



An
Bord
Pleanála

S. 4(1) of Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 2016

Inspector's Report ABP-302521-18



Strategic Housing Development

Demolition of all existing structures and construction of 303 no. apartments with creche facility, gym, community/sports hall, concierge office and community room in 2 no. blocks.

Location

Palmerstown Retail Park, Kennelsfort Road Lower, Palmerstown, Dublin 20

Planning Authority

South Dublin County Council

Applicant

Randelswood Holding Ltd.

Prescribed Bodies

Transport Infrastructure Ireland
National Transport Authority
Irish Water
Irish Aviation Authority and Department

of Defence (Casement Aerodrome)
Dublin Airport Authority

Observer(s) 44 no submissions/observations

Date of Site Inspection 25th November 2018

Inspector Joanna Kelly

Contents

1.0 Introduction.....	4
2.0 Site Location and Description	4
3.0 Proposed Strategic Housing Development	5
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation.....	7
6.0 Relevant Planning Policy	13
7.0 Observer Submissions.....	20
8.0 Planning Authority Submission	23
9.0 Prescribed Bodies.....	29
10.0 Assessment.....	30
11.0 Recommendation	52
12.0 Reasons and Considerations	52

1.0 Introduction

This is an assessment of a proposed strategic housing development submitted to the Board under section 4(1) of the Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 2016 as amended.

2.0 Site Location and Description

- 2.1. The development site is located within the jurisdiction of South Dublin County Council north of the R-148, former N4 Lucan Road. The site is approx. 6km from the city centre. The site adjoins a petrol filling station 'Circle K' to the western boundary of the site, the R-148 to the south/south-west and there is a combination of purpose built one and two storey commercial units and residential uses at Rose View and Old Lucan Road. Access to the site is currently via the Kennelsfort Road Lower in close proximity to the junction with the R-148.
- 2.2. The development lands are triangular in shape with a stated site area of 1.2708ha. There are existing units such as furniture and car sales units which are visible from the R-148 that it is proposed to demolish.
- 2.3 Palmerstown village itself is typically low rise with buildings generally two storey and there is quite a traditional feel to the village. The main concentration of commercial uses is along Kennelsfort Road where the site is accessed from. There are industrial units some with commercial uses accessed from the Old Lucan Road. The Steel Works Unit is located north of the development site and contained large amounts of steel to the site frontage at time of inspection. Aldi is also accessed off the Old Lucan Road. There is a turning circle at the end of the Lucan Road (cul-de-sac). Waterstown park, which is has been subject to a Special Amenity Area Order, is located c. 500m north of the development site.
- 2.4 There is a notable absence of pedestrian crossings in the village with a single crossing at the junction of Kennelstown Road and the R-148. There is a foot bridge immediately adjacent the B & B which provides a crossing route to the other side of the R-148. Bus stops are located along Old Kennelsfort Road and in close proximity to either side of the footbridge along the R-148.

3.0 Proposed Strategic Housing Development

3.1. The proposed residential development consists of 303 residential units as follows:

Table 1: Number of Residential Units proposed

Units Type	No of units	% of each Unit type
Apartments		
Studios	26	9%
1 bed	125	41%
2 bed	133	44%
3 bed	19	6%
Total Apartments	303	100%

The proposed development consists of two apartment blocks as follows:

Table 2: Unit type within Apartment Blocks

Apartment Block	Studios	1 Bed Units	2 Bed Units	3 Bed Units	Total of Units in each Block
Block A	19	102	61	9	191
Block B	7	23	72	10	112
Total Unit Types	21	125	133	19	303

3.2. The following table provides key details as stated by the applicant for the proposed development:

Table 3: Key development details

Detail	Proposal
No. of Units	303 apartments

Site Area	1.2708 ha red-line boundary
Density	238 units per hectare net (stated by applicant)
Building Height	4 to 8 storeys
Public Open Space	14% of total site area
Car parking	274 car parking spaces
Bicycle parking	306 spaces (262 in basement and 44 at surface)
Dual Aspect Apartments	44.5%

4.0 Planning History

Relevant History pertaining to the overall landholding

File Ref. No. SD09A/0021 / PL.06S.234178 There is an extant permission for a mixed-use development including retail, offices, 102 residential units, 220 bed aparthotel, café/restaurant, library and health centre and on the site. Permission extended until May 2020 under file ref. SD09A/0021/EP. Details of the permitted layout are enclosed as an Appendix for ease of reference by the Board.

There are other permitted applications on the site, however, they relate to existing commercial activity.

File Ref. No. SD04A/0982 Permission was refused for a large mixed-use development on the opposite side of Kennelsfort Road Lower.

5.0 Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation

5.1. Overview

A section 5 pre-application consultation took place at the office of An Bord Pleanála on 25 May 2018. The main topics raised for discussion at the tripartite meeting were based on the agenda that issued in advance as follows:

- Residential Amenity – Standards, noise, daylight/sunlight and overshadowing.
- Development Plan – Zoning Objectives, height and mixed-use development.
- Pedestrian/Cycle permeability and public realm.
- Traffic – Junction Design
- Open Space – Roof gardens – Access and Surveillance
- Building Finishes – quality and durability
- Any other Matters

A copy of the Inspector's report and Opinion is on the file for reference by the Board. A copy of the record of the meeting is also available on the file.

5.2. Notification of Opinion

An Bord Pleanála issued notification that, it was of the opinion, the documents submitted with the request to enter into consultations, require further consideration and amendment to constitute a reasonable basis for an application for strategic housing development. The following is a brief synopsis of the issues noted in the Opinion that needed to be addressed:

1. Zoning Objectives

Further consideration of the documents as they relate to the zoning objectives for the site. Particular consideration should be given to the County Development Plan objectives: Specific Local Objective UC6 SLO:1 and Housing Policy 7 Objective 4, that limit building height to no greater than three storeys in Palmerstown Village and the greater Palmerstown Area. An appropriate statement in relation to section 8(1)(a)(iv) of the Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies

Act 2016, should be supported by the relevant national guidance documents. Specific attention is also drawn to the underlying Village Centre land use zoning for the site and a robust justification for the mix of land uses proposed should be prepared that outlines consistency with the relevant development plan objectives for the future development of Village Centres. Further consideration of this issue may require amendment to the documents and/or design proposals submitted.

2. Site Permeability

Further consideration of the documents as they relate to pedestrian and cyclist permeability through the site. Attention is drawn to the 'Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas' (including the associated 'Urban Design Manual') insofar as maximum permeability for pedestrians and cyclists should be considered as a starting point to the design process and the achievement of a compact urban structure. This should include the potential to create a pedestrian link between Kennelsfort Road Lower and the Lucan Road. Consideration should also be given to the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets as it relates to Connectivity and the importance of placing the pedestrian and cyclist at the top of the user hierarchy. Further consideration of this issue may require amendment to the documents and/or design proposals submitted.

3. Public Realm

Further consideration of the documents as they relate to public realm and the creation of a sense of place. Specific reference is made to both the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas and the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets as they relate to streets that contribute to the creation of attractive and lively mixed-use places and new urban spaces that have adequate pedestrian facilities and appropriate junction design. This is all in the context of the existing high quality public realm associated with Palmerstown Village. Further consideration of this issue may require amendment to the documents and/or design proposals submitted.

The Opinion notification pursuant to article 285(5)(b) also referred to specific information that should be submitted with any application as follows:

1. A management plan for open space and roof gardens.
2. Full and complete analysis and drawings that detail the impact of the proposed development on the residential amenity of existing and future residents in relation to daylighting, overshadowing and overlooking. Specific attention should be paid to proposed accommodation and interactions with existing development to the north along Kennelsfort Road Lower, Old Lucan Road and Rose View. In addition, attention is drawn to the residential amenity associated with single aspect corner units in Block A.
3. An architectural report accompanied by photomontages of the proposed development should outline the design rationale for the proposed building height, scale and massing. Photomontage images from a number of key approach roads to the development site and from the Liffey Valley Special Amenity Area Order.
4. A phasing plan for the proposed development.
5. A site layout plan showing which, if any, areas are to be taken in charge by the planning authority.
6. Details of all materials proposed for the proposed buildings, open spaces, paved areas, boundary and any retaining walls.
7. A traffic impact assessment report of the impact the proposal would have on the road network in the area, in particular, the signalised junctions immediately adjacent and east of the development site. Further consultation with the planning authority is advised in this respect.
8. A construction and demolition waste management plan should be provided.

5.3. Applicant's Statement

The applicant has submitted a statement of response to ABP Opinion's which is briefly summarised as follows:

Item 1

Zoning Objective

Response

A statement of consistency with planning policy has been submitted demonstrating that the proposed development is consistent with the relevant national, regional and local policy and guidelines issued under section 28 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. A material contravention statement has also been submitted providing justification for the proposal which materially contravenes the South Dublin County Council Development Plan 2016-2022 in terms of building height i.e. Specific Local Objective UC6 SLO 1 and Housing Policy 7 Objective 4. The site should be considered for increased building heights due to the location of the site adjacent to quality public transport corridors and policies and objectives set out within the Section 28 Guidelines.

In response to the village centre zoning and village centre objectives pertaining to the application site, a community and social infrastructure audit of Palmerstown Village and its environs including a review of Census population statistics. It is set out that given the quantum of existing vacant retail units within the immediate area it is considered unnecessary to provide further retail units for the area as part of this development. While a crèche facility and gym are provided as part of the development, it is the injection of a new population into this area as a result of the delivery of apartments that will provide footfall and a reliable consumer base to the village. This will enable vacant shops within the heart of the village to re-open or support new uses in these units. Reference is also made to a recent decision which sought to convert offices to retail use which will further improve the retail offering within the village centre.

Item 2

Site Permeability

Response

The proposed development now provides a pedestrian and cyclist access through the site in an east-west direction in the form of a pedestrian and cycle path which links the proposed development from Kennelsfort Road Lower through to the Old Lucan Road. This link ensures maximum connectivity to the immediate area and

recognises the importance of placing the pedestrian and cyclist at the top of the user hierarchy. Future access to the rear gardens/backlands of dwellings on Old Lucan Road, located to the north of the application site, is now also possible with the internal road network being designed accordingly.

Item 3

Public Realm

Response

Further to the pre-application consultation the overall design of the proposed public realm onto Kennelsfort Road Lower has been revisited, including the entrance to the development and also the design of Block B at this particular location. The design of this space incorporates seating in the form of a feature cantilever Iroko hardwood L shaped timber benches and hard and soft landscaping including trees define this plaza to the scheme. These landscaping proposals, coupled with high-quality, double height, glazed active frontage of the concierge office and gym, enlivens the streetscape to ensure a strong sense of place, an inviting public space for residents, visitors and customers and overall emphasises this prominent location of the development.

With regard to the specific additional information required, the applicant has responded as follows:

- Management Plan for open space and roof gardens – This plan includes specific details on how the open spaces and roof gardens will be managed and maintained. The overall usability of these spaces has also been duly considered by the design team through the use of screening, planting and solid glazed balustrades to ensure comfort and shelter for those availing of these amenity spaces. The final design of the gardens has been informed by the wind assessment and recommendations prepared by RWDI Consultants.
- Residential Amenity, Daylighting, Overshadowing, Overlooking – Detailed analysis is contained within the report titled 'Potential Daylight and Sunlight Impact' prepared by Digital Dimensions. The report concludes that the development meets the daylight BRE guidelines in the urban context. In terms of sunlight, the analysis confirms that there will be a very minor

reduction in the available sunlight on the ground, with the available sunlight to the amenities meeting the BRE guidelines in all cases. The design of some of the proposed apartments have been revisited. Such design changes include larger windows and doors being provided to allow for more natural light to the units. Overlooking has been addressed through the provision of appropriate separation distances within the scheme itself and also from existing buildings, and through the use of design solutions such as obscure glazing and apartment orientation to ensure no overlooking takes place. The entrance to the development has been revisited and is now further removed from the boundary with 15 Kennelsfort Lower Road and also transitions in height, stepping from 4 storeys to 6 storeys at this location.

- Architectural Report and Photomontages – The Urban Design Statement for the proposed development outlines the design rationale for the proposed building height, scale and massing of the scheme. Such rationale includes the strategic prominent location of the site and the opportunity to create a landmark gateway development on the arterial western approach into Dublin. Numerous photomontages have been prepared.
- Phasing Plan – It is proposed to phase the development into three key stages: No. 1 Demolition works and construction of basement; No. 2 Construction of Block B and: No. 3 Construction of Block A.
- Taking in Charge – The proposed development will be privately managed and the applicant is not proposing any areas to be taken in charge.
- Proposed Materials – The Urban Design Statement provides detailed information on the proposed materials and finishes for the scheme. The Building Lifecycle Report also provides detailed material specification for the development.
- Traffic Impact Assessment – Feedback from a meeting with the Roads Department pursuant to the pre-application consultation has resulted in changes being incorporated into the final proposals. A detailed traffic and transportation assessment report has been prepared and there is no reason why the proposed development should not proceed. A mobility management plan has been prepared. A road safety audit has been carried out.

- Construction and Demolition Waste Management Plan – This plan has been prepared and is submitted with the application.

6.0 Relevant Planning Policy

6.1. Project Ireland 2040 – National Planning Framework

The NPF includes a Chapter, No. 6 entitled ‘People, Homes and Communities’. It sets out that place is intrinsic to achieving good quality of life. A number of key policy objectives are noted as follows:

National Planning Objective 13 provides that “in urban areas, planning and related standards, including in particular, height and car parking will be based on performance criteria that seek to achieve well-designed high-quality outcomes in order to achieve targeted growth. These standards will be subject to a range of tolerance that enables alternative solutions to be proposed to achieve stated outcomes, provided public safety is not compromised and the environment is suitably protected”.

National Policy Objective 33 seeks to “prioritise the provision of new homes at locations that can support sustainable development and at an appropriate scale of provision relative to location”.

National Policy Objective 35 seeks “to increase residential density in settlements, through a range of measures including restrictions in vacancy, re-use of existing buildings, infill development schemes, area or site-based regeneration and increased building heights”.

