



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL06D.248220

Development

The construction of part of a five-storey, over basement, residential building comprising 10 three-bed apartments. The majority of this building and 4 other proposed five-storey, over basement, residential buildings would lie within the administrative area of Dublin City Council. The access to the overall site, which is in the administrative area of Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council, has been permitted.

Location

Greenfield, Lands off Greenfield Park,
Donnybrook, Dublin 4

Planning Authority

Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County
Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

D16A/0987

Applicant(s)

Purleigh Holdings Ltd

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant, subject to 2 conditions

Type of Appeal	Third Parties -v- Decision
Appellant(s)	Greenfield Residents Group Michael G O'Connor
Observer(s)	Nutley Square Management Co. clg
Date of Site Inspection	9 th June 2017
Inspector	Hugh D. Morrison

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1 The overall site is effectively a backland site that was formerly used by UCD's Department of Horticulture. To the west this site adjoins playing fields that are continuous with the overall UCD Campus. The only access to the site is via a short laneway from the end of the Greenfield Park, a residential street which runs on a roughly north east/south west alignment from its junction with Stillorgan Road (N11) and Nutley Lane beyond. The RTE Studios lie to the north of this junction.
- 1.2. The main body of the overall site is of rectangular shape and it slopes in a north easterly direction from c.19.5m OD to less than c.16.5m OD. This site is bound to the south east by the residential clusters known as Donnybrook Green, Nutley Square, and Greenfield Manor, which are all accessed off Greenfield Park. To the north east and the north west it is bound by, variously, the residential cluster known as Thornfield and Airfield Court.
- 1.3. The overall site straddles the administrative boundary between Dublin City Council and Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council. The majority of the site lies within the former administrative area. It is of rectangular shape and it extends over an area of 1.2 hectares. The remainder of the site lies in the latter one and it encompasses a portion of the laneway to the site and a corresponding strip of the main body of the site along its western extremity. This site is thus of elongated form and it extends over an area of 0.1086 hectares.
- 1.4. The access point to the laneway from Greenfield Park is gated. This laneway runs on a roughly north/south axis. It is accompanied by trees and a mature hedgerow on its eastern side and a hedgerow and a lawn on its western side. The access point from the laneway to the main body of the site is gated, too, and the western boundary of the site is denoted by means of a chain link and barbed wire security fence and a further hedgerow.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The construction of part of a five-storey, over basement, 2,720 sqm, residential apartment building.

- 2.2. Part of the proposed apartment building lies within the Dublin City Council administrative area, on land which is subject to a concurrent planning application/appeal (4459/16 and PL29S.248443).
- 2.3. The part of the development site which lies within the administrative area of Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council and to which this current application relates, comprises part of Block 1, specifically part of 10 three-bed apartments over ground, first, second, third, and fourth floor levels, with associated balconies/terraces for each apartment; part of 12 car parking spaces and energy centre/water tank room at basement level; landscaping, boundary treatment, SuDS drainage and all ancillary works necessary to facilitate development.
- 2.4. Access to the development will be via an existing entrance and roadway from Greenfield Park. Widening of the entrance and roadway has been approved under Dun-Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council D15A/0860 / An Bord Pleanala PL06D.246607.
- 2.5. The overall development, the majority of which is located within the administrative area of Dublin City Council, for which a concurrent application has been made, comprises *inter alia*, the construction of 5 five-storey, over basement, residential apartment buildings, accommodating a total of 90 residential apartments, 90 basement level car parking spaces, 37 surface level visitor car parking spaces, 130 bicycle spaces, security/concierge office, community amenity spaces, internal access roads, landscaping, boundary treatments, SuDS drainage and all ancillary site development works.
- 2.6. The parallel application was permitted by Dublin City Council, subject to a condition requiring that the second floor in Block 5 be omitted. The effect of this condition would be that the total number of apartments would be reduced by 4 to 86. This draft permission is the subject of third party appeals. The applicant has not contested the said condition and it has submitted revised plans that show compliance with the same.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission was granted subject to 2 conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

As the parallel proposal (application 4459/16 and appeal PL29S.248443) addresses the proposed additional storey over all 5 apartment blocks, the determination of this proposal would represent the substantive decision. Draft permission was granted to the current proposal on the basis that it would be unlikely to be built in the absence of a permission on the parallel proposal.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Surface Water Drainage: No objection.
- Transportation Planning: No objection, subject to conditions.
- Housing: Part V condition requested.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None

3.4. Third Party Observations

See grounds of appeal and observations below.

