



Development

Demolition of existing dwelling and attached store/boiler room and the construction of 2 detached dwellings together with associated site works.

Location

Glasson's Avenue, Carrignafoy, Cobh, Co. Cork

Planning Authority

Cork County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

255856

Applicant(s)

Alan Bardsley

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Permission + Conditions

Type of Appeal

Third Party Normal Planning Appeal

Appellant(s)

John and Paula Sweeney

Observer(s)

Patricia and Declan Carlos

Date of Site Inspection

19 May 2026

Inspector

Natalie de Róiste

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development.....	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	4
4.0	Planning History.....	5
5.0	Policy Context.....	5
6.0	EIA Screening.....	9
7.0	The Appeal	10
8.0	Assessment	13
9.0	AA Screening.....	17
10.0	Water Framework Directive.....	18
11.0	Recommendation.....	18
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	18
13.0	Conditions.....	19

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site, measuring 990 sqm, is located on the west side of Glasson's Avenue, in Cobh, Co. Cork. It contains an existing bungalow built at an angle to the road to capture sea views to the south. The site itself is relatively flat, although the road slopes downwards from north to south, with a more pronounced incline towards the south.
- 1.2. To the north, the site is bordered by Eastcote, a bungalow located at the rear (west) of the site, facing the road. To the south, the site is bordered by Wilavin, a dormer bungalow located on the northern half of its site, facing south-south-east. Glasson's Avenue is roughly parallel to Wilmount Avenue, which contains a number of detached Victorian properties. One of these, Wilmount House (a protected structure), has been subdivided, and the garden of Wilmount House B borders the site to the west.
- 1.3. There are no footpaths, road markings, or parking controls on Glasson's Avenue. The road is relatively wide at its midpoint (c. 7 metres), with a narrow carriageway (c. 5 metres) where it meets the junction with Carrignafof Avenue to the north, and hairpin bends and a steep gradient where it joins East Hill to the south.
- 1.4. It is a mature residential area, with bungalows and dormer bungalows predominating on the street, with older two-storey houses at the south end. It is c. 18 minutes' walk or 5 minutes' drive to the town centre of Cobh, and c. 24 minutes' walk or 6 minutes' drive to Cobh railway station. It is 5 minutes' walk to the bus stop on Carrignafof Avenue, which provides commuter coach services to Cork city, Little Island and Carrigtwohill.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. It is proposed to demolish the existing four-bedroom bungalow (c. 144 sqm) on the site, and construct two detached two-storey four-bedroom houses (c. 225 sqm each). It is proposed to close up the existing vehicular entrance and provide two new vehicular entrances, all associated site services, landscaping, and associated works.
- 2.2. Following a request for further information, revised drawings were submitted, showing a lower finished floor level (house no 1 reduced by 600 mm, house no 2

reduced by 500 mm), and showing block boundary walls to the rear and side boundaries.

3.0 **Planning Authority Decision**

3.1. **Decision**

3.2. Grant permission.

3.2.1. Conditions

There is no standard first condition attached to the grant; condition 7 has the wording of the first condition. Fourteen conditions were attached, the majority standard technical conditions as per the recommendation of the Area Engineer. Condition 8 regarded Development Contributions.

3.3. **Planning Authority Reports**

3.3.1. Planning Reports

- Report dated 29 October – noted site context, lack of recent planning history, national and county policy, proximity to protected structures, reports and submissions received, and verbal comments from the Conservation Officer (who had no issue). No concerns regarding demolition. Concerns regarding height (8 metres ridge level) in conjunction with proximity to neighbouring houses (c. 5 metres from each house, c. 3.4 metres from each boundary) to north and south. Further information and revised plans requested, to lower the finished floor levels.
- Report dated 28 January 2026 – further information satisfactory, grant of permission recommended.

3.3.2. Other Technical Reports

- Area Engineer – no objection subject to conditions.
- Archaeologist – no comment.
- Ecology – no comment.

3.4. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.5. No reports received.

3.6. **Third Party Observations**

One received, from the appellant. Issues raised are as per the appeal. It further notes:

- The site in question and the third party's site were purchased in the 1970s, and the houses built at the back of each site, facing the sea, to give space and privacy between the houses.
- An appropriate redevelopment of the site would be a bungalow or dormer bungalow on the approximate footprint of the existing bungalow, with the existing boundary wall preserved and heightened.

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. No planning history on site noted in the planner's report. No history files provided.

