



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP-322837-25

Development	LRD: Construction of 124 residential apartments, 1 cafe, 2 office units and associated site works.
Location	Barrys Field, Carrigaline Road and, Churchyard Lane, Douglas Cork
Planning Authority	Cork City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2543605
Applicant(s)	Barry Field Ltd
Type of Application	Large Scale Residential Development (LRD)
Planning Authority Decision	Cork City Council
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Peter Collins Barry Healy Liam Edwards
Observer(s)	None

Date of Site Inspection

22nd August 2025

Inspector

Lorraine Dockery (Lead Inspector)

Karen Hamilton (Second Inspector)

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	5
2.0 Proposed Development	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	10
3.1. Decision	10
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	10
3.4. Third Party Observations	13
4.0 Planning History.....	14
5.0 Policy Context.....	15
5.3. Natural Heritage Designations	19
5.4. EIA Screening	19
6.0 The Appeal	23
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	23
6.2. Applicant Response	25
6.3. Planning Authority Response.....	28
6.4. Observations.....	28
6.5. Further Responses	28
7.0 Assessment.....	28
8.0 AA Screening.....	60
9.0 Recommendation.....	62
10.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	62
11.0 Conditions	67

Appendix 1: Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening	79
12.0 Appendix 2: Form 3 - EIA Screening Determination	81
Appendix 3 – AA Screening	94
13.0 Appendix 4: WFD Impact Assessment Stage 1: Screening	104

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site, which has a stated area of 0.84 hectares, is located within the settlement of Douglas, Co. Cork. The subject site is bound to the west by Churchyard Lane and to the east by the Carrigaline Road while Douglas Village shopping centre is located to the north-west. Existing trees/planting and a stone wall/earthen bank form the western and eastern boundaries of the site. A telecom exchange with graveyard beyond is located to the south of the site while St. Luke's Church of Ireland and graveyard to its south-east. The general area is characterised by a mix of residential and commercial properties.
- 1.2. The site is largely greenfield in nature, roughly square in shape and is relatively level with a minor level difference from south to north. Some works will occur in lands under the ownership of Cork City Council (as outlined in red in the submitted documentation).

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development is for a Large- Scale Residential Development (LRD) consisting of:
- Construction of 124 residential apartments (1, 2 & 3 bed units),
 - Construction of one café and two office units,
 - All associated works including footpaths, parking, drainage, lighting, landscaping and others.
 - Works on Churchyard Lane to include 2 no. pedestrian crossings, footpath upgrades and removal of 6 parking spaces.
 - A new storm and foul sewer will be constructed along Carrigaline Road
 - New access includes a vehicle entrance and pedestrian routes from the Carrigaline Road and two no. pedestrian routes onto Churchyard Lane.
- 2.2. The applicant set up a website for the public at www.barrysfieldlrd.com
- 2.3. The principal development statistics are as shown below:

Table 1:

Site Area	1.04 ha (red line boundary)	
Net Development Area	0.84ha	
No of Units	124 no. apartments	
Net Density	148 uph (units per hectare)	
Building Height	1-5 storeys	
Parking	26 car spaces/274 bicycle spaces	
Communal Open Space	10.5%	
Public Open Space	15.3% of the site	
Private Open Space	Provided to all residential units	
Part V	25 units (10 x 1-bed; 15 x 2-bed)	
Unit Type	No of Units	Gross Floor Space sqm
1 Bed	50 (40%)	2558.5m ²
2 Bed	64 (52%)	5064.8m ²
3 Bed	10 (8%)	1045.3 m ²
Total	124	
Other Uses		
Unit Type		Gross Floor Space sqm
1 Café and 2 office units		395.5 m ²

2.4. The application was accompanied by the following documents:

- Dwelling Mix Report
- Housing Quality Assessment
- Letter of Consent from Cork City Council
- Response to Cork City Council Pre-Application Consultation Opinion
- Letter of Consent- Landowner

- Part V Cost Methodology
- Statement 299B Report
- Statement of Consistency
- Design Statement
- Schedule of Accommodation and Areas
- Planning Statement Report
- Construction and Operational waste management plans (Engineers)
- Traffic, Transport and mobility plans (Engineers)
- Verified Photomontages
- Appropriate Assessment Screening Report
- Archaeology Report
- Bat Survey
- Daylight and Sunlight Analysis Report
- Outlook Lighting Report
- Archaeology Reporting
- Ecological Impact Assessment and Invasive species reports.
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Architecture, Engineering & Public lighting Drawings
- Landscape Drawings including:
 - Tree Clearance Plan
 - Tree Constraints Plan
 - Tree Protection Plan
 - Landscape Masterplan
 - Boundary Treatment

2.5. Planning Authority Opinion

- 2.5.1. A Section 247 Meeting was held on the 19th June 2024. A pre-application LRD Meeting was held on the 19th November 2024 and the LRD Opinion was issued by the Local Authority on the 16th December 2024.
- 2.5.2. In summary, the Cork City Council LRD Opinion concluded that the documents submitted required further consideration and amendment to constitute a reasonable basis on which to make an application. Pursuant to section 32(D)2 the following areas and issues required further consideration:
- (i) Architectural heritage related requirements including of tree-lined western boundary; detailed assessment of Douglas-Donnybrook ACA; 3D visualisations
 - (ii) Strategic Planning Policy requirements in relation to mixed use element of scheme, density calculations, placemaking, provision of photomontages and SuDS proposals
 - (iii) Retention of trees and protection measures; tree planting and species identification
 - (iv) Design related requirements including finishes; introduction of green roofs; pedestrian connections and public realm finishes; refuse collection management; external play and amenity areas
 - (v) Further consideration and amendment to provide for active permeability through the site on cycle/foot; play provision; full details of swales and bioretention areas; tree planting and improved pedestrian flows
 - (vi) Strategic transport related requirements including pedestrian accessibility; pedestrian enhancements to junction of Churchyard Lane/Church Street; provision of separate pedestrian access point from southern end of site; provision of dropped kerbs and footpath to north of proposed vehicular access; cycle accessibility; vehicular accessibility
 - (vii) Urban Roads and Street Design related requirements including enhanced

pedestrian and cycling connectivity/improvements to public realm; centralised location of bicycle stands; auto tracking layout

- (viii) Traffic Regulation and Safety related requirements including car parking; bicycle parking; lighting and traffic signals; greater details regarding pedestrian crossing; road markings and signage
- (ix) Drainage related requirements including wastewater; stormwater
- (x) Construction and demolition related requirements including CEMP and CDRWMP
- (xi) Noise and Vibration related requirements including details to be contained in Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment
- (xii) Operational Waste Management related requirements including details to be included in Operational Waste Management Plan; sweep path drawing for refuse vehicles
- (xiii) Biodiversity related requirements including Japanese Knotweed management; bat surveys, report and Ecological Technical Note Report
- (xiv) Statement on how the development has considered climate resilience from design to implementations stages
- (xv) Scheme Sustainability Statement outlining how the development has considered climate mitigation and adaptation from design to operational stages
- (xvi) Identification of any wayleaves/rights of way
- (xvii) Statement of consistency with relevant objectives of the Development Plan for the area
- (xviii) Information referred to in article 299B(1)(b)(ii)(II) and article 299B(1)(c) of the

(xix) Statement of response to issues set out in Opinion

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

GRANT permission subject to 48 no conditions

Further Information requested by the planning authority in relation to safeguarding of trees and boundaries, in particular along the western boundary, together with details relating to such safeguarding.

The Further Information response resulted in the omission of the internal pedestrian footpath along the southern boundary of the site. Additional documents submitted included site layout plans, Design Statement, Root Investigation Report, Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Landscaping Masterplan and revised verified photomontages.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

There are two Planners' Reports relating to this file. The first report (dated 25/03/2025) sets out the initial analysis of the LRD and recommends Further Information (FI) be submitted. The report notes that the principle of development is supported and welcomed by the planning authority. The proposed development accords with the zoning objectives for the site, the general strategic development objectives of the Cork City Development Plan and national planning guidance and is acceptable in principle.

The second Planner's Report (dated 09/05/2025) refers to the submitted Further Information and recommends a grant of permission, subject to conditions.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- City Architect: No objection (18/03/2025)

- Planning Policy Report: Further Information requested (04/12/24). Notes localised context of site within ACA and cautions against over-reliance on existing landscaping, albeit a positive scheme element (18/03/25)
- Environment Report: No objections, subject to conditions (17/02/25)
- Contributions Report: No objections, subject to conditions (25/02/25)
- Traffic Regulation and Safety Report: No objections, subject to conditions (03/03/25)
- Urban Roads and Street Design (Planning) Report: No objections, subject to conditions (21/03/25 and 24/03/25)
- Area Engineer's Report: No objections, subject to conditions (24/03/25)
- Drainage Report: No objections, subject to conditions (05/03/25)
- Parks and Recreation Planning Report: No objections, subject to conditions (07/03/25)
- Tree Officer Report: Further Information requested (20/03/25). Report and details provided are generally accepted and provide sufficient detail in the context of the proposed development; conditions recommended (26/05/25)
- Housing Report: No objections, subject to conditions (19/03/25)
- Conservation Report: Further Information requested in relation to reduction in height of Block 1 and screening of proposed development (19/03/2025)
- Biodiversity Report: No objections, subject to conditions (undated)

3.2.3. Conditions

Condition No.	Requirement
2	Tree protection measures to be implemented in full and confirmation from a certified arboricultural consultant.
3	A project arborist shall be appointed for the duration of all construction.

4	A tree health and safety assessment shall be conducted for written agreement of the Council.
5	<p>Site clearance outside the bird nesting period.</p> <p>Bat Survey to be undertaken by a qualified ecologist before site clearance. If bat usage is detected, a licenced bat worker should be present on site and all necessary licences for relocation obtained in advance from the NPWS.</p>
7	A suitably qualified Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) to be present on-site for the duration of the construction phase.
8	Method Statement on removal of Japanese Knotweed
9	Submission of Invasive Species Management Plan
11	Installation of hedgehog boxes
12	Installation of nest boxes for sparrows
16	Parking for residents only
17	Appointment of Mobility Manager
19	No HGVs access the site from Churchyard Lane
31	Submission of SuDS Assessment Report
35	Design and construction of pedestrian crossing and tactile paving at site entrance

44	Limitation of light trespass into windows of houses
----	---

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Uisce Eireann

No objection in principle

A Confirmation of Feasibility has issued advising that the water/wastewater connections are feasible subject to upgrades.

Upgrades to the watermain network (extension of approximately 50m from existing 150m diameter watermain network) will be required to cater for the proposed development. Uisce Eireann currently does not have any plans to upgrade these sewers. Any network upgrades will be carried out by UE and funded by the applicant as part of the connection agreement.

Inland Fisheries Ireland

Proposed to dispose of effluent from the development to the public sewer. Requests that Uisce Eireann/Cork City Council signifies that there is sufficient capacity in existence so that it does not (a) overload existing treatment facilities and (b) result in pollution entering waters or (c) cause or contribute to non-compliance with existing legislative requirements.

Transport Infrastructure Ireland

The Authority will rely on the planning authority to abide by official policy in relation to development on/affecting national roads as outlined in DoECLG Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2012) and relevant TII publications

3.4. Third Party Observations

Six third-party observations were received by the planning authority and may be generally summarised as follows:

- Design- Excessive height; excessive unit mix; density too low given locational context of site's in proximity to amenities and public transport
- Traffic and Transport- inadequate parking provision; will result in increased traffic congestion; loss of on-street parking and section of taxi rank
- Heritage/Amenity- impacts on ACA; inadequate screening; loss of vegetation on Carrigaline Road; overlooking of adjacent public house
- Residential Amenity- disruption during construction works and operation; suitability of such a development beside a public house; potential for future noise complaints; impacts on social infrastructure

4.0 Planning History

Subject Site

PL04.302641

Permission REUSED on appeal for mixed-use development, construction of a 3-storey mixed-use (residential, retail, office, and café/coffee shop/restaurant) building with ancillary facilities for one reason relating to design, scale and massing, would be visually dominant, obtrusive and out of character with the pattern of existing development in the Church Street ACA and would prejudice the development potential of adjoining lands to the north. (2019)

PL04-249088

Permission REFUSED on appeal for a licenced discount foodstore and ancillary infrastructure for one reason relating to design and integration of proposal, impacts on ACA and injurious to visual amenities of the area. (2018)

Nearby

ABP-312475-22

Permission REFUSED for construction of 65 apartments and associated site development works for 5 no. reasons relating to density, height, scale and design, together with residential amenity issues. (2023)

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines

The following list of section 28 Ministerial Guidelines are considered to be of relevance to the proposed development. Specific policies and objectives are referenced within the assessment where appropriate.

- Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024)
- Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments – Guidelines for Planning Authorities
- Architectural Heritage Protection, Guidelines for Planning Authorities
- Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets
- The Planning System and Flood Risk Management (including the associated Technical Appendices)
- Urban Development and Building Heights, Guidelines for Planning Authorities
- Childcare Facilities – Guidelines for Planning Authorities
- Cycle Design Manual (2023)
- Appropriate Assessment of Plans and Projects in Ireland - Guidelines for Planning Authorities
- Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Guidance for Consent Authorities regarding Sub-threshold Development

National Policy

- National Planning Framework, First Revision (April 2025)

Objective 4

A target of half (50%) of future population and employment growth will be focused in the existing five cities and their suburbs

Objective 37

Ensure the integration of safe and convenient alternatives to the car into the design of our communities, by prioritising walking and cycling accessibility to both existing and proposed developments and integrating physical activity facilities for all ages.

Objective 45

Increase residential density in settlements, through a range of measures including reductions in vacancy, re-use of existing buildings, infill development schemes, area or site-based regeneration, increased building height and more compact forms of development.

Objective 101

Planning authorities will be required to apply a standardised, tiered approach to differentiate between i) zoned land that is serviced and ii) zoned land that is serviceable within the life of the plan.

- Housing For All- A New Housing Plan for Ireland to 2030
- National Biodiversity Action Plan 2023-2030
- Climate Action Plan 2025 (as informed by CAP 2024)

Regional Policy

- Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy for the Southern Region- located within Cork Metropolitan Area
 - Cork MASP Policy Objective 15- Tourism
- Cork Metropolitan Area Transport Strategy (CMATS) 2040

5.2. Local Planning Policy

The **Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028** applies.

Site is located within the development boundary of Douglas, a South East Suburb (see Figure 2.10 of Plan). The site is located within the 'Inner Urban Suburbs' as set out in Map 8 of Vol 2 of the Plan. Douglas is described as 'a larger suburb with a village character served by two large shopping centres and good public transport links to the City' (see Chapter 11).

Zoning: 'Objective ZO 4' 'Mixed Use' which seeks 'to provide and promote a mix of residential and other uses to ensure the creation of a vibrant and sustainable urban areas'.

Section ZO 4.1

This zoning objective facilitates the development of a dynamic mix of uses which will interact with each other creating a vibrant urban area with residential, employment and other uses. A vertical and horizontal mix of uses should occur where feasible, including active ground floor uses and a vibrant street frontage on principle streets.

Permissible uses within this zone includes residential, general offices and local services.

- Density and Building Height Strategy- Table 11.1 Cork Building Height Standards. Prevailing heights for this location range from 2-3 storeys with target heights between 3-4 storeys. Figure 11.2 shows prevailing height for this area as being 1.8 storeys.
- Table 11.2 Cork City Density and Building Heights Standards- prevailing dwellings/hectare for this area are 5-20 dwellings/ha with a lower target of 50 units/ha and an upper target of 100 units/ha.
- There are a number of policies and objectives which support compact growth, neighbourhood design/placemaking, residential development and protection of built heritage.

Chapter 10, Section 11 Douglas

Objective 10.100 Neighbourhood Development Sites

Subject site is identified as Neighbourhood Development Site 2 (Vol 1, Chapter 10) with recommended land use stated as including residential, community facilities, local services, shops and public realm improvements. A flood risk assessment should be submitted with the application. Consideration should be given to permeability and how users will access the site from adjoining roads or paths. An ACA and/or Protected Structure and/or other historic asset falls within or adjacent to the site. Public realm improvements are required and should be considered as apert of any development proposal. SuDS details are required. A traffic and transport assessment is required as part of the planning application.

Objective 10.321 'The identification of Land at Barry's Field as a local transformation site represents an opportunity to incorporate, a comprehensive high-quality mixed-use development that positively responds to Carrigaline Road, Church Street and

Church Yard Lane. This has the potential to incorporate a mix of employment generating uses, homes and community infrastructure into an underutilised infill site and introduce public realm improvements and pedestrian permeability that will improve the overall urban experience in this part of Douglas. During the lifetime of the Plan, the telephone exchange facility directly to the south could come forward as part of a comprehensive scheme with the Barry's Field Site or independently but having regard to the need to integrate and contribute towards the design ethos and mix of uses proposed at Barry's Field'.