4.0 Planning History

Within Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown:

- **D15A/0860**: Widening of existing vehicular entrance and roadway from Greenfield Park, including the provision of a pedestrian footpath and public lighting: Permitted at appeal PL06D.246607 on 5th December 2016.

- **D16A/0659:** Construction of part of a four-storey, over basement, residential apartment building (7 apartments): Permitted on 13th January 2017.

Within Dublin City Council:

- **2210/16:** Demolition of existing sheds and construction of 5, four-storey, over basement, residential buildings (71 apartments): Permitted at appeal PL29S.247012 on 5th December 2016.
- **4459/16:** Demolition of existing sheds and construction of 5, five-storey, over basement, residential buildings (90 apartments): Draft permission appealed to the Board PL29S.248443.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2016 – 2022 (CDP) shows the site as lying within two zones. The majority of this site is thus subject to zoning objective A, “To provide and/or improve residential amenity”, while the remaining southern tip is subject to zoning objective TLI, “To facilitate, support and enhance the development of third level institutions.” Appendix 9 of the CDP sets out the County’s Building Height Strategy (BHS).

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

n/a

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal: (a) Greenfield Residents Group

- The Planning Authority failed to consider/accept objections set out in letter dated 1st February 2017. These objections can be summarised as follows:
 - Attention is drawn to the motion to reject the parallel application that was passed by the relevant Area Committee of Dublin City Council. Likewise, each of the local residents’ groups are opposed to this application and the current

one. The adequacy of information relating to the applicant's identity is questioned.

- Attention is also drawn to the inspector's recommendation to reduce by condition the previous proposed number of apartments from 71 to 58. The Board's subsequent grant without this condition was passed on a 2:1 basis.
- The proposal would be overbearing and utterly out of character with the established housing within the vicinity of the site, which is of two and three storey form only.
- The proposed green space would be linear, inadequate, and unusable.
- The accessibility of the site to public transport is overstated and proposed car parking provision would be inadequate.
- The Planning Authority's draft permission for 20% of one out of five apartment blocks is premature. This application should have been processed/determined in tandem with the parallel one that is before Dublin City Council for the majority of the proposal.

Grounds of Appeal: (b) Michael G O'Connor of 30 Greenfield Park

- The Planning Authority's draft permission for a small portion of one out of five apartment blocks is premature. This application should have been processed/determined in tandem with the parallel one that is before Dublin City Council for the majority of the proposal.
- The previous proposal was granted for 71 apartments and in 5 four storey blocks. To add a further storey to each block now would be unsuitable to the area and contrary to the adjoining Planning Authority's Zoning Objectives for the site within its context.

6.2. Applicant Response

In relation to appellant (a):

- Attention is drawn to the case planner's report in which the appellant's letter of objection is referred to.

- The height now proposed reflects the revised height policy contained in the recently adopted Dublin City Development Plan.
- Only two appeals have been lodged.
- The applicant has complied with all relevant requirements as to his stated identity.
- The critique of the revised proposal as a whole is not relevant to the current one.
- The inspector's recommendation has been superseded by the Board's decision, as has the earlier motion and draft permission.

In relation to appellant (b):

- The parallel application before Dublin City Council was granted draft permission. If it is appealed, then the Board would be in a position to consider this application and the current one together.
- The proposal would accord with the height policies of the adjoining Planning Authorities.

6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

None

6.4. **Observations**

The observer represents 30 house owners along the south eastern boundary of the site. He supports the ground of appeal cited by appellant (a). Additionally, the following observations are made:

- Contrary to the CDP, no crèche is proposed.
- Due to formal on-street car parking, Greenfield Park functions as a single lane road and so it is too narrow to accommodate the extra traffic that would be generated.

- The height and density of the proposal would be seriously injurious to the residential amenities of the surrounding area, due to overlooking and over shadowing.