6.2. Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines

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

- ‘Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas’ (including the associated ‘Urban Design Manual’)
- ‘Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets’ (DMURS)
- ‘The Planning System and Flood Risk Management’ (including the associated ‘Technical Appendices’)
- ‘Childcare Facilities – Guidelines for Planning Authorities’
- ‘Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities’
- ‘Guidelines for Planning Authorities and An Bord Pleanála on carrying out Environmental Impact Assessment’, August 2018.

Other relevant guidelines include:

- National Planning Framework Project 2020
- Rebuilding Ireland: Action for Homelessness
- Guidelines for Planning Authority, Appropriate Assessment, NPWS

6.3. Local Planning Policy

South Dublin County Council Development Plan 2016-2022

This CDP is the operative development plan for the area. The site is subject to zoning ‘Objective VC - To protect, improve and provide for the future development of Village Centres’, and subject to Specific Local Objective UC6 SLO:1 and a non-specific junction proposal at the junction of Kennelsfort Road Lower/Upper with the New Lucan Road.

Specific Local Objective UC6 SLO:1, states:

‘To preserve the character of Palmerstown Village by limiting any future development on the former Vincent Byrne site to three storeys in height, and two storeys where it backs or sides onto adjoining two storey housing.’

Table 1.1 of the CDP sets out the settlement hierarchy for South Dublin.

Palmerstown is identified as an area for “consolidation within the gateway”. The plan

sets out that there is no significant road, water supply or drainage constraints. Proposed high capacity transport projects would increase capacity of zoned lands.

Core Strategy Policy 1 Consolidation Areas within the Gateway sets out that “it is the policy of the Council to promote the consolidation and sustainable intensification of development to the east of the M50 and south of the River Dodder”.

Housing (H) Policy 7 Urban Design in Residential Developments sets out broad design policies for new development, H7 Objective 4 states: that any future development of both residential and/or commercial developments in Palmerstown Village and the greater Palmerstown Area shall not be higher than or in excess of three stories in height.

The Liffey Valley Special Amenity Area Order 1990 (SAAO) and proposed Natural Heritage Area associated with the Liffey Valley are located to the north of the site.

There is a six-year cycle network programme, the Liffey Valley Greenway seeks a link between Lucan and Palmerstown (from Leixlip to Heuston Station).

6.4 Applicant’s Statement of Consistency

The applicant has submitted a statement of consistency with relevant policy required under Section 8(1)(iv) of the Act which provides, *inter alia*:

- National Policy and Guidelines – reference is made to key national policy and guidelines including *inter alia*, Project Ireland 2040: The National Planning Framework, Rebuilding Ireland, An Action Plan for Housing and Homelessness 2016.
- It is submitted that the 303 no. apartments on the subject site will help Government to achieve the objectives of the Housing Action Plan. 10% of the total units are also proposed for social housing.
- With regard to the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas and Best Practice Urban Design Guidelines 2009, the design of the proposed development has placed considerable emphasis on the context of the site and location as well as the surrounding built environment. The proposal successfully incorporates the criteria of the ‘Urban Design Manual’. The

proposal represents a development that has been carefully and appropriately designed, giving full consideration to its neighbouring properties and would integrate successfully with its environs. The proposal positively contributes to the character and identity of the surrounding neighbourhood. The proposed density will help support efficient public transport. The aim of the proposal is to bring an underutilised site back into use.

- The planning application is accompanied by an Architectural/Urban Design Statement and a Housing Quality Assessment document which demonstrate the consistency of the proposal with the relevant standards in the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities document and the SDCC Development Plan 2016-2022.
- The proposed development complies with the Special Planning Policy Requirements (SPPRs) of the recently adopted Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments. The proposal will help meet the current demand for apartment type developments.
- The proposed development provides for a childcare facility catering for 40 children, totalling 215sq.m. with associated outdoor children's play area which is of a size and scale considered appropriate to meet the needs of future residents and indeed the local community.
- The transport drawings and documentation provide further details in respect of the compliance of the proposed development with the provision of DMURS. A specific statement of compliance with regard to DMURS has been included with the traffic and transportation assessment.
- The proposed development is considered consistent with the requirements of the consultation draft document titled 'Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines for Planning Authorities' 2018.
- It is considered that the proposed development complies with Smarter Travel: A Sustainable Transport Future. The subject site is strategically located within 100 metres walking distance of a bus stop which is located on a QBC from Lucan into Dublin City Centre i.e. Bus Stop No. 2241 on R148 (old N4) Chapelizod Bypass.

- With regard to EIA Directive, it is submitted that there will be no likely significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. It is considered that EIA is not required for the project.
- With regard to AA the proposed development has been screened and a report for Screening for Appropriate Assessment has been prepared. It is concluded that there will be no negative impact on the qualifying interests or species of any Natura 2000 sites within a 15km radius of the proposed development.
- In accordance with the Flood Risk Guidelines, consulting engineers carried out a flood risk assessment. Records and flood mapping show the site is not subject to coastal or fluvial flooding. There is a risk of pluvial flooding due to the high percentage of site being hardstanding and therefore generating a large volume of runoff which cannot enter the sewers. Any flood risk will be overcome by providing a surface water management system that complies with the current design standards such as the GDSDS and as such the proposal is considered consistent with the requirements of the national flood risk guidelines.
- Regional Planning Guidelines for the GDA – The site is located within the Metropolitan Area of the GDA which is targeted for increased development particularly lands that are readily accessible by public transport and roads infrastructure. The site is strategically located within 100m of a bus stop which is located on a QBC from Lucan into Dublin City Centre.
- With regard to the Transport Strategy for the GDA it is submitted that the proposal seeks to redevelop an underutilised brownfield site within walking distance of a QBC and is considered an appropriate form of development.
- With regard to local policy, reference is made to the overarching considerations of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2016-2022. It is set out that a key consideration for the site is the recent Census data which identifies an aging population and stagnant/falling population which presents a serious risk for the viability of services and facilities into the future. Palmerstown has a stagnant, declining population and the proposal will provide an injection of population into the area ensuring the viability and vitality of services and facilities within Palmerstown into the future.

- The proposed development will provide for a high-quality residential development with complementary land uses on what is an underutilised brownfield site in a highly accessible location which is well served by public transport and within the M50 ring and as such is consistent with the core strategy objectives and the housing strategy objectives of the development plan.
- With regard to the Sustainable Neighbourhood Objectives contained in the CDP it is set out that the proposal will promote higher density development that is immediately adjacent to a QBC. The proposed density of the site is 238 units per hectare in excess of the 50 units advocated in national guidelines. The proposed blocks range in height from 4 to 8 storeys and provides a gradual change in height fronting onto Kennelsfort Road Lower in order to respect the surrounding established character. The site represents a strategic, landmark location which has the capacity to provide a high-quality architecturally designed gateway development on one's approach into Dublin City. It is therefore concluded that the proposed development is consistent with the policies and objectives of the Development Plan.
- Four types of units are being provided with 59% of the units larger than the minimum apartment sizes standards as specified within the national apartment guidelines. The design and layout of the development is such that it provides a high-quality living environment for residents and visitors to the scheme. The proposal includes the use of high quality, durable external materials and finishes for the development and the proposed landscaping for the development has been designed to ensure high-quality amenity spaces for the residents. The proposal provides for additional complementary uses such as playground, gym, roof gardens etc.
- Reference is made to the development plan policies in respect of open spaces provision, associated privacy and security. It is submitted that the proposed amenity spaces benefit from passive surveillance from the proposed units. Private amenity space such as balconies and terraces have also been designed in accordance with quantitative and qualitative standards and have appropriate privacy and security. The development will be fitted with CCTV systems for the security and safety of residents. Appropriate separation distances of over 20m have been provided between apartments

buildings to ensure privacy without compromising internal residential amenity of the apartments.

- With regard to residential consolidation policy consideration reference is again made to the strategic location of the site.
- With regard to community facilities and the relevant CDP policies and objectives, it is submitted that the proposal is consistent with these policies and objectives.
- With regard to Urban Centres and Village Centres and the relevant policies and objectives, reference is again made to the Census data and the proposal to inject new population into this area. It is submitted that the proposal will create a new, sustainable community which will integrate with Palmerstown Village centre and revitalise the area through the introduction of 303 residential units with associated complementary land-uses.
- With regard to the land use objective the proposal is considered permitted in principle and is considered consistent with the objectives of the village centre zoning designation.
- Details of compliance with Chapter 11 Implementation are outlined in a table format and generally refer to planning consideration already mentioned heretofore.
- With regard to the Specific Objectives, namely UC6 SLO1, Housing Policy 7 and H7 Objective 4, regarding the preservation of the character of the area and limitation of development on the site to three storeys in height, it is submitted that these objectives are a direct contravention of national policy which promotes increased densities at well served urban sites and discourages general blanket height standards in certain urban areas such as the subject site.
- It is also submitted that the CDP has conflicting objectives insofar as the proposed development is considered, as the development plan also contains objectives regarding higher densities and varied residential building heights. Reference is made to Housing Policy 8 and 9 Residential Density and Building Heights. In this regard, the site is located adjacent to public transport corridors. Restricting height of the development at such a well-served location under the SDCC development plan is a direct contravention of national policy

which promotes increased densities at well served urban sites and discourages general blanket height standards in certain urban areas, such as the subject site. Reference is made to the policies contained in the NPF where there is a strong emphasis placed on increased building heights in appropriate locations within existing urban centres and along public transport corridors. It is submitted that the proposed building height ranging from 4 to 8 storeys is in line with Government guidance and evolving trends for sustainable residential developments in urban areas.

- National Guidelines also recognise that a key design aim in delivering sustainable communities is to reduce, as far as possible, the need to travel, particularly by private car, by facilitating mixed-use development and by promoting the efficient use of lands and of investment in public transport. In this case, the site is zoned 'VC- village centre', therefore limiting height would prevent sustainable, compact developments in the heart of such urban areas and will lead to 'leapfrogging' of developments and urban/suburban sprawl. Thus, the development plan objectives restricting height at the application site conflict with the national planning guidance.
- Reference is made to section 2.23 of new apartment guidelines which also recognises that the NPF signals a move away from rigidly applied, blanket planning standards in relation to building design, in favour of performance-based standards to ensure well-designed high-quality outcomes. The objectives of the development plan materially conflict this national policy.
- The proposal is considered to be in accordance with SPPR3 of the draft consultation guidelines on Building Heights in Urban Areas.
- The statement concludes by re-iterating how the proposal is consistent with the relevant policies and guidelines at national level and set out that the proposal is considered consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

7.0 Observer Submissions

7.1. A total of 44 no. observations were received in respect of the proposed development. There is a significant degree of overlap with the various

issues/concerns raised by observers and in the interests of brevity and clarity I have amalgamated the issues under headings and summarised the main planning issues raised thereunder. A brief summary of each submission received is attached as an Appendix to this report.

7.1.1 Traffic and Transportation

- The issue of traffic, safe access/egress and parking is raised in a significant amount of observers' submissions (if not them all) and significant detail is provided as observers' regarding their day to day experience of daily issues.
- Reference is made to recent permissions in the area and existing uses e.g. HSE, Aldi and Church which have had or will have a huge impact on existing traffic congestion in the area.
- Photographs are enclosed with observers' submissions highlighting congestion issues and parking issues.
- Area currently suffers from congestion with only one access point onto the Old Kennelsfort Road.
- Objective in the CDP to upgrade the junction and this application will compromise this.
- Public Transport in the area is at capacity with buses at capacity before they reach the village.
- Significant congestion and tail backs during peak times.
- Concerns regarding use of car park as a short cut to shops and the existing situation whereby the gates are locked at night for security reasons.
- Health and safety issues regarding emergency vehicle access
- Only one pedestrian crossing in village
- Clarity regarding bicycle parking.
- Insufficient parking
- Previous permission on site provided for an access at the same location and the exit via the west of the site and the old Lucan-Dublin road to the north.

7.1.2 CDP and Local Planning Policies

- Reference is made to local objectives in the CDP particularly H7 Objective 4 and UC6 SCO.
- The proposal materially contravenes the SDCDP which was adopted as part of the democratic process with regarding to building height.
- The rebuilding Ireland Guidelines are only guidelines and the CDP takes precedence.

7.1.3 Impact on residential Amenity

- Concerns about height, overshadowing and impact on daylight to existing residential properties.
- Concerns about overlooking from balconies and terraces.
- Concerns about lack of open space
- Concerns regarding removal of wall to rear of some properties which is in third party ownership.
- Noise from N4 an issue and also from nearby land-uses such as Steel Company to the north of the site.
- Block A wedged between extremely noisy environment.

7.1.4 Drainage and Infrastructural concerns

- Site known as the 'Swamps' and flooding occurs in winter along back gardens.
- Basement car park will exacerbate issue.

7.1.5 Other General Issues

- Lack of community facilities to cater for development.
- Objection to removal of existing party boundary walls.
- No retail space which would add life to the village.

- Welcomes development and emphasis on pedestrian and cycling priority.
- Unit type does not allow for flexibility in changing households.

8.0 Planning Authority Submission

8.1. Overview

The planning authority, South Dublin County Council has made a submission which was received by ABP 2nd November 2018. The report notes the 43 observations/submissions received and summarised the issues raised.

8.2 Summary of Views of Elected Members

- Development will not fit in with the character of Palmerstown village and constitutes overdevelopment.
- Serious traffic impact at one of the busiest congestion points in the County.
- Deficiencies in public transport services.
- Height concerns adjacent to two storey housing
- Lack of parking
- Impacts on residential amenity such as overlooking, overshadowing.
- Conflicts with the objectives of the County Development Plan.

8.3 Planning Analysis

The report which sets out the principle planning considerations and response to issues raised is summarised as follows:

- Zoning and Council policy – Principle of development is acceptable, however, the proposal for buildings of four to eight stories in height, backing onto two storey housing would conflict with UC6SLO1 and H7 Objective 4 and as such constitutes a material contravention of the South Dublin CDP 2016 and is unacceptable.