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1. **Cork County Development Plan 2022-28**

5.1.1. The subject site is located within the development boundary of Cobh in an area zoned '*Existing Residential / Mixed Residential and Other Uses*'.

5.1.2. Section 18.3.3 of the County Development Plan notes, "...*that the objective for this zoning is to conserve and enhance the quality and character of established residential communities and protect their amenities. Infill developments, extensions, and the refurbishment of existing dwellings will be considered where they are appropriate to the character and pattern of development in the area and do not significantly affect the amenities of surrounding properties...*"

5.1.3. Relevant Objectives and text contained in the Plan include:

Chapter 2 Core Strategy

Objective CS 2-7: Network of Settlements – Higher Order Settlements

This sets out that Cobh is one of the 6 Metropolitan Towns, and growth in population and employment is a strategic aim.

Table 2.9 Cork County Core Strategy Table sets out that an additional 1,316 housing units will be required in Cobh during the lifetime of the plan, with 288 of these to be delivered within the built footprint of the town.

Chapter 3 Settlements and Placemaking

Objective PL 3-2 Encouraging Sustainable and Resilient Places, which supports as part (b) of a longer text *“the development of brownfield, infill and under-utilised lands within the built envelope of the existing settlement network”*.

Objective PL 3-3 Delivering Quality and Inclusive Places

This objective will *“implement and promote a series of aims outlined in the Guidelines on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas and accompanying Urban Design Manual and the Design Standards for New Apartments, which seek to create high quality inclusive places”*.

Chapter 4 Housing

Section 4.10 deals with *Building Height and Mix*, and notes there is no restriction on building height across the county, with the suitability of a site to accommodate increased building heights informed by its location, proximity to public transport, and whether it is identified as a priority site.

Objective HOU 4-8 Building Height and Amenity, which supports *“the provision of increased building height and densities in appropriate locations subject to the avoidance of undue impacts on the existing residential amenities...”*

The *Approach to Density within lands zoned Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses* is set out at Sections 4.9.8 and 4.9.9. This notes a general support for proposals for increased densities to optimise the development of lands within the built up area, subject to protecting existing residential amenities and adhering to proper standards. A reduction in the 22 metre separation distance may be considered where high quality architectural responses can be delivered without undue impacts on established residential amenities.

Brownfield Sites and Regeneration is addressed in sections 4.9.10 – 4.9.13. This notes in part that this may include *the provision of higher building heights than had previously prevailed on-site in order to promote a more efficient use of available, accessible land and more focused and efficient investment in infrastructure*.

Chapter 11 deals with Water Management

Objective WM 11-10: Surface Water, SuDS and Water Sensitive Urban Design

- a) *Require that all new developments incorporate sustainable drainage systems (SuDS). Efforts should be taken to limit the extent of hard surfacing and impermeable paving.*
- b) *Encourage the application of a Water Sensitive Urban Design approach in the design of new development or other urban interventions. Opportunities to contribute to, protect or re-enforce existing green infrastructure corridors or assets should be maximised.*
- c) *Optimise and maximise the application of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) to mitigate flood risk, enhance biodiversity, protect and enhance visual and recreational amenity; all in the most innovative and creative manner appropriate and in accordance with best practices. Proposals should demonstrate that due consideration has been given to nature based solutions in the first instance in arriving at the preferred SuDS solution for any development.*

Chapter 12 deals with Transport and Mobility

Objective TM 12-2: Active Travel is a long multi-part objective, which includes:

- b) *All new developments are to be designed to latest DMURS standards, unless precluded by space or other constraints, to be accessible and permeable for pedestrians, cyclists and those of reduced mobility.*

Objective HE16-14: Record of Protected Structures, which seeks as part (g) of a longer text, “to ensure high quality architectural design of all new developments relating to or which may impact on structures (and their settings) included in the Record of Protected Structures.”

Objective HE 16-15: Protection of Structures on the NIAH Protect where possible all structures which are included in the NIAH for County Cork, which are not currently included in the Record of Protected Structures, from adverse impacts as part of the development management functions of the County.

Appendix E Policy Objectives for the Cork Joint Housing Strategy 2022-28

Policy Objective 7

It is the objective of the Councils that new housing delivery over the strategy period will deliver compact and sustainable growth in Cork City, Metropolitan, Key, Ring and County towns and villages, to ensure the achievement of compact growth and regeneration under the NPF, RSES and Cork MASP area, including the requirement that at least 50% of all new homes in Cork City and suburbs, and at least 30% of all new homes in other settlements, be delivered within the existing built-up footprint.

