



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-301159-18

Development

Retention as constructed of light industrial/office building, subdivision of this building into 3 units, mezzanine storage in unit 2, ancillary office, staff room, mezzanine storage in unit 3, revised building facades, reduction in height of building, permission for office space, associated entrances and stair cores and associated site works.

Location

Bromley and Kilpedder East, Co. Wicklow.

Planning Authority

Wicklow County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

17/1173

Applicant(s)

Bromley Business Park Developments Ltd.

Type of Application

Retention Permission and Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Refuse Retention Permission and Permission

Type of Appeal

First Party v. Decision

Appellant(s)

Bromley Business Park Developments Ltd.

Observer(s)

Barbara Murray

P.D. Lane and Associates

Date of Site Inspection

27.06.2018

Inspector

Erika Casey

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The subject site is located to the east of the N11, south of the Greystones Southern Cross Road. The site has been partially developed with one large industrial building constructed to date. Foundations for further buildings, retaining walls and estate roads for the remainder of the site have also been developed. There is existing planting and trees along the northern boundary. A large retaining concrete wall has been constructed along the eastern boundary.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. The proposed development comprises retention of amendments to a previously approved application – Planning Authority Reference 08/1542. The amendments to be retained are as follows:

- As constructed light industrial /office building.
- Subdivision of this building onto 3 individual units.
- Mezzanine storage area within Unit 2 with a floor area of 66 sq. metres.
- Ancillary office, staff room and wc and a mezzanine storage area of 100 sq. metre within Unit 3.
- Revised building facades.
- Reduction in the height of the building by c. 1 metre
- Permission is sought for 126 sq. metre of ancillary office space and associated entrances and stair cores at first and second floor level above Unit 1.
- Revised façade to Unit 1 to facilitate additional own door office space.

2.2 It was clarified at Further Information Stage that Unit 1 is proposed to be used as a commercial vehicle testing centre and will have an area of 795 sq. metres. Unit 2 is light industrial unit and has an area of 554 sq. metres and Unit 3 is light industrial unit and has an area of 577 sq. metres.

2.3 It was also clarified that the own door offices for which permission is sought is in fact ancillary office space that is accessed from the ground floor of Unit 1.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1 To Refuse Permission for the following reasons:

1. *Having regard to:*

- *The lack of information to demonstrate that turning movements associated with parking spaces 17/27 will not interfere with the turning movements of HGV's existing from Building 3.*
- *The failure to provide an adequate amount of parking in accordance with the car parking standards of the Wicklow County Development Plan 2016-2022.*

It is considered that Building 2 would not be provided with a satisfactory amount of parking to meet the needs of the proposed Commercial Vehicle Test Centre and Light Industrial use, and that the layout would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and obstruction of road users.

2. *Insufficient evidence is submitted to demonstrate that the revised surface water attenuation proposals can be accommodated and can meet the needs of the overall scheme. Permitting the development in the absence of this evidence would be prejudicial to public health and would be contrary to proper planning and sustainable development.*

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports (15.11.2017 and 08.02.2018)

- Notes that while an enforcement file has been opened to assess compliance under Planning Application Reference 08/1542, no warning letter or enforcement notices have been issued. On the basis of information available, it appears that Section 35 of the Act would not be applicable in this instance.
- Acknowledges that the building will have a different architectural treatment to the other buildings which are not yet constructed, however, does not consider

that this approach will necessarily be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area. States the proposal is an improvement on the previously refused proposal and that the proposed alterations with red box cladding and glazing will improve the visual appearance of the building from the more open and more visible vistas as travelling from the N/M11 into Greystones. The vista of the building traveling from Greystones to N/M11 is a lot less visible due to existing landscaping along the road.

- Considers that a proposal for a Commercial Vehicle Resting Centre would be in line with the zoning objective which is to provide for employment uses including transport/road dependent uses.
- Notes the autotrack representation showing the turning movements associated with the Test Centre. States that the Roads Section have not indicated any objection to the proposal to turn and exit along the same section of road, however, a one way system would be more advantageous in terms of road safety. This would not be achievable due to the turning movements associated with HGV's from Building 3.
- Concerns regarding car parking provision and that under the Development Plan standards the proposed vehicle testing centre would require c. 50 spaces. There is no room to accommodate spaces at an alternative location within the site. 9 of the spaces would conflict with the HGV movements of Building 3.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Roads Section (10.11.2017 and 26.01.2018): Car parking standards considered acceptable however, notes concern that applicant has not demonstrated that vehicles can safely manoeuvre in and out of spaces taking into account the movements associated with the development granted under application reference 08/1542.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Inland Fisheries (24.10.2017): No objection subject to Irish Water confirming adequate capacity within sewer network and compliance with EPA licence. All construction works to be in line with a Construction Management Plan. Comprehensive surface water management measures must be implemented at the

construction and operational stage to prevent any pollution of the Kilpeddar stream. Policies and recommendations including attenuation made under the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study should be applied in development of a drainage strategy for the site.