6.5. Further Responses

None

7.0 Assessment

I have reviewed the proposal in the light of national planning guidelines, the CDP, relevant planning history, the submissions of the parties and the observer, and my own site visit. Accordingly, I consider that this application/appeal should be assessed under the following headings:

- (i) Legalities and procedures,
- (ii) Land use and density, and height,
- (iii) Height and amenity,
- (iv) Development standards,
- (v) Traffic and parking,
- (vi) Childcare,
- (vii) Water, and
- (vii) AA: Stage 1 Screening.

(i) Legalities and procedures

7.1.1 The appellants raise several legal and procedural points.

- They state that insufficient information has been provided for the identity of the applicant to be properly ascertained. The applicant's agent has responded by stating that the legally required level of information has been submitted in this respect. I note that the application was validated by the Planning Authority and that such validation would have entailed checking this matter. The Authority is the sole statutory body charged with undertaking such validation.

- They state that the two parallel applications for the overall site should have been considered in tandem and Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council's decision in advance of Dublin City Council's was premature. The applicant has responded by stating that, as the decisions on these two applications have been made and duly appealed, the Board is in a position to assess/determine them together.
- They draw attention to opposition to the current two proposals from, variously, the relevant Area Committee of the City Council and local residents' groups. They also draw attention to the inspector's recommendation on PL29S.247012 and the voting pattern by the Board on the ensuing decision. While I note these points, decisions on previous applications/appeals and on the current ones have all been made by the relevant statutory bodies in accordance with established legal procedures.

7.1.2 I conclude that there is no legal or procedural impediment to the Board proceeding to assess/determine this application/appeal in the normal manner.

(ii) Land use and density

7.2.1 The majority of the site is subject to the CDP's residential zoning objective A and the remaining southern tip is subject to educational zoning objective TLI. Residential is permissible in principle under the former zoning but not under the latter, except for student accommodation.

7.2.2 The current proposal is for a residential after use of the overall redeveloped site. The site has the benefit of an extant permission for part of a four storey over basement apartment block. Exception was not taken to the nominal breach of zoning objective TLI under this permitted proposal. Furthermore, extant permission also exists for an upgrade to the adjoining laneway to the site in conjunction with the aforementioned redevelopment. In these circumstances, I do not consider that objection to the said breach would be justified now.

7.2.3 For the purpose of assessing density, the part proposal in isolation from the wider proposal for the overall site would not be meaningful. Thus, if the two sites are aggregated, then the area of the overall site is 1.3086 hectares.

7.2.4 On the basis that 86 apartments are now proposed, the density of the proposal would be 65 dwellings per hectare. The site is an inner suburban one, which is just over 500m from the nearest bus stop on the N11/R138's QBC. Thus, under the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas Guidelines, it is a possible candidate for over 50 dwellings per hectare. The extant permissions for the site indicate that this candidacy has been previously accepted by the Board.

7.2.5 The appellants and observer consider that the aforementioned density would be excessive within the context of existing housing areas around the site. The applicant has responded by recording that these areas have densities that would be higher and lower than that which is proposed.

7.2.6 I conclude that the principle of the proposal to redevelop the site for a residential after use has previously been accepted and its density would accord with national planning policies.

(iii) Height and amenity

7.3.1 The CDP's Building Height Strategy (BHS) envisages that apartment blocks to a maximum of 3 – 4 storeys can be entertained on e.g. large redevelopment sites and adjacent to key public transport nodes. While the site in question is small, it forms part of a larger site on which the current proposal and a parallel one would be developed. And so the overall brownfield site would be redeveloped. Furthermore, the site lies just over 500m from the N11/R138 QBC. Thus, on the basis of these characteristics, I consider that an apartment block of 3 – 4 storeys could, in principle, be justified under the BHS.

7.3.2 The current proposal is for part of a five storey over basement apartment block, i.e. proposed Block 1. The site is the subject of an extant permission for part of a four storey over basement apartment block and so this proposal is essentially for an additional storey. The applicant has outlined the aesthetic benefits that would accrue from it in terms of a stream lined roof, which would be replicated in each of the other 4 blocks that are wholly within Dublin City Council's administrative area.

