



Board Direction

Ref: PL06S.246237

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 4th July 2016. The Board decided to refuse permission, generally in accordance with the recommendation of the Inspector, and in accordance with the draft reasons and considerations set out below.

REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The development that is proposed to be retained is located in a light industrial building, on lands that are subject to an EE (Enterprise and Employment) zoning objective under the South Dublin County Development Plan 2016 – 2022. Having regard to the significance of Monastery Road as a link within the M50/M7 motorway interchange and to the general Clondalkin area, to the significant car parking demand from the existing businesses on this restricted site, and to the demand for car parking that would arise from the retention of the development, it is considered that, in the absence of adequate dedicated on-site car parking, the development to be retained would be deficient in car parking, and would result in over-spill car parking in a road environment that does not have the capacity to cater for it. The development proposed to be retained would, therefore, interfere with the free flow of traffic on and would compromise the level of service and carrying capacity of this road adjoining and providing access to the M50/M7 interchange, and would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard.

Note:

The Board concurred with the view of the Inspector that the use proposed to be retained would be inappropriate in light of the zoning objective for the site, and shared her view that the development would be more appropriately located within a town or neighbourhood centre having community facilities. Furthermore, under the South Dublin County Development Plan 2016 – 2022, the zoning objective for the site has changed from EP2 (Enterprise Priority Two) to EE (Enterprise and Employment), whereby a place of worship is no longer open for consideration, and is not permitted. However, it was considered that this would constitute a new issue in the context of the appeal, and having regard to the substantive reason for refusal, the Board decided not to pursue this matter further.

Please issue a copy of this Direction with the Board Order.

Board Member: _____ Date: 4th July 2016
Fionna O' Regan