandon Road roundabout (J5) of 1%, which is assessed as having a negligible impact on the junction.</p>	<p>No</p>
--	-----------	---	-----------

		Accordingly, I consider the applicant has demonstrated that the key transport routes in the vicinity of the site will not be congested due to or otherwise affected by the project.	
2.8 Are there existing sensitive land uses or community facilities (such as hospitals, schools etc) which could be significantly affected by the project?	No	<p>There are no sensitive community facilities, such as hospitals or schools, in proximity to the site and/ or that will be significantly affected by the project.</p> <p>There are existing residential dwellings located to the east, south, and west of the site. However, the separation distances are such that there is no realistic prospect of undue overlooking, overshadowing, overbearance caused.</p> <p>Site development works will be implemented in accordance with the CEMP which includes mitigation measures to protect the amenity of adjacent properties and residents.</p> <p>The operational phase of the project will cause an increase in activity at the site (traffic generation, use of public and communal open spaces, operation of the childcare facility) which will likely be typical of such mid-scaled, medium density schemes as proposed, in outer suburban locations such as the receiving area, and are anticipated as being well within acceptable parameters for same.</p> <p>If permission is under consideration, it is recommended that the project be conditioned to be under the control of an established management company and/ or elements taken in charge by the local authority, and accordingly no undue impacts would be anticipated.</p>	No

3. Any other factors that should be considered which could lead to environmental impacts			
3.1 Cumulative Effects: Could this project together with existing and/ or approved development result in cumulative effects during the construction/ operation phase?	No	<p>Existing and/ or approved planning consents in the vicinity of the site (in particular Waterfall Heights) and the wider Bishopstown area (Bishopstown Court neighbourhood centre) have been noted in the application documentation and associated assessments, e.g. in respect of the AASR, SSFRA, and TTA.</p> <p>However, these developments are of a nature and scale that have been determined to not have likely significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>While cumulative effects are identified (e.g., increase in traffic generation, I direct the Board to the response to Q: 2.7 above), there are no cumulative significant effects on the area that are reasonably anticipated.</p>	No
3.2 Transboundary Effects: Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects?	No	There are no transboundary effects are arising.	No
3.3 Are there any other relevant considerations?	No	No	No
C. CONCLUSION			
No real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	X	EIAR Not Required	
Real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.		EIAR Required	

D. MAIN REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

Having regard to: -

1. The criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended, in particular:
 - (a) the nature and scale of the proposed residential development (which is below the mandatory thresholds for Class 10(b)(i) and Class 10(b)(iv) of the 2001 Regulations) and the greenfield nature of the site and its location in an outer suburban area which is served by public services and infrastructure.
 - (b) the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity.
 - (c) the location of the development outside of any sensitive location specified in article 109(4)(a) of the 2001 Regulations.
2. The results of other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment submitted by the applicant and the results of the strategic environmental assessment of Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028 undertaken in accordance with the SEA Directive (2001/42/EC).
3. The features and measures proposed by applicant envisaged to avoid or prevent what might otherwise have been significant effects on the environment.

The Board concluded that the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment and that an Environmental Impact Assessment and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Assessment Report would not, therefore, be required.

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Assistant Director Planning: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 4: Water Status Impact Assessment – Screening Form

Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
ABP Ref.	ABP 321949-25	Townland, address	Ardarostig and Ballinaspig More
Description of project		Construction of 164 residential units, childcare facility and all associated site works	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening		<p>The site is greenfield in nature and presently in agricultural use. The topographical and hydrological context of the site are of note. The site is located between two watercourses, Two Pot River is adjacent to the west and Glasheen River is further to the east (c.590m). The lands directly adjacent to the Two Pot River in the northwest of the site are located within the associated Flood Zones A and B (CDP Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, pg. 88). However, I highlight these lands are at a notably lower ground level than the majority of the site, as outlined below.</p> <p>Ground levels across the site decrease steadily in northerly and northeasterly directions (c.10m) and more steeply in a westerly direction towards the Two Pot River (c.15.5m). Due to this topography, the majority of the site (centre, east (80-85%)) drains towards the Glasheen River, while the remainder (west (20%)) drains to the Two Pot River (Section 1, Appendix C, SSFRA). The site is comprised of well-drained soils type with subsoils of sandstone till, on a locally important aquifer with high to extreme vulnerability (EPA).</p>	
Proposed surface water details		<p>Connection to the existing public stormwater network in Waterfall Road (east of site) which in turn discharges to the Glasheen River. A Surface Water Management Strategy (SWMS) has been prepared for the project.</p> <p>Surface water run-off in the proposal will be collected, attenuated on-site, and discharged by gravity to the public network. The proposed development incorporates SuDS features, including permeable paving, blue/ green roofs, filter drains, tree pits, attenuation areas and hydrocarbon interceptors. The surface water run-off will be discharged to the public network (and to Glasheen River) at greenfield rates. No capacity issues are identified by the Drainage Section of the planning authority.</p>	

Proposed water supply source & available capacity	Connection to existing public water mains in Waterfall Road (south of site). Uisce Eireann has provided Confirmation of Feasibility and Statement of Design Acceptance (Appendices A and B, Infrastructure Report). No capacity issues identified.					
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity	Connection to the existing public foul sewer in Waterfall Road (east of site). Wastewater in the proposal will be collected and discharged by gravity to the public network for treatment. Uisce Eireann has provided Confirmation of Feasibility and Statement of Design Acceptance (Appendices A and B, Infrastructure Report). No capacity issues identified.					
Other	<p>There is no history of flood events at the site (Section 3, Appendix B, SSFRA). The site is not prone to any type of flood risk (Section 4, Appenidx A, SSFRA).</p> <p>The site’s aquifer vulnerability rating of high to extreme is noted but on the basis of no historical groundwater flood events, and no indication of springs and/ or wells, the risk to groundwater is reasonably dismissed (Section 4, SSFRA).</p> <p>The proposed development (all residential units and road infrastructure) is located within Flood Zone C, will not increase surface water run-off rates nor increase flood risk elsewhere, and is an appropriate form of development (Section 7.0, SSFRA).</p>					
Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection						
Identified Waterbody	Distance to (m)	Waterbody name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective	Identified pressures on the waterbody	Pathway linkage to water feature
River Waterbody	0m	Two Pot (Cork City)_010/ IE_SW_19T050890	Moderate	At risk	Anthropogenic Pressures	Yes – site’s northwestern boundary is the Two Pot River, and west

							of site drains to Two Pot River.
River Waterbody	c.590m	Glasheen (Cork City)_010/ IE_SW_19G040700	Poor	At risk	Anthropogenic Pressures		Yes – centre/ east of site drains to Glasheen River
Groundwater Waterbody	Underlying site	Ballinhassig East/ IE_SW_G_004	Good	Not at risk	None identified		Yes – well draining sandy soil conditions.
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	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?
1.	Site clearance/ construction	Two Pot (Cork City)_010	Northwestern boundary of site is the Two Pot River	Siltation, pollution events, spillages	Implement CEMP	No	Screened out
2.	Site clearance/ construction	Glasheen (Cork City)_010	None	None	N/A	N/A	Screened out
3.	Site clearance/ construction	Ballinhassig East	Drainage through soil/ bedrock	Pollution events, spillages	Implement CEMP	No	Screened out
OPERATIONAL PHASE							

1.	Surface water run-off	Two Pot (Cork City)_010	None	None	N/A	N/A	Screened out
2.	Surface water run-off	Glasheen (Cork City)_010	Surface water discharge (100%)	Pollution events, spillages	SuDS, greenfield discharge rates	No	Screened out
3.	Groundwater discharges	Ballinhassig East	Drainage through soil/ bedrock	Pollution events, spillages	SuDS features	No	Screened out
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE							
1.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A