

File With _____

**LARGE RESIDENTIAL
DEVELOPMENT
CORRESPONDENCE FORM**

Appeal No: ACP 323082-25

Please treat correspondence received on 17/08/25 as follows:

1. Update database with new agent for Applicant/Appellant _____	
2. Acknowledge with LRD <u>40</u>	1. RETURN TO SENDER with LRD _____
3. Keep copy of Commission's Letter <input type="checkbox"/>	2. Keep Envelope: <input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Keep Copy of Commission's letter <input type="checkbox"/>

Amendments/Comments	<u>online obs. from Sinead Mooney</u>

4. Attach to file (a) SHD/LRD Unit <input type="checkbox"/> (b) Inspector <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	RETURN TO EO <input type="checkbox"/>
--	---------------------------------------

	Plans Date Stamped <input type="checkbox"/>
	Date Stamped Filled in <input type="checkbox"/>
EO: <u>Donna Wt all</u>	AA: <u>SP</u>
Date: <u>20/08/25</u>	Date: <u>22/8/25</u>



Planning Appeal Online Observation

Online Reference
NPA-OBS-004949

Online Observation Details

Contact Name Sinead Mooney	Lodgement Date 17/08/2025 17:58:37	Case Number / Description 323082
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Payment Details

Payment Method Online Payment	Cardholder Name Sinéad Mooney	Payment Amount €50.00
----------------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------

Processing Section

S.131 Consideration Required

Yes — See attached 131 Form

N/A — Invalid

Signed

EO

Date

Fee Refund Requisition

Please Arrange a Refund of Fee of

€

Lodgement No

LDG—082180-25

Reason for Refund

Documents Returned to Observer

Yes No

Request Emailed to Senior Executive Officer for Approval

Yes No

Signed

EO

Date

Finance Section

Payment Reference

ch_3Rx9uiB1CW0EN5FC0BVgZvf3

Checked Against Fee Income Online

EO/AA (Accounts Section)

Amount

€

Refund Date

Authorised By (1)

SEO (Finance)

Authorised By (2)

Chief Officer/Director of Corporate Affairs/SAO/Board Member

Date

Date

File With

[Empty box]

SECTION 131 FORM

Appeal No

ABP—

Defer Re O/H

Having considered the contents of the submission dated/received
from I recommend that section 131 of the Planning
and Development Act, 2000 be/not be invoked at this stage for the following reason(s):

Section 131 not to be invoked at this stage.

Section 131 to be invoked — allow 2/4 weeks for reply.

Signed

[Empty box]

Date

[Empty box]

EO

Signed

[Empty box]

Date

[Empty box]

SEO/SAO

M

Please prepare BP — Section 131 notice enclosing a copy of the attached submission.

To

[Empty box]

Task No

[Empty box]

Allow 2/3/4 weeks

BP

Signed

[Empty box]

Date

[Empty box]

EO

Signed

[Empty box]

Date

[Empty box]

AA

Sidwell House
3 Homeville,
Sunday's Well Road
Cork T23 H9N4
drsineadmooney@gmail.com

August 17th 2025

An Coimisiún Pleanála appeal number 323082-25

[Cork City Council Planning Reference 2543847]

Applicant Name: Bellmount Good Shepherd Ltd.

Subject Site Owners: Moneeda Developments Ltd

**Address: Former Good Shepherd Convent Site, Convent Avenue and Buckston Hill,
Sunday's Well, Cork**

To whom it concerns,

The proposed development for 1000 student beds, with specific provision for tourist accommodation in the summer months, on the grounds of the former Good Shepherd Convent, Sunday's Well, Cork, is ludicrously inappropriate for the site.

We wish to enter an observation on the planning permission application which has been approved for the proposed development of the former Good Shepherd Convent site, Sunday's Well Cork.