Policy Objective 8

It is the objective of the Councils that new housing delivery over the strategy period will support urban renewal and urban regeneration and will strengthen the roles and viability of Cork City and of Metropolitan, Key, Ring and County towns and villages in Cork County. The Councils through the City and County Development Plans will support the delivery of housing on brownfield / built footprint land and in major urban regeneration areas such as the Cork Docklands, as well as infill sites in smaller towns and villages.

5.1.4. Volume 4 South Cork

5.1.5. This volume sets out that Cobh is a Main Town in the Cobh Municipal District, along with Carrigtwohill, Little Island and Monard. It reiterates the aim for growth in population and employment.

5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

5.3. Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024)

5.3.1. These guidelines reiterate the National Planning Framework and the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy priority of ambitious growth targets for cities and metropolitan areas, including delivering brownfield and infill development at scale within the existing built-up footprint. There is an emphasis on compact growth, and the provision of more houses and denser development in cities and towns in proximity to existing services and public transport.

5.3.2. They set out SPPRs on separation distances; private and semi-private open space; and car and cycle parking. The standards are aimed at consolidating existing settlements and avoiding sprawl, and creating compact settlements. They replace the

Guidelines for Planning Authorities Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas (2009) which are referred to in the Development Plan, which was adopted in 2022.

- 5.3.3. SPPR 1 – Separation Distances requires a minimum of 16m between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses and duplexes above ground floor level.
- 5.3.4. Section 5.3.7 – Daylight indicates that a detailed technical assessment is not required in all cases, regard should be had to standards in the BRE 209 2022 or similar.

5.4. **DMURS (2019)**

- 5.4.1. This sets out statutory guidance and standards in relation to the design of individual streets and urban roads to promote safer and more vibrant streets.

5.5. **Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2018**

- 5.5.1. These guidelines are part of a package of measures to deliver more compact forms of growth, new housing, and more integrated and sustainable travel patterns. They set a performance-based approach to the assessment of building height.

5.6. **Natural Heritage Designations**

Cork Harbour SPA 004030 – 3.8 kilometres to the southwest of the site.

Great Island SAC 001058 – 3.8 kilometres to the southwest of the site.

6.0 **EIA Screening**

- 6.1. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed

development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

One appeal was received, from the neighbours to the south, appealing against the grant of permission. Issues raised included the following:

- The design is out of character with the existing development in the area, which are bungalows and dormer bungalows. There are no two-storey houses, apart from two period properties (Athenian Terrace and Mount Alto) at the lower end of the avenue.
- The size and mass of the development is excessive, similar to the developer's houses at Norwood Park, Cobh (planning file 244064). That is a more appropriate site for this design.
- The side windows directly overlook our dwelling, and it is not possible to screen these windows.
- The development is too close to the boundary, and will reduce light and privacy.
- Sightlines at the proposed entrance are inadequate.
- Recent planning permissions granted on Glasson's Avenue have been poor, the road has been poorly reinstated, and there is no monitoring of same by the local authority.
- The road is sub-standard in many areas, narrow, and unsuitable for extra traffic or construction traffic. This was a boreen, before being tarmacked partly at the expense of the owners in the 1970s. The junctions – to Carrignafoy at the top, and to Summerhill & East Hill at the lower end – are both dangerous, and their use by construction traffic would be hazardous.
- Access to mains water will require digging of the whole road.

7.2. Applicant Response

7.3. A response was received on behalf of the applicant, summarised as follows:

- A detailed evaluation has been carried out by the Local Authority, including residential amenity, design, access, and servicing, and it has been deemed acceptable.
- The proposal to build two-storey buildings is in character with the wider area, and aligns with national planning policy (National Planning Framework, Compact Settlement Guidelines) and Development Plan policy, which promotes the consolidation and sustainable use of serviced sites within existing urban areas.
- The sloping topography leads to variations in ridge levels, and the development has been designed having regard to this context. The revised levels following Further Information were deemed satisfactory by the Area Planner.
- The development is located to the north of the appellant's dwelling, and unlikely to have overshadowing impacts. The planning authority concluded that overshadowing impacts were acceptable.
- The development has been designed to minimise impacts on privacy, with the 1.8 metre boundary wall addressing privacy issues from ground floor windows, and no first floor windows overlooking the site. The finished floor level of the bungalow is higher than that of revised House Type B, further reducing the potential for overlooking or privacy impacts. The development complies with the standards set out in the Compact Settlement Guidelines.
- Traffic generation and traffic safety was assessed by the council, including the Area Engineer, who conducted a site inspection, and confirmed that the site access and proposed utilities connections were acceptable. A number of conditions have been attached to ensure traffic safety, and these are welcomed by the applicant. Traffic generated by 2 dwellings will be low and acceptable.
- Regarding digging up the road to access mains water, this is a standard part of residential development in urban areas, and is subject to licence. The development contribution towards infrastructure is noted.
- All third party concerns have been reviewed through the planning process. The project complies with planning policies and technical assessments. The Commission should uphold the grant of permission.