- Part V Housing – A Part V condition should be attached to any grant of permission.
- Residential and Visual Amenity – There would be a separation distance of 37 metres between Block A and existing residential dwellings to the north and a separation distance of 9 metres between Block B and No. 15 Lower Kennelsfort Road. Majority of ground floor units have own door access which is desirable as this creates increased passive surveillance. The PA usually requires the main bedroom in residential units to be a minimum of 13sq.m. especially in one bedroom apartments in the interests of residential amenity. This matter could be conditioned. The PA has serious concerns with regard to the bulk and scale of Block B in such close proximity to the existing two storey terraced houses on Kennelsfort Road Lower and also along Old Lucan Road. It remains that there would be serious and unacceptable overbearing, overshadowing and overlooking impacts on the adjoining houses on Kennelsfort Road. The height of Block B, combined with windows and roof gardens would result in serious loss of privacy and overbearing issues along with overshadowing of the rear gardens of houses on the Old Lucan Road. The density and scale of the proposal would be out of character with the pattern of development in the village centre. Six apartments have been identified in the Daylight and Sunlight Impact Report that may have poor daylighting due to galley kitchens and balconies positioned over windows of residential units below. Overshadowing of the rear garden areas for the nearest three dwellings on Kennelsfort Road Lower can be seen on March shadow analysis diagrams at 3pm.
- Vehicular Access and Car Parking – The existing wayleave to the Old Lucan Road is not indicated on the proposed site layout plan submitted. Vehicular access to the subject site would be from Kennelsfort Road Lower and vehicular movements out of the site would be left out only due to the proximity to the corner junction with the N4 Lucan Road/Palmerstown Bypass. The SDCC Roads section states that the site is well connected by public transport links. A NTA Greater Dublin Network Cycle Plan route runs through Palmerstown Village to the north of the site and there are several cycletracks in place on the surrounding road network. The site is well connected in terms of road access. The roads section considers that the proposed development is premature pending the submission of proposals/master plan for the subject

site and adjoining industrial site that address connectivity and permeability for all road users.

- Open Space, Trees and Landscaping – The Planning Authority has concerns with regards to the proposed roof gardens on Block B and considers that roof gardens on Block B should be screened in such a manner so as to avoid overlooking of existing rear garden areas to the north and east. Additional tree planting and screening should be provided along the northern site boundary bounding existing residential rear garden areas.
- Archaeology, Bats and Badgers – An archaeological report has been submitted which states that should archaeological remains be discovered work should cease. A bat and badger survey was carried out and one species of bat was recorded and no evidence of badgers on site. Recommended site be re-surveyed for bats if more than 6 months lapse between a grant of permission and demolition works commence.
- Public lighting and taking in charge – A standard public lighting condition should apply. A standard condition regarding taking in charge should be imposed.
- Public Health and Noise – Concerns regarding noise levels for future occupants with south facing apartments. The differing noise levels reported could have an impact on the construction requirements i.e. glazing specifications to be used to achieve the required internal noise levels. ABP should examine this issue and assign conditions as deemed appropriate. A condition requiring the 3 metre high noise wall to the children’s playground should also be attached.
- Flood Risk Assessment, Services and Drainage – A minimum of 6m wayleave should be provided for a 225mm surface water sewer. The Drainage section states that there is no report to show what capacity of flow is in the surface water sewer and if it could accept flows from the 225mm surface water sewer. A report showing what available capacity in the existing 450mm surface water sewer is required before deciding on suitability of surface water system. Drainage section report states that there is a history of a stream flowing through the site and information showing how surface water from the site would be drained should be submitted. These concerns are significant because the application needs to be assessed with respect to the

GDR Code of Practice for Drainage Works. IW has no objection subject to conditions.

- Phasing – A phasing plan has been submitted.
- Waste Management – The Construction and Demolition Waste Management Plan refers to a greenfield site which is incorrect and material will be generated from demolition.
- Conclusion – It is the opinion of the planning authority that the application would not be consistent with the South Dublin CDP and as such permission should be refused for four reasons as follows:
 - proposal materially contravenes the UC6 SLO objective which limits any future development on the former Vincent Byrne site to three storeys and two storeys where it backs or sides onto adjoining two storey housing.
 - Proposal by virtue of its height and massing and close proximity to existing two storey dwelling would have an unacceptable overbearing, overshadowing and overlooking impact which would seriously injure the residential amenity
 - Density and scale out of character with the pattern of development in the village centre
 - Proposal would be self-contained with a single access and egress point onto Kennelsfort Road Lower. The layout proposed provides limited opportunities to facilitate potential future access to the rear gardens of the houses to the north, or for future connectivity to the lands to the west of the application site. The proposal is premature pending the preparation of a master plan for the subject site and adjoining industrial sites that addresses connectivity and permeability for all road users.

8.3 Inter-Departmental reports

The report also contains reference to inter-departmental reports which are summarised briefly below:

Roads Section Proposal would remove the existing site access which is effectively an uncontrolled arm of the signalised junction between Kennelsfort Road

Lower/R148 which is a traffic hazard. As there is a left turn filter light off the R148 onto Kennelsfort Road Lower, signal sequencing and timings would have to be assessed to ensure that excessive queuing does not occur onto Kennelsfort Road Lower due to vehicles waiting in the right turn filter lane to access the development. The previously approved application on site provided for permeability through the site for vehicles with access to both Kennelsfort Road Lower and Old Lucan Road. The current proposal under consideration provides for east-west permeability through the site for pedestrians and cyclists which connect Kennelsfort Road Lower and Old Lucan Road. This link also provides for future development of lands to the west of the site. However, this site is not designed to allow heavy vehicular traffic to flow through it as there are ramps, a podium deck and shared surface area to negotiate while passing through the site. There is backland development potential in the gardens to the north of the site and this has been somewhat addressed by the proposed layout. The proposed layout is not conducive to allowing comprehensive development as some of the gardens may become inaccessible due to the location of the proposed location of the basement ramp. The location of the ramp also results in an acute angle at the top of the ramp where drivers exiting the basement would be required to look over their right shoulder to ensure that they can proceed. This would become a safety issue if lands to the west of the subject site are developed and access is granted via the internal access road through the subject development. The roads section considers that the proposed development is premature pending the submission of proposals/master plan for the subject site and adjoining industrial sites that address connectivity and permeability for all road users.

Parks and Landscaping services section Landscaping plan has insufficient details. Trees along the entrance/avenue should be included to reduce and soften the urban impact of the development. Limited screening has been proposed in the south of the development beside the Chapelizod road. Green roofs are proposed but no details are submitted. Many plants proposed aren't pollinator, shade and maintenance friendly. Boundary treatments are unclear. Unclear what is to be taken in charge. A daylight and sunlight test should be submitted; the proposed development magnitude may have adverse effects on the selection of plants and for the proposed development and on neighbouring dwellings. The design has not adequately provided information on accessibility. No levels and no cross sections have been provided in the landscape masterplan. Playground is limited in terms of

play value. Greater passive surveillance to the climbing frame to the north should be provided. The drainage scheme does not comply with the objectives of the development plan in terms of green infrastructure. Attenuation tanks greatly reduce the amenity of the open space and prevent tree planting. Further information is required in respect of the issues raised.

Infrastructure report The proposed wayleave either side of the 225mm surface water sewer is too small; there should be a minimum of 3m either side. There is no report to show how the flow capacity of the 225mm surface water sewer would be maintained at its current rate. If a surface water sewer is to be diverted on adjacent property then permission from the owner is required and 6m way leave provided. A report showing what available capacity in the existing 450mm surface water sewer is required before deciding on suitability of surface water system. There is no surface water layout of the development that drains the site above basement level. There is history of a stream flowing through the site and information showing how surface water from the site would be drained should be submitted. Concerns are significant because the application needs to be assessed with respect to the GD Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works and recommends that this information be submitted prior to commencement of development.

8.4 Recommended Conditions

Appendix 1 of the Chief Executive's report recommends that permission is granted subject to conditions. A summary of the conditions outlined in section 6 of the Chief Executive report is provided as follows:

- | | |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|
| Condition 1 | Accord with plans and particulars |
| Condition 2 | Part V |
| Condition 3 | Restriction on use and occupancy |
| Condition 4 | External Material finishes |
| Condition 5 | Drainage |
| Condition 6 | Noise |
| Condition 7 | Landscape Design and rationale |
| Condition 8 | Semi private open space |

Condition 9	Play area details
Condition 10	SuDS
Condition 11	Public realm lighting scheme
Condition 12	Construction Traffic Management Plan
Condition 13	Mobility Management Plan
Condition 14	Advertisements signage
Condition 15	Electric Vehicles
Condition 16	Taking in charge
Condition 17	Location of services underground
Condition 18	Occupation subject to service connection
Condition 19	Phasing
Condition 20	Bin storage
Condition 21	Pest control
Condition 22	Construction noise
Condition 23	Contaminated land
Condition 24	Dust
Condition 25	Public realm Debris avoidance
Condition 26	Project Construction Waste and Demolition management plan

9.0 Prescribed Bodies

9.1 Irish Water

IW confirms that subject to a valid connection agreement being put in place the proposed connections to IW networks can be facilitated.

9.2 Irish Aviation Authority

No observations on this application.

9.3 Transport Infrastructure Ireland

The proposed development shall be undertaken in accordance with the recommendations of the Transport (Traffic) Assessment and Road Safety Audit submitted. Any additional works required as a result of the Transport Assessment and Road Safety Audits should be funded by the developer.

10.0 Environmental Impact Assessment

A EIA Preliminary Examination for this application has been undertaken dated 10th September 2018 and is attached to the file.

11.0 Assessment

11.1 Pursuant to site inspection and inspection of the surrounding environs including the road network, examination of all documentation, plans and particulars, and submissions/observations on file, the following are the relevant planning considerations of this application:

- Zoning and Specific Local Objectives
- Urban Design, Layout and Density
- Commercial Uses
- Residential Amenity
- Visual Impact
- Infrastructural Services and Flood Risk
- Movement and transportation
- Other issues
- Appropriate Assessment

11.1.1. Zoning and Specific Local Objectives

Zoning - The development site has a land use zoning objective 'VC' which seeks "to protect, improve and provide for future development of village centres". The South

Dublin CDP specifically sets out that “the village centre zoning will support the protection and conservation of the special character of the traditional villages and provide for enhanced retail and retail services, tourism, residential, commercial, cultural and other uses that are appropriate to the village context”. The proposal in this instance is to provide 303 apartments together with a crèche, gym, community/sports hall and community centre. I am satisfied that the uses are such that are compatible with the village centre zoning.

11.1.2. Specific Local Objectives – There are specific local objectives pertaining to the development site contained within the SDCC development plan. The primary objectives are:

UC 6 SLO 1 “To preserve the character of Palmerstown Village by limiting any future development on the former Vincent Byrne site to three storeys in height, and two storeys where it backs or sides onto adjoining two storey housing”.

H7 Objective 4 “That any future development of both residential and/or commercial developments in Palmerstown Village and the greater Palmerstown Area shall not be higher than or in excess of three storeys

The proposals before the Board for consideration contains two no. apartment blocks which range in height from four to eight storey on the Vincent Byrne site which is a direct material contravention of this specific local objective. A material contravention statement has been submitted by the application in accordance with section 8(1)(a)(iv) of the Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act, 2016 as amended. This section of the Act provides that where the proposed development materially contravenes the said plan, other than in relation to the zoning of the land, indicating why permission should nonetheless be granted, having regard to a consideration specified in section 37(2)(b) of the Act of 2000.

11.1.3 Section 37(2)(b) of the Planning and Development Act of 2000 as amended provides that where a planning authority has decided to refuse permission on the grounds that a proposed development materially contravenes the development plan, the Board may only grant permission in accordance with paragraph (a) where it considers that –

(i) The proposed development is of strategic or national importance,

- (ii) There are conflicting objectives in the development plan or the objectives are not clearly stated, insofar as the proposed development is concerned or
- (iii) Permission for the proposed development should be granted having regard to the regional spatial and economic strategy for the area, guidelines under section 28, policy directives under section 29, the statutory obligations of any local authority in the area, and any relevant policy of the Government, the Minister or any Minister of the Government or
- (iv) Permission for the proposed development should be granted having regard to the pattern of development, and permissions granted, in the area since the making of the development plan.

11.1.4 The applicant submits that there are conflicting objectives contained in the development plan and that the policies and objectives stated in section 28 national guidelines enable increased building height and residential densities on sites adjacent to quality transport routes and within existing urban areas. The primary argument advanced by the applicant is that national guidance in particular, the “Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas, 2009”, “ Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2018”, and the recently published Consultation Draft of “Urban Development and Building Heights, Guidelines for Planning Authorities” and the “Project Ireland: National Planning Framework 2040” enable increased building height and residential densities on sites adjacent to quality transport routes and within existing urban areas.

11.1.5 The development site, as stated heretofore, is located within a designated village centre within the Metropolitan area of Dublin. The NPF advocates compact, smart, sustainable growth in national policy objective 3. National Policy Objective 3b seeks to “deliver at least half (50%) of all new homes that are targeted in the five Cities and suburbs of Dublin, Cork, Limerick, Galway and Waterford, within their existing built-up footprints”. The proposal before the Board is, in my opinion, consistent with this national objective. National Policy Objective 11 provides
“in meeting urban development requirements, there will be a presumption in favour of development that can encourage more people and generate more jobs and activity within existing cities,

towns and villages, subject to development meeting appropriate planning standards and achieved targeted growth”.

11.1.6 In this regard, I am satisfied that the proposal would contribute to targeted growth within the Dublin metropolitan area in line with national policies and would also help increase the population in an area where it is stagnating or declining. The re-development of this site will contribute to higher densities along a QBC within the metropolitan area. I refer the Board to National Policy Objective 13 which sets out that

“in urban areas, planning and related standards, including particular building height and car parking will be based on performance criteria that seek to achieve well designed high-quality outcomes in order to achieve targeted growth. These standards will be subject to a range of tolerance that enables alternative solutions to be proposed to achieve stated outcomes, provided public safety is not compromised and the environment is suitably protected”.