Irish Water (28.09.2017): No objection.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

Barbara Murray

- Concerns regarding the height of the development and landscape and visual impact. Notes that there has been extensive filling across the site which has increased the ground levels.
- Objects to potential construction phase impacts.

Geraldine and Keith Brassington

- Concerns regarding waste water disposal from the development and visual impact.

P.D. Lane Associates

- Notes that unauthorised development has taken place on the site since 2016 and that in this context, Section 35 of the Act is applicable. The applicant has demonstrated various serious past failures to comply. Concern that the units will be utilised for retail warehouse and car showroom use, in breach of the parent permission.
- Consider that application is invalid as permission for retention and completion has not been sought. Concerns regarding validity of the site notice and that the development is in breach of relevant fire and building regulations.
- State that the development is contrary to the County Development Plan. No clarity provided regarding access, internal roads, cycle facilities etc. and that there are no proposals for wastewater drainage and attenuation.
- Concerns regarding the visual impact of the development and the lack of a Visual Impact Assessment and photomontages. Consider that the development is piecemeal and not in accordance with the masterplan prepared for the site.

Permission was not given for the construction of one structure and to abandon the remainder to create a planning eyesore at this sensitive location. The design is poorly considered and bears little reference to the architectural quality of the permitted development under Application Reference 08/1542. It will conflict architecturally with the remaining permitted structures and result in a more industrial estate type design.

4.0 Planning History

Planning Authority Reference 17/662

- 4.1 Permission refused for the retention of building no. 2 as constructed under Planning Reg. 08/1542 to include the subdivision of the building into 3 no. units together with all associated site works and services. The reason for refusal stated:

“Having regard to:

The size, height, scale and design of the building,

The location of the building at highly visible and prominent location at a gateway point to Greystones – Delgany a level 3 growth town,

Objective EMP12 of Wicklow CDP 2016-2022 stating that any development on the site be of good architectural design,

Objective EMP11 of Wicklow CDP 2016-2022 stating that employment based developments are to be of the highest standard of architectural design,

it is considered that the building to be retained is seriously injurious to the visual amenities of the area, would materially contravene the objectives of the Wicklow CDP 2016-2022 and would set an undesirable precedent for the treatment and design of the elevations of other buildings permitted in the employment park. This would be contrary to proper planning and sustainable development.”

Planning Authority Reference 08/1542

- 4.2 This is the parent permission pertaining to the site. Permission was granted in February 2009 for an employment park comprising warehousing and light industrial use with ancillary offices to include:

Building 1: 1,584 sq. metres comprising light industrial and ancillary office space.

Building 2: 1,642 sq. metres comprising light industrial and ancillary office space.

Building 3: 4,643 sq. metres comprising warehousing and ancillary office space.

Building 4: 5,672 sq. metres comprising warehousing and ancillary office space.

Access roads/roundabout, car parking c. 370 spaces, landscaping (with access from the Greystones Southern Access Route (R774) off existing roundabout at Bromley) and services including watermains, pumping station and attenuation pond.

- 4.3 Under Planning Authority Reference 14/1052 an extension of duration of this permission was granted until 01.07.2019.

Planning Authority Reference 04/288

- 4.4 Outline permission refused for business, industrial, light industrial park.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1 The operative Development Plan is the Wicklow County Development Plan 2016-2022.

- 5.1.2 The subject site is zoned EMP12 Employment – Kilpedder Interchange: *To provide employment based development to be of the highest standard of architectural design and layout and comply with the Development and Design Standards set out in this plan.*

- 5.1.3 The plan goes on to state:

“Kilpedder Interchange (27.7ha): To provide for employment uses including industrial, transport, distribution or warehouse development of good architectural design, layout and landscaping including substantial screening from the N11. The provision of transport facilities will not be at the expense of facilities in existing settlements. Any redevelopment of the (former) Dan Morrissey/SM Morris sites shall include significant proposals to address the unsightly appearance of these sites. In addition, any development on these lands shall connect the footpath from Greystones towards the pedestrian bridge at Kilpedder.”