Objective 10.82 Douglas Sustainable Transport, Placemaking and Public Realm which seeks to optimise placemaking and contribute to multifunctional and inclusive public realm that assists in improving the attractiveness of Douglas.

Site is located within the Douglas-Donnybrook Architectural Conservation Area (ACA). It is specifically located in Sub Area B: Douglas East of the ACA and its character is defined as 'typical of a market town of main street from the period before Douglas became part of the growing city' (se Vol. 3 of Plan).

Objective 8.23 Development in Architectural Conservation Areas

Parking- Variation No 1 (Revised Parking Standards on a City Wide basis) of the Cork City Development Plan 2022 - 2028 was made on 08.05.2023. As per the Variation the site lies within Parking Zone 2 which reflects areas that are or will be accessible to mass transit alongside public transportation corridors. Standards have been revised as follows: 'Parking Zone 2- 1 space per 1-2 bed unit and 2 spaces per 3-3+bed units and 100m² for café and office element.

Public Transport

CMATS proposes proposals for higher frequency on the existing Ringaskiddy-Monkstown-Douglas-City route, the prioritisation of the Douglas Road and South Douglas Road bus corridor and an orbital bus corridor which would run from Cork University Hospital (CUH) via the Western Road to Hollyhill, Blackpool, Mayfield, through the Jack Lynch Tunnel, and on to Mahon Point, Douglas village and the Black Ash park and ride site, before returning to CUH. (see Chapter 10).

To address the significant shortfall in local connectivity in the southern city area, CMATS also identifies the requirement for a more comprehensive, multi-modal Southern Distributor Road.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

There are no Natura 2000 sites within the boundary of the appeal site nor are there any Natura 2000 sites directly abutting the appeal site or within the immediate context of the site. Cork Harbour SPA (Site Code: 00430) and Great Island Channel SAC (Site Code: 1058) are located approximately c.280m and 6.8km from the appeal site respectively as the crow flies.

5.4. EIA Screening

- 5.4.1. Class (10)(b) of Schedule 5 Part 2 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) provides that mandatory EIA is required for the following classes of development:
- Construction of more than 500 dwelling units,
 - Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 ha in the case of a business district, 10 ha in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 ha elsewhere. (In this paragraph, “business district” means a district within a city or town in which the predominant land use is retail or commercial use.
- 5.4.2. The proposed development is for 124 residential units, café, 2 no. offices and associated site works on a site c. 0.84 hectares (nett). The site is currently under grass, is zoned and can be serviced.
- 5.4.3. The site is located within the administrative area of Cork City Council and is within the built-up area. The proposed development is considered to be sub-threshold in terms of EIA having regard to Schedule 5, Part 2, 10(b) (i) and (iv) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended), in that it is less than 500 units and below 10ha.
- 5.4.4. The criteria at Schedule 7 to the Regulations are relevant to the question as to whether the proposed sub-threshold development would be likely to have significant effects on the environment that could and should be the subject of environmental

impact assessment. The application is accompanied by an EIA Screening Report which includes the information required under Schedule 7A to the planning regulations. The Screening Report concludes that having regard to the nature, extent, and the characteristics of the likely impacts identified for the construction and operational phases, it is considered that the proposed residential development at the subject site will not give rise to a likely significant environmental effect and accordingly a sub-threshold EIA is not required. I am satisfied that the submitted EIA Screening Report identifies and describes adequately the direct, indirect, secondary and cumulative effects of the proposed development on the environment.

- 5.4.5. I have assessed the proposed development having regard to the information above; to the Schedule 7A information and other information which accompanied the application, *inter alia*, Appropriate Assessment Screening, Ecological Impact Assessment Report and Statement in Accordance with 299B(1) (b) (ii) (II) and article 299B(1) (c) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001-2024, and I have completed an EIA screening assessment as set out in Appendix 3.
- 5.4.6. The current proposal is an urban development project that would be in a built-up area. The proposal is for 124 residential units, café and 2 office units on a stated site area of 0.84 hectares. The nature and size of the proposed development is well below the applicable thresholds for EIA. The residential uses would be similar to the predominant land uses in the area. The proposed development would be located on greenfield lands beside existing development. The site is not designated for the protection of a landscape. The proposed development is not likely to have a significant effect on any Natura 2000 site. This has been demonstrated by the submission of an Appropriate Assessment Screening Report which concludes that there will be no impacts upon the conservation objectives of the Natura sites identified.
- 5.4.7. The development would result in works on zoned lands. The proposed development is a plan-led development, which has been subjected to Strategic Environmental Assessment. The proposed development would be primarily a residential use, which is a predominant land use in the vicinity. The proposed development would use the municipal water and drainage services, upon which its effects would be marginal. The site is located within a defended flood zone and the proposal will not increase the risk of flooding within the site. The development would not give rise to significant

use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution, nuisance or a risk of accidents. The potential for contaminated material to be encountered during excavation, with the potential for impacts on the environment with regard to land and soils, was considered and assessed in the submitted EIA Screening Report, and the proposal will not give rise to significant environmental impacts. The features and measures proposed by the applicant envisaged to avoid or prevent what might otherwise be significant effects on the environment, including measures identified in the proposed Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Construction Resource Waste Management Plan (CRWMP) are noted.

5.4.8. The various reports submitted with the application address a variety of environmental issues and assess the impact of the proposed development, in addition to cumulative impacts with regard to other permitted development in proximity to the site, and demonstrate that, subject to the various construction and design related measures recommended, the proposed development will not have a significant impact on the environment. I have had regard to the characteristics of the site, location of the proposed development and types and characteristics of potential impacts. I have examined the sub criteria having regard to the Schedule 7A information and all other submissions and I have considered all information which accompanied the application including inter alia:

- Appropriate Assessment Screening Report, prepared by Limosa Environmental
- EIA Screening Report, prepared by McCutcheon Halley Planning Consultants
- Construction Resource and Waste Management Plan, prepared by DOSA Consulting Engineers
- Construction and Environmental Management Plan, prepared by DOSA Consulting Engineers Infrastructure Report, prepared by DOSA Consulting Engineers
- Flood Risk Assessment, prepared by Arup
- Drainage Impact Assessment Report, prepared by DOSA Consulting Engineers
- Outdoor Lighting Report, prepared by MBA Engineers
- Ecological Impact Assessment, prepared by Limosa Environmental

- Bat Survey Report, prepared by Greenleaf Ecology
- Design Statement, prepared by O'Mahony Pike Architects
- Archaeological Testing Report, prepared by Avril Purcell
- Traffic and Transport Assessment Report prepared by MHL & Associates Consulting Engineers
- Sustainability/Energy Statement, prepared by Martin Buckley & Associates Ltd.

5.4.9. In addition, noting the requirements of Section 299B (1)(b)(ii)(II)(C), whereby the applicant is required to provide to the Board a statement indicating how the available results of other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment carried out pursuant to European Union legislation other than the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive have been taken into account, the applicant has submitted a Statement in Accordance with 299B(1)(b)(ii)(II) and article 299B(1)(c) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001-2024. An AA Screening Report in support of the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) and the Birds Directive (2009/147/EC) has been submitted with the application. A Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment has been submitted, which has had regard to Directive 2002/49/EC, Environmental Noise Directive. A Flood Risk Assessment, prepared by Arup has had regard to Directive 2007/60/EC, Floods Directive. The EIA screening report prepared by McCutcheon Halley Planning Consultants has had regard to Directive 2014/52/EU, EIA Directive and under the relevant themed headings, considered the implications and interactions between these assessments and the proposed development, and as outlined in the report states that the development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment. A Drainage Impact Assessment, prepared by DOSA Consulting Engineers, has had regard to Directive 2000/60/EC, Water Framework Directive. I am satisfied that all other relevant assessments have been identified for the purposes of screening out EIAR. I have had regard to all of the reports detailed above and I have taken them into account in this assessment, together with the SEA for the operative City Development Plan.

5.4.10. I have completed an EIA screening assessment as set out in Appendix 2 of this report.

- 5.4.11. I consider that the location of the proposed development is such that the environmental sensitivity of the geographical area would not justify a conclusion that it would be likely to have significant effects on the environment. The proposed development does not have the potential to have effects the impact of which would be rendered significant by its extent, magnitude, complexity, probability, duration, frequency or reversibility. In these circumstances, the application of the criteria in Schedule 7 to the proposed sub-threshold development demonstrates that it would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment and that an environmental impact assessment is not required before a grant of permission is considered. This conclusion is consistent with the EIA Screening Statement submitted with the application.
- 5.4.12. I am overall satisfied that the information required under Section 299B(1)(b)(ii)(II) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) has been submitted. A Screening Determination should be issued confirming that there is no requirement for an EIAR based on the above considerations.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1.1. Three no. third party appeals have been received from Liam Edwards, Barry Healy and Peter Collins. Two of the appeal submissions state that they have no objection to the principle of redevelopment of the site but raise the following concerns:

Impacts on character of ACA/Visual Amenity

- Location of site within Douglas-Donnybrook ACA
- Impact on character and appearance of village and ACA; contrary to Objective 8.23 of Cork City Development Plan (CCDP) which seeks to conserve and enhance the special character of the ACA
- Regard should be had to the report of the Conservation Officer which recommends a reduction in height to more appropriately address the lower-scale village and create a more comfortable transition across the site. Their report also notes heavy reliance on trees

- Inappropriate design, excessive massing and building height will fail to integrate into this architecturally sensitive area; visually discordant and dominant development
- Requests reduction in scale of development along Carrigaline Road to provide a more comfortable transition to existing streetscape in vicinity, together with the retention of most of existing boundary treatment, save for pedestrian/cyclist access. This will respect the established character of the area and positively contribute to ACA

Height/ Density

- Concerns regarding excessive height along northern section of Carrigaline Road
- Excessive density of development; overdevelopment of site
- Density and height at odds with density and building height strategy of CCDP and proposal has failed to satisfy SPPR3 of Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2018)- has not been demonstrated that the proposed development satisfies development management criteria set out under section 3.2 of same. Planning authority have failed to refine and determine what an appropriate development density for the site may be having regard to Compact Settlement Guidelines
- Proposal incapable of being modified by condition to address concerns

Mix of Uses

- Proposed mix of uses is heavily weighted in favour of residential and does not provide an appropriate mix of uses
- Proposal contrary to Objective 10.100 of CCDP in relation to Neighbourhood Development Sites and associated guidance contained in Neighbourhood Development Site 2

Tree and Earthen Bank Removal

- Concerns regarding removal of existing naturalised stone-lined earthen bank boundaries and trees along Carrigaline Road. Effect being that the bulk and massing of the proposed development along Carrigaline Road will not be screened or softened

Other Matters

- Previous refusals from An Coimisiún Pleanála (ACP) for development up to 3 storeys in height for reasons including visual dominance/out of character with pattern of development in ACA
- Windows at 1st and 2nd floor level at northern end of block fronting Carrigaline Road would undermine future residential amenities due to outlook onto Barry's Pub; also undermine development potential of this adjoining site
- Lack of car parking would likely result in indiscriminate kerbside parking to the detriment of safety conditions on surrounding street network; concerns regarding pedestrian sightlines at Churchyard Lane and junction sightlines at entrances

6.1.2. A third appeal submission (from Barry Healy), who again is not opposed to the principal of development on the site raises the following matters:

- Considers that proposed densities, heights and massing are insufficient for a location of this nature, which is well positioned near local amenities, a robust transport system and all necessary public service infrastructure
- Development sites such as this are uncommon and chance to fully leverage their potential should not be overlooked
- Overall height should be at least seven storeys
- Sufficient availability of three- and four- bedroom residences in this area. Addition of one- and two- bedroom units is necessary to rectify the existing imbalance. Proposes that three-bed apartments be omitted from proposal in favour of increasing the overall number of one-bed units

6.2. Applicant Response

A response received on behalf of the applicant on 18/07/2025 may be summarised as follows:

- Carefully designed using stepped massing strategy with lower heights positioned along sensitive site boundaries and greater heights positioned centrally within the site; gradual and respectful transition; varied building heights and high-

quality material palette; active on-street frontage; public open space in excess of minimum standards; well considered architectural response

- Setback of apartments 10-15m from western boundary (Churchyard Lane) ensuring substantial separation distances preventing direct lines of sight into neighbouring private spaces; overlooking mitigated by lower block heights, careful window placement and substantial intervening planting
- Proposal in compliance with Objective 3.5 of CCDP; integrating new residential units into an established village setting
- Density also supported by Objectives 3.6, 8.23 and 11.1 of CCDP with balanced range of unit sizes; high quality, design-led scheme; integrates new pedestrian routes and public open space; respects and enhances the special character of Douglas ACA; integrates sensitively with ACA; minimal alterations to existing boundary; retention of mature landscape features
- Conservation Officer concerns fully addressed during application stage; additional reports and verified photomontages submitted at FI stage. Strongly aligns with aforementioned objectives
- Historical refusals did not share the same residential focus, design approach or architectural language; current proposal fundamentally different in character
- Daylight and sunlight assessment undertaken shows that all neighbouring residential properties will continue to meet BRE guidelines with only minimal changes to light levels, which are well within light levels; will not give rise to any adverse daylight/sunlight impacts
- TTA confirms that proposal will generate a modest number of additional vehicular trips which can be accommodated safely on existing road network without significant impacts on operational performance. Analysis demonstrates that nearby junctions have sufficient capacity to manage future traffic volumes
- No individually allocated residential car parking spaces; shared to maximise efficiency and flexibility; quantum aligns with broader sustainability and compact growth objectives

- Excellent accessibility of site well served by public transport with numerous high-frequency bus routes nearby; within 500m of a planned high-frequency urban bus service; proposed Route 3 has a 10-minute frequency, which stops to the north of the site; strongly aligns with Objective 11.1 of CCDP

A further response received on behalf of the applicant on 28/07/2025 reiterates many of the points made in the previous submission. Additional points may be summarised as follows:

- Building height and density carefully refined through a thorough and collaborative process with Cork City Council; scheme achieves a balanced outcome that aligns with national and local policy objectives whilst respecting the site's uniqueness including its location within the ACA
- Setbacks and adjustments to top floor of Block 1 introduced at Further Information (FI) stage to address concerns of Conservation Officer, together with updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment
- Proposed unit mix fosters an inclusive and sustainable community that contributes to a socially diverse urban neighbourhood; allows it to accommodate changing demographic needs over time in accordance with national guidance
- Proposal fully complies with section 3.2 of Building Height Guidelines and has been assessed against all of the criteria set out in section 3.2. Proposal also complies with SPPR 3 of Building Height Guidelines
- Proposal is in compliance with mixed-use zoning objective and provides active frontage; late night commercial uses would not be appropriate in this primarily residential context
- Concerns regarding privacy and overlooking have been addressed by generous separation distances, thoughtful architectural design, strategic window orientation and enforceable planning conditions
- Current scheme carefully designed to respect existing boundaries; proposal will not undermine Barry's Pub or other local businesses' viability or future potential
- Proposed pedestrian crossing has been designed in accordance with DMURS; Road Safety Audit found the proposal to be appropriately designed and safe for

all users; removing all existing parking on Churchyard Lane is unnecessary to achieve compliant pedestrian sightlines

- TTA and RSA confirm that appropriate visibility splays have been provided in accordance with DMURS standards and national guidance; parking provision aligns with Objective 10.25 of CCDP; refuse truck tracking analysis fully complies with relevant design standards. No report submitted by appellant Peter Collins to validate concerns regarding car parking provision
- FI documents submitted to PA are available online and fully accessible to the public

6.3. Planning Authority Response

None

6.4. Observations

None

6.5. Further Responses

None

7.0 Assessment

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

- Principle of proposed development including mix of uses
- Design Rationale including height/density
- Impact on character of ACA/visual amenity impacts including tree/earthen bank removal
- Traffic and Transport Matters

- Other Matters

7.2. In the interests of clarity, I highlight to An Coimisiún that the Old Carrigaline Road is referred to as 'Old Carrigaline Road' and 'Carrigaline Road' intermittently in the documentation attached to this file.