11.1.7 Notwithstanding the specific local objective in respect of the site which limits the height as set out in the CDP, I accept the argument by the applicant that the local planning policies conflict with national policies which advocate higher densities and increased height within existing settlement boundaries subject to performance based criteria. The specific local objective is considered unduly restrictive in the context of national guidance and would run counter to the objectives that national policies seek to achieve, namely compact, smart, sustainable growth. In this regard, I consider that having regard to the existing character of the site, a brownfield site located along a national transport corridor, the presence of a QBC and existing amenities and services within the designated village centre lands of Palmerstown, the proposal before the Board is of a strategic nature where there are conflicting objectives in the County Development Plan in the context of national policy objectives contained within the National Planning Framework and other section 28 Ministerial guidance where increased densities at appropriate locations are supported. I, therefore, conclude that permission can be granted having regard to the considerations specified in section 37(2)(b) (i) and (iii) of the Act of 2000 as amended. The development should nonetheless be tested against performance based criteria which is dealt with under the next section of this report.

11.2 Urban Design, Layout and Density

11.2.1 An architectural/urban design statement has been submitted with the application.

This statement provides a contextual analysis for the site including reference to the permitted scheme on the site with a building height of 26.8m. The current scheme has an overall height of 24.8m. It is submitted that the proposal provides a strong frontage onto the main Chapelizod bypass (R-148). The design report refers to the creation of a sense of place through the incorporation of an urban plaza, and an area of open space that fronts onto the main Kennelsfort Road Lower. A play area is proposed also.

11.2.2 The proposal provides for the provision of 303 residential units on the overall site which represents a density of 238 units per hectare. The proposed apartments are provided within two apartment blocks (Blocks A and B) which range in height from four storey to eight stories. The height restriction policy set out in the South Dublin Development Plan have been addressed heretofore. With regard to the proposed urban design response and layout of the proposed scheme and pursuant to site inspection and inspection of the immediate area, I would have serious concerns regarding the proposed urban design response in particular the scale and mass of the two blocks and their arrangement/orientation on site. The development will change the character of the R-148 at this location given the prominence and extent of site frontage. Developments along the R-148 are generally low rise and nondescript and as such it is considered that development of this site should set a precedent for high quality innovative design that is sensitive to the locational context and which provides an interesting architectural response along the R-148 while not detracting from the village setting of Palmerstown.

11.2.3 The existing village is very low density and low rise and given its proximity to city centre and location along a QBC is an ideal location for higher density development. However, the design strategy proposed by the applicant is to locate two eight storey structures of approx. 85m and 88m respectively in length with no variation in height, in an east-west direction bounding residential properties along the north. The consequence of this is that the structures appear monolithic and repetitive particularly when viewed from the Old Lucan Road. A greater transition and variation

in height across the site would help reduce the dominance of structures. It appears that an attempt to reduce the scale has been made by using various finishes to the facades. Notwithstanding the concerns raised by observers regarding height, I consider that the site can accommodate taller structures to those that exist in the village however the design strategy should be one that creates a high quality architectural feature/structures which acts as a beacon/s within the village and wider environs towards the site.

11.2.4 A previously permitted scheme consisted of a development similar in height, however, the design strategy and arrangement of structures on site differed in that structures were arranged in a north-south orientation thus reducing the scale and dominance of the structures on the adjacent residential properties. The planning authority and indeed most of the observers have raised serious concerns about the bulk and scale of this development. The planning authority refer to its opinion at pre-application stage where it sought a more sensitive transition between existing and proposed development. The planning authority has recommended a refusal on the grounds of height, massing and close proximity to existing two storey dwellings, which would have a significant and unacceptable overbearing, overshadowing and overlooking impact. I don't necessarily agree that the height is an issue, *per se*, but rather it is the arrangement of the structures on the site in conjunction with the massing and bulk of the proposed structures that will result in a development which, in my opinion, is of unsympathetic proportions and excessive mass having regard to its context and gives rise to a design that is monotonous and repetitive. The effects of the proposal on existing residential amenity is discussed further in this report.

11.3 Commercial Uses

11.3.1 The crèche facility is located at ground floor level consisting of four main rooms and a kitchenette with ancillary office and toilet facilities. I note that the proposed configuration results in three of the main rooms having no natural light or ventilation. Furthermore, I do not consider that the layout of the crèche is such that is conducive to the operation of such a facility. For example, there are no toilet facilities/sleeping areas identified within the rooms for children. While internal configurations can be dealt with at construction stage, the lack of natural light to some rooms is a concern and difficult to address without a fundamental change to the layout. The acoustic

report recommends a 3m high screen wall to the playground serving the crèche which has not been indicated on the layout plan submitted or the elevational plans.

11.3.2 There is a gym proposed at the ground floor level of Block B which will front onto a new civic plaza. It is also proposed to have a meeting room and concierge area at this level. Details on file indicate that the gym and meeting room will be available to the public. Whilst I note concerns raised by observers regarding the 'village centre' location of the site and that more active commercial uses should be provided, I consider the uses proposed are acceptable and will contribute to an active street frontage.

11.4 Residential Amenity – Existing and Proposed

11.4.1 Future residential amenity

With regard to the residential amenity for future occupants of the scheme, I would have concerns regarding the qualitative standards regarding a number of proposed units. Unit A9, A35, A65, A88, A119, A142 and A170 are one bed single aspect units within Block A. These units are considered to have poor aspect mainly due to the proximity of the windows on these units to a projecting element of this block. The balcony area associated with these units are c. 3.2m from the projecting wall. Reference is made to the fact that single aspect units overlook open space. I note that the balcony screens are quite high at c. 1.6m and appear as a dominant feature on the elevations and would in my opinion also interrupt potential views out onto open space. I refer the Board also to the sunlight and daylight analysis which indicates that these one bed single aspect apartments have significantly reduced vertical sky component for a new development. While the applicant indicates that the proposal is acceptable due to the large windows that are to be provided, I consider that the findings demonstrate that an alternative design strategy should have been considered to avoid units with such significantly low VSC in the first instance. The overhang from balconies above in addition to the projecting wall will exacerbate the concern with these units. This issue was raised during the course of the pre-application consultation.

11.4.2 13.6% of public open space has been provided. Two roof gardens are provided in each of the apartment blocks. Private amenity space consists of terrace areas at

ground floor area and balconies on upper floors. Some apartments contain winter gardens which can be used all year long. I do consider it imperative that opaque glass is fitted at either end of the balconies to avoid overlooking of adjacent and/or nearby residential units. With regard to the open space provision at ground level, I would have concerns regarding the qualitative nature of the public and semi-public open space to be provided which is primarily located along/fronting the R-148 which is heavily trafficked. The Acoustic report indicates a daytime level of 70dB(A) $L_{Aeq, 16\text{ hour}}$ along the R-148 with a prediction of an increase in this level to 72dB(A) $L_{eq, 16\text{ hour}}$ based on a forecast growth of 4.2% increase in traffic volume annually over 10 years. The previous scheme had open space which was enclosed by the structures thus offering a buffer from noise and also providing a more private environment for future residents. While the details on file indicate that buffer planting will be provided I do not consider this to be sufficient in this instance to address concerns regarding the qualitative aspect of the open space along the R-148.

11.4.3 Existing residential amenity

Many observers have raised concerns about the impact of the proposed development on their existing residential amenity. While the properties at Rose View have quite long back gardens and the minimum separation distances are met with regard to overlooking, I can understand the concerns raised. The proposal is for two large residential blocks with lengths of approx. 85-88m running in an east-west direction. There are a significant number of windows and balconies along the northern elevations which will result in a significantly different context for the existing residential properties. The dominance of the structures along the northern boundary, notwithstanding the separation distances from the nearest dwellings, will in my opinion give rise to an unacceptable level of perceived overlooking by virtue of the excessive massing and scale of the development relative to the village style context of Rose View development and the properties along Kennelsfort Road. I note that the owner of no. 15 Kennelsfort Road has raised concerns regarding impact on his residential amenity. A four storey element is being provided at this location of the site which rises to eight storey. While I consider that a greater transition could have

been provided at this location to reduce the perceived impacts on this property I am satisfied that the proposal would not unduly overlook or overshadow this property although I do consider that the proposal will result in a significantly altered context for this property.

11.4.4 A report which provides details in respect of the vertical sky component (VSC) on a number of properties that may potentially be affected by the proposal has been submitted. The results of the report indicate that the VSC for the property no. 4 Rose View will reduce to below the 27% and also below the 80% ratio (as a % of the existing value). The report sets out that the extension to this property is glazed on both sides and has 2 roof lights and any impact will be diluted and impact from the proposed development will be negligible. I disagree and consider that the impact demonstrates that the proposal will have an undue negative impact on the amenities of this property where an alternative design strategy could easily have addressed this issue. It is submitted that there will be an improvement in available daylight to the windows on the side elevation of no. 15 Kennelsfort road which is primarily due to the setting back of the building from this boundary. I note that shadow impacts were only submitted for March. The results indicate that the greatest impact is to the two properties no. 4 and 5 Rose View. Further analysis should also have been submitted for the winter when the impact tends to be greatest. In any event, the results that have been submitted for March demonstrate that the proposal will have an undue negative impact on the rear gardens of these properties from 1500 hours. I consider that the proposal would have an unacceptable level of impact on the existing residential amenities of both 4 and 5 Rose View by reason of overshadowing and reduction in daylight.

11.5 Visual Impact

11.5.1 A visual impact assessment has been submitted. This assessment refers to a number of photomontages that have been prepared showing the proposed development as seen from ground level at a number of locations in the surrounding area. There are a number of key locations where the development will be particularly

prominent including, View 2, along the Lower Kennelsfort Road. The visual impact at this location is considered 'significant'. The assessment refers to the definition of 'significant impact' as an impact which, by its character, magnitude, duration or intensity alters a sensitive aspect of the environment. Difficulty in assessing whether an impact might or might not be significant lies in the word 'sensitive' in that what one person might be sensitive to another might not. It is set out that a conservative approach has been taken in the assessment in classifying impact as significant even though many observers might not regard them as significant. In this instance, I consider the visual impact of the proposal is significant having regard to the magnitude and character of the development relative to the traditional village character at this location. I would also caution that some of the photomontages may not accurately show the full extent and magnitude of the impact of the proposed development particularly the view from Old Lucan Road towards Rose View in the direction of the site.

11.5.2 An argument is presented in the visual impact assessment that "where proposed new development is openly visible and substantial element in a view, but where development of the scale proposed is supported by policy, the visual impact would usually be rated as 'moderate', that is, consistent with emerging trends". It is set out that having regard to the Draft Urban Design and Building Heights Guidelines for Planning Authorities, which seek to drive a general increase in building heights (e.g. SPPR 2), it may be appropriate for the overall visual impact of the proposed development on the built environment to be considered consistent with emerging trends for development and therefore, 'moderate' in extent. While this may be the case, I refer the Board to the provisions of the National Planning Framework and the guidance provided regarding "performance-based design standards". This is a brownfield development where planning policies and standards need to be flexible, focusing on design-led and performance based outcomes, rather than specifying absolute requirements in all cases. The NPF advocates the replacement of general restrictions on building height or universal standards for car parking or garden size with performance based criteria appropriate to general location, e.g. city/town

centre, public transport hub, town, village etc. National Planning Objective 13 is particular relevant in this context however the NPF advocates qualitative outcomes. In general, and as discussed heretofore, I consider that the design strategy does not provide the optimal architectural solution for the site and the structures will appear incongruous at this location particularly when viewed from the Old Lucan Road.

11.6 Infrastructural Services including Flood Risk

11.6.1 Water and Waste Water

It is proposed to connect to the public water and foul sewer network. It is proposed to divert a section of foul sewer that traverses a portion of the site to the east i.e. follows an existing building line which is to be demolished. Irish Water has raised no objections with regards the proposal.

11.6.2 Surface water drainage and attenuation

A flood risk assessment has been submitted with the application and identifies part of the site to the east at risk from pluvial flooding. The assessment indicates that the site does not benefit from surface water runoff attenuation. This fact would correlate with the concerns raised by observers with regard to flooding/ponding and that the site is referred locally as 'The Swamps'. It is indicated that the proposed design will remove the local low point within the site through an engineered drainage system. It is set out that the surface water network will be designed to cater for storm water from both roof of the buildings and podium areas on the entire development in accordance with the GDSDS and will contain the 1 in 100 year event plus 20% climate change allowance. The report concludes that the site is located within flood zone C and that the proposal will not increase the flood risk elsewhere. The site will be managed so that attenuation is provided for 1 in 100 year rainfall event.

11.6.3 The infrastructure report submitted indicates that there is a 225mm diameter surface water pipe traversing the site and discharges into the 750mm dia pipe at the junction of R-148 and Kennelsfort Road. There is a 450mm diameter pipe along the southern boundary which also discharges into the 750mm dia pipe. It is proposed to divert the

225mm pipe so that it discharges into the 450mm pipe and then discharges to the 750mm pipe. The Chief Executive's report refers to the comments from water services section raising concerns about the lack of information regarding the capacity of the 450mm sewer to cater for this increased flow and that a report regarding this is required before deciding on the suitability of the surface water system. Having regard to concerns raised by observers regarding ponding to rear gardens along Kennelsfort Road and the information regarding pluvial flooding occurring on the site, I consider that details demonstrating the capacity of the existing surface water network should have been submitted with the application so as to demonstrate that the proposal would not increase the surface water run-off from the site to unacceptable levels whereby the existing network capacity is compromised. The drainage section also refer to a stream historically flowing through this site which is not referenced in any documentation submitted. In the absence of details demonstrating the capacity of the existing surface water network to cater for the proposed development and the history of pluvial flooding at this location, it is considered that the proposal would be prejudicial to public health.

11.7 Movement and Transportation

11.7.1 Traffic Impact Assessment

A Traffic Impact Assessment has been submitted with the application. Observers raise concerns about the use of TRICS to calculate trip generation. However, this is an accepted model. Comparisons are made to the anticipated trip generation from the proposed development and the permitted and extant permission for a mixed-use development. Pursuant to site inspection and noting traffic movements in the area generally I understand the observers' concerns. The extant permission theoretically would generate a higher trip generation to this proposed development however, there were significant less parking spaces provided as part of that permission. The significant increase in parking spaces as part of this development would tend to suggest that notwithstanding the presence of a QBC that there is likely to be significantly more traffic movements to and from the site. This must be considered in the context of the location of the access and proximity to the Kennelsfort Road lower

junction with the Lucan Road and potential impact these movements would have in particularly on the capacity of this junction.