- 5.1.4 The following policies and objectives are of relevance:

EMP5:

“To promote the development of employment generating uses at location which comply with sustainable transportation objectives i.e.

- *Promoting the development of ‘product; intensive industries (typically manufacturing and logistics based uses) at locations that are accessible to strategic road infrastructure;*
- *Promoting the development of people intensive industries (typically office, services and start up entrepreneur based uses) at locations that are accessible by public transport networks and substantial residential areas, served by cycle networks and walking routes;*
- *Promoting the intensification of existing employment land uses that are in proximity to good public transport facilities and*
- *Where appropriate, promoting the integration of employment uses with other land uses, including residential, tourism and retail uses, in an effort to provide mixed use developments, which can reduce the need to travel.”*

EMP11:

“To require employment based developments to be of the highest standard of architectural design and layout and comply with the Development & Design Standards set out in this plan.”

5.1.5 Appendix 1 of the plan sets out development and design standards for business, commercial and employment developments. This notes in particular:

“Variation in building form is recommended to reduce the mass of building walls. Overly long rectangular buildings will not generally be acceptable – the impact of these structures will be expected to be softened by breaking up the mass into appropriately stepped sections.

The sides of each building on a site, particularly buildings visible from multiple street frontages shall be consistent in design and should be compatible with other development in the immediate vicinity.

In the case of development of two or more industrial or warehouse buildings, a uniform design, including architectural treatment, roof profiles, boundary fences and building lines is essential.”

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

5.2.1 The nearest Natura 2000 sites are the Glen of the Downs SAC located c. 1.6 km to the north of the site and The Murrow Wetlands SAC/SPA located c. 3.1 km to the east.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- Building 2 was constructed on a similar footprint to that permitted under the parent permission. Amendments to the design of the building were made on foot of tenant requirements. In 2017, retention permission for these amendments was refused. The current application proposes further revisions to the design of the facades.
- Revised site layout drawing submitted indicating that HGV's can turn within the site without infringing on car parking spaces no.s 18 to 29. HGV's serving Building 3 approach the building in a south east direction, and once past the loading dock the HGV will stop and reverse up to the loading dock. When completed, the HGV will then travel in a south east direction around Building 2 and will exit the development in a north westerly direction. It is stated that this one way traffic system is deemed to be the safest way to move HGV's through the site and minimise risk to both employees and the general public. The movements can be achieved without any impact on the car parking spaces proposed.
- State that under the parent permission, building 2 was permitted as a light industrial use which had a requirement for 42 no. car parking spaces. Under the current application, the uses of the 3 units are known as being more akin to warehousing use and thus 27 car parking spaces are provided. Notwithstanding this, revised drawing submitted indicating that 42 no. spaces can be achieved

on the subject site. Note that the Roads Section of Wicklow County Council had no objection to the car parking provision. Having regard to the revised drawing submitted, it is evident that there is no danger to public safety by reason of traffic hazard and obstruction of road users.

- Due to the provision of increased car parking space, it is proposed to provide ground water storage in a holding tank to facilitate surface water run off in lieu of a pond. The holding tank enables the retention of existing vegetation and landscaping, further softening and enhancing the development. It is stated that the provision of a 12.5m x 12.5m underground concrete tank with capacity for 150 cubic metres will combine seamlessly with the proposals put forward under Plan Ref. 08/1452.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

- No response received.

6.3. Observations

P.D. Lane Associates

- Considers development description is misleading as building proposed for retention is not the same as that permitted under Application Reference 08/1542. Notes dispute regarding intellectual property and copyright issues.
- The attenuation proposal only caters for the subject building and does not provide for the remainder of the development permitted under the parent permission. The remainder of surface water from the overall development falls into this corner which has experienced extensive flooding in the past and the revised attenuation solution does not provide for the needs of the overall site.
- The proposed building for retention is a significant departure from the design of the building permitted and will conflict with the remainder of the permitted development. Refers to objective EMP 12 of the County Plan and the requirement for good architectural design for such developments. Considers that Building 2 is not to the same architectural quality of the permitted development and will result in a more industrial estate type of design.