7.3. **Principle of proposed development including mix of uses**

- 7.3.1. The subject site is located within the urban settlement boundary of Douglas, a South East Suburb of Cork City (see Figure 2.10 of City Development Plan). Douglas is also designated as a District Centre, see Figure 2.8 Cork City 2040 Concept Plan. The site is located within the 'Inner Urban Suburbs' as set out in Map 8 of Vol 2 of the City Development Plan. Douglas is described as 'a larger suburb with a village character served by two large shopping centres and good public transport links to the City' (see Chapter 11). The subject site is largely greenfield in nature and is zoned 'Objective ZO 4' 'Mixed Use' which seeks 'to provide and promote a mix of residential and other uses to ensure the creation of a vibrant and sustainable urban areas'. Section ZO 4.1 of the operative City Development Plan states that this zoning objective facilitates the 'development of a dynamic mix of uses which will interact with each other creating a vibrant urban area with residential, employment and other uses. A vertical and horizontal mix of uses should occur where feasible, including active ground floor uses and a vibrant street frontage on principle streets. Permissible uses within this zone include residential, general offices and local services'. The proposal comprises a mixed-use development of a café, 2 no. offices and 124 no. residential units. The uses proposed are considered to comply with the zoning objective. Uses proposed will interact with each other to create a vibrant urban area. Active ground floor uses are proposed which will create a vibrant street frontage. The proposal also provided for public open space and public realm provisions, together with enhanced pedestrian and cycle connections.
- 7.3.2. There is a recognised need for additional residential units within the existing footprint of Cork city, with a 14% population increase anticipated within the South-East suburbs during the life of the current Plan. I note that there are numerous policies and objectives within the operative City Plan which support residential development within existing settlement boundaries on infill sites. Table 2.6 of the operative City Plan states that the role of the City Suburbs, of which Douglas is one such suburb, in

the Core Strategy is to consolidate and enhance by providing a mix of new neighbourhood uses in suitable underutilised locations; to prioritise walking, cycling and public transport access; to deliver uses, layouts and densities that enhance existing local character; to deliver high quality sustainable transport orientated development in combination with high frequency bus routes, ...and prioritised cycling and walking routes set out in CMATS. Having examined the entirety of the proposal before me, I am of the opinion that the proposal is in compliance with Table 2.6 of the Plan in this regard. The proposal is also considered to be in compliance with national and regional policy in this regard and I note that the RSES envisage a population growth target of 75,000 for Cork City and Suburbs to 2031. The National Planning Framework, First Revision, sets out ambitious growth targets to enable the four cities of Cork, Limerick, Galway and Waterford to each grow by at least 50% to 2040.

- 7.3.3. In addition, the site forms part of the Neighbourhood Development Site 2 (Vol 1, Chapter 10) with the following requirements noted: (i) recommended land use stated as including residential, community facilities, local services, shops and public realm improvements. (ii) A flood risk assessment should be submitted with the application. (iii) Consideration should be given to permeability and how users will access the site from adjoining roads or paths. (iv) An ACA and/or Protected Structure and/or other historic asset falls within or adjacent to the site. (v) Public realm improvements are required and should be considered as part of any development proposal. (vi) SuDS details are required. (vii) A traffic and transport assessment is required as part of the planning application. I highlight to An Coimisiún that the proposed mix of uses include residential, local services and public realm improvements. A flood risk assessment (FRA) was submitted with the application documentation. Consideration has been given to permeability and how users will access the site from adjoining roads or paths. The site is located within an ACA and regard has been had to same in the design proposal put forward. Public realm improvements are proposed. SuDS measures have been put forward. A TTA was submitted with the application documentation. I consider the proposal to be generally in compliance with the requirements of Neighbourhood Development Site 2.
- 7.3.4. Furthermore, I note Objective 10.321 of the operative City Development Plan which states that 'The identification of land at Barry's Field as a local transformation site

represents an opportunity to incorporate, a comprehensive high-quality mixed-use development that positively responds to Carrigaline Road, Church Street and Church Yard Lane. This has the potential to incorporate a mix of employment generating uses, homes and community infrastructure into an underutilised infill site and introduce public realm improvements and pedestrian permeability that will improve the overall urban experience in this part of Douglas. During the lifetime of the Plan, the telephone exchange facility directly to the south could come forward as part of a comprehensive scheme with the Barry's Field Site or independently but having regard to the need to integrate and contribute towards the design ethos and mix of uses proposed at Barry's Field'. I consider the proposal to represent a comprehensive high-quality mixed-use development that positively responds to Carrigaline Road and Church Yard Lane, onto which the subject site has direct frontage. A mix of employment generating uses and homes, together with public realm improvements and pedestrian permeability have been put forward on this underutilised infill site, which will improve the overall urban experience in this part of Douglas. The site will benefit the local neighbourhood and support compact growth. The development proposal will address the relevant points highlighted by the text and icons associated with the maps and relevant objectives throughout this plan in accordance with Objective 10.100 of the operative City Development Plan. An indicative layout has been put forward for the telephone exchange facility to the south of the site (which does not form part of this current proposal). I am generally satisfied in this regard and consider the proposal to be generally in compliance with Objective 10.321 of the operative City Development Plan.

- 7.3.5. Having regard to all of the above, I am satisfied that the principle of a mixed-use development is acceptable on this site, located within an established neighbourhood with excellent accessibility to local services, employment, and public transport facilities. I consider that the proposal would aid in achieving targets for residential development within the settlement, while also fulfilling a local office/cafe function at an appropriate scale. I do not concur with the assertion, in a submission to the planning authority, that the extent of mixed-use element is such that it does not comply with the zoning objective for the site. While a greater mix of uses may have been welcomed, I consider that an appropriate scale of retail/commercial is proposed, given the location of the site. The planning authority are generally

satisfied in this regard. The Policy Division of the planning authority note that the commercial element comprises 3.6% of the overall scheme and while they consider this to be minimal, they state that it achieves the objective of creating an active frontage along Carrigaline Road, which is the considered to sufficiently meet the relevant objectives of the Plan. I am generally satisfied with regards the principle of the proposed development.

7.4. Design Rationale including height/density

- 7.4.1. Concerns have been expressed in the third-party submissions received in relation to the proposed design rationale including opinions relating to the proposal representing an inappropriate design; that the excessive massing and building height will fail to integrate into this architecturally sensitive area and that the proposal will be a visually discordant and dominant development at this location.
- 7.4.2. The planning authority, in their decision, did not raise concerns in this regard. The City Architect did not raise concerns. I note that the Conservation Officer raised concerns regarding the overall height of the proposal and on foot of these concerns, a Further Information request issued from the planning authority which was duly responded to by the first party. There was no subsequent report from the Conservation Officer.
- 7.4.3. I am generally satisfied with the design rationale permitted by the planning authority. I welcome the setback from the western boundary with retention of much of the existing boundary, trees and understory vegetation (save as to facilitate the proposed pedestrian access points), together with the provision of additional bulb seed planting. This will largely protect and maintain much of the sylvan character of Churchyard Lane. I welcome the provision of a stronger urban edge along Old Carrigaline Road. I have had due regard to Appendix D: Design Checklist of the Sustainable and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) in coming to this conclusion. The subject Design Checklist was developed to assist in the application of Section 4.3- Key Indicators of Quality Urban Design and Placemaking in these forementioned Guidelines. Having examined the Design Checklist, I note that in terms of *Sustainable and Efficient Movement*, the open space area will provide an attractive space for locals to gather, as will the enhanced public realm along Carrigaline Road. The proposal has had regard to BusConnects

in its design. Car parking has been minimised. In terms of *Mix of Land Uses*, the mix and intensity of land uses is considered appropriate to the site and its location. The ground floor office/café use will enliven the street. The mix of uses proposed will add to the vibrancy of the area. The proposal will reduce vacancy on this greenfield, infill site where there was evidence of anti-social behaviour at the time of my site visit. In my opinion, a development of an appropriate scale for this location is proposed. In terms of *Green and Blue Infrastructure*, the proposal has responded positively to the environment in which it is located. Trees and stone-lined earthen bank are being retained where possible. Open space is universally accessible. SuDS measures are proposed. A detailed landscaping plan has been put forward. In terms of *Responsive Built Form*, the layout, orientation and scale of development supports the formation of a coherent and legible urban structure. The proposal appropriately addresses the street with clearly defined spaces. The proposal integrates well with its context and provides appropriate transitions in scale. The proposal does not detract from the ACA. The provision of the setback along Carrigaline Road will provide a pleasant area of public open space. To conclude, the design rationale is such that the proposed development will provide a quality development at this location, will aid in the mix of uses provided, will enhance the built heritage and will provide additional residential units without detracting from the architectural heritage or residential amenities of the area. I am generally satisfied in this regard.

Height

- 7.4.4. The height of the proposal ranges from single storey to five storeys- three storeys fronting onto Carrigaline Road (with setback at 3rd floor level) rising to five storeys as one moves west towards Churchyard Lane.
- 7.4.5. Some of the submissions received raise concerns regarding the height of the proposed development. Some consider that the height is excessive, in particular along the northern section of Carrigaline Road. They consider this to be particularly pertinent given the location of site within Douglas-Donnybrook ACA. Reference is made to the planning history and previous refusals from ACP for development up to 3 storeys in height for reasons including visual dominance and proposal being out of character with pattern of development in ACA. Another submission received gives

an alternative opinion and considers that the proposed height is inadequate and given the locational context of the site, should be increased to seven storeys.

- 7.4.6. A Design Statement submitted with the application documentation (updated as part of FI response to planning authority) noted that the proposed height of up to five storeys is supported by the location of the site, is within close walking distance of amenities and employment opportunities available in Douglas Village and that it is located on existing and proposed public transport routes. The applicants continue by stating that setbacks from existing buildings, the retention of a significant number of trees and the existing boundary treatment to the west mean that the development can be integrated successfully into its context.
- 7.4.7. Table 11.1 Cork Building Height Standards notes that the prevailing heights for this location range from 2-3 storeys with target heights between 3-4 storeys identified. Figure 11.2 shows prevailing height for this area as being 1.8 storeys. The proposal ranges in height from 3-5 storeys inclusive of setback.
- 7.4.8. The planning authority note that the height and density exceed the targets set out in the City Development Plan. However, they acknowledge that the Compact Settlement Guidelines are a material consideration and that given the setbacks from existing buildings, the proposed retention of a significant number of trees as well as the existing boundary treatment to the west, these measures allow the development to be integrated successfully into its context. They have not raised concern in relation to the height proposed nor do they state that the proposal represents a material contravention of the operative City Development Plan.
- 7.4.9. I concur with the opinion of the planning authority that the subject site would be categorised as a City-Urban Neighbourhood in the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024). These Guidelines recognise that in order to achieve compact growth we will need to support more intensive use of existing buildings and properties, including the re-use of existing buildings that are vacant and more intensive use of previously developed land and infill sites, in addition to the development of sites in locations served by existing facilities and public transport. Douglas is well served by public transport, this is a highly accessible site and I note CMATS proposals for higher frequency public transport on the existing Ringaskiddy-Monkstown-Douglas-City route, the

prioritisation of the Douglas Road and South Douglas Road bus corridor and an orbital bus corridor which would run from Cork University Hospital (CUH) via the Western Road to Hollyhill, Blackpool, Mayfield, through the Jack Lynch Tunnel, and on to Mahon Point, Douglas village and the Black Ash park and ride site, before returning to CUH. I am also cognisant of the Urban Development and Building Heights, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2018) which sets out the requirements for considering increased building height in various locations but principally, inter alia, in urban and city centre locations and suburban and wider town locations. It recognises the need for our cities and towns to grow upwards, not just outwards. I have had particular regard to SPPR3 and the development management criteria, as set out in section 3.2 of these Guidelines, in assessing this proposal including at the scale of relevant city/town, at the scale of district/neighbourhood/street, at the scale of the site/building, together with specific assessments. In his regard, I note the following:

Table 2:

At scale of relevant city/town
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal assists in securing objectives of the NPF, in terms of focusing development in key urban centres, fulfilling targets in relation to brownfield, infill development and delivering compact growth • Site is well served by public transport • Proposal would successfully integrate into/enhance the character and public realm of the area and makes a positive contribution to place-making. Landscape and Visual Assessment submitted • Proposal would not adversely affect the skyline- height of nearby buildings noted • Given the scale of development proposed, I have no information before me to believe that the infrastructural carrying capacity of the area could not accommodate the proposed development. Neither the PA nor Uisce Eireann have raised concerns in this regard
At District/Neighbourhood/Street Level

- Proposal responds well to its overall environment and would make a positive contribution to the urban neighbourhood/streetscape of the area
- Proposal puts forward a good design response- it is not monolithic nor does it have long, uninterrupted walls of building
- High quality, well considered materials proposed- this matter could be adequately dealt with by means of condition
- Proposal would enhance the overall urban design context. Presently the site adds little to the streetscape
- Proposal would make a positive contribution to legibility of the area; good public realm is proposed; would make an appropriate level of enclosure of streets/spaces
- Proposal would positively add to the mix of uses within the area; would allow meaningful contact between the development and the street and would make a positive contribution to the character and identity of the area. The uses proposed at ground floor level are noted
- Proposal would respect the form of buildings and landscape around the site's edges and the amenity enjoyed by neighbouring properties. This has been demonstrated in the submitted documentation

At site/building scale

- Proposed design maximises access to natural daylight, ventilation and views and minimise overshadowing. The proposal has been examined in the context of BRE guidelines and I am satisfied in this regard
- Proposal ensures no significant adverse impact on adjoining properties by way of overlooking overbearing and/or overshadowing. Any impacts are considered to be in line with what one would expect within such an urban area
- Proposal would result in an effective urban design and streetscape solution

Specific Assessments

- Environmental assessment has been undertaken within this report and I am satisfied in this regard

7.4.10. I note RPO 10 of the Southern Region Assembly- Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy 2020 in relation to compact growth in metropolitan areas. This is an infill site that is well served by existing facilities and public transport. In addition to the provision of residential units, the subject application also seeks to introduce a mix of other uses including café and offices. I am satisfied that the proposal is consistent with same.

7.4.11. I have assessed all of the information before me in relation to the suitability of this proposed development at this location, including its overall height. I acknowledge the concerns expressed by the third parties. I acknowledge that at five storeys, the proposal is higher than the target height indicated for Douglas. The target height indicated for is 3 (lower target) to 4 (upper target) storeys. However, I note that it does fall within the range of 3-5 storeys, as indicated for the Inner Urban Suburbs (within which Douglas is located) as outlined in Tables 11.1 and 11.2 of the Cork City Development Plan. The Plan could be considered to be confusing in this regard, giving differing targets for the same area. Notwithstanding this, I note the use of the word 'target' in this regard. The definition of 'target' in the Oxford Dictionary is 'a result that you try to achieve'. It is therefore not something that must be achieved, the word 'shall' is not being utilised. I consider the term 'target' as expressed in Table 11.1 to constitute a recommended range as opposed to a definitive limitation, which SPPR 1 of the Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines prohibits development plans from providing for. I note section 1.16 of the operative City Development Plan notes that 'The Plan must also comply with Ministerial Guidelines issued under section 28 of the Planning and Development Act and any Specific Planning Policy Requirements ('SPPRs') included within'. It further notes under section 3.58 that the implementation of the policy objectives for the City Development Plan are informed by the 'Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas' (2009) and its companion document; 'Urban Design Manual– A Best Practice Guide' (2009) and any updated versions that may be published over the lifetime of the Development Plan.

7.4.12. In addition, I note that SPPR 3 of the Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines states that if the Board concurs with an applicant's case and is satisfied that a development complies with the criteria under section 3.2 then a development may be approved, even where specific objectives of the relevant development plan may indicate otherwise. An Coimisiún may consider the proposal to represent an unidentified material contravention of the operative City Development Plan in relation to height, given that the upper target height indicated for Douglas is 4 storeys. The planning authority have not stated that they consider it to be a material contravention of their Plan. I do not consider it to be a material contravention of the Plan given that the site does fall within the range of 3-5 storeys, as indicated for the Inner Urban Suburbs (within which Douglas is located). In this regard, I note previous decisions of An Coimisiún, for example ABP-319482-24 for a site on Blackrock Road, Cork city also located within an Inner Urban Suburb area. An Coimisiún considered in that case that while Table 11.1 of the Development Plan sets target building heights for these areas, it does not prohibit buildings of six storeys in the Inner Suburbs Area and in that case that the omission of one storey from the six-storey apartment block was therefore not warranted or necessary. In the interests of clarity, the maximum height proposed in this current appeal is 5 storeys. An Coimisiún, in that appeal, did not consider the proposal to be a material contravention of the City Development Plan. An Coimisiún may wish to omit a storey in this case (reducing the overall scheme to a maximum of four storeys) but I do not consider it warranted in this instance. I consider that the height of the proposal before me responds well to its context, provides an efficient use of lands within an established settlement boundary in close proximity to existing and planned public transport infrastructure. I am satisfied that a height such as that proposed is appropriate at this location and is allowable under the current policy objectives of the City Development Plan. I also consider the proposal to be in compliance with Government guidelines in this regard. I note proximity to existing and future public transport links and the fact that this is a greenfield site that is currently underutilised. The proposed height would not detract from the visual or residential amenities of the area and would make a positive addition to the streetscape at this location. I am satisfied in this regard.