11.7.2 The TIA identifies that there is a safety issue with the existing uncontrolled site access location, just outside a signalised junction. The proposed design will accommodate the relocation of the current access to the northern most point of the site access along Kennelsfort Road thus relocating the access point within the signalised junction. This will eliminate uncontrolled movements that give rise to conflict in traffic movements. Observers have raised concerns as to how this would work on the ground given that it is proposed to have flexible bollards. Concerns are also raised about drivers being tempted to do illegal right out turns. The reality is that there is limited scope for the applicant to provide vehicular access to the site. I note that the operator of the B & B has raised concerns regarding access to his site opposite the development site. Access to his site will become more awkward involving cars having to cross two lanes of traffic to access which is not atypical in an urban area.

11.7.3 The TIA indicates that in terms of impact on junctions that only one junction i.e. Junction 2 Kennelsfort Road Lower/Lucan Road exceeds the 5% threshold thus requiring modelling. The results indicate that the junction is reaching theoretical capacity during the 2034 base. Taking a measured approach, I consider that all junctions experience delays/capacity issues at peak times. This is an urban area where congestion is to be expected. The key factors are whether alternatives to a car dependent development are provided and whether the proposal would compromise public safety. The proposal is adjacent a QBC and while there may be operational capacity issue with buses, this is a matter that can be resolved with an increase provision to serve increasing demand. Details on file indicate that a proposal to upgrade the junction i.e. Kennelsfort Road Lower/R148 would not be precluded. The planning authority has not commented on this specific matter.

11.7.4 Connectivity

The Opinion that issued in respect of the proposed development raised concerns about connectivity and the planning authority also raised concerns in this regard. The proposal provides for a pedestrian and cyclist route along the northern boundary allowing for access to the lands to the west through an existing car park serving industrial/commercial units. I would have concerns about the deliverability of this access for pedestrians and cyclists and also the qualitative nature of the route/access to Old Lucan Road. This proposed access route is via an independent industrial area which would appear to be in private ownership. No letter of consent to access these lands has been submitted. The route via an industrial development is not the most pleasant environment for pedestrians or cyclists movements and would also give rise to conflict in movements particularly as heavy goods vehicles would tend to be associated with these units.

11.7.5 The Roads department has raised concerns about connectivity and the Chief Executive's report cites prematurity pending the preparation of a master plan for the subject site and adjoining industrial sites that addresses connectivity and permeability for all road users as a reason for refusal. I note the extant permission provided for a vehicular access to the Old Lucan Road, however the site incorporated lands to the north which had direct access to this road. The site in this application no longer includes this portion of land which is the critical link between the site and remaining landholding along the Old Lucan Road. No reference is made in the documentation as to why these lands no longer form part of the site but it is intimated that there are issues regarding rights of way. A landholding map indicates the applicant still own lands north of the site however they no longer immediately bound the application site thus limiting the options to provide an alternative vehicular access point. The proposed layout of the two blocks would also in my opinion greatly reduce the potential for any future vehicular access. I do consider that the requirement for a masterplan as cited in the reason for refusal by the planning authority is somewhat onerous given that there is an extant permission on the site. However, I do consider that the issue of connectivity particularly given the scale and density of this scheme, is such that needs to be considered and tangible and

qualitative routes provided to ensure that all road users have an alternative route to access the Old Lucan Road. The lack of pedestrian crossings in the village compounds the potential for conflict in traffic and pedestrian movements arising from this development.

11.7.6 Parking provision

The applicant is proposing 274 no. car parking spaces, five of which are at surface level and the remaining spaces are located at basement level. The documentation submitted indicates that GoCar has confirmed that it is willing to provide 2-3 shared car club vehicles in the development. There is a supporting letter from GoCar on file. 10% of spaces at basement level have electric charging points.

11.7.7 The proposed parking provision is generally consistent with the maximum standards set out in section 11.24 of the county development plan which advocates a balanced approach to car parking management and takes the need to *inter alia* limit the impact of traffic congestion and promote more sustainable forms of transport. The CDP sets out different standards depending on the location of the development. The development site is located within Zone 2 which apply more restrictive rates for applications within town and village centres, within 400m of a high quality public transport service (includes a train station, Luas station or bus stop with a high-quality service). I calculate the maximum number of spaces to be 266 spaces and as such the number of spaces are just marginally over i.e. by 8 no. spaces.

11.7.8 262 no. bicycle spaces are also provided along with 22 no. motorcycle spaces. In general, I consider that the provision is adequate although I do accept some of the bicycle parking may be tight/awkwardly located. I note the reference to the requirement for 624 no. bicycle parking in line with the apartment guidelines however the applicant has advanced an argument that the more pertinent issue is the provision of qualitative bicycle parking to encourage people to use their bicycles in the first instance.

11.7.9 Mobility Management Plan

An outline of a Mobility Management Plan has been submitted. It is proposed that an action plan co-ordinator would establish initiatives outlined such as promoting walking events/advertising the bike to work scheme. I consider this too late and that a co-ordinator should be appointed prior to the construction of any units and such initiatives should form part of the marketing campaign for selling these units to encourage potential occupants towards more sustainable modes of transport.

11.8.0 **Other Issues**

11.8.1 Part V

Part V details have been submitted and it is indicated that 30 no. units are proposed to be provided to South Dublin County Council. These consist of a mix of 1 and 2 bed apartments which are proposed to be located within Block A from ground floor to floor 7. The proposal is acceptable to the Housing section. A Part V condition should be attached to any grant of permission.

11.8.2 Building Life Cycle Report

A building life cycle report has been submitted. While the report identifies elements of the development that would need to be considered as part of the 'sinking fund' no indication of costs for works required have been outlined.

11.8.3 Phasing and taking in charge

A phasing plan has been submitted and it is proposed to demolish the structures on site first, and then construct Building A and then Building B. It is proposed that a management company would be set up. There is no reference to any element of the development being taken in charge. The pedestrian connectivity to the north-west would therefore remain a serious concern in that the planning authority would have no control over the provision of this connection in perpetuity or pending the provision of a more suitable alternative.

11.8.4 Landscaping and boundary treatment

I note concerns raised in the planning authority's report regarding landscaping and lack of boundary treatment detail. The issue of landscaping and boundary treatment could be dealt with by way of condition and should be subject to the written agreement of the planning authority.

11.8.5 Archaeology

An archaeological desk study has been submitted. The study recommends that archaeological inspection of topsoil stripping is carried out during the site preparation phase of the proposed development and the National Monument Service be informed if archaeological remains are discovered. The NMS are satisfied with this proposal.

11.9 Appropriate Assessment

11.9.1 Screening report

The applicant has submitted an AA screening report which details a description of the proposed development. Section 2.3.1 of the report provides a description of the receiving environment. It is set out that the site has no extant habitats of natural value and are fully developed with warehousing, buildings and hard standing road surfaces such as tarmac. Section 2.2 provides an assessment of relevance of proposed development to Natura 2000 sites. The report identifies eight Natura 2000 sites within 15km radius of the site. There are no sites located either within or directly adjacent to the proposed development site. Surface waters from the environs of Palmerstown ultimately drain to the River Liffey c. 750m the north of the site. This watercourse hydrologically connects the site to the Natura 2000 sites in Dublin Bay. Section 3 of the screening report provides an assessment of proposed development at Palmerstown and indicates that the nearest Natura 2000 site is 7.7km from the site i.e. Rye Water Valley/Carton SAC. It is concluded that “due to the distance from the site to the boundary of the Natura 2000 sites combined with best practice site management no significant direct or indirect effects on the qualifying interests/species of conservation interest.” The report sets out that cumulative/in combination impacts have also been considered and concludes that the proposed development, either individually or cumulatively/in combination with other identified plans and projects, will not adversely affect the integrity of any Natura 2000 sites. Stage 2 appropriate assessment is therefore not required.

11.9.2 Identification of sites

Table 4: Natura 2000 sites within 15km range of site

Natura 2000 Code	Site Code	Distance to site (as crow flies)	Qualifying Interests
Rye Water Valley/Cartron SAC	001398	7.9km west of the site	7220 Petrifying springs with tufa formation (Cratoneurion)* * denotes a priority habitat 1014 Narrow-mouthed Whorl Snail <i>Vertigo angustior</i> 1016 Desmoulin's Whorl Snail <i>Vertigo moulinsiana</i>
Glenasmole River Valley SAC	001209	10km south of site	6210 Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (Festuco-Brometalia) (* important orchid sites) 6410 <i>Molinia</i> meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils (<i>Molinion caeruleae</i>) 7220 Petrifying springs with tufa formation (Cratoneurion)*
South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SAC	000210	11.1km east of site	Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140] Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210] Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310] Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]
South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA	004024	9.7km east of site	Light-bellied Brent Goose (<i>Branta bernicla hrota</i>) [A046] Oystercatcher (<i>Haematopus ostralegus</i>) [A130] Ringed Plover (<i>Charadrius hiaticula</i>) [A137]

			<p>Grey Plover (<i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>) [A141]</p> <p>Knot (<i>Calidris canutus</i>) [A143]</p> <p>Sanderling (<i>Calidris alba</i>) [A144]</p> <p>Dunlin (<i>Calidris alpina</i>) [A149]</p> <p>Bar-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa lapponica</i>) [A157]</p> <p>Redshank (<i>Tringa totanus</i>) [A162]</p> <p>Black-headed Gull (<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>) [A179]</p> <p>Roseate Tern (<i>Sterna dougallii</i>) [A192]</p> <p>Common Tern (<i>Sterna hirundo</i>) [A193]</p> <p>Arctic Tern (<i>Sterna paradisaea</i>) [A194]</p> <p>Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]</p>
North Bull Island SPA	004006	13km east of site	<p>Light-bellied Brent Goose (<i>Branta bernicla hrota</i>) [A046]</p> <p>Shelduck (<i>Tadorna tadorna</i>) [A048]</p> <p>Teal (<i>Anas crecca</i>) [A052]</p> <p>Pintail (<i>Anas acuta</i>) [A054]</p> <p>Shoveler (<i>Anas clypeata</i>) [A056]</p> <p>Oystercatcher (<i>Haematopus ostralegus</i>) [A130]</p> <p>Golden Plover (<i>Pluvialis apricaria</i>) [A140]</p> <p>Grey Plover (<i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>) [A141]</p> <p>Knot (<i>Calidris canutus</i>) [A143]</p> <p>Sanderling (<i>Calidris alba</i>) [A144]</p> <p>Dunlin (<i>Calidris alpina</i>) [A149]</p> <p>Black-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa limosa</i>) [A156]</p> <p>Bar-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa lapponica</i>) [A157]</p> <p>Curlew (<i>Numenius arquata</i>) [A160]</p> <p>Redshank (<i>Tringa totanus</i>) [A162]</p> <p>Turnstone (<i>Arenaria interpres</i>) [A169]</p>

			Black-headed Gull (<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>) [A179] Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]
North Dublin Bay SAC	000206	13km east of site	Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140] Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210] Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310] Atlantic salt meadows (<i>Glaucopuccinellietalia maritimae</i>) [1330] Mediterranean salt meadows (<i>Juncetalia maritimi</i>) [1410] Embryonic shifting dunes [2110] Shifting dunes along the shoreline with <i>Ammophila arenaria</i> (white dunes) [2120] Fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation (grey dunes) [2130] Humid dune slacks [2190] <i>Petalophyllum ralfsii</i> (Petalwort) [1395]
Wicklow Mountains SPA	004040	14.3km south of site	Merlin (<i>Falco columbarius</i>) [A098] Peregrine (<i>Falco peregrinus</i>) [A103]
Wicklow Mountains SAC	002122	14.3km south of site	Oligotrophic waters containing very few minerals of sandy plains (<i>Littorelletalia uniflorae</i>) [3110] Natural dystrophic lakes and ponds [3160] Northern Atlantic wet heaths with <i>Erica tetralix</i> [4010] European dry heaths [4030] Alpine and Boreal heaths [4060] Calaminarian grasslands of the <i>Violetalia calaminariae</i> [6130] Species-rich <i>Nardus</i> grasslands, on siliceous substrates in mountain areas (and submountain areas, in Continental Europe) [6230] Blanket bogs (* if active bog) [7130] Siliceous scree of the montane to snow

			<p>levels (<i>Androsacetalia alpinae</i> and <i>Galeopsietalia ladani</i>) [8110]</p> <p>Calcareous rocky slopes with chasmophytic vegetation [8210]</p> <p>Siliceous rocky slopes with chasmophytic vegetation [8220]</p> <p>Old sessile oak woods with <i>Ilex</i> and <i>Blechnum</i> in the British Isles [91A0]</p> <p><i>Lutra lutra</i> (Otter) [1355]</p>
--	--	--	---

As identified in Table 4 above there are 8 European sites located within a 15 kilometre range of the proposed project. Site synopsis and conservation objectives for each of these Natura 2000 sites are available on the NPWS website. In particular the attributes and targets of these sites are of assistance in screening for AA in respect of this project.

11.9.3 Assessment of likely Significant Effects on Designated Sites

The potential for likely significant effects should be assessed in the context of the relevant sites' conservation objectives. The development site in question is not part of or located adjacent to any of the designated sites. Having regard to the 'source-pathway-receptor' model, the site is hydrologically linked to a number of Natura 2000 sites via a water pathway. Surface waters from the site will discharge via surface water network which eventually feeds into the River Liffey entering Dublin Bay at Dublin Port where the boundaries of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, North Bull Island SPA and North Dublin Bay SAC are located. Wastewater from the proposal will discharge to the public foul network.

Having regard to the lack of direct entry of surface and waste waters to any of the Natura 2000 sites; the use of best construction practices as an integral component of the development; treatment of waste waters prior to discharge; and the dilution of waters prior to enter to Dublin Bay the proposal either individually or in-combination

with other plans or projects could not be considered to have likely significant effects in view of the sites' conservation objectives.

AA screening – Conclusion

11.9.4 I have had due regard to the screening report and data used by the applicant to carry out the screening assessment and the details available on the NPWS web-site in respect of the Natura 2000 sites identified as being within 15km radius of the development site, including the nature of the receiving environment and proximity to the nearest European site. I consider it is reasonable to conclude that on the basis of the information on the file which includes inter alia, AA screening report submitted by the applicant and all of the planning documentation, which I consider adequate in order to issue a screening determination, that the proposed development, individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to have a significant effect on any European site, in view of the said sites' Conservation Objectives, and a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not therefore required.

