



Cork City Council

Development Management, Strategic Planning and Economic Development
Directorate

Pre-Planning Record of Minutes

Section 247 (2) of the Planning & Development Act 2000 (as amended) states “*the planning authority shall advise the person concerned of the (1) procedures involved in considering a planning application including any requirements of the permission regulations, and shall, as far as possible, indicate (2) the relevant objectives of the development plan which may have a bearing on the decision of the planning authority.*”

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Date Requested/Date Held		13/05/2021
2. Email/Meeting/Telephone	Online TEAMS Meeting	
3. Site Location/Site Address	Bessboro, Ballinure, Blackrock, Cork	
4. Person Requesting Meeting	Harry Walsh (HW Planning)	
5. Applicant	Estuary View Enterprises 2020 Limited (EVE)	
6. Person's Interest in Land/Letter of Consent	Owner	

ATTENDEES

Cork City Council	Lucy Teehan Eoin Cullinane Tony Duggan Cathy Beecher Simon Lyons Valerie Fenton Fiona Redmond Alison O'Rourke Liam Casey
Agent	Harry Walsh (HW Planning) Deirdre Tobin (HW Planning) Glen Barry (Shipsey Barry) Ilsa Rutgers (Ilsa Rutgers Landscape Architects) Diarmuid O'Brien (JB Barry) Tim Finn (JB Barry) John Cronin (John Cronin Conservation)
Applicant	Liam Ormond (EVE)

DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED

Yes	Site layout, proposed plans and elevations, additional documentation
-----	--

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT/PROPOSAL

A residential development of approximately 300 units and all ancillary site development works

SITE PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Reference: n/a	An Bord Pleanála Appeal: n/a
Final Decision: n/a	If Refused, Reasons for Refusal: n/a

APPLICANT MUST READ COMMENTS BELOW IN CONJUNCTION WITH & REFER TO CORK CITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN:
WWW.CORKCITYDEVELOPMENTPLAN.IE OR VIEW HARD COPY AT COUNTER/CITYLIBRARIES

KEY DEVELOPMENT PLAN OBJECTIVES: OTHER INFORMATION

- Lucy Teehan (LT) confirmed, from documents submitted, that proposal meets the criteria for applying through the SHD process
 - *SHD Criteria: 100 or more houses on land zoned for residential use & less than 15% or 4500m² for other uses*
 - *Proposed Development: Exceeding 300 residential units*
- Harry Walsh (HW) introduced the scheme and indicated that the proposed development would be applied for through the SHD process.
- Glen Barry (GB) gave an overview of the proposed development.
- HW gave an overview of the overall plan for all of the applicant's landholding
- HW indicated that consultation and discussions would take place regarding any legacy issues relating to this site
- GB stated that the level change across the site from North to South allows for podium parking to be concealed and allows for the opening up of the public space in the centre of the site.
- GB stated that on designing the site they had looked to create permeability through the site
- GB confirmed that a creche has been designed and will be included in the scheme (not shown on submitted drawings). It is proposed to be a 25 place creche.
- GB stated that the design of the scheme provides for 43.5% of apartments to be dual aspect
- Ilsa Rutgers (IR) stated that the public open space provision amounts to approximately 17%
- IR stated that this public space is generally on the outer sides (West & East) of the proposed buildings
- IR indicated that there would be approximately 3600m² of communal space provided which would be semi-public and mostly consist of the courtyard area.
- IR stated that the Northern Courtyard would be loosely landscaped and have an organic feel while the Southern Courtyard would be a more formal space.

