



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report PL27.247362

---

<b>Development</b>	Demolition of link building, construction of four-storey extension. New two-storey extension, 34 car parking spaces, four temporary single- storey classroom units.
<b>Location</b>	St. David's Secondary School, Marine Road, Greystones, Co. Wicklow.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Wicklow County Council.
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	15/1318
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Le Cheile Schools Trust
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third-v-Grant First-v-Condition
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	(1) Robert Thomas & Susanna Murdoch (2) Le Cheile Schools Trust

**Observer(s)** (1) Mark O'Hara  
(2) Eileen Davy

**Date of Site Inspection** 6th January 2017

**Inspector** Colin McBride

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

1.1. The appeal site, which has a stated area of 1.006 hectares, is located to the north east of Greystones town centre. The appeal site is located between Marine Road and Kimberley Road. The appeal site is occupied by an existing school premises with an existing two-storey building on site. The school building runs north south on site with an open area between it and the road frontage along Marine Road. Part of the existing structure on site has frontage along Kimberley Road. Adjoining uses include a detached dwelling immediately to the north of the site, the garden area associated with dwelling (on Kimberley Road) to the south of the site. To the west of the site and located north of the portion of the existing school building fronting Kimberley Road are 3 no. single-storey detached dwellings that back onto the appeal site. To the south of the existing structure fronting Kimberley Road and west of the site is a three-storey apartment structure.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the demolition of a single-storey link building between the main blocks of the school, and the construction of a) an extension, (in its place), to the existing school (area 1820sqm) and b) a new two-storey PE hall and ancillary accommodation block to the south of the site (area 1030sqm) with external store (area 50sqm). The total new build area is 2900sqm, the proposed extension (a) is a four-storey building comprising entrance hall, administration areas, library, external play area, external store and external covered areas. The proposed PE block (b) comprises PE hall, fitness suite, entrance and ancillary accommodation. The new buildings (extension, PE Block and store) will be finished in brickwork with pitched membrane roofs and aluminium glazing.
- 2.2. Permission is also sought for the replacement of windows in the existing buildings with new aluminium windows and for recladding the existing buildings in insulated render with mineral paint finish. Existing buildings will be refurbished internally. New fencing, gates and additional planting will be provided to parts of the site perimeter. 34 staff car parking spaces will be provided with new gates and existing entrances

onto Marine Road. Permission is also sought for (c) four additional temporary single-storey classroom units (area approx. 180sqm) to be located in front of the existing school and one temporary stairs to the front of the building, to assist in the phased constriction of the school. All temporary accommodation will be removed upon completion of the project.

- 2.3. The proposal was revised in response to further information with the changes being a reduction in height of the extension changing it from a four-storey section to a three-storey section and a total decrease in ridge height by 1.4m. The new PE hall was reduced in height by 2m by lowering the ground level of such by the same amount. In granting permission a condition was applied requiring revisions including a reduction in height of the extension by at least 5m and the PE hall block by at least 3m

### **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

#### **3.1. Decision**

Permission granted subject to 8 conditions. Of note are the following conditions.

Condition no. 2: Prior to the commencement of development. The applicant shall submit for written agreement of the Planning Authority.

- (a) Proposals for a reduction in the height of the extension by a minimum of 5m;
- (b) Proposals for a reduction in the height of the PE hall by a minimum of 3m;
- (c) Proposals for the provision of flat roofs or very shallow pitched roofs to the extension and PE hall.

#### **3.2. Local Authority and External reports**

3.2.1. Irish Water (29/01/16): No objection.

3.2.2. Planning report (16/02/16): Further information required including proposal to deal with concerns regarding the height and scale of the proposal in the context of visual and residential amenities, a revised traffic assessment taking into account certain junctions not included and possible future developments in the vicinity, a revised

proposal for 2 car parking space per classroom and details of surface water and foul sewerage.

3.2.3. Irish Water (19/08/16): No objection.

3.2.4. Municipal District Engineer (29/08/16): Response to further information does not deal all aspects raised in regards to traffic assessment.