12.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission be **refused** for the proposed development for the following reasons and considerations.

13.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. It is considered that the proposed design strategy as it relates to scale, mass and orientation of structures on the site does not provide the optimal design solution having regard to the site's locational context along the R-148 and established character and pattern of residential development along the northern boundary which are located within an existing traditional village

setting. It is considered that the arrangement and overall design of the scheme is monolithic and repetitive with unsympathetic proportions relative to the character of the properties located to the north. The proposal would have an overbearing and overshadowing impact on the existing residential amenities of the properties to the northern boundary particularly no. 4 and 5 Roseview. The proposed development would be contrary the National Planning Framework and section 28 Ministerial Guidance which promote innovative and qualitative design solutions. The proposal would, therefore be inconsistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. It is considered that the traffic generated by the proposed development of 303 residential units and the provision of a single vehicular access/egress point at the junction of Kennelsfort Road and the R-148, would endanger public safety by reason of increased traffic movements and would lead to conflict between road users, that is, vehicular traffic, pedestrians and cyclists. Further the proposal for a pedestrian and cycle route through an existing industrial/commercial area which appears to be in private ownership is inappropriate and would militate against the creation of an attractive pedestrian environment. The proposal would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
3. The location of the public and semi-private open space along the frontage of the R-148 which is heavily trafficked would compromise the use and enjoyment of this area by future residents. The Board also has concerns regarding the poor aspect associated with a number of the single aspect one bed units within Block B. The proposal would therefore, be prejudicial to the future residential amenities of the proposed development and as such would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

4. The Board is not satisfied that adequate information has been provided to demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in the existing surface water network to cater for the proposed development. In the absence of the required information, the Board is not satisfied that the stormwater outflow arising from the development can be limited such that it would be in accordance with the requirements of Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Work (Volume 2 New Development version 6.0) or that the site when developed can be adequately and sustainably drained so as not to result in any significant environmental effects on the quality of the receiving water, the River Liffey as a result of the potential increased discharges or such as to give rise to flooding. The proposed development would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development.

Joanna Kelly
Senior Planning Inspector
4th December 2018

Appendix A Summary of Observations received

1. Garvan Cagney

- The proposed pedestrian and bicycle access and egress point is from the rear of the site through what is now the carpark for Palmerstown Business Park which does not have the infrastructure in place to deal with the potentially large footfall that could arise. The carpark is owned by the Business Park owners with a right of way for the garage business directly beside the Palmerstown Business Park.
- There is limited space in the car park to serve as route for Fire Tender/Emergency vehicle access.
- Proposal may result in many adults and children using the car park as a short cut to the shops which is not suitable.
- If the gate at the rear of the development was open to pedestrian traffic it would be inevitable that the residents would park in the Palmerstown car park areas.
- The main gate is locked at night due to anti-social behaviour. If these gates are not locked there will again be issues with security.
- The position of the gate cannot be moved as it will interfere with the car parking spaces in the business park.
- Any gates should open into the site and not reduce the flow of traffic within the car park.
- Proposal will have a big impact on insurance premium.
- The owners/occupiers of the business units own the car parking spaces.

2. Michael Callan

- Concerns raised about health and feasibility for emergency vehicles to enter/exit Palmerstown village.
- No additional community facilities to cater for the proposed development.
- Photographs are enclosed to demonstrate the lack of privacy as the height of the development will shadow his property.

- Vincent Byrne site was a swamp and the proposal will bring many problems i.e. rodent infestation.
- Reference is made to flooding in winter months along back gardens which take days/weeks to subside.
- Bus connect has rerouted buses so there is no adequate public transport to cater for residents.
- The proposed retail units i.e. gym, creche will only be available to residents and split the area in two.
- There are no traffic management studies completed. The traffic problem is at a dangerous level.
- There is only one pedestrian crossing in the area.
- Eight stories is too high and will take the distinct look of the village away.
- There is a large wall at the rear of his property and observer is refusing to allow this to be removed.

3. Barbara Liddy

- The proposed pedestrian and bicycle access and egress point is from the rear of the site through what is now the carpark for Palmerstown Business Park which does not have the infrastructure in place to deal with the potentially large footfall that could arise. The carpark is owned by the Business Park owners with a right of way for the garage business directly beside the Palmerstown Business Park.
- There is limited space in the car park to serve as route for Fire Tender/Emergency vehicle access.
- Proposal may result in many adults and children using the car park as a short cut to the shops which is not suitable.
- If the gate at the rear of the development was open to pedestrian traffic it would be inevitable that the residents would park in the Palmerstown car park areas.
- The main gate is locked at night due to anti-social behaviour. If these gates are not locked there will again be issues with security.
- The position of the gate cannot be moved as it will interfere with the car parking spaces in the business park.

- Any gates should open into the site and not reduce the flow of traffic within the car park.
- Proposal will have a big impact on insurance premium.
- The owners/occupiers of the business units own the car parking spaces.

4. Mary and Brian Fleming

- Submission provides a description of the character of the area and sets out that the village is quite small in size and limited in space.
- The major development in recent times was the Aldi development granted by ABP. The effect of this has been of moving the shopping areas further into the residential part of the village and attracting a significant amount of traffic from outside to enter the area. This has led to traffic congestion particularly along Kennelsfort Road/R148 junction.
- The Inspector had recommended a refusal of the Aldi store for reasons of traffic congestion.
- SDCC has recently granted permission for change of use of office to retail on a site very close to Aldi. This will add to the traffic problems.
- The other major development in recent years concerns Stewarts Hospital. The HSE rent the floors of the old hospital with in excess of 150 staff which generate extra traffic Monday to Friday.
- The proposal is completely out of scale with the neighbouring houses.
- The proposal does not comply with the requirements of the CDP. Reference is made to the NPF and Objective No. 33 which sets out that development “should be of appropriate scale”.
- The site in Palmerstown is located beside a QBC but is in an area zoned village.
- There is no suggestion in the Urban Development and Building Heights document of any need for increased building heights in villages.
- Reference is made to a previous Inspector’s report Section 19.3 PL.06S.234178 who could see a case for a maximum of five stories but considers that heights need to be below that on those parts of the site adjoining existing houses.

- With regard to the Urban Design Statement, the observer makes reference to many historical buildings not referenced.
- With regard to Traffic and Transportation it is important to estimate future pressures on the system arising from car ownership and/or traffic movements.
- The Roads department seem to have no clear vision or plan for traffic in Palmerstown. Concerns are expressed about traffic proceeding along Lower Kennelsfort Road to the junction of the Old Lucan Road which is very time consuming.
- Parking is already very difficult in the village. When the cycleway is introduced the effect will be to remove 58 parking spaces currently in use.

5. Gerardine Ford and Richard Ford

- Proposal is not in keeping with the historic village of Palmerstown.
- No objection to development on the site but object to proposed eight stories.
- The proposal will holdup traffic to and from the city. This junction needs to be upgraded to an overpass or underpass.
- Palmerstown is a family area and we do not feel this development is in keeping with that.

6. Sam Villena

- Development should be no more than three stories.
- The historic element of the village which is being restored by SDCC and the community will be destroyed with such over development.
- Traffic is currently difficult and getting access in and out of the village at peak hours takes a long time.
- Local schools in the area are either full or close to full.
- There are only 276 parking spaces provided.

7. Philip Maguire

- Object to scale of development.

- Reservations regarding his property and how it will be protected from demolition of old Vincent Byrne shop which forms part of his boundary wall with a distance of only 3.5m from his property.
- A full structural assessment of his property before any development takes place and a meeting should take place with him.
- Concerns raised about health and safety, noise, difficulty accessing his parking space.
- Object to boundary being taken down as it provides privacy to his property since 1979 which he claims he owns.

8. Anne and Oswald Correa

- The height of the apartment blocks are out of character with existing buildings.
- The number of units far in excess which could be integrated into the community.
- Hazardous implications for traffic.
- Implications for vulnerable residents of Stewarts Hospital.
- No soft landscaping.
- No play areas.
- No retail space or other amenities which would add life to the village.

9. John Doran

- Traffic problems have increased over the years.
- The scale and height of the proposed development is completely out of character with the existing village.
- Proposed traffic management is totally inadequate and will create permanent gridlock.
- The extra traffic in the area will adversely affect the environment and safety of the residents of Stewarts Care.

10. Dr .Paul Corcoran

- Dublin Cycling Campaign welcomes this development and its emphasis on pedestrian and cycling priority.
- It is difficult to determine what type of bicycle stand is being used and the “toaster design” is completely inadequate for cycling users.
- The use of Sheffield stands is recommended.
- It is not clear if bicycle parking will be enclosed with security access. Bike theft is a major issue.
- There is no indication that there is bicycle parking available for Cargo bike users. Some extra space is needed for bicycle users with special needs.
- No reference to speeds in the underground car park or at the entrance to the development. There are no cycle lanes provided at the main entrance.
- The opening at the north-west corner of the site should be considered a priority and to encourage walking and cycling there should be more than one exit/entry point.
- Further details on Dublin Cycling Campaigns bicycle parking guidelines is provided.

11. Joe Harrington

- The proposal will make the traffic situation even worse.
- Eight stories is too high and will have very negative impact on neighbours and ruin the village.
- Health and safety does not appear to be in place because the village is home to a cross section of people of all ages and a large percentage are vulnerable.
- The proposal does not meet proper planning criteria set out in the SDCC Development plan.

12. Enda Mullally and Helen Mullally

- Proposal will have devastating effect on village.
- The village is already congested with cars parked all day and very large lorries accessing Aldi and the Steel Works site of D. Kennedy.

- A roundabout at Palmerstown House would cause much difficulty to the articulated lorries, buses and ambulances taking patients to Stewarts Hospital on a daily basis.
- It is important to take account of the many other developments proposed within the village.
- A proper traffic plan must be undertaken.

13. Thomas O'Dowd and Phyllis O'Dowd

- Traffic is a huge issue. It is difficult as it stands to go about daily tasks without being at the behest of the traffic. All new traffic generated will have to turn into the village and try and get back out.
- Proposed scale and size is grotesquely out of proportion with the village.
- Shadows cast will be far reaching.
- Proposals will forever scrap aspirations of a future upgrade of the junction at the proposed site.
- The safety of people in the village crossing the road needs to be considered.
- There are many young and elderly that use the village and traffic will put them at extra danger including the clients of Stewarts Hospital.
- The proposal is like putting Liberty Hall in the middle of the village. It is absolutely out of proportion with the rest of the village and wider Palmerstown area.

14. Tom Carroll – Director Palmerstown RPM Company NO 2 Limited by Guarantee

- The right of way through the car park extends approx. 40m into the west side of the proposed development for the benefit only of the present garage.
- If it is intended to use this right of way for all cyclists and pedestrians the traffic through the car park will increase dramatically causing danger and congestion.
- The gate to the car park is locked since 2004 and if it is intended to leave this open it is anticipated that there will be a reoccurrence of anti-social behaviour.

- It is submitted that access to the site through the car park is not suitable for lorries or similar vehicles.
- Increased access to the proposed site may result in increased insurance premiums.
- The proposal will lead to increased congestion – has this been considered?

15. Amy Nyhan

- Sheer scale of the development is quite disturbing.
- It will block light into the surrounding area.
- Concerns about impact of the development on traffic in Palmerstown and in the village particularly.
- How can 274 car parking spaces be deemed adequate to serve the apartments.
- The inevitable spill over of cars cannot be supported by existing infrastructure.
- Development does not seem to cater for families with only 19 three bed units. Palmerstown is a small community that is mainly made up of families therefore a development that was aimed at families would be more suitable and welcomed.

16. Palmerstown Community Council – Siobhan Clancy

- Concerns raised about traffic and that the R148 is currently at overcapacity.
- SDCC identifies this junction for a major upgrade but has not been in a position to source funding for such an upgrade.
- The proposal will increase the traffic using this junction and result in serious traffic congestion.
- The proposed development will result in the village being swamped by the scale of the development and indeed will drastically alter the village status of the village.
- The issue of overlooking, overshadowing and privacy is of great concern.
- The proposal is in direct conflict with the county development plan.

- The increase in traffic emanating from this proposal will cause further issues regarding the personal safety of all village residents.

17. Amanda and Graham O’Cheallaigh

- Object to the over development of the site with inadequate roads and facilities infrastructure.
- Proposal will put people’s safety at risk.
- The recent permission for a new Indian Orthodox Church in the village the only one in Ireland will account for significant amount of added traffic at weekends and evenings that is not included or accounted for in the questionable traffic assessment.
- Insufficient parking provisions.
- There is only one pedestrian crossing in the village, 5 metres from the entrance and exit of the development.
- Proposal makes a mockery of the CDP and goes against the recommendation for a maximum of 3 stories.
- The houses will ensure major loss of daylight in their properties.
- The proposal does not respect the heritage and built environment of this historic community.
- The proposed development will block the view of Farmleigh Tower from Kennelsfort Road upper.
- Rebuilding Ireland guidelines are not legally binding and request ABP consider the CDP adopted by the elected representatives on behalf of the community.
- Infrastructure is simply not suitable or capable of sustaining this surge on population and the community would not recover from such an eyesore of a development being shoved upon them.

18. Redcow Cottages /Woodfarm Cottages Residents’ Association

- References the character and unique location of Palmerstown village which was nominated for the Carlo Scapa Prize, in building a sense of community,

protecting heritage and encouraging others to take responsibility for the beautiful valley.

- Reference is made to other groups/organisations that are working towards developing community projects.
- The proposal will stand out for all the wrong reasons.
- If the development is constructed the opportunity to upgrade the junction is gone forever and traffic gridlock will be guaranteed for residents
- Only one pedestrian crossing in the village.
- The right turn into the development is not feasible and could cause a huge risk.
- Reference is made to existing traffic generating uses in the area.
- The number of car spaces proposed is unacceptable.
- When planning permission was sought by the owner of the Palmerstown B & B lodge to expand his business, on the opposite side of the road to this site, it was refused due to traffic onto the R-148. This traffic has not vanished.
- The N4/R148 is according to the NRA at full capacity at Lucan and Newcastle junction and comments have been made in reports in SDCC about the Coldcut junction being at capacity. The Coldcut junction filters drivers to Upper Kennelsfort as a link road to join the R148.
- The site in question is commonly known as the 'Swamps'. Houses at Lower Kennelsfort Road and The Horseshoe on the Old Lucan Road who back onto the site all experience bad soakaway. This will only increase with the introduction of underground parking.
- Would like to see the development designed in such a manner so as to enhance the village and not over burden and swamp residents.