- GB stated that the elevations were guided by the surrounding landscape and would appear formal and grid-like to contrast the natural landscaping adjacent
- GB indicated that the design of the Southern building had been lowered in height to allow more light access the central courtyard area
- GB stated that the heights step down to the North to respect the lower height buildings to the North.
- GB indicated that on designing the scheme permeability was created through all sides of the development (North, South, East and West).
- Diarmuid O'Brien (DO'B) gave an overview of the services proposed for development site
- DO'B confirmed that the Irish Water Confirmation of Feasibility has been received
- Tim Finn (TF) stated that SUDS has been incorporated into the scheme
- TF indicated that stormwater is to be retained on site
- LT stated that the Planning Authority has concerns regarding the proposed developments relationship with the proposed development on the adjacent site to the South
- LT indicated that a concern would be that the proposed development would need to demonstrate a sense of place being created
- LT stated concerns relating to the proposed development addressing the private amenity walk to the East and that, given that this is the primary amenity in the area, should be better addressed.
- LT raised concerns regarding the design and scale of Block D, in particular indicating that this block should be looked at further and possibly broken up in scale.
- LT indicated serious concerns with the location of the proposed vehicle access to the development site
- LT stated that it would be preferable if the buildings addressed the roadway better and that the location of a public plaza at the Western edge of the site may not be appropriate
- Tony Duggan (TD) indicated that the rectangular/grid approach is generally acceptable in principle however he had some concerns with the layout
- TD indicated that the proposed development should have some regard to the outbuildings of the existing area and that the angles generated by these and the amenity walk and the contours of the site should be taken into consideration when revising the layout
- TD stated that the architectural language of the proposal was generally acceptable
- TD considered that the internal courtyard area works well
- TD stated that the higher elements should be located near the amenity walkway and should step-down to the West

- GB agreed to review the scheme relating to the above comments and suggested discussing alterations/revisions with Tony Duggan as they are progressed
- HW queried the concerns in relation to the position of the carpark entrance
- LT suggested discussing the entrance position with Tony Duggan as the revisions to the proposal are progressed
- LT stated that it will be important for the proposal to create a sense of place and a sense of arrival
- Valerie Fenton (VF) raised concerns regarding the quantum of car-parking spaces being provided for on-street
- VF re-iterated Lucy Teehan's concerns regarding the position of the vehicle entrance and stated that this should be reviewed along with sightlines, etc...
- VF raised concerns regarding the set-down area for the creche and indicated that this would only be in use for a small portion of the day and should be considered as being incorporated into the public realm
- VF raised concerns regarding the access onto the existing greenway amenity walk and indicated that a ramped access would be required for people with mobility issues, prams, etc... This would be very important when reviewed in relation to future developments in the area
- HW indicated there are concerns regarding the height difference between the subject site and the greenway which would make a ramped access difficult
- HW indicated that a ramped access would be available to the greenway through the adjacent development on the Southern site should it get permission
- GB stated that a universal ramped access would require a ramp of 120m and raised concerns that this would entail the removal of vegetation and some public open space
- Fiona Redmond (FR) stated that if accessibility/connectivity for the overall site is to be proposed through this or the adjacent development, then a strong justification would be required at application stage
- VF stated that if the universal access is to be provided through the adjacent site to the South, the connectivity/desire lines need to be reviewed
- IR suggested the possibility of a large-scale access lift to the Greenway
- VF stated that a lift would be acceptable should it be under the scope/maintenance of the management company/plan for the development
- FR suggested reviewing the comments above and further discussing with Valerie Fenton and Liam Casey and proposal is revised

- Cathy Beecher (CB) indicated that no traffic details were submitted at pre-application stage and requested that details be provided as the development revisions progress
- CB stated that any traffic modelling would need to take the proposed junction upgrades into consideration
- CB also stated that all traffic modelling and reports should include all phases of the development of the overall site to allow for a full, cumulative assessment
- LT stated that archaeology comments were as follows
 - Previous testing has occurred on site
 - Previous testing results should be included with any planning application
 - Further Archaeological testing of the site would be required
- LT stated that 10% of development should be included for Part V considerations
- HW stated that all of the above comments would be reviewed, and that any revisions would be further discussed with Cork City Council

	SIGNATURE	DATE
Eoin Cullinane, AP, Cork City Council.		13/05/2021

*The applicant is advised in accordance with **Section 247 (3)** of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), that “the carrying out of any consultations shall not prejudice the performance by a Planning Authority of any other of its functions under this Act, or any regulations made under this Act & cannot be relied upon in the formal planning process or in legal proceedings”.*



Cork City Council

Development Management, Strategic Planning and Economic Development
Directorate

Pre-Planning Record of Minutes

Section 247 (2) of the Planning & Development Act 2000 (as amended) states “*the planning authority shall advise the person concerned of the (1) procedures involved in considering a planning application including any requirements of the permission regulations, and shall, as far as possible, indicate (2) the relevant objectives of the development plan which may have a bearing on the decision of the planning authority.*”