7.4. Planning Authority Response

Cork County Council is of the opinion that all relevant issues have been covered in the technical reports already forwarded to the Commission, and has declined to make any further comment.

7.5. Observations

One received, from Patricia Carlos, the neighbour immediately to the north of the appeal site. Issues raised include the following:

- There was a complete oversight and lack of consideration of the adjacent property to the north in the Design Statement submitted by Hogan Associates (extracts attached).
- The development will have overbearing and overshadowing effects on the house and gardens to the north, including living, dining, and kitchen areas.
- References to Victorian properties on Wilmount Avenue as precedent for the building height is inappropriate – these are period properties with large gardens, on another road.
- The lowering of the floor levels of both properties will lead to excessive excavation, with risk of disturbance to a sewer which services the observer's property. This sewer was not referred to in the application, although it was a significant issue in application 20/04555 (extracts attached).
- The road is not suitable for construction traffic.
- The County Council's planning submission platform was changed with no notice during the observation period, leading to an inability to submit an objection on the local authority application (correspondence attached).
- We fully support the third party appeal.
- No objection in principle to the redevelopment of the site.

7.6. Further Responses

None on file.

8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. I have examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the submission received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, the material submitted with the application, and the planning history. I have inspected the site, and I have had regard to relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance. I consider the substantive issues to be considered as follows:

- Height design and character of the development
- Impacts on neighbouring residential amenity
- Traffic safety

8.2. **Height design and character of the development**

8.3. The appellant and the observer both object to the height and scale of the development. The observer notes that a single-storey property on the footprint of the existing house would be acceptable.

8.4. I note at the outset that it is government policy to increase heights and densities in urban and suburban areas, subject to a 'performance-based' assessment; that is, rather than setting out height limits for a site or an area, an assessment of impacts of taller buildings is to be undertaken. I assess impacts on neighbouring residential amenity below. This policy at national level is part of a suite of measures to provide compact settlement and avoid urban sprawl.

8.4.1. As noted above, the *Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements* guidelines (2024) reiterate the National Planning Framework and the RSES priority of ambitious growth targets for cities and metropolitan areas, including delivering brownfield and infill development at scale within the existing built-up footprint. There is an emphasis on compact growth, and the provision of more houses and denser development in cities and towns in proximity to existing services and public transport. This site is located in a

8.5. The Development Plan also supports infill developments and the redevelopment of underutilised brownfield sites, subject to the protection of neighbouring amenities.

The fact that the neighbouring houses on the road are predominantly bungalows or dormer bungalows is not in itself an impediment to the construction of taller buildings.

8.6. The proposed houses are taller than those adjacent, but not excessively so, being c. 2 metres taller than the bungalow on either side, following submission of Further Information. There is an existing variation in roof heights and profiles on the road. The nearest houses on Wilmount Avenue, The Elms and Wilmount House, are large Victorian houses. I note the Conservation Office had no concerns about impacts on any heritage building in the vicinity (both the Elms and Wilmount House on Wilmount Avenue are protected structures). The site does not terminate any vista, or feature prominently in harbour views. Visual impacts are localised and acceptable.

8.7. **Impacts on neighbouring residential amenity**

8.8. The appellant and the observer have concerns regarding overlooking, overbearing impacts, and impacts on daylight and sunlight.

8.9. The proposal is for two houses, both of which face the street. The main windows at ground floor and first floor mainly face east (looking out on the road) or west (over the rear garden). I have no concerns about overlooking or privacy impacts from any ground floor windows, as the standard boundary treatments between sites will provide adequate screening. Regarding first floor windows, the bedroom windows to the rear are between 8 and 9 metres from the rear boundary. They look over the long narrow garden of Wilmount House B, and beyond that over the gardens of The Elms. There are no directly opposing first floor windows within 22 metres (the Development Plan standard) or within 16 metres (the Compact Settlement Guidelines standard, which). The windows in the east elevation of the Elms are c. 20 metres from the new windows of the rear bedroom windows of the house to the north, at a slightly oblique angle. The impacts of this mutual overlooking are acceptable.

