

Board Direction BD-014027-23 ABP-314620-22

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 09/10/2023.

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

Reasons and Considerations

- 1. The proposed development is within an area which is at risk of flooding. The appeal site is located within Flood Zones A & B, as outlined in Appendix 15 of the current development plan for the area, and indicated on Flood Zone Map 10. Section 6.29, relating to the Deansgrange Stream, identifies the Seafield, Bayview and neighbouring residential areas as being at the downstream end, and subject to extensive flood risk. Until such time as the Deansgrange Flood Relief Scheme is completed, development of a vulnerable class (such as housing) is not permitted within Flood Zone A, and only minor development is permitted within Flood Zone B. Ongoing studies relating to the Deansgrange Stream Flood Relief Scheme, have identified possible works within the appeal site, consisting of new flood relief walls. Construction works are estimated for the period 2024-2025. The proposed development is premature, pending establishing what works will comprise the preferred options, and when and how such works may be carried out.
- 2. The applicant has not indicated whether adequate sight lines can be provided at the access onto Killiney Hill Road; whether and how connection is to be made to

the public footpath network on Killiney Hill Road; how the access to the bungalow ('Westgate' is to be incorporated in a safe manner into the proposed development access; how vehicles can safely turn within this cul-de-sac development; and how pedestrian/bicycle permeability might be realised with adjoining housing developments/open space areas. The proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard or obstruction of road users.

Note:

The Board also considered that the information provided with the application had not satisfactorily addressed matters relating to 1) connection to a water supply and public foul sewer, 2) provision of a public lighting plan and 3) compliance in relation to Part V of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended) While ordinarily these would warrant further consideration and a request for further information, in this instance given the substantive reasons for refusal above, it was decided not to pursue these matters under the current appeal.

Board Member

Date: 09/10/2023