



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

**Board Direction**  
**BD-001945-18**  
**ABP-302521-18**

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on December 12<sup>th</sup> 2018.

The Board decided to refuse permission, generally in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation, for the following reasons and considerations.

### **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 an appropriate design solution having regard to the site's locational context along the R-148 regional road and to the established character and pattern of residential development along the northern boundary which is 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, and would represent over-development of this site. Furthermore, the proposed development would have an overbearing and overshadowing impact on the existing residential amenities of the properties to the northern boundary, particularly numbers 4 and 5 Roseview. The proposed development would be contrary to the National Planning Framework and Ministerial Guidelines, which promote innovative and qualitative design solutions, and would seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The proposed development would be self-contained with a single access and egress point onto Kennelsfort Road Lower. It is considered that the layout of the proposed development provides limited opportunities to facilitate potential future access to the rear gardens of the houses to the north, or for future connectivity (pedestrian, cyclist and vehicular) to the lands to the west of the application site. The proposed development is therefore 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, and to permit the development of this site, as proposed, would prejudice the future redevelopment of adjoining lands in a comprehensive fashion.
  
3. 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 Lower and the R-148 regional road, would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard from increased traffic movements and would lead to conflict between road users, that is, pedestrians, cyclists and vehicular traffic. Furthermore, 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 proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
  
4. The location of the public and semi-private open space along the frontage of the R-148 regional road, which is heavily trafficked, would compromise the use and enjoyment of this area by future residents. It is also considered that, by reason of the design, bulk and massing of Block A, a number of the single aspect one-bed units within this Block would have a poor aspect, with limited penetration of daylight and sunlight. The proposed development would, therefore, seriously injure the residential amenities of future occupants and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

5. 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 storm water 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 a risk of flooding. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development.

**Note 1.** In making its decision, the Board had regard to the Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines for Planning Authorities, issued on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2018. In this context, the Board decided not to include refusal reason number 1, as recommended in the South Dublin County Council Chief Executive's Report, as this relates to objectives of the South Dublin County Development Plan which set specific limitations on building height on the subject site (and adjoining lands).

**Note 2.** In including reason number 2, the Board had regard to the Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines for Planning Authorities, and in particular paragraph 2.11 of these Guidelines, which refer to the need to prepare master plans for areas that have the potential for comprehensive urban development or redevelopment, and where assessment of movement, public realm, design and other issues are best addressed at a neighbourhood level rather than at an individual site scale.

**Note 3.** In including reason number 3, the Board did not consider that the trip generation predictions for the development were convincing, and was of the view that the selection parameters and filtering selection chosen for the model used in the submitted Traffic and Transport Assessment were inappropriate, and were not properly representative of the location and circumstances of the site. In addition, the

Board noted the planning history of this site, which provided for entry only at the location of the proposed access, with exit for vehicular traffic onto the old Lucan Road, and considered that the proposed traffic arrangements, with the sole egress as well as access adjoining the junction of Kennelsfort Road Lower and the R-148, would be unacceptable.

*[Please issue a copy of this Direction to the parties with the Board Order.]*

**Board Member**

**Date:** 13<sup>th</sup> December 2018

---

Philip Jones