8.10. Regarding overlooking impacts on the appellant (to the south) and the observer (to the north), there is a window from the ensuite bathroom in each house facing the boundary at a distance of c. 3 metres from the boundary. Subject to being permanently obscured, these will have no impacts on neighbouring privacy. This can be addressed by condition.

- 8.11. Regarding overshadowing, the observer's property to the north is more vulnerable than the appellant's property to the south, due to the path of the sun. There will be additional overshadowing of this property, due to the greater height and proximity of the new development. However, the shadows from the new house will be transient, and affect the rear conservatory only briefly in the morning before moving to fall on the blank gable of the house and then on the front driveway, before falling on its own front garden. I have no concerns regarding overshadowing to the south, including overshadowing of the solar panels, as the orientation of the new house is due north of the existing house. Overshadowing impacts are acceptable.
- 8.12. Regarding impacts on daylight (light from the sky, as opposed to direct sunlight), there are no windows in the south gable of the observer's house. There are a number of windows and glazed doors to the rear elevation of the appellant's house, which face the boundary with the appeal site at an oblique angle. These are located between 2 and 6 metres from the boundary. One part-glazed door, located at the east end of the elevation, will likely see a reduction in daylight. However, this is partly due to its own proximity to the boundary, as the house has been sited and oriented to benefit from views and sunlight to its main elevation to the south. In any case, impacts on daylight to the other windows to the rear will be minimal or negligible, and the house will continue to enjoy good daylight and sunlight overall.
- 8.13. Regarding overbearing impacts, I do not have concerns regarding overbearing impacts on any neighbouring property. There will be an additional sense of enclosure to the ground floor rear windows of the appellant's property, as the new house is set closer to the boundary than the existing house (which has a very large lawn to the front). However, there is sufficient setback from the boundary to prevent undue overbearing impacts.
- 8.14. **Traffic Safety**
- 8.15. The appellant and observer have concerns regarding both the safety of the existing road environment, and the impacts of additional construction traffic. While the carriageway is ample at the midpoint of the road (c. 7 metres), there is no footpath. The carriageway is narrow at the junction with Carrignafey Avenue (c. 5 metres

wide), with a low corner radius. The environment to the south is more challenging again, with steep slopes, sharp bends, a narrow carriageway, and limited visibility.

- 8.16. Regarding construction traffic, the number of houses constructed on the road (including infill houses in recent years), and the number of houses with extensions indicates that the site is accessible to construction traffic, and the road is suitable for same. A construction management plan with a simple construction traffic management plan might usefully be submitted prior to commencement of development, given the residential environment, and the challenging junctions. Construction site safety is regulated by the Safety, Health and Welfare at Work (Construction) Regulations 2013 (as amended). Regarding connection to the mains water on the other side of the road, any road closures or traffic management (e.g., stop and go system) on the public road are an issue for licencing by the Transportation Department of the Local Authority.
- 8.17. The appellant has provided an extract from the minutes of a council meeting from 2nd September 2024. (I have verified the content of this on the council website). This notes that the road (L-9625) will be assessed for speed ramps. It notes that a previous survey of the road showed an average speed of 38 km per hour.
- 8.18. I found the road to be lightly trafficked on my site visit (at noon on a weekday), with little or no through traffic and no high speed vehicles. There was no cyclist traffic, and few if any pedestrians. However, I note the bad weather on the date of the visit, and the nearby schools, park, GAA pitch, bus stop, and graveyard on Carrignafof Avenue, which would all generate trips by all road users, including children and young people.
- 8.19. I note the condition recommended by the area engineer, to set the entrance back by a minimum of 3 metres and provide a splay at an angle of 45 degrees. This would eat into the area available for in-curtilage parking and turning; the drawings submitted at Further Information stage show a setback of 2 metres. Additionally, a three-metre setback does not comply with DMURS standards, and is more typical of an edge-of-town development. Given the low traffic volumes on the road, the design speed of the road, and the low traffic volumes from each entrance (serving a single house), a setback of 3 metres is not required. A revised condition, to provide an entrance

compliant with DMURS standards for the design speed of the road, would be appropriate.