3.2.5. Senior Engineer (31/08/16): Recommended a grant of permission on the basis of the site being an appropriate location due to its accessibility to other modes of transport other than cars (public transport, cycling, walking).

3.2.6. Planning report (31/08/16): The response to further information was noted including revisions to the scale of the proposed development. It was considered subject to conditions requiring further alterations including reduction in the height of the PE block that the proposal would be satisfactory and in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. A grant of permission was recommended based on the conditions outlined above.

## **4.0 Planning History**

4.1 No planning history.

## **5.0 Policy Context**

### **5.1. Development Plan**

5.1.1 The relevant Development Plan is the Greystones/Delgany & Kilcoole Local Area Plan 2013. The site is zoned TC/Town Centre with a stated objective 'to protect, provide for, and improve the development of a mix of town centre uses including retail, commercial, office and civic use, and to provide for "Living Over the Shop" residential accommodation, or other ancillary residential accommodation, to consolidate and facilitate the development of the central area, and to identify, reinforce, strengthen and promote urban design concepts and linkages between town centre activity areas'.

5.1.2 The site is located within the Harbour Architectural Conservation Area.

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1 Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1 A third party appeal has been lodged by Robert Thomas & Susanna Murdoch, Valaura, Kimberley Road, Greystones, Co. Wicklow. The grounds of appeal are as follows...

- The appellants reside adjacent the appal site and have concerns regarding the impact of the proposed development on their residential amenity.
- The appellants raise concerns regarding the traffic impact of the proposal noting the road network in the vicinity is narrow one-way system that already suffers from traffic congestion due to the existing school. It is considered that the increase in pupil numbers would exacerbate this situation and would be dangerous for pedestrians and other road users.
- It is noted that the proposal does not feature much outdoor space for the pupils.
- It is considered that the design and scale of the proposal is out of character and scale and would have an overbearing impact on the appellants' property causing overshadowing and loss privacy.

6.1.2 A first party appeal has been lodged by GVA Planning on behalf of Le Cheile Schools Trust. The grounds of appeal are as follows...

- The appeal is against the application of condition no. 2. It is noted that reduction in scale required under condition no. 2 is unreasonable and unnecessary and that the impact on adjoining amenities and visual amenities in the area would not be altered significantly as a result of the reduction

required under condition no. 2. It is noted that the reduction required is technically unfeasible and makes the proposal unworkable due to issues with floor to ceiling heights.

- The appeal submission includes details of how the terms of the condition is unfeasible from the point view of floor to ceiling height to both the extension including the classroom areas and the PE hall.
- It is considered that the overall visual impact of the proposal is satisfactory and that the Planning Authority has concerns regarding the impact of views of Bray Head from South Beach. It is noted that the proposal will not eliminate views of such and that the visual impact assessment submitted demonstrates such. Alternative views from South Beach have also been submitted to demonstrate that the visual impact of the proposal is satisfactory.
- In regards to residential amenities, it is noted that the dwellings along Kimberley Road already have a view of the existing school building and the proposal (including revisions subject to condition no. 2) would not change or alter the existing situation and relationship with existing dwellings. It is considered that the proposal is satisfactory in regards to impact upon residential amenity and the revisions under condition no. 2 are unnecessary.
- The appellants have provided details of what amendments would be feasible in the event of the Board considering such necessary. The amendments entail a reduction of the extension by 3.27m and the PE hall by 3m. Revised plans showing these amendments have been submitted.

## **6.2 Responses**

### **6.2.1 Response by the GVA Planning on behalf of the applicant, Le Cheile, Schools Trust.**

- The applicants note that all issues regarding the third party appellants' concern have been dealt with in the application documentation as well as the first party appeal submission.
- In addition it is noted that all issues regarding traffic impact have been dealt with in the Planning Authority's reports. It is noted that the existing road

network is of sufficient standard to cater for the traffic likely to be generated by the proposed development.