19. Christopher and Anita Donohoe

- Proposal completely out of scale with its surroundings by instantly doubling its population.
- The huge development is at the very entrance of the only entrance to the village one which is at capacity for access.
- The development is contrary to the SD CDP.

- Scale of development having its access within 13m from the R-148 will significantly increase safety concerns.
- The development will choke the very life out of the village that SDCC has looked to promote and protect.

20. Paul O’Connell on behalf of Daniel Kennedy

- D Kennedy Steel Supplies is a family owned company located immediately to the north of the Randelswood Holdings site. Company supplies steel and handles large quantities of steel on site. Operations include sawing, guillotining, welding, drilling etc. Deliveries are received and dispatched on a 24 hour basis.
- Concerns regarding the scale and layout of the proposed development in close proximity to an established engineering works.
- Palmerstown village retains the scale and appearance of a village, particularly in the vicinity of Kennelsfort Road and its junction with the old main Lucan-Dublin road.
- The village is one of nine “traditional villages” where the objective UC3 Objective 1 applies.
- The development fails to meet these reasonable policy objectives of the planning authority.
- Block A will be wedged between the extremely noisy environment of the by-pass and the property of D Kennedy Steel Supplies.
- The only external noise measured in connection with the application is that of the Palmerstown By-pass traffic. No substantive reference is made to noise from other developments.
- It is noted that a “relaxation” is applied to noise levels and mitigation is proposed in the form of high specification glazing which will be negated if a window is left open.
- The observer commissioned Dalton Acoustics Ltd. To carry out a survey of noise from the d Kennedy property. It is set out that notwithstanding the mitigation measures proposed, at levels up to 105dB(A), the resulting noise level during day time in bedrooms could be up to 70dB(A) which would be very undesirable.

- In relation to noise emanating from the engineering works the time averaged levels (LA_{eq}) are not any higher than the local traffic noise as previously established by Resonate.
- Noise from the steel works will have a very different tonal spectrum to that of road traffic.
- The development will potentially give rise to conflict with existing legitimate land uses, which provide valuable employment.
- The report on wind identifies areas where performance is suboptimal and could affect pedestrians.
- There is a deficiency in the proposed access arrangements of sufficient magnitude to constitute a serious traffic hazard.
- Drivers exiting the new development will have a maximum sightlines of 46.5m to the right which is well below the minimum DMURS standard of 65m.
- ABP previously granted permission for an access at the same location as per SD09A/0021, however this was for an arrangement whereby vehicles could only enter the site from Kennelsfort Road, with the exit via the west of the site and onto the old Lucan-Dublin road to the north.
- Traffic leaving the site will have to make a left turn into the village and then eastwards to a junction with the Bypass near Stewart's Hospital, at the Applegreen service station.
- Proposal likely to give rise to drivers attempting to make illegal right turns.
- Observer sets out that there are critical differences between the development permitted on site and this application. There was not a particular village centre type zoning, as now applies under the previous CDP. The design and layout of the scheme permitted is quite different to the current proposal. Residential was not the predominant land use proposed.
- It is submitted that the site is not suitable for the development for the reasons set out.

It is noted that a Noise Monitoring Report and report on traffic-related concerns has been submitted and contents noted.

21. Frances Fitzgerald TD

- There is a significant traffic problem in the village, with congestion at peak time in the village.
- Village also used as a park and ride facility with parking in the Church, ALDI which adds to traffic.
- The addition of almost 300 car owners would increase traffic congestion.
- The area is an ideal commuter location due to its geographical proximity to the City and the M50. However, there is limited public transport services currently serving the village.
- Consideration must be that the bus services serve the area to deal with the problems.
- It is imperative that key infrastructural changes be put in place to quell the increase of traffic congestion in the village.

22. Shane Moynihan

- The nature of the development would be inconsistent with the character of the village. Reference is made to H7 Objective 4 and UC6 SLO 1. It is difficult to see how the development is consistent with the architectural heritage of the area.
- The proposal will have a traffic impact on the village.
- There is insufficient parking available in the village.
- There will be a knock on effect for traffic from Lucan. There are only a number of alternatives to allow the extra traffic to go on the N4.
- Consideration should be given to any potential in the reduction of quality of life for existing residents in terms of traffic management, parking and environmental impact, knock on effects for surrounding and adjacent areas to Palmerstown such as Lucan and Ballyfermot and the quality of life for new residents.
- It is important that any development on this site is consistent with the area's architectural heritage and environment but also does not lead to sub-optimal quality of life for new residents.

23. Felicity McGreever and Senan Bannon

- Development would be an overdevelopment of a relatively small area in Palmerstown and will lead to a deterioration in the quality of life of all inhabitants.
- There is insufficient parking provision in the proposed development.
- While the bus corridor on the R148 is espoused by the developer as a significant advantage for the inhabitants it is noted from personal experience that it is not unusual for buses to run at capacity before reaching the village.
- The R148 is the main route and therefore traffic should be given priority on this route.
- The CDP recommends a maximum of 3 storeys for any new building in Palmerstown. The proposed development is for 4-8 stories.

24. Gerald O'Connor

- Observer is the owner of the Palmerstown Lodge Guesthouse opposite the applicant site.
- There is an existing lined triangular box which enables access to and from his business.
- The applicant has altered this lined triangular area as clearly illustrated on the proposed visibility splay and proposed site ground floor area.
- The realignment would effectively force traffic turning right into the guesthouse beyond the existing entrance and into the northern pillar thus creating a scenario whereby this traffic would be forced to execute a U turn to gain access.
- The realignment would effectively force traffic exiting the Guesthouse and turning right to compete with two lanes of traffic.
- The realignment suits the applicants interests in their proposal.
- It is incumbent to address the inherent design limitations within Palmerstown village.

25. Shane and Clare King

- All development should be in keeping with the character of Palmerstown Village which is a low-density village with approximately 300 residences.

- There are currently no residences with height of more than two storeys although permission has been granted for seven three storey houses at a site on Waterstown Avenue.
- Height and massing of the proposal is grossly disproportionate.
- Oppressive building that will be totally at variance to the character of the village.
- Reference is made to the use of the “Island” apartment development on the cover of national guidelines as a very good example of how apartment development can be assimilated to a village context.
- Stewarts are considered the backbone of Palmerstown Village, a voluntary organisation providing community based services to in excess of 800 people with intellectual disability. Stewarts and Riversdale House in Palmerstown Village is not mentioned in the application.
- Proposal will result in traffic and parking problems for vulnerable people that cross the R148.
- The proposal with a very high proportion of studios and one bed apartments is such that the core of the development will be transient.
- There is only one way in and out of the development.
- The TII, NTA and emergency services should be concerned about the likely effects on traffic flows along the R-148 and it is recommended that they are invited to submit their comments.
- The TTA grossly understate number of vehicles that will exit and enter the proposed development at peak hours.
- Reference is made to the limited time and numerous vehicles that break the red light thus crashing into vehicles exiting from the right turning lane from Kennelsfort Road Lower and vehicles existing from the site of the proposed development. reference is made to these type of incidences and tha the TTA does not include such detail but the SHD at Citywest, Cooldown Commons and Fortunestown does.
- An independent road safety audit is required to examine the problems outlined.
- Proposal to provide ‘Go Cars’ cannot be relied upon as this is a private commercial entity.

- Junction 1 is currently the only pedestrian lights in Palmerstown Village. It is recommended that ABP observe how Junction 2 operates for pedestrians because it demonstrates what will happen at Junction 1 following construction.
- Reference is made to the risk to cyclists particularly at peak times. The Old Lucan Road forms part of the Radial Route 6 – Dublin West Sector in the Greater Dublin Cycle Network Plan.
- The number of parking spaces are grossly underestimated. Location should be regarded as a “peripheral and/or less accessible urban location” and apply the requisite 1 car per unit.
- The reason for the three empty retail premises on Kennelsfort Road Lower is not connected with low footfall because footfall has increased year on year in past 10 years. This is demonstrated in Aldi applying and obtaining permission for an extension of its store. The problem for retail premises on Lower Kennelsfort Road is its proximity to the R148 and low traffic flow in front of those premises.

26. Riversdale River and Old Lucan Road Residents’ Group c/o Michael Kenny

- ABP should consider and maintain the existing visual amenity of the locality, and the specific residential amenity of the adjacent properties in determining this SHD application.
- The proposed development is an enormous overdevelopment of the site and will unharmoniously overbear and overlook the private amenity space of adjacent properties as well as a traffic hazard that will lead to substantially unsafe environment for the public.
- The proposal should be refused permission.
- The applicants have failed to correctly identify the applicable policies that relate to the proposed development. This failure eludes to the non compliance with the development plan policies for the sustainable development of lands.
- Reference is made in the submission to policies H6 which pertains to supporting development of sustainable communities and to ensure that new

housing development is carried out in accordance with Government policy in relation to the development of housing and residential communities.

- Other policies include H7 Obj 1, H7 Obj. 2, H7 Obj 3, H7 Obj. 4, H8 Obj. 1, H8 Obj. 2, H8 Obj. 6, H9 Obj. 1, H9 Obj. 4, H10 Obj. 1, H11 Obj. 1, H11 Obj. 2, H12 Obj. 1, H12 Obj. 2, H12 Obj. 3, H13 Obj. 1, H13 Obj. 2, H14 Obj. 1, H14 Obj. 2, H15 Obj. 1, H15 Obj. 2, H15 Obj. 3, H15 Obj. 4.
- Specific Local objective UC6 relating to building height which limit future building height. It is set out that the proposed development completely contravenes the height objectives.
- The proposed development is in clear contrast with Objectives 4, 13, 33, 34 and 35 of the National Planning Framework. NPF Objective 4 sets out that it is an objective to ensure the creation of attractive, liveable, well designed, high quality urban places that are home to diverse and integrated communities that enjoy a high quality of life and well-being. The proposed dwellings are poorly designed, with 56% of single aspect apartments having no south facing windows.
- It is acknowledged that the site provides opportunity for residential growth, however, the scale and height of development does not achieve a well-designed high-quality housing growth outcome.
- Building height is completely inappropriate in the low-density residential setting.
- Car parking and traffic implication particularly given location of access onto traffic intersection creates considerable congestion and parking outcomes.
- 94% of development consists of studio, 1 and 2 bedroom apartments and does not provide for flexibility in changing households or for families.
- With regard to Rebuilding Ireland, the proposed development fails to address the need for families to have access to social housing and emergency accommodation. With only 26 no. three bedroom apartments this leaves limited availability for families. All the social housing are located within Block A and consist of 1 and 2 bedroom apartments. They have not been scattered throughout the development.
- The submission makes reference to section 28 guidelines and that the development has failed inter alia to have regard to the existing character and

pattern of development in the area. The eight storey development is completely out of context, character and is of an inappropriate scale and height. It is submitted with the proposal is a serious overdevelopment of the site, with no visual, functional, environmental gain from increasing the building height to such a level. The cumulative impact to the surrounding village is immense.

- The proposal will result in a significant loss of residential amenity of the immediately adjacent dwellings that are all within the 'Objective VC' zoned area, where it is the objective to protect, improve and provide for the future development of village centres.
- The proposed development would constitute over-development on a prominent site and could lead to a proliferation of similar ad-hoc infill developments in the vicinity of the site, thereby damaging the consistent pattern and character of the area.
- It is considered that the proposal will result in significant overlooking of adjacent properties. The proposed 1st to 7th floor bedroom and living windows to apartment block B facing north, north west and west which directly overlook into the rear yards of the properties along Rose View, Lucan Road Old and Kennelsfort Road Lower. The proposed roof terrace to both apartment block A and B will provide further opportunity for overlooking as well as noise.
- A fundamental concern is the significant degree of overbearing that will result from the proposed development. The scale is excessive and oppressive for such a prominent site which abuts sensitive low-density residential development within proximity.
- The massing of the two apartment blocks is of considerable concern and will significantly contribute to the development dominating the surrounding landscape. The overall length of the development is 195.5m in length stretching from east to west.
- With regard to the loss of light and daylight, the reduction in sunlight to be considered 'very minor' is considered to be an oversight given the available information. Of particular significant is the property at 15 and 16 Kennelstown Road Lower, which is completely shaded for large sections of the date. It is set out that the assessment of access to sunlight and the implications the

development will have on surrounding properties has been assessed against the BRE Guide. The guide identifies that the recommendations are not necessarily transferable across all applications, particularly in relation to the context of specific sites relating to densification.

- The proposed development and supporting daylight and sunlight analysis report have had total disregard to the amenity of the village centre of Palmerstown, by proposing an 8 storey development within a two and three storey neighbourhood.
- The proposal will give rise to significant visual impacts principally affecting the immediate adjacent properties within the locality of the subject site as well as the wider Palmerstown village.
- The proposed development is of poor design as they do not readily correspond to the surrounding dwellings or character of Palmerstown.
- The landscaping proposal submitted is poor and does not respond to the development nor the site surrounds. Majority of the landscaping has been provided to the southern boundary of the site. Only 6 trees have been provided on the northern boundary.
- The previous ABP approval was a maximum of 7 storeys. There was a greater effort given to breaking up the built form and reducing the mass and bulk of the development by dividing into 4 no. individual blocks and the length of the buildings north south as opposed to east west.
- Proposal is considered inappropriate from an access and traffic perspective. A comprehensive discussion regarding the grounds of objection relating to the proposed access and traffic resulting is provided in the Technical Note prepared by MPA Consulting Engineers who conclude that the proposal would lead to increased traffic congestion and create a road safety hazard for a number of reasons.
- The proposed density greatly exceeds the maximum of 50 units per hectare further highlighting that the development is inappropriate for the site and inconsistent with the objectives of SDC development plan.
- The amenity and accordingly the value of property will be seriously impacted upon by this development if permitted.