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Date Requested/Date Held		10/06/2021
2. Email/Meeting/Telephone	Online TEAMS Meeting	
3. Site Location/Site Address	Bessboro, Ballinure, Blackrock, Cork	
4. Person Requesting Meeting	Harry Walsh (HW Planning)	
5. Applicant	Estuary View Enterprises 2020 Limited (EVE)	
6. Person's Interest in Land/Letter of Consent	Owner	

ATTENDEES

Cork City Council	Lucy Teehan Eoin Cullinane Tony Duggan Fiona Redmond Liam Casey Pat Ruane
Agent	Harry Walsh (HW Planning) Deirdre Tobin (HW Planning) Glen Barry (Shipsey Barry) Ilsa Rutgers (Ilsa Rutgers Landscape Architects) Diarmuid O'Brien (JB Barry) John Cronin (John Cronin Conservation)
Applicant	Liam Ormond (EVE)

DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED

Yes	Site layout, proposed plans and elevations, additional documentation
-----	--

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT/PROPOSAL

A residential development of approximately 300 units and all ancillary site development works

SITE PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Reference: n/a	An Bord Pleanála Appeal: n/a
Final Decision: n/a	If Refused, Reasons for Refusal: n/a

APPLICANT MUST READ COMMENTS BELOW IN CONJUNCTION WITH & REFER TO **CORK CITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN:**

WWW.CORKCITYDEVELOPMENTPLAN.IE OR VIEW HARD COPY AT COUNTER/CITYLIBRARIES

KEY DEVELOPMENT PLAN OBJECTIVES: OTHER INFORMATION

NOTE: This meeting is a follow-on meeting from that previously held in relation to the subject site on 13th May 2021

- Glen Barry (GB) gave an overview of the revisions to the proposed development.
 - Approximately 288 apartments
 - 40.2% dual aspect ratio
 - Parking Ratio: approx.. 35%
- GB stated that the scheme had be redesigned following the previous pre-application discussions
- GB stated that discussions had taken place with the City Architect (Tony Duggan) in relation to the revisions to the scheme
- GB stated that the revised design creates four no. L-shaped blocks ranging in height from 4 to 10 stories with the tallest building to the North-East
- GB stated that there would be a significant accessway through the site (East-West orientation) with active uses along this public accessway
- GB stated that the development was designed with the Southern scheme in mind
- GB stated that oner of the big revisions was for a pedestrian bridge over the Greenway from the subject site to connect with the access ramp on the Eastern side of the Greenway
- Liam Casey (LC) stated that he agrees with the solution proposed of the pedestrian bridge over the Greenway to join the access ramp
- LC stated that details of the proposed bridge should be agreed prior to application and that the design of the bridge should be a unique solution and have individual character
- LC stated that a singular access ramp, as proposed, is considered the best solution
- Pat Ruane (PR) stated that there no major conservation concerns relating to the proposed development
- PR stated that the proposed pedestrian bridge would enhance connectivity
- Lucy Teehan (LT) queried location of access to carpark

- GB stated that this was being reviewed at present but that the likely position was under the South-Western building due to ground levels
- LT stated that there may be concerns regarding a lack of live frontages to Southern elevation at Ground Floor Level
- GB stated that the proposal will have apartments and public green areas opening onto both the Northern and Southern elevations
- Harry Walsh (HW) indicated that the proposed bridge may bring a large footfall predominantly through the centre accessway of the site and that live uses would be located there
- GB stated that the Southern area would be a landscaped public park area
- Ilsa Rutgers (IR) indicated that this area would be an organic/park-like setting linking around the South of the site to connect with the proposed bridge
- HW stated that the proposed revisions were at the early design stages and that further details will be worked on.

	SIGNATURE	DATE
Eoin Cullinane, AP, Cork City Council.		10/06/2021

*The applicant is advised in accordance with **Section 247 (3)** of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), that “the carrying out of any consultations shall not prejudice the performance by a Planning Authority of any other of its functions under this Act, or any regulations made under this Act & cannot be relied upon in the formal planning process or in legal proceedings”.*