## 7.0 Observations

7.1 An observation has been submitted by Mark O'Hara, 'Sunbeam', Marine Road, Greystones. Co. Wicklow.

- The proposed development would be out of character and scale at this location and have a detrimental impact on visual amenities of the area. The sea front area is a significant amenity and the proposal would have a significant impact and set an undesirable precedent.

7.2 An observation has been submitted by Fenton Associates on behalf of Eileen Davy, Carrigart, Marine Road, Greystones. Co. Wicklow.

- The observer owns a dwelling abutting the site to the south and raises concerns regarding the scale of the proposal. The observer raises concern regarding the impact on residential amenity through overlooking of her property and loss of views towards the sea from Marine Road.
- The observer notes the various reports and assessment of the proposal by the Planning Authority including the concerns raised regarding design and scale. It is considered that permission was granted without adequate regard to all planning matters including impact on existing views along Marine Road and what is protected vista under the Local Area Plan.
- It is considered the proposal should be setback further north from the southern boundary adjoining the observer's property and further west from Marine Road frontage to give adequate regard to the protected vista and designation as an ACA.

## 8.0 Assessment

8.1. Having inspected the site and examined the associated documentation, the following are the relevant issues in this appeal.



Principle of the proposed development.

Design, scale, visual amenity.

Adjoining amenity.

Traffic impact.

Other

## 8.2. **Principle of the proposed development:**

8.2.1. The proposal is for an extension of an existing school premises and alterations to the existing layout and elevations on site as well as temporary classroom accommodation for the duration of the works. The proposal is for extension and alterations to a long established use at this location. According to the information on file the existing school has a capacity of 550 students but as of the current school year is catering for 680 pupils. I would consider that the principle of the proposed development is acceptable given the established use on site. The acceptability of the proposed development is contingent on it being satisfactory in the context of the visual amenities of the area, the amenities of adjoining properties and its impact in regards to traffic safety. These aspects of the proposal are to be examined in the following sections of the report.

## 8.3. **Design, scale, visual amenity:**

8.3.1 One of the main issues concerning the proposal relates to is overall design and scale. The third party appeal submission raises concern regarding the regarding the impact of the proposal on the visual amenities of the area and the residential amenities of their property immediately adjoining the site. The Planning Authority in granting permission imposed a condition (no. 2) that reduces the height of the two new extensions due to concerns regarding overall visual impact. The first party appeal concerns the imposition of this condition which is considered unnecessary.

8.3.2 The main aspects of the proposal are two extensions to the existing school, which is currently a two-storey structure. The existing structure is an L-shaped block that is

made up of two blocks with a link building between the two. It is proposed to demolish the link structure and construct a new structure between the existing blocks with it initially proposed to provide a four-storey (ridge height 18.535m at its highest point). The roof profile is a monopitch decreasing in height moving east to west (Kimberley Road). This was reduced to three-storeys in response to further information (reduction in ridge height by 1.4m with an increased floor area at second floor level, extended south on the roof of the existing structure). Condition no. 2 appears to require a 5m reduction in height of the original proposal. The other extension is a sports/PE hall extension to the south of the site. This extension originally had ridge height of 11.120m relative to finished floor level. In response to further information this was reduced by 2m by reducing the finished floor level by the same amount. Condition no. 2 requires a reduction of at least 3m in the height of the proposed sports/PE hall.

8.3.3 The Planning Authority expressed concern regarding the overall visual impact of the proposal at this location. The applicant requests to provide revisions to address such concern by way of further information. The revisions submitted by applicant were not considered adequate and permission was granted with condition no. 2 attached to deal with this issue. The concerns appear to relate to visual impact in respect of south beach located to the south of the site and view along the coast to Bray Head.