Our grounds for objection to the planning decision are as follows:

1. Population Density and Overdevelopment, Incompatibility with Community Needs

This is a ludicrously inappropriate development for this site. The development proposes to more than double the local population by adding 1000 new residents without any addition to already overstrained local infrastructure and amenities. There would be some obvious benefit to the local community from the arrival of a mix of new permanent or longterm residents with a stake in the area, but a transient student population and, for three months in the summer, a transient tourist population – as the planning application specifically proposes -- provides no such benefits to offset all the disadvantages of such a dramatic increase in the local population. To do so would directly contravene the Cork City Development Plan, which advocates compact growth in sustainable neighbourhoods.

2. Access, Parking, Traffic Impact, Construction Traffic

The main traffic artery of the area, Sunday's Well Road, cannot cope with current levels of traffic. Narrow and with many houses without off-road parking, there are many pinchpoints where two cars cannot pass, resulting in frequently lengthy tailbacks, with the current level of traffic. The proposed development's traffic plan does not even engage with the current traffic problems, based on their single day sample, far less provide a workable solution for the absorption of 1000 new residents, other than an unworkable, notional 'car-free status'. 37 car parking places is not going to cater for an increasingly car-dependent student population, which will inevitably mean an increase in congestion, parking overflow onto already overcrowded surrounding resident streets, pedestrian danger, and problems with emergency services access. The proposed renting of student apartments by tourists in the summer will inevitably mean even more congestion and traffic problems for which the planning application does not even begin to consider. There is no public transport in the immediate area which connects it with the city centre, and the roads and footpaths are too narrow to allow the construction of cycle lanes. That the site can only be accessed via the narrow, steep Convent Avenue, another residential street with street parking on both side and where two cars cannot pass, means that the passing of construction traffic will not just be intolerable for local residents, but totally impracticable.

3. Insensitivity to the Site's History, Likelihood of Unmarked Burials

The proposed development of multiple multi-storey accommodation blocks on the site of a 19th-century convent, orphanage and Magdalen laundry is completely inappropriate to the site and its history. The new blocks proposed dwarf the existing listed buildings to be retained, and their design makes no attempt to reference, or even to blend in with the listed structures. Furthermore, the site's history of confinement and abuse of women and children deserves the utmost sensitivity. It is extremely likely that, as well as the nuns' graveyard and the separate graveyard of the 'Magdalen' women, there are other unmarked burials on the site. These need to be investigated fully before any development of the site takes place, and it is our opinion that the site should be developed as a memorial to those who were confined and mistreated here. Its current dereliction and the proposed development both suggest a failure to acknowledge the horrors of the recent past.

4. Strain on infrastructure, flood risk, geological instability, loss of habitat

There is serious concern that local infrastructure, particularly sewage and water, cannot support such dense development. Because of the steep topography and the presence of numerous springs, Sunday's Well already experiences significant problems with surface water run off in wet weather, and a recent small development on Strawberry Hill saw significant problems with flooding. The introduction of large volumes of impermeable surfaces will reduce the extent to which the site currently absorbs water. Much more serious investigation of this risk is needed before any development should be permitted. The clearing of the site, which contains many mature trees, would drastically reduce the

biodiversity of the area, harm wildlife by loss of habitat, and contravene the conservation imperative.

5. Loss of privacy/overlooking

Because of the steepness of the local terrain, the proposed three-story building towards the front of the development will overlook our house, straight into our kitchen, bedrooms and bathroom beyond our ability to screen it. The upper floor windows of the current two-story building at the front of the site already overlook us, and are only adequately screened when the laurel hedge on the site is left to grow beyond a certain height. When it is cut, as it is periodically, we are directly overlooked by ground and first floor windows. A student/tourist development, with a transient population is more likely than a mixed development to involve considerable anti-social behaviour, which will be particularly problematic for those houses which, like ours, are directly bordering the site.

It is our opinion that this proposed development of the former Good Shepherd Convent site should not be approved on the grounds that it is totally inappropriate on the grounds set out above. The site should be developed as a combination of affordable housing and a park including a memorial to the history of institutional abuse. We respectfully request that you give due consideration to the objections raised and overturn the decision to grant planning permission.

Yours sincerely,
Sinéad Mooney and Ian Flanagan