7.3.3 In my discussion of height and amenity for the parallel application/appeal, I note that proposed Blocks 1, 3, and 5 are closer to the north western boundary

of the overall site than proposed Blocks 2 and 4. The applicant's Daylight and Sunlight Report identifies lighting implications that would arise for Nos. 3 & 4 Airfield Court as a result of the proximity of proposed Blocks 1 and 3. I note, too, that the proposed additional storey would have more of an overbearing effect on the rear gardens of these residential properties. Accordingly, I recommend that the proposed additional storey in each of these Blocks should be removed by the omission of the second floor, just as Dublin City Council/applicant has already required/done to the equivalent floor in proposed Block 5. The combined reductions would introduce a greater variety to the height of the 5 blocks when viewed from the south east in, especially, Nutley Court, thereby easing the visual impact of the overall proposal.

7.3.4 I conclude that the second floor of the proposed block should be omitted, thereby reducing its height and ensuring its compatibility with the visual and residential amenities of the area.

(iv) Development standards

7.4.1 The proposal would comprise part of 10 three-bed apartments. These apartments would form part of the wider proposal for the overall site, which, as originally submitted to Dublin City Council, would comprise a total of 90 apartments, of which 72 (80%) would be two-bed and 18 (20%) would be three-bed. This mix would accord with the requirements of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016 – 2022. It would also accord with the requirements of the Dun Laoghaire County Development Plan 2016 – 2022, as over 20% of the apartments would exceed 80 sqm in floorspace, i.e. they all would.

7.4.2 Quantitatively, the applicant has submitted a schedule of the proposed apartment accommodation, which indicates that this accommodation would either coincide with or comfortably exceed all relevant floor area and private open space standards set out in the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines. Qualitatively, too, each of the apartments would be dual aspect.

7.4.3 The parallel proposal would entail the provision of 1,950 sqm of communal open space or 15% of the overall site area. This space would be laid out along the south eastern and north eastern boundaries of this site. Additional details of

what is envisaged for it were submitted under further information to Dublin City Council. Appellant (a) expresses concern that the linear form of the space would militate against its usability. However, these details show that the area adjoining the south eastern boundary would be opened up by means of a footpath through it, which would be accompanied by a centrally placed multi-functional area.

7.4.4 The proposal is accompanied by a tree survey, which identifies and categorises the condition of existing specimen trees at the northern end of the site. These trees would be removed and compensatory tree planting would be undertaken at this end of the site. Elsewhere, on the larger adjoining site, some tree retention would be undertaken along with more extensive compensatory and additional tree planting along the north western, north eastern, and south eastern boundaries of this site. Tree and shrub planting would also be undertaken within it. In time, this combined planting would serve to soften the presence of the proposed apartment blocks and accompanying visitor car parking, thereby providing a measure of screening.

7.4.5 The proposal would comply with all relevant quantitative and qualitative development standards.

(v) Traffic and parking

7.5.1 The applicant has submitted a Transportation Assessment, which addresses public transport, the local road network and in particular the junction between Greenfield Park, Nutley Avenue, and the R138, proposed on-site access and parking arrangements.

7.5.2 With respect to public transport, attention is drawn to the QBC on the R138 and the high frequency of buses on this Corridor, due to the multiple bus routes that serve the same.

7.5.3 With respect to the local road network, the presence of formal on-street car parking arrangements on alternate sides of Greenfield Park is acknowledged, as is the relatively high usage of this residential street by pedestrians and cyclists accessing UCD from its western extremity. The junction between Greenfield Park, Nutley Avenue, and the R138 experiences capacity pressures at peak time. However, the view is taken that these pressures would not be

appreciably affected by traffic generated by the proposal, due to the disparity in traffic volumes on Greenfield Park compared to Nutley Avenue. As these two streets correspond to one another across this junction and are twinned with one another for signalling purposes, the relevant stage in the signalling sequence reflects the higher volumes on the Nutley Avenue arm of this junction and so there is spare capacity on the Greenfield Park arm. Thus, while traffic generated by the proposal would increase markedly on Greenfield Park, it would not lead to a deterioration in traffic flow along the R138.

7.5.4 The existing access road to the site from Greenfield Park is the subject of an extant permission for its improvement in conjunction with the development of this site, i.e. widening and the provision of a footpath and street lighting. On the overall site the road layout would entail a loop with accompanying cul-de-sacs and it would incorporate two-way and one-way sections. Where this loop would pass underneath proposed Blocks 4 and 5 it would be ramped downwards to where the basement level residents' car and cycle parking spaces would be sited. Likewise, the cul-de-sacs would be ramped downwards to where the basement level residents' car and cycle parking spaces would be sited underneath proposed Blocks 1, 2, and 3.