8.3.4 The existing structure on site is a sizeable two-storey structure. As noted above the proposal has two main aspects including a new extension to the school which provides an additional two-storeys above existing roof level of the school and a new sports hall to the south that projects forward of the building line of the existing school. Given the existing scale of the structure on site I would note that the overall visual impact of the sports hall would not be detrimental to the visual amenities of the area. The structure is not out of scale in comparison with the existing school building and projects a modest amount beyond the front building line of the existing structure. I would consider that the proposal to reduce the height of the structure by 2m by reducing the finished floor level by 2m would be a positive element and further reduce its visual impact. In the event of a grant of permission I would recommend

that person is granted for the sports hall/PE block as per the plans submitted by way of further information. I would note that photomontages were submitted with the original proposal and with the revised plans as per the further information response. I am satisfied that such demonstrates that the revised plans for this block would have an acceptable visual impact.

8.3.5 The main element of the proposal in regards to visual impact is the structure proposed to replace the demolished link building between the two existing blocks that make up the school building. Initially the proposal was for a four-storey structure that runs east west with its eastern elevation coinciding with the eastern elevation of the existing structure on site and western elevation set back from the western elevation along Kimberley Road. In response to further information this structure was revised to be a three-storey structure with a reduced ridge height and an extended floor area at second floor level. Photomontages of the original proposal and revised proposal were submitted including photomontages taken from the beach area to the south of the site. The original proposal does have a significant impact as it is a significant increase in height of what is already a large structure in an area that is an attractive sea front location with good views north and south along the coast. I would be concerned that the original proposal would have would have a disproportionate and dominant visual impact at this location. In response to concerns over design and scale the applicant did provide a revised proposal that reduced the ridge height of the extension by 1.4m, however to compensate for the loss of a floor, widened the extension (extended south at second floor area), Despite the decrease in floor area, the width and bulk of the extension and its visual impact, when viewed along the Marine Road and the seafront is increased. I would consider that the revised proposal for this element of the extension does not successfully address concerns regarding visual impact.

8.3.6 Condition no. 2 required that this portion of structure be reduced in height by a minimum of 5m. I would concur with the first party appellant's argument that such a reduction of the submitted plans is not necessarily easy to implement. The first party appellants have submitted a revised proposal with the appeal submission with

alterations proposed to the extended area of the school and the PE/sports hall block. As noted above I do not consider that any amendments are required to the PE/sports hall block with the plans submitted in response to further information acceptable in the context of visual amenity. The amended proposals for the extension to the school building in place of the link building provide for an extension with a flat roof (similar in width to the further information plans) but with a reduced ridge height of 4.74m compared to the original proposal and 3.27m compared to the revised further information proposal. I would consider that the revised proposal would be significantly reduce the overall visual impact of the proposal and would be satisfactory in the context of the visual amenities of the area and in the event of grant of permission should be implemented.

- 8.3.7 The proposal entails alterations to the existing elevations including new windows. These alterations would be acceptable in context of the visual amenities of the area and will improve the aesthetics of a dated school building.

#### **8.4 Adjoining amenity:**

- 8.4.1 In regards to adjoining uses the site has most of its road frontage along Marine Road and a small amount of frontage along Kimberley Road. The existing structure on site is an L-shaped block whose long side runs on a north south axis and short side runs east west with frontage along Kimberley Road. To the west and north of the L-shaped block are three-single-storey detached dwellings on Kimberley Road that back onto the site with the existing school building located to the south and east of the existing dwellings. To the south of the site along Kimberley Street is a three-storey apartment block with the existing two-storey school building located immediately to the north of it and an open area (playing area) associated with the school located to the west of the apartment block. In this case the appellants dwelling is located immediately adjacent the site on Kimberley Road with the existing two-storey structure located to south and east of the appellants dwelling.

8.4.2 The proposal as noted earlier has two main components which are an extension of the existing school building with a four-storey structure to replace a demolished section of the existing school and a new PE/sports hall block. The third party appellants concerns mainly relate to the extension to the existing school building. The appellants dwelling fronting onto Kimberley Road is located both to the north and west of the existing L-shaped school building on site. The extended section of the school is located to the south east of the appellants' property and not directly to the rear of the appellants property and is setback from the Kimberley Road a significant amount and its western limit coincides with the western elevation of the long side of the L-shaped school building.