27. Community Alliance c/o Guss O'Connell

- Current proposal is overly ambitious in terms of size, scale and in respect of traffic access/egress.
- The proposal represents a massive overdevelopment of the site.
- The current proposal will have a very serious impact on existing residences in the area in terms of overlooking, shadowing and access to privacy.
- The proposal is a material contravention of the CDP.
- The current proposal would frustrate the policy objectives of the Council to develop and restore palmerstown village to one of the oldest in the County.
- The increase in population for the village area at around 100% does not represent good community development and is unsustainable.
- The proposed development is incapable of being implementable due to scale, height and density.
- The entrance/egress is fraught with traffic and safety problems.
- The issue of location of the R148 and the entrance to the site is highlighted as a potential problem regarding vehicular and pedestrian safety in the Randelswood Road Safety Audit.
- Proposal will impact significantly on all traffic using the R148 junction.
- The proposal is in direct conflict with the objectives of the SDCC to provide a segregated junction at the R148/Kennelsfort Road.
- The contention that objectives within SDCCDP which restrict height at the application site contradict national planning policy is disputed.
- While guidelines have relevance generally they do not apply across the board. Reference is made specifically to the established identities and communities with distinct heritage and character. Reference is made to the objectives that were included in the CDP for that reason.
- The development would interfere with the proper future planning and execution for a grade separated junction between Kennelsfort Road and the R148.
- The developer should be levied for a significant proportion of final cost of this junction.
- Reference is made to land uses which generate traffic and pedestrian movements.

- Anything above two storey will have a definite impact on light from March until September of each year.

28. Terry Brannigan

- Insufficient critical amenities for population explosion
- Only 12 known spaces in local primary schools.
- Unrealistic traffic analysis at the new development
- Reference is made to the recorded trips from the site on 28th September 2018 which was 1 arrival and no departures within the timeframe and no 57 arrivals suggested by the TRCIS.
- To use this model to estimate the trips generated from the proposed development is clearly inappropriate.
- Reference is made to the reality of living in Palmerstown and the traffic issues in the area.
- The proposed development is not appropriate in scale for the area.
- Schooling capacity is not available in the locality.

29. SystemVideo

- The garage presently located at the western end of the proposed site has a right of way through the car park but has no rights to car parking spaces.
- Vans and lorries deliver goods to and from the 6 business units in Palmerstown Business Park.
- In 2004 due to anti-social behaviour it was agreed by the owners to lock the gate from the car park onto the Old Lucan Road at night and any move to leave this gate open at night is resisted.

30. Riversdale Riverview Old Lucan Road Residents' Group

- A description of the village is given.
- The submission outlines CDP policy and objectives relative to the site.
- The applicants quote national policy in respect of height and this also refers to "subject to the development meeting appropriate planning standards".

- The proposed site being beside a QBC but is not in a town/city core being zoned town centre. There is no suggestion in Urban Development and Building Heights of any need for increased heights in villages.
- As proposed Guidelines, they are not legally binding.
- There is no indication of any serious effort by the applicant to 'respond to the overall natural and built environment' as required in government guidelines.
- The construction of the Aldi store has resulted in substantial increase in traffic volume from a catchment area that extends to Upper Palmerstown, Ballyfermot, Cherry Orchard, Chapelizod, and Inchicore.
- Reference is made to recent developments which have been granted permission and will be constructed in the village in the near future and will inevitably increase traffic volume and challenge the limited amount of parking which remains in the village.
- Reference is made to the R148 Junction and Lower Kennelsfort road. The location of only one pedestrian and vehicular exit from the proposed development at this Junction is of primary concern for local residents.
- The applicant proposed to erect frangible bollards to prevent or discourage car drivers exiting the basement car park turning right. Reference is made to the right-in arrow in the photo and consequentially that the bollards could not be erected.
- The junction of Lower Kennelsfort Road and the Old Lucan Road is the point at which all traffic entering the village joins the main street of the village and is the busiest. The problems at this junction are made more acute because there exists only one lane approach and a cycling route also passes through the junction in both directions.
- Reservations about the number of car parking spaces provided at the development and the consequences of under-estimation. Comparisons are drawn to other development standards for parking in other jurisdictions.
- Concerns raised that the majority of residents will use public transport.
- Concerns are raised about on-street parking which is currently limited and problematic for residents.
- Concerns are raised about health and safety particularly in relation to pedestrians and vulnerable users.

31. Gareth Kelly and Nicola O'Sullivan

- Proposal constitutes overdevelopment of the site and excessive in height.
- The excessive height will create a significant degree of overshadowing and loss of light to adjacent properties immediately surrounding the development.
- The CDP recommends 3 stories for any new building in Palmerstown.
- The proposal is excessive in density and will create significant traffic issues in the area.
- The granting of a church recently in the village will lead to increased traffic volumes that must be taken into account.
- The proposed entrance/exit point is too close to the existing junction and cannot be regarded as safe or appropriate.
- There is insufficient parking provided for the number of residential units placing additional pressure on street parking in the immediate area.
- There will be a significant loss of privacy to local residential properties.
- The appearance of the building out of character with the existing local built environment.
- The proposal to provide a community centre/meeting room is unnecessary.
- The need for increased density does not provide an excuse for poorly considered overdevelopment of sites such as is being proposed in this application.

32. Alan and Claire Hayes

- Object to the overdevelopment of the site with inadequate roads and facilities infrastructure.
- Proposal will put people's lives at risk.
- Reference is made to traffic congestion in the village.
- There is insufficient parking proposed and the village is already at capacity.
- There is only one pedestrian crossing in Palmerstown.
- It is impractical to place a mini roundabout at the T-junction of the Old Lucan Road and Kennelsfort road lower due to the movement of articulated type vehicles.
- The proposed height is excessive and goes against the CDP.

- The proposal does not respect the heritage and built environment of his historic community.
- The proposed development will block the view of the Farmleigh Tower from Kennelsfort Road upper.
- The scale of this development will likely prevent the future upgrade of the junction R148/Kennelsfort road to a grade separated junction.
- The proposed inclusion of a community centre and gym within the development are dependent on the provision by a management company.
- The new children's hospital is being constructed and this development will compound traffic delays on the N4.

33. Gráinne Ní Mhuirí

- Observer comments on the traffic congestion experienced in the village.
- Parking is a long-standing issue for residents.
- Palmerstown may be on a QBC but it is almost at the end of the line for buses servicing Lucan.
- Reference is made to the village objective in the CDP and the proposal is considered to contravene what anyone's idea of what a village is.
- The site should be developed at a more modest scale similar to Palmerstown Square.
- The proposal will increase traffic and pedestrian/commuter footfall which will clog up the area and destroy the sense of community which defines community.

34. Palmerstown Meitheal Tidy Towns

- Reference is made to the performance of Palmerstown village in the Tidy Towns for the last number of years.
- The site is currently an eye sore and commented by the adjudicators of the Tidy Towns in a negative way. However the proposal does not fit with an entrance to a traditional historical village.

- One of the main concerns is the visual impact the proposed development will have on the entrance to the village.
- The visual impact is considered to be 'significant' in 7 out of the 10 photomontages submitted.
- The design and scale is not informed by any understanding of the architectural heritage of the village nor is there any effort to 'respond to the overall natural and built environment'.
- Concur with other observations that the proposal will add to existing problems of traffic congestion and parking in the village.
- Proposal will hamper proposals to unite the people of Palmerstown and bring people down to the village and Mill lane.
- It would be a pity to have recent efforts of the committee damaged by the unsympathetic overdevelopment and congestion which will have long lasting detrimental effects on the community.

35. Emma Darcy

- Strong objection to the proposed emergency exit from the intended housing development into Orby Way as there are 26 resident's vehicles which have to park in the cul-de-sac of Orby way.
- The parking facilities for resident's cars is limited enough as it is and if it is the intention to take away the three allocated parking spaces at the top of the cul-de-sac to make room for an emergency exit, that will reduce parking further.
- The other concern for residents who have children living in the cul-de-sac is for their safety when playing in the road.
- Residents bought houses on a cul-de-sac to avoid "rabbit run" with passing traffic.

36. John Curran TD

- The 6 and 8 storey heights proposed are completely out of keeping with the sub-urban village of Palmerstown where the majority buildings are only two stories high.

- Concerns over the density of 230 units per hectares and that the development does not offer sufficient recreational open spaces.
- There is considerable traffic congestion at the location of the access.
- A full traffic survey should be conducted independently in advance of any development on this site.
- Consideration may also be given to a grade segregated intersection at the junction of the N4 and Kennelsfort Road.
- Concerns about the height, scale and density of the development will be visually obtrusive and completely out of keeping with the character of Palmerstown village.

37. Josephine Kelly and Paul Lynch

- Object to the proposal on grounds of height and scale. This will be a serious invasion of their privacy as their garden will be overlooked.
- All apartments are to have private balconies or terraces.
- The building will block out sunlight to their garden and home.
- The rooftop garden will create noise and further invade privacy.
- Construction period will have a considerable negative impact on their lives due to dust, noise and evasion of privacy.
- The scale of the proposal is unsustainable having regard to the size of the village and amenities available.
- Traffic will have a huge impact on the village, access to the M50 and the N4 also. This is already a highly congested area.

38. Karen Wilson

- Increasing the population of a small village by 303 apartments is unsustainable.
- Traffic in the area is already highly congested.
- The proposed entrance to the development will be no safer than the death trap that already exists.
- Concerns about impact on vulnerable users.

- The proposal will have a negative impact on the users of the R148 which is a main arterial route to the city.
- Development has to be considered in light of the needs of the residents.

39. Michael and Michelle Phelan

- The scale of the development will likely prevent the much needed future upgrade of the junction R148/Kennelsfort road to a grade separated junction.
- The junction as it is unsafe and any increase in traffic will only increase the potential of incidents.
- Reference is made to current and proposed development and traffic issues in the area.
- There is insufficient parking in the area.
- There is only one pedestrian crossing in the village.
- It is impractical to place a mini-roundabout at the T-junction of the Old Lucan road and Kennelsfort road lower.
- Any increase in traffic should result in the creation of dedicated cycle lanes on the Old Lucan Road to protect cyclists.
- The scale of the development in no way respect the heritage and built environment of the historic community.
- There are three community centres in the village and the offering of another is not necessary.
- Reference to the rebuilding Guidelines calling for increased density in suitable location does not take account of the lived reality and negative impact on traffic at this location.
- The Guidelines are not legally binding.
- Request ABP to take account of the provisions of the CDP which was adopted by elected members.
- The N4 and R148 is the major arterial route to the new children's hospital. Traffic delays will increase if this development proceeds.

40. Eugene and Adele Hutchinson

- If the project as proposed is implemented it would dwarf the current village of Old Palmerstown utterly changing the character of the neighbourhood.
- It is proposed that this enormous project should go ahead without any provision for the upgrading and expansion of local infrastructural facilities.
- The proposal is in stark contrast to the CDP provision for a maximum of three storeys for new buildings.
- Already three community meeting places in Palmerstown.
- The proposal violates the heritage and building style of this historic community.
- The CDP takes precedence over non-binding Rebuilding Ireland Guidelines.
- No regard for Health and Safety in the proposal.
- Reference is made to the traffic, congestion and health and safety issues.
- In the absence of a grade separated junction on the R148 the problem will be compounded with the arrival of some 1000 new residents.
- No regard has been given to the existing activities in the village.
- The recent church permission will generate significant amount of traffic.
- There is already a constriction outside the b & B located opposite, where the footpath protrudes onto the road creating a single lane of traffic that causes many cars to mount the footpath on exiting the village.
- Only 1 pedestrian crossing in the village. It is impossible to position a safe and effective roundabout at the T junction of the Old Lucan Road and kennelsfort Lower.
- There are no cycle lanes on the Old Lucan Road which would be essential if this development proceeds.
- Proposal would have a negative impact on the quality of life for the residents, severely impinging upon the health and safety of the clients of Stewarts Hospital and create a traffic hazard at the junction.

41. Simon Hall

- The proposed development in two blocks of 8 storey in height is not compatible with the CDP objectives H7 Objective 4 and UC6 SCO1.

- Palmerstown is one of only a number of small traditional villages in South County Dublin. It has a unique and special village character. The CDP recognises this.
- The proposed development is not sympathetic to the existing village and is at odds with what section 5.1.2 of the development plan seeks to achieve.
- It is contended that the proposed development will have an adverse effect on traffic volumes and congestion in the village.
- The CDP recognises the needs to upgrade the junction.
- Most of the bus services are full by the time they reach the village.
- 274 car parking spaces are not enough for the proposed development.

42. Mark Lynch and Suzanne Barr-Lynch

- The proposed buildings make no attempt to integrate with the surrounding dominant architecture which is two storey semi-detached and terraced housing.
- The proposal for 8 stories is too high.
- The height difference will cause over-shadowing and loss of light and privacy to existing area residents.
- The proposed building materials are entirely inappropriate and insensitive to the historic surroundings. The overall structure, shape and form of the proposed buildings' frame features are not sympathetic to the local architectural styles.
- The development would destroy the character of the village and make the traffic much more severe to a village that already suffers from severe traffic congestion.
- The development of a large number of units on such a small site fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area and the way it functions. There has been no allowance made to add amenities.
- It seems that there is insufficient open space to serve the development.
- There is a real issue with regards to public transport and no consideration appears to have been taken of the further impact on the already poor transport links.

- Minimal effort has been made to consult with the community.
- It is essential to get the quality and size of this development right in order to complement the existing environment.

43. Ruth Collender

- Reference is made to the CDP policies and objectives with regard to the character of the village.
- Parking is currently an issue.
- Reference is made to the current traffic issues within the village.
- The transport infrastructure is strained to meet current needs at peak time.
- Under the Dublin Area Bus Networks Redesign CTS Public Consultation report, it is proposed that some of bus services will be reduced and replaced with less frequent services which will have a huge impact on commuters.

44. Brendan and Sinead Clancy

- Traffic generation. A lot of traffic already entering and exiting the village.
- Scale of development – the sheer size dwarfs the existing houses and building and would interfere with the character of the surrounding landscape.
- Impact on local community – Palmerstown village is an old village.
- A scaled down version of this development with better traffic management structure in place would be more appropriate.