7.4.13. I note that some of the submissions received highlight that permission was previously refused by ACP for development of lesser height for reasons relating to

height and impacts on the character of the area. The first party in their response to the appeal notes that historical refusals on this site did not share the same residential focus, design approach or architectural language as the current proposal and were fundamentally different in character. I would concur with this assertion and also note that the current proposal is being assessed under a different Development Plan. I also note the introduction of updated national guidance in the interim. Finally, I note that each application is assessed on its own merits.

Density

- 7.4.14. I highlight to An Coimisiún that the matter of density was raised as an issue in many of the third-party submissions received. The density of development proposed is stated by the applicant as being 153.7 units/hectare. By my calculations, based on a net site area of 0.84ha, the density of development is 147.6 units/hectare. This is a somewhat marginal difference but I highlight to An Coimisiún nonetheless.
- 7.4.15. Table 11.2 of the operative City Development Plan 'Cork City Density and Building Height Standards' notes that for this location the prevailing density is in the range of 5-20dph, with a lower target of 50dph and an upper target of 100dph. The planning authority note the publication of Guidelines for Planning Authorities, Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements (Jan 2024), and state that the subject site would be categorised as a 'City-Urban Neighbourhood' (which is defined in Table 3.8 of said Guidelines) and therefore that densities in the range of 50dph to 200dph shall be generally applied. The planning authority have not raised concerns in this regard and note that the proposed density is justified against the highly accessible location of the site. While they note that the density exceeds the targets set out in the operative City Development Plan, they are of the opinion that the density proposed is acceptable having regard to the revised density guidelines referenced above. They do not consider the density to be a material contravention of the operative City Development Plan. I again note section 1.16 of the operative City Development Plan notes that 'The Plan must also comply with Ministerial Guidelines issued under section 28 of the Planning and Development Act and any Specific Planning Policy Requirements ('SPPRs') included within'. It further notes under section 3.58 that the implementation of the policy objectives for the City Development Plan are informed by the 'Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas' (2009) and its companion

document; 'Urban Design Manual– A Best Practice Guide' (2009) and any updated versions that may be published over the lifetime of the Development Plan.

7.4.16. I highlight to An Coimisiún that the proposed density may be considered to be an unidentified material contravention of the operative City Development Plan, given that an upper target of 100uph applies to this area, as per Table 11.2 of the operative City Development Plan, while the density proposed is 148 uph. An Coimisiún may consider section 37(2)(a) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, relevant in this instance. I have had regard to The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024), with particular reference to Table 3.1, which sets out density ranges for Dublin and Cork City and Suburbs. Given the locational context of the site, I concur with the opinion of the planning authority and also consider it to be located within a City-Urban Neighbourhood, a highly accessible urban location with good access to employment, education, institutional uses and public transport. The site is proximate to a High-Capacity Public Transport Node or Interchange within 500m walking distance of an existing or planned BusConnects 'Core Bus Corridor' stop as per the aforementioned Guidelines. There are three bus stops serving Route Nos. 207, 216, 219, 220 & 223 just to the north and west of the site, with additional bus stops within walking distance. The site is within 500m of a planned high frequency urban bus service with proposed Route 3 with a 10-minute frequency has stops just to the north of the site at Douglas Village Shopping Centre.

7.4.17. I therefore consider the density proposed to be in accordance with Policy and Objective 3.1 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2024. I also have had regard to the policies and objectives of the operative City Development Plan in relation to compact growth within existing established settlements. I note Objective 3.5 in relation to residential density, in particular (b) which seeks to ensure that urban density is achieved by development proposals providing for high quality sustainable residential development, ensure a balance between the protection of the established character of the surrounding area and existing residential amenities and the Cork City Urban Density, Building Height and Tall Building Study. I consider the proposal to be in compliance with same. Additionally, as stated above, I note the use of the word 'target' as applied in Table 11.2 of the operative City Development Plan. The

definition of 'target' in the Oxford Dictionary is 'a result that you try to achieve'. It is therefore not something that must be achieved, the word 'shall' is not being utilised. I consider the term 'target' as expressed in Table 11.2 to constitute a recommended range as opposed to a definitive limitation.

7.4.18. Given the locational context of the site within an 'Inner Suburb' in the immediate vicinity of existing and planned high-capacity public transport corridor, within the urban core of Douglas, within walking distance of a number of established services and facilities and in proximity to good pedestrian infrastructure, I am satisfied that the proposed density is acceptable. Having regard to the assessment and conclusion set out above, I am satisfied that the proposed development is consistent with the requirements of planning policy at national, regional and local level. An Coimisiún should not, therefore, consider itself constrained by Section 37(2) of the Planning and Development Act.

7.5. Impact on character of Architectural Conservation Area (ACA)/visual amenity impacts including tree/earthen bank removal

Character of ACA/Visual Amenity

7.5.1. The subject site is located within the Douglas-Donnybrook Architectural Conservation Area (ACA). It is specifically located in Sub Area B: Douglas East of the ACA and its character is defined as 'typical of a market town of main street from the period before Douglas became part of the growing city' (see Vol. 3 of Plan). The submitted Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment (AHIA) states that historically, this was the commercial and administrative centre with typical market town main street buildings facing redevelopment pressures and increased traffic. There are no Protected Structures or NIAH structures within the subject site. The nearest Protected Structure is the former Garda Station located approximately 10m to the east. River View House, which is listed on the NIAH (20871038) as being of Regional Interest for Architectural and Artistic categories backs onto the Old Carrigaline Road and is located to the north-east of the subject site. I would suggest that the character of Churchyard Lane is almost sylvan in nature with the stone wall of the graveyard on one side of the lane and the dense planting sod/stone wall/ditch of the subject site on the other. The boundary along the Old Carrigaline Road is defined with a stone-lined earthen bank and dense planting. The site is well

screened on all sides and is not unduly visible behind the dense planting/earthen bank. The properties along Church Street largely screen the site from view at this location. At the time of my site visit, I noted some evidence of anti-social behaviour on the site with some dumping evident.

7.5.2. Some of the submissions received raised concerns in relation to impacts on the character of the ACA and visual impacts, due to the extent of development proposed, together with concerns regarding tree removal and removal of the stone-lined earthen bank along Carrigaline Road. Concerns are also raised regarding inappropriate design, that the excessive massing and building height will fail to integrate into this architecturally sensitive area; that the proposal represents a visually discordant and dominant development and that the proposal is contrary to Objective 8.23 of CCDP which seeks to conserve and enhance the special character of the ACA. I have dealt with the matter of design, height and scale in the preceding section and I refer An Coimisiún to same. Furthermore, third parties contend that regard should be had to report of Conservation Officer which recommends a reduction in height to more appropriately address the lower-scale of the village and create a more comfortable transition across the site. Their report also notes a heavy reliance on trees in the proposal. Third parties request a reduction in scale of development along Carrigaline Road to provide a more comfortable transition to the existing streetscape in the vicinity, together with the retention of most of the existing boundary treatment, save for pedestrian/cyclist access. They consider that this will respect the established character of the area and positively contribute to ACA. As stated above, one third-party submission received considers that the height and scale of the proposal should be increased to reflect the locational context of the site.

7.5.3. In response, the first party state that the proposal has been carefully designed using a stepped massing strategy with lower heights positioned along sensitive site boundaries and greater heights positioned centrally within the site. They consider the proposal to represent a gradual and respectful transition with varied building heights and high-quality material palette; active on-street frontage and public open space in excess of minimum standards. They further state that the proposal provides a well-considered architectural response to its location and note the submission of Further Information to address the initial concerns of the planning authority in this regard.

- 7.5.4. The planning authority requested Further Information in relation to this matter and noted that the screening and setting offered by the existing mature trees, boundary walls and established vegetation, is critical to the acceptability of the scheme and its successful integration into the receiving environment and this part of the Douglas - Donnybrook ACA. They further noted that the visual impact of the development is softened by the presence of these trees and boundary treatments, without which, measures to reduce the height and massing would be required. They noted that this was particularly crucial on the western boundary (I highlight to An Coimisiún that this is the Churchyard Lane boundary). They requested Further Information in relation to the level of detail provided regarding the structural and physiological condition of the trees in question, requested an updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment which should include a clear assessment of the potential impact of excavation, changes in ground levels, and construction activities on root protection areas (RPAs) and tree health.; additional root investigations to confirm extent and viability of root systems; clarify whether retained trees present any risk to future occupants in terms of stability, subsidence, or structural interference, together with a clear justification for any trees proposed for removal. In response, the first party submitted a number of documents including site layout plans and sections; Design Statement; Root Investigation Report; Landscaping Masterplan and revised Verified Photomontages. An Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment was also submitted as part of the Further Information response, which concludes that the proposal will result in very slight changes to the visual character of the area of Douglas village with any impacts considered to be negligible. Updated visualisations were also submitted.
- 7.5.5. The planning authority states that their Tree Officer met with the first party on site to discuss the RFI and have confirmed that the Further Information provided is generally acceptable and provides sufficient detail in the context of the proposed development. They state that overall the FI submitted has adequately addressed their concerns. Conditions are recommended in this regard.
- 7.5.6. The report of the Conservation Officer of the planning authority has been highlighted in some of the third-party submissions received in support of their concerns regarding the five-storey height proposed due to the conservation sensitivities of this location. The Planner's Report notes that the City Architect had no objection to the heights proposed. The Planner's Report notes that the bulk and massing of the

scheme are to a large degree softened by the presence of existing trees and hedgerows and they agree that FI regarding retention of same is essential to the overall acceptability of the scheme. No further report from the Conservation Officer is available, subsequent to the submission of the FI response. I have dealt with the FI request in the preceding paragraphs. I acknowledge that there will be some loss of trees and earthen bank/ditch/wall along the boundaries of the site. I also acknowledge that the outlook will change as the site changes from its current condition to one accommodating a development of the nature and scale proposed. I do not consider this to be a negative. The majority of trees are being retained on site and integrated into the proposal, for example the pocket park in the NE portion of the site is designed around an existing stand of trees. I acknowledge that the existing planting both within the site and on adjoining lands aids in screening and softening the proposed development and aids in the integration of the overall proposal. This screening is being largely retained and is welcomed. However, notwithstanding this, I consider that in the absence of such planting, the proposal would be a successful intervention in the streetscape in its own right. I am satisfied with the height, scale and massing proposed and consider it appropriate for this location.

- 7.5.7. Objective 8.23 of the operative City Development Plan is noted which relates to development in Architectural Conservation Areas. Some of the third-party submissions received state that the proposal is not in compliance with this objective. In this regard, I consider that the proposal would not impact negatively upon features within the public realm. The design and detailing responds respectfully to the historic environment in a way that contributes new values from our own time. This is being achieved by considering layout, scale, materials and finishes and patterns. Historic materials are being referenced in the materiality proposed. Materiality has been considered in the Elevation Strategy, as contained in the Design Statement (dated 8th May 2025). The addition of new materials is considered appropriate and in keeping with the character of the original structures/area. I am satisfied that the proposal is substantially in compliance with Objective 8.23 of the operative City Development Plan.
- 7.5.8. One of the third-party submission received raises concerns regarding impacts of the proposal on their property River View House, which is listed on the NIAH (20871038) as being of Regional Interest for Architectural and Artistic categories. This property

backs onto the Old Carrigaline Road and is located to the north-east of the subject site. Having regard to the layout of the proposed development and the design rationale put forward, I consider that any impacts on this property would not be so great as to warrant a refusal of permission or amendment to the design. Having regard to all of the information before me, I am generally satisfied that the proposal would not detract from the setting or character of the ACA or any Protected Structure or NIAH listed structure to such a degree, as to warrant a refusal of permission or alteration of the proposed scheme. The verified photomontages demonstrates that the scale of development will not have a negative impact on the village core and any designated Protected Structures/NIAH structures located therein. Overall, the design aims to create a vibrant, sustainable urban area that respects the existing character and enhances the public realm of Douglas Village. I am satisfied that the proposal can be successfully integrated into Douglas village without detriment to the visual amenities of the area. I am satisfied with the transitions proposed and consider that they appropriately reflect the locational context of the site. A balance needs to be achieved between protecting the character and setting of our historic villages whilst at the same time permitting sensitive development that meets the current demands of society. I am satisfied that this balance is being achieved in this instance and that the site has the capacity to accommodate a development of the nature and scale proposed, without detriment to the built heritage or visual amenity of the area.

Tree/Earthen Bank Removal

- 7.5.9. Some of the third-party submissions received raise concerns regarding the extent of tree/earthen bank removal. In total there are 96 trees within the Tree Survey Area (8 species of which 50% of native and the remainder are non- native-introduced species). The following is noted:

Table 3:

Category	No. of Trees	Trees to be removed
A	2 no.	0
B	46 no.	18- to facilitate development
C	43 no.	7- to facilitate development

U	5 no.	5- due to condition
Total	96	30

7.5.10. The applicants state that the proposed development has been designed with the objective of preserving the subject trees on site. The trees along the eastern boundary require removal, stated to be at the request of the planning authority, so as to allow the development be easily accessed and become part of the Douglas village community. I would agree with the design rationale behind this decision. Mitigation measures for the protection of remaining trees have been set out.

7.5.11. I note that there are 6 no. Lombardy Poplar trees located along the southern boundary of the site. These have been identified in the documentation as high-value trees that contribute significantly to the landscape character of the ACA. They are being retained in the proposal. A Root Investigation Report was submitted with the FI response to the planning authority which outlines details of root investigations which were undertaken to ensure that the construction can proceed without compromising their health or structural stability. It is concluded in the report that with site-specific mitigation measures in place, the development can proceed without compromising the condition or safety of these trees. I am satisfied in this regard.

7.5.12. I am satisfied that a certain amount of tree and earthen bank removal is necessary to facilitate the proposed development. This is somewhat inevitable on any such similar sites. Two-thirds of the existing planting is being retained. The existing boundary treatment along Churchyard Lane is largely being retained. Additional compensatory planting is proposed, together with public/communal open space areas. I am satisfied that any loss of trees/planting/earthen bank would not be so great as to warrant a refusal of permission.

7.6. Traffic and Transport Matters

7.6.1. One of the appeal submissions raises concerns regarding the level of parking proposed, increased congestion, together with sightlines proposed (both pedestrian and vehicular) and overall road safety impacts. They further consider that lack of car parking would likely result in indiscriminate kerbside parking to the detriment of safety conditions on surrounding street network. The first party in response states that the submitted TTA confirms that the proposal will generate a modest number of additional vehicular trips which can be accommodated safely on existing road

network without significant impacts on operational performance. They note that there are no individually allocated residential car parking spaces- spaces are shared to maximise efficiency and flexibility and that the quantum aligns with broader sustainability and compact growth objectives. They further state that analysis demonstrates that nearby junctions have sufficient capacity to manage future traffic volumes. The first party further highlight the excellent accessibility of the site, which is well served by public transport with numerous high-frequency bus routes nearby. The site is located within 500m of a planned high-frequency urban bus service with a proposed Route 3 with a 10-minute frequency, which stops to the north of the site. They further state that the proposal strongly aligns with Objective 11.1 of CCDP in this regard. I highlight to AN Coimisiún that Objective 11.1 relates to Sustainable Residential Development (see page 474 of CCDP).

- 7.6.2. A DMURS Statement of Compliance, Mobility Management Plan, Traffic and Transport Assessment and Road Safety Audit were submitted with the application documentation.
- 7.6.3. The proposed development includes a single vehicular entrance via Old Carrigaline Road which will operate as a priority junction. Two pedestrian access points (and associated pedestrian crossings) are proposed on Churchyard Lane with one additional pedestrian access (with demountable bollards) onto Old Carrigaline Road. In total 26 no. car parking spaces are proposed of which 2 no. are car club spaces (located outside the access barrier) and 2 no. are accessible spaces. Standards in the operative City Plan for car parking are maximum standards. As per the Variation No. 1, the site lies within Parking Zone 2 which reflects areas that are or will be accessible to mass transit alongside public transportation corridors. Standards have been revised as follows with maximum Parking in Zone 2 being 1 space per 1-2 bed unit and 2 spaces per 3-3+bed units and 1 space per 100m² for each of the café and office element. This would result in a maximum of 155 car parking spaces for the apartments, 8 spaces for the café/office units (total 163 spaces). Chapter 11 of the Plan deals with Transport and Mobility. The Plan states that all new development proposals will be subject to maximum car parking standards to achieve greater modal shift and promote sustainable transport patterns and aims to set out car-free or low car standards in development areas within an 800m walking catchment area of Cork city centre and/or of quality public transport. In locations where there is

existing and/ or planned high frequency public transport accessibility (as per CMATS and Bus Connects Cork) and where the receiving road/ street network currently experiences congestion, Cork City Council will require a reduction in parking provision below the maximum standards as presented in Table 11.13.