8.4.3 It is notable that the existing school building has a significantly lower finished floor level than the existing dwellings fronting Kimberley Road. The location of the portion of the extension that provides both the second and third floor level is not directly to the rear of the existing dwelling but offset to the south east. In addition the western limit of extended second and third floor area is set well back from the rear elevation of the existing dwelling and from the rear boundary of the garden areas serving the dwelling. A revised proposal reducing the extension to three-storeys (reduced ridge height of 1.4m) was submitted by way of further information. I would consider that the original proposal four four-storeys could be determined to have an overbearing impact on the nearest dwelling due its height and proximity. I would consider a reduced height extension would be more acceptable such as a single-storey above the existing two-storey structure. I would consider that the revised proposal submitted as further information would be acceptable in the context of the residential amenities of existing dwelling (and those further to the north and the apartment block to the south). This provides for only one additional storey and is set back and adequate distance from the adjoining property. I am satisfied based on the shadow study submitted that the proposal as amended in response to further information would have no significant or adverse impact in regards to overshadowing over and above the existing structure on site. I would consider that the set back of the

additional floor and its orientation is satisfactory in context of maintaining an acceptable level of privacy to the rear of the existing dwelling. Notwithstanding such, having regard to the assessment of visual amenity, I would consider that the revised plans submitted by the first party appellant be the ones that are permitted in the event of a grant of permission. These plans provide for a reduced ridge height and a reduced impact in regards to adjoining properties.

8.4.4 The proposed PE/sports hall extension is located to the south of the site. Adjoining uses include the three-storey apartment block to the west and the garden area of a dwelling located along Kimberley Road but with a vehicular entrance off Marine Road. In regards to overall design and scale, the proposed PE/sports hall block is located sufficient distance from the east facing windows on the apartment block to the west of the site. I would consider that the revised proposal submitted as per further information has a lesser impact in regards to its relationship with the existing apartment block in that it features a reduced ridge height (reduced finished floor level) and is located further east on site giving increased separation distances from the existing apartment block.

8.4.5 One of the observations submitted is from the owner of the dwelling to the south with concerns regarding the impact of PE/sports hall extension in terms of overlooking and loss of views to the north towards the sea. In regards to impact on the extension despite being close to the boundary with the adjoining dwelling to the south, it is located a significant distance from the dwelling itself with a large garden area that at present is quite open and visible from the public road. I am satisfied that the proximity and scale of the revised proposal (further information) would be acceptable in regards to the residential amenities of the adjoining property. In regards to overlooking, I would note that windows on the southern elevation are high level window that facilitate light to the hall and do not allow for overlooking. Notwithstanding such, given the nature of the structure, such could be omitted by way of condition by the Board if considered necessary. In relation to impact on views

from the observers dwelling I would note that loss of views is not factor in terms of assessing impact on residential amenity. I am satisfied that the proposed structure is sufficient distance from the observers dwelling so as not impinge significantly on existing residential amenity. The existing dwelling still has significant views of the sea front regardless of the proposed development. The impact on the visual amenities of the area have been assessed earlier and as noted above I consider that the revised design of the PE/sports hall block submitted as further information is satisfactory in design and should be permitted in the event of a grant of permission.

## **8.5 Traffic impact:**

8.5.1 The third party appeal submission notes that the existing road network and school development result in congestion at this location during certain times. It is noted that the proposal to increase the capacity of the school would exacerbate these traffic issues. In assessing the proposal the Local Authority raised some concerns regarding the scope of the Traffic Impact Assessment in terms of its consideration of certain junctions in the vicinity and the failure to consider the impact of the proposal in conjunction with other permitted/planned development in the vicinity. The existing school is located between Kimberley Road (west of the site) and Marine Road (east of the site). The school has significant road frontage along Marine Road with two existing vehicular entrances from the public road. The school has less frontage along Kimberley Road but does have pedestrian access on this frontage. There is currently a one-way system of traffic movement along both Kimberley and Marine Road with there being on street car parking available along both streets. Marine Road is also served by a cycle way along the eastern side of the road.