7.5.6 Car parking provision would entail the allocation of 1 space to each apartment. In addition, 37 visitors' car parking spaces would be laid out along the north western boundary. On the basis of the revised proposal for 86 apartments, the combined provision of 127 spaces, including 7 for the mobility impaired.

7.5.7 Drawing no. A-PA03 shows the proposed basement plan. Of the proposed 127 spaces only 12 would lie within the administrative area of Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council. None of the proposed motorbike or cycle spaces would lie within this area. Under the Dun-Laoghaire-Rathdown CDP, two-bed apartments should be accompanied by 1.5 spaces, i.e. the same standard as the Dublin CDP applies. If it is assumed that the spaces would serve the two-bed apartments in Block 1 above the basement in question, then these spaces can be included in the overall assessment of the site, wherein 86 x 1.5 spaces is the appropriate level of provision, i.e. 129 spaces, which would approximate to the 127 proposed.

7.5.7 Eight motorbike spaces would be provided in accordance with Dublin CDP standards.

7.5.8 One hundred and thirty cycle spaces would be provided, i.e. 90 for residents and 40 for visitors (at ground floor level), again in accordance with Dublin CDP standards.

7.5.9 I, therefore, conclude that the traffic generated by the proposal would be capable of being accommodated satisfactorily on the local road network. I also conclude that site access and parking arrangements for the proposal would be satisfactory.

(vi) Childcare

7.6.1 Under the Childcare Facilities Guidelines, proposals for in excess of 75 apartments should be accompanied by a childcare facility. As originally submitted and subsequently revised, the current proposal for the overall site would exceed this threshold and yet no such facility is proposed. The observer draws attention to this matter.

7.6.2 By way of response, the applicant, under the parallel application/appeal, draws attention to the fact that, of the originally proposed 90 apartments, only the 18 three-bed apartments would lend themselves to family accommodation. It also draws attention to the existing demographic profile of the surrounding area, in which, as a proportion of the population, the 0 – 4 age group is under represented. Nevertheless, this area is well-served by childcare facilities. In these circumstances, the applicant concludes that the omission of such a facility from the proposal is justified. Dublin City Council has not challenged this conclusion. Nor do I.

(vii) Water

7.6.1 The applicant has submitted an Engineering Services Report for the project as a whole on the overall site.

7.6.2 Accompanying drawing no. D652-H02 revision B shows that the project would be connect to the public water mains in Airfield Court to the north of the site. No supply issues exist and the on-site network would be metered and it would incorporate water saving devices.

7.6.3 Accompanying drawing no. D652-H01 revision C shows the project would likewise be connected to the public foul water sewer in Airfield Court. The aforementioned Report sets out calculations that demonstrate that there are no capacity issues in the former sewer, which was studied as far as its connection to the public foul water sewer under Stillorgan Road. The new on-site system would be provided to the required standard.

7.6.4 Under the GSDS, the project must have the capacity to retain storm flows and release them at a controlled rate, while ensuring that storm water discharged to the public sewer is of a good quality. This project would incorporate SuDS measures that would ensure that these objectives would be capable of being met.

7.6.5 The applicant has also submitted a Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment. This Assessment concludes that the site is not at risk of either fluvial or tidal flooding and so it is in Zone C for these purposes. It also includes an extract from the OPW's PFRA for Dublin, which shows that there is a 1% AEP of pluvial flooding on Greenfield Park and Stillorgan Road within the wider vicinity of the site. The applicant estimates that the nearer of these two roads, Greenfield Park, would be c.2m below the entrance to the site and, as it is not otherwise linked to this site, no overland flows would arise. Beyond this risk, the risk of on-site pluvial flooding would be addressed by means of attenuation storage. Any risk of ground water flooding is judged to be negligible.

7.6.6 I conclude that the proposed water supply and drainage arrangements for the site, including flood mitigation measures, would be satisfactory.

(vii) AA

7.7.1 The site lies neither in nor near to a Natura 2000 site. As an urban site, which would be serviced by the public drainage system, I do not consider that any Appropriate Assessment issues would arise.