7.6.4. Figure 11.4 of the Plan states that no parking/support car club is applicable for sites with densities in excess of 100 dph. Density proposed is 148 dph and therefore no parking could be considered applicable in this instance, as per the aforementioned Figure 11.4 of the operative Plan. I note SPPR 3 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) which states that it is a specific planning policy requirement of these Guidelines that (i) in city centres and urban neighbourhoods of the five cities...car parking provision should be minimised, substantially reduced or wholly eliminated. The maximum rate of car parking provision for residential development at these locations, where such provision is justified to the satisfaction of the planning authority, shall be 1 no. space per dwelling. The subject site is located within a designated 'Inner Urban Suburb' as set out in the operative City Development Plan.

7.4 Having regard to the above, I am generally satisfied with the proposal before me. I consider the site to fall the category City- Urban Neighbourhood, located at a High Capacity Public Transport Node or Interchange within 500m walking distance of an existing or planned BusConnects 'Core Bus Corridor' stop. There are a number of high frequency bus stops nearby, together with being within 500m of a planned high-frequency urban bus service with a proposed Route 3 with a 10-minute frequency, which stops to the north of the site. The TII have not raised concern in relation to the proposed development. The planning authority state that the level of parking provision is supported as Douglas village is well served with local services and has very good access to both existing and planned bus routes. They further state that the provision of two car share spaces outside of the access barrier to the parking area is welcomed. I am of the opinion that the proposal accords with local and national guidance in relation to parking provision at such locations and the recognised need for a change in modal split. I have no information before me to believe that public safety would be compromised in any way as a result of the proposed parking provision. The planning authority have not raised concern in this regard.

7.6.5. The DMURS Statement of Compliance examines the four core design principles in the design of streets and roads. It states that the proposed development has been designed to ensure that the focus on connectivity is centred on pedestrians and cyclists. The availability of high levels of connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists will promote walking and cycling by making them an attractive travel mode. The proposed development is well connected to the adjoining village centre and local amenities, with access to adjoining cycle and pedestrian linkages. Pedestrian crossings are proposed to ensure benefits to the wider community. Its location alongside a number of regular city bus route services makes it very accessible to city wide amenities and services. A Stage 1/2 Road Safety Audit has also been prepared as part of the application, with a number of recommendations set out. Contrary to the opinion of the appellants, it does not recommend the omission of all existing carparking spaces along Churchyard Lane to achieve compliant pedestrian sightlines. I consider this to be an unnecessary measure. I note that no refuse collection will be carried out from either the Old Carrigaline Road or Churchyard Lane. I have no information before me to believe that appropriate sightlines have not been provided for in the proposal. The Urban Roads and Street Design (Planning) Division of the planning authority have not raised concerns in this regard and highlight the ease of movement by both pedestrians and cyclists alike within the proposal, integrating with existing services within the Douglas village area. They further state that generally, the improvements to Churchyard Lane and Carrigaline Road are welcomed and overall there is no objection to the development once conditions are adhered to. I am of the opinion that if An Coimisiún is minded to grant permission, a condition ensuring the findings of the Road Safety Audit are incorporated into the development and the carrying out of a Stage 3 and 4 Road Safety Audit is recommended.

7.6.6. I consider that it is somewhat contradictory of the third-parties to on one hand raise concerns with the inadequate level of car parking proposed and then conversely also raise concerns in relation to increased congestion as a result of the level of traffic movements associated with the proposed development. Further carparking would inevitably lead to greater congestion. Given the level of parking proposed, the TTA states that based on worst case scenario the proposed development would result in a maximum of 52 no. vehicles inbound and outbound per peak hour. The impact of

the estimated future year development traffic on the existing network traffic flows was examined in the TTA. It found that the proposed development would result in a very minor percentage increase at junctions in its immediate vicinity- less than a 5% increase at all existing junctions. Four junctions were examined. This percentage impact on these junctions points to them being sub-threshold for analysis in a Traffic and Transport Assessment, as per the NRA Traffic & Transport Assessment Guidelines. This is considered acceptable. The planning authority are satisfied with the findings of the assessment (see report from Traffic: Regulation & Safety Division). They further state that the proposed development will not cause unacceptable operational traffic impacts and will support the delivery of compact growth as part of an integrated neighbourhood, serviced by good quality active and sustainable travel connections. I have no information before me to believe that the existing road network does not have capacity to accommodate the level of traffic increase associated with the proposed development. The MMP notes that substantial efforts will be made to encourage the use of sustainable travel modes. The quality of pedestrian and cycle facilities, coupled with the level of public transport available to residents means that achieving an appropriate, sustainable modal split is entirely achievable. This is considered acceptable and reasonable. Issues raised in relation to illegal parking are matters for traffic enforcement, outside the remit of this planning appeal.

- 7.6.7. I note that the proposal includes for the removal of 4 no. existing on-street car parking spaces on Old Carrigaline Road to facilitate the construction of a new vehicular access to the proposed development. The planning authority have not raised concern in this regard. I noted at the time of my site visit (late afternoon on 21/08/2025) that the majority that the existing car parking spaces along this roadway were available. Two no. car club spaces are proposed which will be available for general use. I am satisfied with the extent of carparking being removed to facilitate the proposed development.
- 7.6.8. To conclude, I am satisfied with regards this element of the proposed development. I have no information before me to believe that the proposed development would lead to the obstruction of road users or the creation of a traffic hazard. The proposal is considered to be in compliance with Development Plan policy in this regard, together with national guidance.

7.7. Other Matters

Unit Mix

- 7.7.1. One of the third-party submissions received raises concern regarding the variety of unit types proposed and states that there is sufficient availability of three- and four-bed residences in the area and that the addition of one- and two- bedroom apartments is necessary to rectify the existing imbalance. They suggest eliminating the three-bed apartments in favour of increasing the number of one-bed apartments. In response, the first-party states that the proposed unit mix fosters an inclusive and sustainable community that contributes to a socially diverse urban neighbourhood and allows the proposal to accommodate changing demographic needs over time in accordance with national guidance.
- 7.7.2. The mix of residential units proposed is as follows:

Table 4:

1 Bed	50 (40%)
2 Bed	64 (52%)
3 Bed	10 (8%)
Total	124 units

- 7.7.3. A Dwelling Mix Report was submitted with the application documentation, which sets out a justification for the proposed unit mix. The methodology used included using data from Census 2022 within the catchment area. The report concluded that the proposed development will address the gaps in the current supply of dwellings through the design of the proposed development, which will increase the number of apartments on offer in the catchment area by 124 no. apartments, representing an increase of more than 50% on the figure recorded in 2022. Secondly, the proposed development is designed to add 114 no. 1- and 2-bedroom units to the catchment area, which will increase the number of 1- and 2-bedroom by more than a quarter. Therefore, the report concludes that the proposed development is an example of a measure that will serve to achieve the housing mix targets for areas within the city suburbs of Cork City. A Housing Quality Assessment was also submitted.

- 7.7.4. The operative City Development Plan states that 'All planning applications for residential developments or mixed-use developments comprising more than 50 dwellings will be required to comply with the target dwelling size mix specified in Tables 11.3-11.9, apart from in exceptional circumstances'. Table 11.8 applies to City Suburbs in which Douglas is located, with a max 25% one-bedroom units, maximum 40% two-bed units and a minimum of 18% three-bed units set out. The proposal does not comply with these ranges. While the planning authority have accepted the justification put forward for the proposed unit mix, I note that they have not addressed the matter of compliance or otherwise with Development Plan standards in this regard within their assessment. They state that the applicant has put forward an argument for the proposed housing mix, which is based on addressing the current over-provision of 3 - and 4 - bedroom properties in the area. They further state that the surrounding buildings are largely commercial in nature, and the residential offering in the wider area is mainly larger family houses at quite a low density. They consider that in this instance, the mix proposed in this highly sustainable location can be successfully accommodated and would assist in balancing the existing housing provision. The planning authority have not addressed the matter of material contravention and accept the unit mix proposed.
- 7.7.5. An Coimisiún may consider this to be an unidentified material contravention of the Plan. Given that the application was lodged to the planning authority on 29/01/2025, the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities (July 2023) apply. In particular, I note SPPR1 in this regard which states that 'Housing developments may include up to 50% one-bedroom or studio type units (with no more than 20-25% of the total proposed development as studios) and there shall be no minimum requirement for apartments with three or more bedrooms. Statutory development plans may specify a mix for apartment and other housing developments, but only further to an evidence-based Housing Need and Demand Assessment (HNDA), that has been agreed on an area, county, city or metropolitan area basis and incorporated into the relevant development plan(s)'. I note that the 'Cork City and County Joint Housing Strategy and Housing Need Demand Assessment was undertaken and I note their Joint Housing Strategy 2022-2028 in this regard. The South-East Suburbs which includes Douglas sets a population target of 58,457 by 2028 for the area, an increase of 13%, and a housing

target of 2,752 units. It further states that given the scale of land available, the area will be critical for delivering on all forms of housing need for Cork City across housing tenure, type and size. Having regard to SPPR1 cited above, the proposal is considered to be in compliance with same.

7.7.6. I also note that SPPR 3 of the Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines states that if the Board concurs with an applicant's case and is satisfied that a development complies with the criteria under section 3.2 then a development may be approved, even where specific objectives of the relevant development plan may indicate otherwise. An Coimisiún may consider the proposal to represent an unidentified material contravention of the operative City Development Plan in relation to unit mix. The planning authority have not stated that they consider it to be a material contravention of their Plan. I consider that the unit mix does represent a material contravention of the Plan in relation to unit mix. I have assessed the proposal above against section 3.2 of Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines. In the interest of brevity, I shall not reiterate but refer An Coimisiún to same (see Table 2 above). I consider that the proposed unit mix before me responds well to its context within an established settlement boundary in close proximity to existing and planned public transport infrastructure. I am satisfied that a unit mix such as that proposed is appropriate at this location. I also consider the proposal to be in compliance with Government guidelines in this regard. I note proximity to existing and future public transport links and the fact that this is a greenfield site that is currently underutilised. The proposed unit mix would not detract from the visual or residential amenities of the area and overall the proposal would make a positive addition to the streetscape at this location. I am satisfied in this regard.

7.7.7. I consider that the provisions of section 37(2)(a) are open to An Coimisiún in relation to this matter. I accept the justification put forward in the submitted Dwelling Mix Report and note that the site is located within an area in which the residential offering was traditionally two-storey housing. This has begun to change in recent times with developments in the wider area. Given the unit mix within the area, I consider that the proposed mix would offer greater choice to future residents. The proposal to include a number of three-bed units is also welcomed so as to cater for a greater cohort of the population within the scheme, possibly people at differing

stages of the lifecycle. The regeneration of this site will be a benefit to the wider community. I am satisfied with the unit mix proposed.

Development Potential of adjoining lands

- 7.7.8. One of the appeal submissions received raises concerns regarding impacts on the future development potential of their site, Barry's Pub, which is located to the north of the subject site. I note a separation distance of in excess of 44m between the proposed development and the existing Barry's pub building. Open space, switchrooms and emergency access separate the proposed building from Barry's Pub site. I have no information before me to believe that the proposed development would have impacts on the development potential of any adjoining sites and note, in any event, that each application is assessed on own merits

Planning Authority Assessment

- 7.7.9. I have no information before me to believe the planning authority did not undertake a comprehensive assessment of the proposed development.

Residential Amenity

- 7.7.10. The first party address matters in relation to overlooking, overshadowing and impacts on privacy- matters which were raised by third parties in their original submissions to the planning authority. However, these matters were not raised in their appeal submissions to An Coimisiún. In the interests of completeness, I have examined these matters. In terms of impacts on the amenity of existing development in the area, I acknowledge at the outset that there will be a change in outlook as the site moves from its greenfield nature to that accommodating a development such as that proposed. This is not necessarily a negative. In terms of impacts on residential amenity, I am cognisant of the relationship of the proposed development to neighbouring properties. I note the locational context of the site within an urban area; the separation distances with nearby properties; the nature of the uses proposed and the design of the proposed development. I consider that separation distances typical, or in excess of what would normally be anticipated within such an urban area are proposed. In my opinion, any impacts are in line with what might be expected in an area such as this and therefore are considered not to be excessively overbearing given this context. The design rationale is noted which includes for setbacks from the boundaries and setbacks at upper levels. I consider that the

proposal would not result in excessive levels of overlooking, overshadowing or impact on privacy. I note section 11.102 of the operative City Development Plan which states that there are no minimum separation distances for front and street-facing elevations and distances will generally be derived by street typology. Furthermore, section 11.104 states that proposals for apartment developments and those over three storeys high, shall provide for acceptable separation distances between blocks to avoid negative effects. There is an acknowledged housing crisis. This is a serviceable site, on which uses proposed are permissible uses. The site is located within an established inner suburban area, where there are good public transport links with ample services, facilities and employment in close proximity. I am generally satisfied in this regard.

- 7.7.11. I acknowledge the concerns raised by the appellants regarding issues being raised by future occupiers regarding activities, noise and the like from the public house. I would be of the opinion that any future occupants would make the decision to reside in this proposed scheme, or otherwise, based on the fact that the public house and associated beer garden are currently in place. I note that this is a town centre location and noise associated with such uses at such a location are to be anticipated. There are other existing residential properties within the vicinity. I am not unduly concerned in this regard.

Consideration of Local Authority Conditions

- 7.7.12. Table 5 below details the reasoning behind my recommended conditions for the proposed development.