8.5.2 Based on the information submitted the existing school premises has an attendance of 530 pupils (at the time the application was lodged) with the proposed development designed to cater for 750 pupils. It is noted in the first party appeal submission that the current enrolment in the school is 680 pupils. A Traffic Assessment Report was

submitted. This report included a traffic observation survey conducted during the morning peak hours (8:00am to 9:00am). The conclusions of such are that no major congestion currently occurs during the peak hours. The assessment includes a mobility survey identifying the modal split between various modes of transport from pupils and staff. In regards to trip generation the information is based on a total of 530 pupils (assessment relates to previous school year not the current school year). Based on the mobility survey trip generation 220 additional pupils was estimated with it determined that the proposal would result in 90 additional car trips for pupils and 4 additional car trips for staff. The assessment also outlines the proposed parking arrangements on site and the set down area available serving the school along Marine Road. In response to further information the applicant noted that the existing road network is sufficient to cater for the proposed development with the increase in traffic considered acceptable. Given the established use on site it is considered that it would be unreasonable to restrict the future development of the school on traffic grounds.

8.5.3 As noted earlier the proposal entails extension of the existing school to cater for a capacity of 750 pupils. The information on file indicates at the time of submission of the application, 2015/2016 school year, the enrolment was 530 pupils and the Traffic Assessment Report is based on this figure. The first party appeal submission notes that the current enrolment of the school (2016-2017 school year) is 680. One of the biggest considerations in regards to traffic is the fact that the proposal is an extension of a long-established use at this location and it is clear that an increase in school traffic at this location is not contingent on a physical permission being granted at this location, and can occur regardless of such due to the demand that exists within the Greystones area, which is a relatively large and thriving settlement and it appear that the attendance at the school has increased greatly since the application was originally lodged.



8.5.4 I would consider that there are number factors for consideration in regards to traffic. Firstly the long established nature of the use on a site within the built up area. The proximity of the site to existing housing, public transport facilities, pedestrian/cycling facilities (cycleway along Marine Road) are all factors that would serve to reduce dependence on car transportation with the existing school accessible for other modes of transport. I would note that the existing road network and in particular the one-way traffic flow system along Kimberley Road and Marine Road simplifies traffic movement with no conflict between traffic approaching from opposing directions. It is clear that the Marine Road side is the more prominent location for traffic travelling to the school with the two vehicular entrances serving the site. In addition there is a significant level of on-street car parking located either side of Marine Road available for set down. As noted earlier the one-way traffic flow eliminates conflicting turning movements. I would consider that the existing road network is of a sufficient standard to cater for the level of traffic likely to be generated as a result of the proposed development. In regards to other development (planned/permitted developments) I would note that the traffic generation of the school is confined to specific peak hours and is not constant throughout day or even the year. I would also reiterate the point that the level of pupils attending the school is not contingent on the proposed of the proposed development with attendance numbers having increased over the period that the development in this case has been under consideration. In this regard I would consider the proposal would be satisfactory in regards to traffic safety.

8.5.5 The proposal provides for 34 car parking spaces on site with the Development Plan policy requiring at least 32 (based on two spaces per classroom). It is notable that the proposal was revised to provide 32. I am satisfied that the proposal is adequately served in terms of off-street car parking.

## **8.6 First party appeal:**

8.6.1 The proposal is being considered de novo and has been assessed above in the context of visual amenity, adjoining amenities and traffic impact. The first party appeal is contrary condition no. 2 that seeks reductions in the ridge height of both extensions. As outlined above there are a number of concerns regarding the original design of the proposal in particular concerning the four-storey extension to the school building. As noted in the assessment above I would recommend a grant of permission for a three-storey extension to the existing school as per the amended plans submitted by the applicant/first party appellant with their appeal submission and for the PE/sports hall extension as per the plans submitted by way of further information.