7.7.2 Having regard to the nature of the receiving environment and the distance from the nearest European site in Dublin Bay, no Appropriate Assessment issues arise and it is not considered that the proposal would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

8.0 Recommendation

That the proposal be permitted.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas Guidelines, the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines, the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown Development Plan 2016 – 2022, the planning history of the site, and the nature and scale of the proposal within its context, it is considered that, subject to conditions, the proposal would not seriously injure the visual and residential amenities of the area. The proposal would, likewise, accord with relevant density, height, and residential development standards set out in the Development Plan. Traffic generated by the site would be capable of being accommodated on the local road network. Proposed drainage arrangements would be satisfactory and they would mitigate any risk of pluvial flooding. No Appropriate Assessment issues would arise. Thus, the proposal would accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, 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. The proposed development shall be amended as follows:
 - (a) The second floor shall be omitted.

Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be

submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual and residential amenity.

3. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed apartment blocks shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

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

Reason: In the interest of public health.

5. Public lighting shall be provided in accordance with a scheme, which shall include lighting along pedestrian routes through open spaces, details of which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Such lighting shall be provided prior to the making available for occupation of any house.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and public safety.

6. All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground. Ducting shall be provided by the developer to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

7. Prior to commencement of development, the applicant or other person with an interest in the land to which the application relates shall enter into an agreement in writing with the planning authority in relation to the provision of housing in accordance with the requirements of section 94(4) and section 96(2) and (3) (Part V) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, unless an exemption certificate shall have been applied for and been granted under section 97 of the Act, as amended. Where such an agreement is not reached within eight weeks from the date of this order, the matter in dispute (other than a matter to which section 96(7) applies) may be referred by the planning authority or any other prospective party to the agreement to An Bord Pleanála for determination.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Part V of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and of the housing strategy in the development plan of the area.

8. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 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. 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:

- (a) Location of the site and materials compound(s) including area(s) identified for the storage of construction refuse;
- (b) Location of areas for construction site offices and staff facilities;
- (c) Details of site security fencing and hoardings;
- (d) Details of on-site car parking facilities for site workers during the course of construction;
- (e) Details of the timing and routing of construction traffic to and from the construction site and associated directional signage, to include proposals to facilitate the delivery of abnormal loads to the site;
- (f) Measures to obviate queuing of construction traffic on the adjoining road network;
- (g) Measures to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble or other debris on the public road network;
- (h) Alternative arrangements to be put in place for pedestrians and vehicles in the case of the closure of any public road or footpath during the course of site development works;
- (i) Details of appropriate mitigation measures for noise, dust and vibration, and monitoring of such levels;
- (j) Containment of all construction-related fuel and oil within specially constructed bunds to ensure that fuel spillages are fully contained. Such bunds shall be roofed to exclude rainwater;
- (k) Off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste and details of how it is proposed to manage excavated soil;
- (l) Means to ensure that surface water run-off is controlled such that no silt

or other pollutants enter local surface water sewers or drains.

A record of daily checks that the works are being undertaken in accordance with the Construction Management Plan shall be kept for inspection by the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of amenities, public health and safety.

10. The site shall be landscaped in accordance with a comprehensive scheme of landscaping, details of which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This scheme shall include the following:

(a) A plan to scale of not less than [1:500] showing –

(i) The species, variety, number, size and locations of all proposed trees and shrubs.

(ii) Details of screen planting.

(iii) Details of roadside/street planting.

(iv) Hard landscaping works, specifying surfacing materials, furniture and finished levels.

(b) Specifications for mounding, levelling, cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment.

(c) A timescale for implementation.

All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of five years from the completion of the development [or until the development is taken in charge by the local authority, whichever is the sooner], shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity.

11. At least one car and one cycle parking space shall be allocated to each apartment. Spaces shall not be sold off in connection with the apartments and they shall not be sold separately, or let to avoid non-take-up of residents.

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

12. No additional development shall take place above roof level, including lift motor enclosures, air handling equipment, storage tanks, ducts, or other external plant, telecommunications aerials, antennas or equipment, unless authorised by a further grant of planning permission.

Reason: To protect the visual amenities of the area.

Hugh D. Morrison
Planning Inspector

10th August 2017