Table 5:

Consideration of Local Authority Conditions		
ACP-322837-25 P.A Ref: 2543605		
PA Condition No.	Subject	Included/Modified/Excluded in Schedule of Conditions and reasons

1	Plans and Particulars	Modified Covered in Condition No.1 (Standard ACP condition)
2	Tree Protection Measures	Modified Covered in Condition No. 13 (Standard ACP condition)
3	Tree Protection	Modified Covered in Condition No. 13 (Standard ACP condition)
4	Tree Protection	Modified Covered in Condition No. 13 (Standard ACP condition)
5	Bird Protection	Modified Covered in Condition No. 13 (Standard ACP condition)
6	Bat survey	Omitted- bat protection covered in Condition No. 2
7	Ecological Clerk of Works	Omitted- Covered in Condition No. 2 (Standard ACP condition)
8	Invasive Species	Modified Covered in Condition No. 3 (Standard ACP condition)
9	Invasive Species	Modified Covered in Condition No. 3 (Standard ACP condition)
10	Wildlife Protection- Lighting	Modified Covered in Condition No. 14 (Standard ACP condition)
11	Hedgehog Boxes	Modified Covered in Condition No. 3
12	Sparrow Boxes	Modified Covered in Condition No. 3

13	Landscape	Modified Covered in Condition No. 12 (Standard ACP condition)
14	Landscape	Modified Covered in Condition No. 12 (Standard ACP condition)
15	Works to Carrigaline Road and Churchyard Lane	Modified Covered in Condition No. 3 (Standard ACP condition)
16	Parking	Modified Covered in Condition No. 7 (Standard ACP condition)
17	Mobility Management	Modified Covered in Condition No. 7 (Standard ACP condition)
18	Traffic Management Plan	Modified Covered in Condition No. 7 (Standard ACP condition)
19	Traffic Management	Modified Covered in Condition No. 7 (Standard ACP condition)
20	Traffic Management	Modified Covered in Condition No. 7 (Standard ACP condition)
21	Traffic Management	Modified Covered in Condition No. 7 (Standard ACP condition)
22	Public Lighting	Modified Covered in Condition No. 7 & 14 (Standard ACP condition)
23	DMURS	Modified Covered in Condition No. 7 (Standard ACP condition)

24	DMURS	Modified Covered in Condition No. 7 (Standard ACP condition)
25	Traffic	Modified Covered in Condition No. 7 (Standard ACP condition)
26	Drainage	Modified Covered in Condition No. 10 (Standard ACP condition)
27	Drainage	Modified Covered in Condition No. 10 (Standard ACP condition)
28	Drainage	Modified Covered in Condition No. 10 & 11 (Standard ACP condition)
29	Drainage	Modified Covered in Condition No. 10 (Standard ACP condition)
30	Drainage	Modified Covered in Condition No. 10 (Standard ACP condition)
31	Drainage	Modified Covered in Condition No. 10 (Standard ACP condition)
32	Drainage	Modified Covered in Condition No. 10 (Standard ACP condition)
33	Drainage	Modified Covered in Condition No. 10 (Standard ACP condition)
34	Roads	Modified Covered in Condition No. 7 (Standard ACP condition)

35	Roads	Modified Covered in Condition No. 7 (Standard ACP condition)
36	Roads	Modified Covered in Condition No. 19 (Standard ACP condition)
37	Roads	Modified Covered in Condition No. 7 (Standard ACP condition)
38	Waste Management	Modified Covered in Condition No. 19 (Standard ACP condition)
39	Waste Management	Modified Covered in Condition No. 19 (Standard ACP condition)
40	Waste Management	Modified Covered in Condition No. 21 (Standard ACP condition)
41	Hours of work	Modified Covered in Condition No. 9 (Standard ACP condition)
42	Construction Noise Control	Modified Covered in Condition No. 19 (Standard ACP condition)
43	Operational Noise Control	Omitted- not considered necessary given nature of development
44	Operational Lighting	Omitted- not considered necessary given nature of development and locational context

45	Section 96	Modified Covered in Condition No. 23 (Standard ACP condition)
46	Management Company	Modified Covered in Condition No. 24 (Standard ACP condition)
47	Bond	Modified Covered in Condition No. 25 (Standard ACP condition)
48	Contribution S.48	Modified Covered in Condition No. 26 (Standard ACP condition)

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1.1. See Appendix 3 below.
- 8.1.2. I have considered the proposal in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 8.1.3. The Cork Harbour SPA (Site Code:004030) is located approximately 280m and the Great Island Channel SAC (Site Code:001058) is located approximately 6.8km from the subject site.
- 8.1.4. In summary, the proposal includes for a development up to 5 storey in height, of mixed-use comprising 124 apartments, 1 café, 2 offices and associated site development works on a site area 0.86 hectares. It is located within the settlement boundary of Douglas. There are no open watercourses on, or adjacent to, the site. The habitat on site is not suitable for feeding by Qualifying Interest birds. Dry Meadows and Grassy Verges (GS2) habitat was recorded in the main area open area within the study site boundary and consisted of a tall, rank grassland which was dominated by coarse grasses. Mature treelines were recorded around the boundary. No Annex I bird species were recorded on site and no Red-listed species of highest conservation concern were recorded. The bird species recorded (Table 10 of EcIA) are considered common and widespread birds of the Irish countryside. The site is classified as Flood Zone A and a Justification Test for the development has been

undertaken. It is considered that the proposed development satisfies all the criteria of the development management Justification Test and that the risks relating to flooding will be managed to acceptable levels and therefore fully comply with DoEHLG/OPW and Cork City Council planning guidelines. The proposed development site lies within the defended area of the Douglas Flood Relief Scheme. It is defended to a level equivalent to the Q100 event (100-year flood) with an additional allowance for freeboard which is generally set at 0.5 m across Douglas. The risk of fluvial flooding to the site is limited to design exceedance fluvial events and possible climate change scenarios which may lead to overland flow along Churchyard Lane. In such an event, the risk of ingress to the site will be managed by ensuring the ground levels at the pedestrian entrances are set c. 200 mm above the existing road levels- sufficient to ensure that water does not enter the site. The risk of tidal, groundwater and pluvial flooding to the site is very low.

- 8.1.5. Concerns regarding impacts on designated sites were not raised in the appeal submissions received.
- 8.1.6. An AA Screening Report was submitted with the application. It concludes that significant negative impacts upon Cork Harbour SPA and Great Island Channel SAC can be ruled out at screening stage. The planning authority state that the relevant European Sites are the Cork Harbour SPA (Site Code: 004030) and the Great Island Channel cSAC (Site Code:001058) and that having regard to the location of the proposed development site relative to these European Sites and related watercourses and to the nature and scale of the proposed development, it is considered that the proposed development would not affect the integrity of the European Sites referred to above. The planning authority considered that appropriate assessment was not required.
- 8.1.7. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that the above designated sites can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Nature of works e.g. scale and mixed-use nature of the development
 - Location-distance from nearest European site and lack of connections

- The hydrological distance of indirect pathways to these European Sites where any likely pollutant in surface waters would be sufficiently diluted and or dispersed
- Taking into account screening report by the PA

I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

- 8.1.8. I consider that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually, or in-combination with other plans and projects, on a European Site and appropriate assessment is therefore not required.

9.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission is GRANTED, subject to conditions

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the following:

- a) the location of the site in the established 'Inner Urban Suburb' of Douglas,
- b) the policies and objectives of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028, Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy for the Southern Region 2020-2032 and the Cork Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan.
- c) the Rebuilding Ireland Action Plan for Housing and Homelessness, 2016
- d) Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024)
- e) the Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments (2018)
- f) the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS) (2013)
- g) the Planning System and Flood Risk Management (including the associated Technical Appendices) (2009)

- h) the nature, scale and design of the proposed development
- i) the availability in the area of a wide range of social, community, transport and water services infrastructure,
- j) the submissions and observations received
- k) the provisions of section 37(2)(a) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended

it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would constitute an acceptable density of development in this accessible urban location, would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area, would be acceptable in terms of urban design, height and quantum of development and would be acceptable in terms of pedestrian and traffic safety. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Recommended Draft Order

Appeal by Liam Edwards, Barry Healy and Peter Collins against the decision made on the 04th June 2025 by Cork City Council to grant permission to Barryfield Ltd.

Proposed Development.

The development will consist of the following Large-Scale Residential Development (LRD) located at Barry's Field, Carrigaline Road and Churchyard Lane, Douglas, Cork, comprising the construction of 124 no. residential apartments (consisting of a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bed units), 1 no. cafe unit and 2 no. office units, in a development ranging in height from 1 to 5 storeys and all associated site development works including footpaths, car and bicycle parking, drainage, bicycle and bin stores, lighting, fencing, landscaping/amenity areas, ESB substation/switchroom and plant room. Site development works include 2 no. new uncontrolled pedestrian crossings and footpath improvements on Churchyard Lane which requires the removal of 6 no. existing on-street car parking spaces. The proposed development works include a connection and construction of a new storm water and foul sewer along Carrigaline Road. Access to the site will be via a new vehicle access point and a new pedestrian connection from Carrigaline Road and 2 new pedestrian connections onto Churchyard Lane. The new vehicular access requires the removal of 4 no. existing car parking spaces. The application may be inspected online at the following website set up by the applicant: www.barrysfieldlrd.com.

Decision

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

Matters Considered:

In making its decision, An Coimisiún had regard to those matters to which, by virtue of the Planning and Development Acts and Regulations made thereunder, it was required to have regard. Such matters included any submissions and observations received by it in accordance with statutory provisions. In coming to its decision, An Coimisiún had regard to the following:

- a) the location of the site in the established 'Inner Urban Suburb' of Douglas,
- b) the policies and objectives of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028, Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy for the Southern Region 2020-2032 and the Cork Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan.
- c) the Rebuilding Ireland Action Plan for Housing and Homelessness, 2016
- d) Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024)
- e) the Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments (2018)
- f) the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS) (2013)
- g) the Planning System and Flood Risk Management (including the associated Technical Appendices) (2009)
- h) the nature, scale and design of the proposed development
- i) the availability in the area of a wide range of social, community, transport and water services infrastructure,
- j) the submissions and observations received
- k) the provisions of section 37(2)(a) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended

An Coimisiún considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity, would be acceptable in terms of urban design, height and quantum of development and would be acceptable in terms of traffic and pedestrian safety and convenience. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Appropriate Assessment (AA):

An Coimisiún agreed with the screening assessment and conclusion carried out in the Inspector's report that the proposed development 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] is not required.

This conclusion is based on:

- Objective information presented in the Screening Report
- Standard pollution controls that would be employed regardless of proximity to a European site and effectiveness of same
- Distance from European Sites,
- The absence of meaningful pathway to any European site

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening

An Coimisiún completed an environmental impact assessment screening of the proposed development and considered that the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) Screening Report submitted by the applicant, identifies and describes adequately the direct, indirect, secondary and cumulative effects of the proposed development on the environment.

Having regard to: -

1. the criteria set out in Schedule 7, in particular
 - (a) the nature and scale of the proposed mixed-use development, in an established urban area served by public 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 Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)
2. the results of other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment submitted by the applicant
3. the features and measures proposed by applicant envisaged to avoid or prevent what might otherwise have been significant effects on the environment, and in particular the proposal to provide a high quality design and a detailed landscape plan to mitigate the visual impact of the proposal

An Coimisiún concluded that the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment, and that an environmental impact assessment report is not required.

Conclusions on Proper Planning and Sustainable Development:

An Coimisiún considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would constitute an acceptable density of development in this urban location, would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area, would be acceptable in terms of urban design, height and quantum of development and would be acceptable in terms of pedestrian and traffic safety. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 29th day of January 2025, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The mitigation measures and monitoring commitments identified in the Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA), Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Root Investigation Report, Tree Protection Plan, Japanese Knotweed Management Plan, Bat Survey, Construction and Environmental Management Plan and other plans and particulars submitted with the application shall be carried out in full except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with other conditions.</p>

	<p>Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit a schedule of mitigation measures and monitoring commitments in a single document, as identified in the submitted documents and details of a time schedule for implementation of the mitigation measures and associated monitoring, to the planning authority for written agreement</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity and protection of the environment during the construction and operational phases of the proposed development.</p>
3.	<p>Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall submit to the planning authority for their written agreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Details regarding the provision of hedgehog boxes and their connectivity within the proposed development (b) The provision of nest boxes for house sparrows. Details shall include location, plans and maintenance details of boxes (c) Final geometric layout for works on both Old Carrigaline Road and Churchyard Lane (d) the applicants shall ascertain and comply with all requirements of the planning authority with regards to the eradication of invasive species from the site. Any works to eradicate invasive species from the site shall be carried out under the supervision of an invasive species specialist, who shall monitor all site investigations and other works and who, on completion shall submit a report certifying that the removal process of invasive species is satisfactory. <p>Reason: In the interests of clarity and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area</p>
4.	<p>Prior to the occupation of any residential unit, the developer shall ensure</p>

	<p>that the public realm areas and new routes, as outlined in the site layout plan and landscape drawings shall be fully completed and open to the public.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of social inclusion and to secure the integrity of the proposed development including open spaces.</p>
5.	<p>Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed development shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
6.	<p>Each residential unit shall be used as a single dwelling unit only and shall not be sub-divided in any manner or used as two or more separate habitable units.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of sustainable development and proper planning</p>
7.	<p>The developer shall comply with all requirements of the planning authority in relation to roads, access, lighting and parking arrangements, including facilities for the recharging of electric vehicles. In particular:</p> <p>(a) The roads and traffic arrangements serving the site (including signage) shall be in accordance with the detailed requirements of the Planning Authority for such works and shall be carried out at the developer's expense.</p> <p>(b) The roads layout shall comply with the requirements of the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets, in particular carriageway widths and corner radii;</p> <p>(c) The materials used in any roads / footpaths provided by the developer shall comply with the detailed standards of the Planning Authority for such road works,</p>

	<p>(d) Parking shall be reserved for residents of the proposed development only. Spaces shall not be reserved for any individual or individual units</p> <p>(e) All construction related traffic shall access the site via the Old Carrigaline Road from the south. No construction related Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) shall access the development site via Churchyard Lane</p> <p>A detailed construction traffic management plan shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. The plan shall include details of arrangements for routes for construction traffic, parking during the construction phase, the location of the compound for storage of plant and machinery and the location for storage of deliveries to the site.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and convenience.</p>
8.	<p>The proposed development shall make provision for the charging of electrical vehicles. All car parking spaces serving the development shall be provided with electrical connections, to allow for the provision of future charging points and in the case of 10% of each of these spaces, shall be provided with electrical charging points by the developer. Details of how it is proposed to comply with these requirements, including details of design of, and signage for, the electrical charging points and the provision for the operation and maintenance of the charging points shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: in the interests of sustainable transportation</p>
9.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900, Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1600 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.</p>

	<p>Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>
10.	<p>Drainage arrangements including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the relevant Section of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit to the planning authority for written agreement a Stage 2 - Detailed Design Stage Storm Water Audit. Upon completion of the development a Stage 3 Completion Stormwater Audit to demonstrate Sustainable Urban Drainage System measures have been installed and are working as designed and that there has been no misconnections or damage to storm water drainage infrastructure during construction, shall be submitted to the planning authority for written agreement.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and surface water management</p>
11.	<p>Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall enter into a Connection Agreement (s) with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for a service connection(s) to the public water supply and/or wastewater collection network.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water/wastewater facilities.</p>
12.	<p>The landscaping scheme as submitted to An Coimisiún Pleanála shall be carried out within the first planting season following substantial completion of external construction works.</p> <p>All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of five years from the completion of the development shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p>

	<p>The developer shall retain the services of a suitably qualified Landscape Architect throughout the duration of the site development works. The developer's Landscape Architect shall certify to the planning authority by letter his/her opinion on compliance of the completed landscape scheme with the approved landscape proposal within six months of substantial completion of the development hereby permitted.</p> <p>Site clearance works, including the removal of existing vegetation, is not permitted during the bird nesting season (March 1st to August 31st).</p> <p>Reason: To ensure a satisfactory completion and maintenance of the development in the interests of residential amenity and in the interests of protecting the environment</p>
13.	<p>Prior to commencement of any permitted development, the developer shall engage the services of a qualified arborist as an arboricultural consultant, for the entire period of construction activity. The developer shall inform the planning authority in writing of the appointment and name of the consultant, prior to commencement of development. The consultant shall visit the site at a minimum on a monthly basis, to ensure the implementation of all of the recommendations in the tree reports and plans. To ensure the protection of trees to be retained within the site, the developer shall implement all the recommendations pertaining to tree retention, tree protection and tree works, as detailed in the in the submitted Tree Survey Report. All tree felling, surgery and remedial works shall be completed upon completion of the works. All works on retained trees shall comply with proper arboricultural techniques conforming to BS 3998: 2010 Tree Work – Recommendations. The clearance of any vegetation including trees and shrub shall be carried out outside the bird-breeding season (1 March–31 August inclusive) or as stipulated under the Wildlife Acts 1976 and 2000. The arborist shall carry out a post construction tree survey and assessment on the condition of the retained trees. A completion certificate is to be signed off by the arborist when all permitted development works are</p>

	<p>completed and in line with the recommendations of the tree report. The certificate shall be submitted to the planning authority upon completion of the works.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure and give practical effect to the retention, protection and sustainability of trees during and after construction of the permitted development.</p>
14.	<p>Public lighting shall be provided in accordance with a scheme, which shall include lighting along pedestrian routes through open spaces, details of which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development/installation of lighting.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of amenity and public safety</p>
15.	<p>No signage, advertisement or advertisement structure (including that which is exempted development under the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001 (as amended)), other than those shown on the drawings submitted with the application, shall be erected or displayed on the buildings or within the curtilage of the site unless authorised by a further grant of planning permission.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity</p>
16.	<p>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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual and residential amenity.</p>
17.	<p>Notwithstanding the exempted development provisions of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, or any statutory provision amending or replacing them, no additional plant, solar/PV panels, machinery or</p>

	<p>telecommunications structures shall be erected on the roof of the proposed development. No fans, louvres or ducts shall be installed unless authorised by a further grant of permission.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the visual amenity of the area</p>
18.	<p>Proposals for an estate/street name, house numbering scheme and associated signage shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, all signs, and unit numbers, shall be provided in accordance with the agreed scheme. The proposed name(s) shall be based on local historical or topographical features, or other alternatives acceptable to the planning authority. 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).</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of urban legibility and to ensure the use of locally appropriate placenames for new residential areas.</p>
19.	<p>The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction and 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, inter alia: details and location of proposed construction compounds, details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise and dust management measures, details of arrangements for routes for construction traffic, parking during the construction phase, and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of public safety and residential amenity.</p>
20.	<p>Construction and demolition waste shall be managed in accordance with a</p>

	<p>construction waste and demolition management plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall be prepared in accordance with the “Best Practice Guidelines on the Preparation of Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects”, published by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government in July 2006.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of sustainable waste management.</p>
21.	<p>(a) A plan containing details for the management of waste (and, in particular, recyclable materials) within the development, including the provision of facilities for the storage, separation and collection of the waste and, in particular, recyclable materials and for the ongoing operation of these facilities shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, the waste shall be managed in accordance with the agreed plan.</p> <p>(b) This plan shall provide for screened communal bin stores, the locations and designs of which shall be included in the details to be submitted.</p> <p>Reason: To provide for the appropriate management of waste and, in particular recyclable materials, in the interest of protecting the environment.</p>
22.	<p>All plant including extract ventilation systems and refrigerator condenser units shall be sited in a manner so as not to cause nuisance at sensitive locations due to odour or noise. All mechanical plant and ventilation inlets and outlets shall be sound insulated and/or fitted with sound attenuators to ensure that noise levels do not pose a nuisance at noise sensitive locations.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.</p>

23.	<p>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 section 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.</p> <p>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.</p>
24.	<p>The management and maintenance of the proposed 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 taken in charge. Detailed proposals in this regard shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the satisfactory completion and maintenance of this development.</p>
25.	<p>Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company, or other security to secure the provision and satisfactory completion of roads, footpaths, watermains, drains, open space and other services required in connection with the development, coupled with an agreement empowering</p>

	<p>the local authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory completion of any part of the development. The form and amount of the security shall be as agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of agreement, shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the satisfactory completion of the development.</p>
26.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable 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.</p> <p>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.</p>

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.