## **8.7 Other Issues:**

8.7.1 The proposal entails the provision of temporary buildings on site. These are structures that are modest in scale relative to the existing structure on site. I am satisfied subject to a condition requiring their removal when the extensions to the school are completed and occupied, that such would be acceptable in the context of proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

8.7.2 The third party appeal submission is critical of the level of open space/recreational space provided on site as a result of the proposal. In this regard I would note that the only area of open space that is being lost is the area where the PE/sports hall block is located. Given the nature of this extension, which provides for recreational space, I do not consider that the loss of the open space is significant or detrimental to existing amenity at the school. I would also note that there is significant level of open space existing on the eastern side of the school.

8.7.3 Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and its proximity to the nearest European site, no Appropriate Assessment issues arise and it is not

considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

## **9.0 Recommendation**

9.1 I recommend a grant of permission subject to the following conditions.

## **10.0 Reasons and Considerations**

10.1 Having regard to the nature of the proposed development, to the established use of the subject lands as a school and to the zoning of the site it is considered that the proposed development, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area, would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## **11.0 Conditions**

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars submitted on the 05th day of August, 2015 and on the 03<sup>rd</sup> day of October 2016, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2.

a) The proposed extension to the existing school building that replaces the existing link building to be demolished shall be carried out in accordance with the plans submitted on the 03<sup>rd</sup> day of October, 2016.

b) The PE/sports hall extension shall be carried out in accordance with the plans submitted on the 05<sup>th</sup> day of August 2015.

Reason: In the interests of clarity.

3. On completion and occupation of the proposed extensions to the existing school building, the temporary classroom buildings are to be removed from site.

Reason: In the interests of orderly development.

4. Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works.

Reason: To ensure adequate servicing of the development, and to prevent pollution.

5. All public service cables for the development, including electrical and telecommunications cables, shall be located underground throughout the site.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

6. Prior to the occupation of the school, a School Travel Plan (Mobility Management Plan) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority. This plan shall seek to minimise the use of individual private cars and to encourage the use of public transport, cycling, walking and carpooling by students and staff. It shall

be implemented within three months of the opening of the extension to the school and continued and updated annually during the operation of the school.

Reason: In the interest of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

7. The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including noise management measures, traffic routes to and from the proposed development and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.

Reason: In the interests of public safety and residential amenity.

8. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1800 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0700 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.

9. A plan containing details for the management of waste and recyclable materials within the development, including the provision of facilities for the storage, separation and collection of the waste and, in particular, recyclable materials and for the ongoing operation of these facilities shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, the waste shall be managed in accordance with the agreed plan.

Reason: To provide for the appropriate management of waste and recyclable materials, in the interest of protecting the environment.

10. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed development, along with the fixing methodologies proposed for use with vertical cladding panels, shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

11. Access road, footpaths and external lighting on site shall be provided in accordance with a scheme details of which shall be submitted to the planning authority for written agreement prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and public safety.

12. A comprehensive landscaping scheme shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority, prior to commencement of development. The boundary treatment and landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed scheme.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

13. The developer shall facilitate the archaeological appraisal of the site and shall provide for the preservation, recording and protection of archaeological materials or features which may exist within the site. In this regard, the developer shall:

(a) notify the planning authority in writing at least four weeks prior to the commencement of any site operation (including hydrological and geotechnical investigations) relating to the proposed development, and

(b) employ a suitably-qualified archaeologist prior to the commencement of development. The archaeologist shall assess the site and monitor all site development works.

The assessment shall address the following issues:

- (i) the nature and location of archaeological material on the site, and
- (ii) the impact of the proposed development on such archaeological material. A report, containing the results of the assessment, shall be submitted to the planning authority and, arising from this assessment, the developer shall agree in writing with the planning authority details regarding any further archaeological requirements (including, if necessary, archaeological excavation) prior to commencement of construction works.

In default of agreement on any of these requirements, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.

Reason: In order to conserve the archaeological heritage of the area and to secure the preservation (in-situ or by record) and protection of any archaeological remains that may exist within the site.

---

Colin McBride  
Planning Inspector

17<sup>th</sup> January 2017