8.20. **Other issues**

- 8.21. The observer has concerns regarding a sewer on the site, and refers to application 20/4555, an earlier application for 'Gladwyn', a house at the end of the road. I have looked at that application on the council website. That application required diversion of a sewer running through that site.
- 8.22. In this instance, the applicant provided Confirmation of Feasibility from Irish Water as an appendix to their Services Infrastructure Report with their initial application. In that Confirmation of Feasibility, Irish Water has confirmed that no infrastructure upgrades are required for the development, and have expressed no concerns about a risk to any of their assets. The drawings show the houses will be connected to existing mains drainage at the front of the site. This differs from the nearby application, where the drain ran under a building, and needed to be diverted.
- 8.23. I note the observer's concerns regarding the difficulties with the transition between the planning portals. Notwithstanding these difficulties, I am satisfied that the application was publicly advertised in line with statutory requirements, and that the observer has been able to make representations.
- 8.24. I note condition 1, regarding utility poles and manholes within the site to be repositioned within the revised boundary. This condition does not meet the standard for necessity, and should be omitted.
- 8.25. I note condition 10, which de-exempts Class 1 development (house extensions). This is reasonable, given the shallow depth of the rear garden.

9.0 **AA Screening**

I have considered the development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located over 3 kilometres from the nearest European site.

The proposed development comprises two houses, connected to mains drainage.

No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Nature of works
- Distance from nearest European site and lack of connections

I conclude, 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.

Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1.1. I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively, due to the scale and nature of the development.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend a grant of permission.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028, the nature, scale, character and location of the proposed residential development, the guidance set out in Sustainable Residential Development and Compact

Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024), DMURS, and other Section 28 Guidelines, it is considered that the proposed development, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, would not seriously injure the residential amenity of properties in the vicinity, and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the seventh day of January 2026, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The vehicular entrances shall comply with the design standards outlined in Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS).

Details shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and of traffic and pedestrian safety.

3. Prior to commencement of works, the developer shall submit to, and agree in writing with the planning authority, a Construction Management Plan, which shall be adhered to during construction and demolition. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise and dust management measures, arrangements for parking, access and storage during construction and demolition, and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.

Reason: In the interest of public safety and amenity.

4. The glazing to all bathroom and en-suite windows shall be manufactured opaque or frosted glass and shall be permanently maintained. The application of film to the surface of clear glass is not acceptable.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.

5. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed dwellings shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure an appropriate high standard of development.

6. Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements, in writing where necessary, of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health and flood prevention.

7. Prior to the commencement of development the developer shall enter into Connection Agreements with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for service connections to the public water supply and/or wastewater collection network.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water/wastewater facilities.

8. The developer shall clean any spillages on the public roads arising from development as the need arises or when requested by the Planning Authority or Area Office.

Reason: in the interest of road safety.

9. The landscaping scheme shown on drawing number 202411/S:D/P01 Rev A, as submitted to the planning authority on the 7th day of January, 2026 shall be carried out within the first planting season following substantial completion of external construction works.

All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a

period of three 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.

Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity.

Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 8.00 and 18.00 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 08.00 and 14.00 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.

10. Notwithstanding the exempted development provisions of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended, and any statutory provision replacing or amending them, no development falling within Class 1 of Schedule 2, Part 1 of those regulations shall take place on the site without a prior grant of planning permission.

Reason: In order to ensure that a reasonable amount of rear garden space is retained for the benefit of the occupants of the dwelling.

11. 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 Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the

Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

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

Natalie de Róiste
Planning Inspector

3 June 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500875-CK-26
Development Address	Glasson's Avenue, Carrignafoy, Cobh, Co. Cork.
Proposed Development Summary	Two houses.
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
(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)	
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	

<p>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?</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><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)</p>	<p>Class 10(b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units – Sub Threshold Class 10(b)(iv) [Urban Development – 10 hectares – sub threshold]</p>
<p>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)?</p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</p>
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-500875-CK-26
Proposed Development Summary	Two houses.
Development Address	Glasson's Avenue, Carrignafoy, Cobh, Co. Cork.
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed. The development has a modest footprint, comes forward as a standalone project, does not require the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, and is not vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic,	Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed The development is situated in a built up area, removed from sensitive natural habitats.

cultural or archaeological significance).	
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects. Having regard to the modest nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitats/features, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

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

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)