Lorraine Dockery

Senior Planning Inspector

09th September 2025

Appendix 1: Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP 322837-25
Proposed Development Summary	LRD: Construction of 124 residential apartments, 1 cafe, 2 office units and associated site works.
Development Address	Barry's Field, Carrigaline Road at Churchyard Lane, Douglas, Cork.
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	Class 10(b)(i) 'Construction of more than 500 dwellings units Class 10(b)(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'

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No <input type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: Lorraine Dockery

Date: 09/09/2025

Appendix 2: Form 3 - EIA Screening Determination

A. CASE DETAILS		
An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ACP-322837-25	
Development Summary	LRD: Construction of 124 residential apartments, 1 cafe, 2 office units and associated site works at Barry's Field, Carrigaline Road at Churchyard Lane, Douglas, Cork.	
	Yes / No / N/A	Comment (if relevant)
1. Was a Screening Determination carried out by the PA?	Yes	
2. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?	Yes	EIA Screening Report submitted by the applicant
3. Has an AA screening report or NIS been submitted?	Yes	AA Screening Report submitted
4. Is a IED/ IPC or Waste Licence (or review of licence) required from the EPA? If YES has the EPA commented on the need for an EIAR?	N/A	

5. Have any other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment which have a significant bearing on the project been carried out pursuant to other relevant Directives – for example SEA	N/A	Flood Risk Assessment submitted as the site lies within a defended area of the Douglas Flood Relief Scheme (FRS).	
B. EXAMINATION	Yes/ No/ Uncertain	Briefly describe the nature and extent and Mitigation Measures (where relevant) (having regard to the probability, magnitude (including population size affected), complexity, duration, frequency, intensity, and reversibility of impact) Mitigation measures –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 proposal includes the construction of a housing scheme with 124 apartments in addition to a café unit, office units and associated works including surface water treatment, cycle and car parking and new access. The site is located within Douglas, a suburb of Cork City.	No

1.2 Will construction, operation, decommissioning or demolition works cause physical changes to the locality (topography, land use, waterbodies)?	Yes	The site is currently a greenfield site located within a suburban setting. The construction will require the removal of some trees along the edge of the road and change the characteristics of the site to include a built form.	No.
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?	Yes	<p>The Project will use land and construction materials. There is no evidence to suggest that the project will have a detrimental impact on natural resources in the area.</p> <p>The proposed development is located on a greenfield site that will be temporarily disturbed as a result of development works.</p> <p>The removal of material from the site is addressed in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) prepared by the applicant.</p> <p>Water will be sourced from the existing public mains supply. The proposal will lead to an increase in water usage.</p> <p>In relation to biodiversity, the planning application includes an Ecological Impact Assessment.</p> <p>No significant effects on the environment are anticipated as a result of materials used in the construction process.</p>	No
1.4 Will the project involve the use, storage, transport, handling or production of	No	Waste arising during the construction stage of the proposed development will be	No

<p>substance which would be harmful to human health or the environment?</p>		<p>managed in accordance with the procedures to be outlined in a final Waste Management Plan. A Construction Resource Waste Management Plan was submitted with the application.</p> <p>Construction best practice measures (of relevance in respect of any potential ecological impacts) will be implemented throughout the project, including the preparation and implementation of detailed method statements.</p> <p>Construction waste generated will include the main non-hazardous items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • topsoil, excavated subsoil, concrete blocks, cladding, metals, tiles, glass, plastics, packaging and timber <p>The hazardous waste streams may include the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • oils/fuels from machinery & equipment <p>The risk of encountering significant ground contamination (i.e. hazardous soils) beneath the site is considered to be highly unlikely at this preliminary juncture.</p> <p>The management of waste generation during the operational phase can be dealt with by condition to ensure long term impact of waste generation is minimised.</p>	
---	--	---	--

<p>1.5 Will the project produce solid waste, release pollutants or any hazardous / toxic / noxious substances?</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No major pollutants expected. Subject to waste management practices outlined in submitted documents, no hazardous or noxious substances are expected.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Stormwater Drainage A Stormwater Management Plan will be applied to surface water discharges into adjacent network. There will be one no. surface water discharge points to service the developed site and it will discharge to the stormwater network at the junction between East Douglas Street and Church Street. Surface water discharge rates will be controlled by SUDs features, a vortex flow control devices (Hydrobrakes or equivalent) and associated attenuation tanks. A series of above ground infiltration/detention systems shall also be provided. Surface water runoff from the site's road network will be directed to the proposed pipe network and infiltration/detentions systems via conventional road gullies with additional surface water runoff from roofs also routed to the proposed surface water network.</p> <p>Foul Water Drainage The foul sewer network will have to be extended by approximately 80m which discharge to the foul network on the adjoining Carrigaline Road, in accordance with Uisce Eireann specifications and details. It will</p>	<p>No</p>

		ultimately discharge to Cork City (Carrigrennan) Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP).	
1.7 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	Yes	<p>During the construction and operational phases, the project will have the potential to generate pollution or potential nuisance associated with dust, odour, litter and birds, vermin and traffic.</p> <p>Best practice methods will be utilised during construction to mitigate potential impacts from pollution on the local environment in relation to dust control. There is not anticipated to be any odour issues at construction or operational phases.</p> <p>There will be some potential for short-term noise and vibration and dust impacts during construction. Prevention measures to reduce nuisance have been set out in the CEMP, that accompanies the planning application.</p> <p>A final Waste Management Plan will be implemented to deal with waste generated by the development during the operational phase.</p> <p>Traffic impact at construction stage is expected to be short term and not significant to slight. Traffic impacts at operational stage are considered to be imperceptible.</p> <p>Significant impacts are unlikely to arise.</p>	No

<p>1.8 Will there be any risks to human health, for example due to water contamination or air pollution?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>During the construction stage there is a potential for polluting matter to enter onto land, water and ground water.</p> <p>The project is not of a type/ form that would be expected to have impacts on human health. During the construction stage there is a potential for polluting matter to enter onto land, water and ground water.</p> <p>Standard preventative measures are provided as part of the project, which will be carried out in accordance with best practice and specific controls will be put in place to manage risks. These measures are captured in the enclosed CEMP. It is noted that the measures included are best practice and have not been included to avoid or reduce harmful effects on any European site.</p> <p>Once operational, there are no foreseen risks to human health.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>1.9 Will there be any risk of major accidents that could affect human health or the environment?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Some risk to human health associated with construction phase activities. This will be managed through standard on site health and safety practices.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>1.10 Will the project affect the social environment (population, employment)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The proposal is considered to provide a positive impact through provision of employment in the area.</p>	<p>No</p>

		Negative impacts are possible in relation to visual and sunlight/daylight impacts to adjoining residential communities.	
1.11 Is the project part of a wider large scale change that could result in cumulative effects on the environment?	No	<p>Cumulative impacts with other development in the area have been considered and are not likely to give rise to significant impacts.</p> <p>The proposed development is located on a site which is zoned 'Objective ZO 4' 'Mixed Use' which seeks 'to provide and promote a mix of residential and other uses to ensure the creation of a vibrant and sustainable urban areas' in the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028.</p> <p>The project is consistent with the Development Plan vision for the City, the relevant site land use zoning objective and the overarching objectives for mixed-use development contained within the Development Plan.</p>	No
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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - European site (SAC/ SPA/ pSAC/ pSPA) - NHA/ pNHA - Designated Nature Reserve 	Yes	<p>The proposed development is not located within any of these areas but is proximate to the Cork Harbour SPA and Great Island Channel SAC (European Sites).</p> <p>The Screening for Appropriate Assessment prepared by the applicant concludes that it is possible to rule out significant impacts of the</p>	No

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Designated refuge for flora or fauna - 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 		proposed development on European Sites, alone or in-combination with other plans and/or projects. Therefore, Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment(s) is not required.	
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 affected by the project?	No	An Ecological Impact Assessment was submitted by the applicant, which concludes that the proposed project is considered unlikely to result in any significant negative impacts upon the site or local ecology. Proposal includes for provision of hedgehog boxes; use of native trees/shrubs that provide berries for birds and installation of housing for House Sparrows which will enable nesting birds to access trees/shrubs easily. This will result in a net gain. Mitigation and management measures have been put forward to deal with alien invasive species.	No
2.3 Are there any other features of landscape, historic, archaeological, or cultural importance that could be affected?	No	An Archaeological Testing Report was submitted with the application which concludes that no features or finds of archaeological significance were identified in site investigations undertaken in 2017. No further archaeological intervention is recommended. There are no protected structures within the boundary of the site and the NIAH does not list any upstanding building or structures for the lands. The site is located within the Douglas-Donnybrook ACA	No

		but the proposal has been designed to minimise any impacts on same. There is therefore considered to be no direct impact on known architectural and cultural heritage.	
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?	No	<p>The Ecological Impact Assessments (EclA) prepared by the applicant for each Phase of development concludes that provided the mitigation measures outlined in the EclAs are effectively implemented, no significant negative ecological impacts as a result of the proposed Project are expected.</p> <p>The development will connect into existing services.</p> <p>This area has the ability to absorb the proposed development. The proposed operational phase of the development will not have any out of the ordinary impacts on natural resources.</p> <p>Having regard to the character of the receiving environment and the surrounding area, the Project will not individually or cumulatively significantly impact on the integrity of any main habitats.</p> <p>By association, the Project will not, individually or cumulatively, significantly impact on the relative abundance, quality and regenerative capacity of natural resources in the area during construction and / or operational phases.</p>	No

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?	No	The proposed development site is not within or directly connected to any water body, coastal zone or marine environment.	No
2.6 Is the location susceptible to subsidence, landslides or erosion?	No	N/A	No
2.7 Are there any key transport routes (eg 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?	No	The site is located within an urban area that is zoned for mixed use development. Traffic impacts are considered to be imperceptible in the operational phase.	No
2.8 Are there existing sensitive land uses or community facilities (such as hospitals, schools etc) which could be affected by the project?	No	The site is a greenfield site at present. There are no sensitive land uses such as schools or hospitals located in the surrounding area. It is considered that the site is located within a robust suburban area consolidating the existing built form that will be developed in line with the underlying land zoning and objectives contained within the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028 and as such sensitive land uses will not be unduly impacted by the proposed development.	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	No	Cumulative impacts with other mixed-use development permitted and applied for in the area	No

development result in cumulative effects during the construction/ operation phase?		have been considered and are not likely to give rise to significant impacts. There is no significant third-party development planned in the vicinity, which would give rise to significant cumulative impacts.	
3.2 Transboundary Effects: Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects?	No	N/A	No
3.3 Are there any other relevant considerations?	No		
C. CONCLUSION			
No real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	EIAR Not Required	
Real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	EIAR Required	
D. MAIN REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS			
<i>EIAR <u>not</u> Required</i>			
Having regard to: -			
1. the criteria set out in Schedule 7, in particular <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the nature and scale of the proposed mixed-use development, in an established urban area served by public infrastructure (b) the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity, and the location of the proposed development outside of the designated archaeological protection zone (c) the location of the development outside of any sensitive location specified in article 109(4)(a) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) 			

2. the results of other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment submitted by the applicant
3. the features and measures proposed by applicant envisaged to avoid or prevent what might otherwise have been significant effects on the environment, and in particular the proposal to provide a high quality design and a detailed landscape plan to mitigate the visual impact of the proposal

An Coimisiún concluded that the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment, and that an environmental impact assessment report is not required.

Inspector Lorraine Dockery

Date 09/09/2025

Approved (DP/ADP) _____

Date _____

Appendix 3 – AA Screening

Screening the need for Appropriate Assessment

Finding of no likely significant effects

Appropriate Assessment: Screening Determination

(Stage 1, Article 6(3) of Habitats Directive)

I have considered the proposed development at Douglas, Co. Cork in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

A screening report for Appropriate Assessment was submitted with this planning appeal case. The planning authority note that the relevant sites are Cork Harbour SPA and the Great Island Channel SAC. They note that having regard to the location of the proposed development relative to these European Sites and related watercourses and the nature and scale of the proposed development, they consider that the proposed development would not affect the integrity of the European Sites referred to above and accordingly, they consider that appropriate assessment is not required.

A detailed description of the proposed development is presented in Section 2 of my report and detailed specifications of the proposal are provided in the AA Screening Report and other planning documents submitted by the applicant. In summary, the subject site is located within the settlement of Douglas, Co. Cork, an established suburb of Cork city. It has a stated area of 0.86 hectares. Douglas Village shopping centre is located to the north-west. The subject site is bound to the west by Churchyard Lane and to the east by the Carrigaline Road.

The proposed development will be served by public mains connections. SuDS measures are proposed, which are standard measures in all new such developments and are not included to avoid/reduce an effect to a Natura 2000 site. The site is greenfield in nature comprising a 'field' containing rank, unmanaged grassland, surrounded and enclosed by treelines.

The subject site lies within the defenced area of the Douglas Flood Relief Scheme. It is defended to a SoP equivalent to the Q100 event with an additional allowance for freeboard which is generally set at 0.5m across Douglas. The site is located within Flood Zone C, as per the Cork City Development Plan. However, flood zoning is assigned on the conservative basis that there are no flood defences in place and is therefore classified as being within Flood Zone A. A Justification Test was undertaken which satisfied all relevant criteria and demonstrated that the risks relating to flooding will be managed to acceptable levels and therefore comply with DoEHLG / OPW and Cork City Council planning guidance. Historic flood events in Douglas occurred before the implementation of the Douglas Flood Relief Scheme in 2022. The residual risk of flooding from a design exceedance/climate change event will be managed by ensuring that the maintenance of the existing boundary walls on Churchyard Lane and ensuring that a high point in the ground levels at the pedestrian entrances to the site is maintained in order to ensure that any surface water on Churchyard Lane is prevented from getting onto the site. No significant effects are anticipated.

European Sites

The proposed development site is not located within or immediately adjacent to any site designated as a European Site, comprising a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) or Special Protection Area (SPA). The proposed development site is a greenfield site within an established built-up area, within the settlement boundary of Douglas, an inner suburb of Cork city.

The boundary of the nearest European Sites to the proposed development are

- **Cork Harbour SPA** (Site Code:4030) – 280m distant
- **Great Island Channel SAC** (Site Code: 001058) – 6.8km distant

I have no information to believe that there is direct hydrological connectivity between the proposed development site and these designated sites. Foul water from the proposed development will be conveyed for treatment to Cork City (Carrigrennan WWTP) that ultimately discharges into Cork Harbour at Lough Mahon. While Great Island Channel SAC is not downstream of the WWTP discharge point, tidal/wind movements could be of some relevance in relation to the SAC, its boundary being c.550m north-east of the WWTP's discharge point. Other potential connections identified which could give rise to impacts include:

Ex-situ impacts with potential for waterbirds to occur within site.

Uncontrolled/unattenuated surface/storm water could impact water quality in wider Cork Harbour SPA

Impacts on water quality from pollution from accidental spills during construction phase.

Foul water discharge during operation.

Spread of invasive species.

In-combination impacts.

The NPWS have not raised concerns in this regard- no report received. A Confirmation of Feasibility and Statement of Design Acceptance previously issued from Uisce Eireann and they did not raise concerns in this regard. The proposed development works include a connection and construction of a new storm water and foul sewer along Carrigaline Road. Uisce Eireann state that the watermain network will have to be extended by approx. 50m from the existing 150mm diameter watermain network at the junction of Old Carrigaline Road and East Douglas Street. The wastewater network will have to be extended by approx. 50m from the existing 1400mm diameter wastewater network in Old Carrigaline Road. These works will be carried out by Uisce Eireann, at the developer's expense. The report of the IFI is noted which requests clarification in relation to capacity in order to avoid overloading of infrastructure. Uisce Eireann have indicated that there is spare capacity in the Carrigrennan WWTP (as per www.water.ie, Aug 2025 update).

As a highly precautionary measure, I will examine both of the above sites in further detail. However, given the limited scale of the proposal and distances involved, I do not consider it necessary to examine the potential for significant effects on any European Sites beyond

those of **Cork Harbour SPA (Site Code:004030)** and **Great Island Channel (Site Code: 001058)**.

Cork Harbour SPA (Site Code:4030) – 280m distant Cork Harbour SPA National Parks & Wildlife Service (npws.ie) Qualifying Interests	Conservation Objective
Little Grebe	Maintain the favourable conservation condition Attributes- Population trend and distribution Long term population trend stable or increasing. No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by little grebe, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.
Great Crested Grebe	Maintain the favourable conservation condition Attributes- Population trend and distribution Long term population trend stable or increasing. No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by great crested grebe, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.
Grey Heron	Maintain the favourable conservation condition Attributes- Population trend and distribution Long term population trend stable or increasing. No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by grey heron, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.
Cormorant	Maintain the favourable conservation condition Attributes- Population trend and distribution Long term population trend stable or increasing. No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by cormorant, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.
Shelduck	Maintain the favourable conservation condition Attributes- Population trend and distribution

	<p>Long term population trend stable or increasing.</p> <p>No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by shelduck, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.</p>
Wigeon	<p>Maintain the favourable conservation condition</p> <p>Attributes- Population trend and distribution</p> <p>Long term population trend stable or increasing.</p> <p>No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by wigeon, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.</p>
Teal	<p>Maintain the favourable conservation condition</p> <p>Attributes- Population trend and distribution</p> <p>Long term population trend stable or increasing.</p> <p>No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by teal, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.</p>
Pintail	<p>Maintain the favourable conservation condition</p> <p>Attributes- Population trend and distribution</p> <p>Long term population trend stable or increasing.</p> <p>No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by pintail, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.</p>
Shoveler	<p>Maintain the favourable conservation condition</p> <p>Attributes- Population trend and distribution</p> <p>Long term population trend stable or increasing.</p> <p>No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by shoveler, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.</p>
Red-breasted Merganser	<p>Maintain the favourable conservation condition</p> <p>Attributes- Population trend and distribution</p> <p>Long term population trend stable or increasing.</p> <p>No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by</p>

	Red-breasted Merganser, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.
Oystercatcher	Maintain the favourable conservation condition Attributes- Population trend and distribution Long term population trend stable or increasing. No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by oystercatcher, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.
Golden Plover	Maintain the favourable conservation condition Attributes- Population trend and distribution Long term population trend stable or increasing. No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by golden plover, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.
Grey Plover	Maintain the favourable conservation condition Attributes- Population trend and distribution Long term population trend stable or increasing. No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by grey plover, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.
Lapwing	Maintain the favourable conservation condition Attributes- Population trend and distribution Long term population trend stable or increasing. No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by lapwing, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.
Dunlin	Maintain the favourable conservation condition Attributes- Population trend and distribution Long term population trend stable or increasing. No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by

	dunlin, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.
Black-tailed Godwit	Maintain the favourable conservation condition Attributes- Population trend and distribution Long term population trend stable or increasing. No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by black-tailed godwit, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.
Bar-tailed Godwit	Maintain the favourable conservation condition Attributes- Population trend and distribution Long term population trend stable or increasing. No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by bar-tailed godwit, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.
Curlew	Maintain the favourable conservation condition Attributes- Population trend and distribution Long term population trend stable or increasing. No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by curlew, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.
Redshank	Maintain the favourable conservation condition Attributes- Population trend and distribution Long term population trend stable or increasing. No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by redshank, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.
Black-headed Gull	Maintain the favourable conservation condition Attributes- Population trend and distribution Long term population trend stable or increasing. No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by black-headed gull, other than that

	occurring from natural patterns of variation.
Common Gull	Maintain the favourable conservation condition Attributes- Population trend and distribution Long term population trend stable or increasing. No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by common gull, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.
Lesser Black-backed Gull	Maintain the favourable conservation condition Attributes- Population trend and distribution Long term population trend stable or increasing. No significant decrease in the range, timing or intensity of use of areas by lesser black-backed gull, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.
Common Tern	Maintain the favourable conservation condition Attributes- breeding population abundance, Productivity rate, distribution, Prey biomass available, Barriers to connectivity, Disturbance at the breeding site No significant decline in breeding population abundance, productivity rate, distribution, prey biomass availability. No significant increase in barriers to connectivity. Human activities should occur at levels that do not adversely affect the breeding common tern population.
Wetland and Waterbirds	Maintain the favourable conservation condition Attribute- Habitat area The permanent area occupied by the wetland habitat should be stable and not significantly less than the area of 2,587 hectares, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation
Great Island Channel SAC (Site Code: 001058)- – 6.8km distant Great Island Channel SAC National Parks & Wildlife Service Qualifying Interests	

Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide	<p>Maintain the favourable conservation condition</p> <p>Attributes- Habitat area and community distribution.</p> <p>The permanent habitat area is stable or increasing, subject to natural processes.</p> <p>Conserve the following community type in a natural condition: Mixed sediment to sandy mud with polychaetes and oligochaetes community complex</p>
Atlantic salt meadows	<p>Restore the favourable conservation condition</p> <p>Attributes- Habitat area and distribution; physical structure vegetation structure; vegetation composition.</p> <p>Area stable or increasing, subject to natural processes, including erosion and succession.</p> <p>No decline or change in habitat distribution, subject to natural processes</p> <p>Maintain/restore natural circulation of sediments and organic matter, without any physical obstructions</p> <p>Maintain/restore creek and pan structure, subject to natural processes, including erosion and succession</p> <p>Maintain natural tidal regime</p> <p>Maintain range of coastal habitats including transitional zones, subject to natural processes including erosion and succession</p> <p>Maintain structural variation within sward</p> <p>Maintain more than 90% area outside creeks vegetated</p> <p>Maintain range of sub-communities with typical species listed in SMP</p> <p>No significant expansion of common cordgrass (<i>Spartina anglica</i>), with an annual spread of less than 1% where it is known to occur</p>
<p>Likely impacts of the project (alone or in combination)</p> <p>Due to the enclosed nature of the development site, the limited scale of development and the presence of a significant distance between this existing site and the Cork Harbour SPA and Great Island Channel SAC , I consider that the proposed development would not be</p>	

expected to generate impacts that could affect anything but the immediate area of the development site, thus having a very limited potential zone of influence on any ecological receptors.

The proposed development would not have direct impacts on any European site. There are no spatial overlaps with any Natura 2000 site.

Proposed storm water drainage system has been designed to cater for all surface water run-off from all hard surfaces within the proposed development. A surface water management strategy has been prepared. The existing topography is a single catchment. SUDS infrastructure shall be utilised. Greenfield run-off rates shall be used. Surface water management is in accordance with best practice. A CEMP has been prepared, which sets out good practice measures- these measures would be utilised irrespective of the presence of designated sites or otherwise.

Japanese Knotweed and other invasive alien species are known to occur within the site. It has been subject to survey and a management plan has been drawn up and should be successfully eradicated from the site. These measures will be incorporated into the site landscaping and maintenance proposal as standard. They are good practice measures, not intended for the protection of any European sites.

Likely significant effects on the European sites in view of the conservation objectives

The construction or operation of the proposed development will not result in impacts that could affect the conservation objectives of the above two designated sites. Due to distance and lack of meaningful ecological connections there will be no changes in ecological functions due to any construction related emissions or disturbance. SuDs measures are proposed (standard construction practices); the risk of flooding is very low and neither the planning authority nor NPWS have raised issue in this regard.

I have examined the Natura 2000 data forms as relevant and the conservation objectives supporting documents for these sites, available through the NPWS website (www.npws.ie). During this examination and assessment, I noted that there are two additional species of bird listed as qualifying interests in Schedule 3 of SI 391/2021 – European Union Conservation of Wild Birds (Cork Harbour Special Protection Area 004030) Regulations 2021. The two additional species are Mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos*) and Greenshank (*Tringa nebularia*). I am satisfied that the potential significant effects from the proposed development are the same for these two bird species as for the other waterbirds listed as qualifying interests. I consider that the conservation objectives for both the Mallard and the Greenshank would be ‘to maintain the favourable conservation condition of’ both species’.

Given the nature of the site with limited natural habitats/species of conservation interest, there will be no direct or ex-situ effects from disturbance on mobile species, including ex-situ foraging and roosting habitat during construction or operation of the proposed development due to the location of the development site and the absence of suitable habitat.

In combination effects

The proposed development will not result in any effects that could contribute to an effect with other developments in the area.

No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions. Mitigation measures put forward in the submitted documentation are considered to be standard measures to prevent

ecological impacts and are not a mitigation measure for the purpose of avoiding or preventing impacts to the designated sites.

Overall Conclusion

Screening Determination

In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on any European Site, including Cork Harbour SPA and Great Island Channel SAC and is therefore excluded from further consideration. No further assessment is required for the project. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- The scale of the development and lack of impact mechanisms that could significantly affect a European Site
- Distance from and weak connections to the European sites
- Taking into account screening determination by LPA

Inspector: Lorraine Dockery

Date: 09/09/2025

12.0 Appendix 4: WFD Impact Assessment Stage 1: Screening

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Bord Pleanála ref. no.	ACP-322837-25	Townland, address	Barry's Field, Carrigaline Road at Churchyard Lane, Douglas, Cork.
Description of project		<p>LRD: Construction of 124 residential apartments, 1 cafe, 2 office units and associated site works</p> <p>The proposed development works include a connection to and construction of a new storm water and foul sewer along Carrigaline Road.</p>	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,		<p>Site is located within the settlement boundary of Douglas. The site is greenfield in nature and relatively flat and is not connected to any identifiable watercourses. Storm water from the proposed development shall discharge into existing stormwater network at the junction between East Douglas Street and Church Street via a hydro brake manhole, which will limit the amount of water discharging to the network. The site is located within the Lee, Cork Harbour and Youghal Bay catchment.</p>	
Proposed surface water details		<p>There will be one no. surface water discharge points to service the developed site and it will discharge to the stormwater network at the junction between East Douglas Street and Church Street. SuDS will be used.</p>	
Proposed water supply source & available capacity		<p>Connect to existing supply. Uisce Eireann confirmed capacity available with upgrades.</p>	

Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues			Uisce Eireann Wastewater connection available with upgrades. All works will be in accordance with Uisce Éireann Code of Practice for Wastewater Supply & the Wastewater Infrastructure Standard Details			
Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection						
Identified water body	Distance to (m)	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk	Identified pressures on that water body	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater)
River Waterbody	230m W	MONEYGURN EY_010 IE_SW_19M30 0900	Good	Not at Risk	None identified	Yes – stormwater ultimately drains to Lough Mahon via stormwater sewer to Carrigrennan Municipal WWTP. SuDs features drain to ground water following attenuation.
Groundwater Waterbody	Underlying site	Ballinhassig East IE_SW_G_004	Good	Not at Risk	None identified	Yes, via groundwater

Transitional Waterbody		250m NE	Lough Mahon IE_SW_060_0750	Moderate	At risk	Urban run off	Yes – stormwater ultimately drains to Lough Mahon via stormwater sewer to Carrigrennan Municipal WWTP. SuDs features drain to ground water following attenuation.
Step 4: Detailed description of any component of the development or activity that may cause a risk of not achieving the WFD Objectives having regard to the S-P-R linkage.							
CONSTRUCTION PHASE							
No.	Component	Waterbody receptor (EPA Code)	Pathway (existing and new)	Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact	Screening Stage Mitigation Measure*	Residual Risk (yes/no) Detail	Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if ‘screened’ in or ‘uncertain’ proceed to Stage 2.
1.	River	MONEYGURNEY_010 IE_SW_19M300900	Stormwater ultimately drains to Lough Mahon via stormwater sewer to Carrigrennan Municipal WWTP. SuDs features drain to ground water following attenuation.	Siltation, pH (Concrete), hydrocarbon spillages	Standard construction practice CEMP	No, due to separation distance and location.	Screened out

2.	Ground	Ballinhassig East IE_SW_G_004	Yes pathway exists via drainage characteristics	Spillages	As above	Yes – drainage characteristics warrants further assessment.	Screened in.
3.	Transitional	Lough Mahon IE_SW_060_0750	Yes. Pathway via drainage characteristics.	Spillages	As above	Yes – drainage characteristics warrant further assessment.	Screened in.
OPERATIONAL PHASE							
1.	River	MONEYGU RNEY_010 IE_SW_19 M300900	Stormwater ultimately drains to Lough Mahon via stormwater sewer to Carrigrennan Municipal WWTP. SuDs features drain to ground water following attenuation.	Hydrocarbon spillage/siltation	Connection to existing storm sewer network/SuDs	No, due to separation distance and location. No connection.	Screened out
2.	Ground	Ballinhassig East IE_SW_G_004	Yes pathway exists via drainage characteristics	Spillages	As above	Yes. Drainage characteristics warrant further assessment	Screened in
3.	Transitional	Lough Mahon IE_SW_060_0750	Pathway exists via drainage characteristics	Spillages	As above	Yes – drainage characteristics warrant further assessment.	Screened in

DECOMMISSIONING PHASE							
5.	N/A						
STAGE 2: ASSESSMENT							
Details of Mitigation Required to Comply with WFD Objectives							
Surface Water							
Development/Activity e.g. culvert, bridge, other crossing, diversion, outfall, etc	<u>Objective 1:Surface Water</u> Prevent deterioration of the status of all bodies of surface water	<u>Objective 2:Surface Water</u> Protect, enhance and restore all bodies of surface water with aim of achieving good status	<u>Objective 3:Surface Water</u> Protect and enhance all artificial and heavily modified bodies of water with aim of achieving good ecological potential and good surface water chemical status	<u>Objective 4: Surface Water</u> Progressively reduce pollution from priority substances and cease or phase out emission, discharges and losses of priority substances	Does this component comply with WFD Objectives 1, 2, 3 & 4? (if answer is no, a development cannot proceed without a derogation under art. 4.7)		
	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 1:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 2:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 3:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 4:			

Construction works	<p>Site specific mitigation methods described in the Construction Environmental Management Plan including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid works during wet conditions • Management of soil • Fuel and chemical handling to include bunding, check for leaks, labelling • Availability of spill kits <p>Site specific construction mitigation methods including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good practice, standard construction methodologies to reduce surface water run-off during construction • Appropriate management of chemical storage 	Site specific mitigation methods as described.	Site specific mitigation methods as described.	Site specific mitigation methods as described.	YES
--------------------	--	--	--	--	-----

	including spillage procedures, bunded storage areas, security, management of refuelling practices, leakages. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of sediment and silt levels within the site. 				
Stormwater drainage	Adequately designed SUDs features and attenuation	SuDS features as described	SuDS features as described	SuDS features as described	YES
Details of Mitigation Required to Comply with WFD Objectives					
Groundwater					
Development/Activity e.g. abstraction, outfall, etc.	<u>Objective 1: Groundwater</u> Prevent or limit the input of pollutants into groundwater and to prevent the deterioration of the status of all bodies of groundwater	<u>Objective 2: Groundwater</u> Protect, enhance and restore all bodies of groundwater, ensure a balance between abstraction and recharge, with the	<u>Objective 3: Groundwater</u> Reverse any significant and sustained upward trend in the concentration of any pollutant resulting from the impact of human activity	Does this component comply with WFD Objectives 1, 2, 3 & 4? (if answer is no, a development cannot proceed without a derogation under art. 4.7)	

		aim of achieving good status*		
Development Activity 1: Mixed-use development	<p>Site specific construction mitigation methods including:</p> <p>Good practice, standard construction methodologies to reduce surface water run-off during construction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate management of chemical storage including spillage procedures, bunded storage areas, security, • Management of refuelling practices, leakages. • Management of sediment and silt levels within the site. 	Site specific mitigation methods as described.	Site specific mitigation methods as described	Yes

Inspector: Lorraine Dockery **Date:** 09/09/2025