- In light of the proposed use of the building as a Commercial Vehicle Test Centre, a full Traffic Impact Assessment should be carried out by the applicant. Consider the development to be a people based activity, remote from public transport which is contrary to Regional Planning Guidelines. Note that under the parent permission, people based activity was excluded from the development.

Barbara Murray, Old Russian Village, Kilquade

- Concerns regarding visual impact of the development. Considers Building 2 to be inappropriate in terms of materials, height massing and built form.
- Notes ongoing construction activity on the site and concerns regarding potential impacts on the Kilpedder Stream, loss of trees and vegetation.
- Objects to proposed route for HGV vehicles and considers it congested and unsafe. States that the development will transform the area into an industrial zone rather than as a business park, impacting negatively on the residential amenities of the area.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. The main issues are those raised in the grounds of appeal and observations and it is considered that no other substantive issues arise. Appropriate Assessment also needs to be addressed. The issues can be dealt with under the following headings:

- Procedural.
- Principle of Development.
- Design and Visual Impact.
- HGV Access and Parking.
- Surface Water Attenuation.
- Appropriate Assessment.

7.2. Procedural

7.2.1 It is noted that one of the observers raised a number of issues regarding intellectual property rights and copyright. It is considered that this is a legal and contractual issue between the observer and the applicant and outside the scope of this assessment. With regard to the validity of the site notice, it is noted that Wicklow County Council deemed the application to be valid.

7.2.2 Section 3.4 of the Development Management Guidelines 2007 sets out guidance regarding the public notices. It is stated:

“The purpose of the notices, that is, the newspaper notice (Article 18 of the Planning Regulations) and the site notice (Article 19), is to inform the public of the proposed development and alert them as to its nature and extent.....In recent years the amount of detail in the public notice has increased continuously to the extent that such notices frequently include every detail of the proposed development, rather than comprising a brief description the proposed development.....The public notice should therefore be drafted so as to give a brief indication as to the nature and extent of the proposed development and is not required to go into excessive detail.”

7.2.3 Having regard to this guidance, I am satisfied that the nature and content of the site and newspaper notice submitted with the application and at Further Information Stage was sufficient. I am satisfied that third party rights were not prejudiced with the regard to the detail and content of the public notices.

7.2.4 Concerns regarding compliance with the fire and building regulations are not a relevant planning consideration as these issues are assessed under separate regulatory codes.

7.3 Principle of the Development

7.3.1 Under the parent permission pertaining to the site, permission was granted for an employment park comprising warehousing, light industrial and ancillary offices with a total gross floor area of 13,535 sq. metres. It was clarified at Further Information Stage that the now subdivided building will be used in part for a commercial vehicle testing centre. The remaining two units are to be used for light industrial use with ancillary office accommodation. Concerns have been raised by the observers regarding the appropriateness of a commercial vehicle testing centre at this location. In considering this issue, the Planning Authority noted that such a use would be in

line with the zoning objective which is to provide for employment uses including transport/road dependent uses and also that it would be in line with objective EMP5 which promotes the development of product (typically manufacturing and logistics based uses) at locations that are accessible to strategic roads infrastructure.

7.3.2 Under the current County Development Plan, the subject site is zoned EMP12 Employment – Kilpedder Interchange: *To provide employment based development to be of the highest standard of architectural design.* It is further clarified under the specific objectives pertaining to these lands that the objective is to provide for employment uses including industrial, transport, distribution or warehouse development.

7.3.3 Commercial vehicle testing centres are not specifically defined in the Development Plan. However, given that this use would be associated with light and heavy goods vehicles, I would consider this use to be akin to a logistics or transport type of development and thus generally acceptable at this location having regard to the zoning objective. It is stated by one of the observers that under the parent permission, the Planning Authority raised objections to the potential development of 'people based activities' at this site. It is considered by the observer that the proposed commercial vehicle centre constitutes such a use. However, having reviewed the Further Information Request relating to Application Reference 08/1542, the Planning Authorities concerns specifically related to retail warehousing and car showroom use at this location. I do not consider the proposed commercial vehicle centre to be comparable to these types of uses.

7.4 **Design and Visual Impact**

7.4.1 Under the parent application, permission was granted for 4 no. buildings on the site as part of an integrated development proposal with extensive landscaping. To date only one of these buildings, Building no. 2 has been constructed. Some construction work has commenced on the remainder of the development, but it remains largely incomplete. The existing permission expires in July 2019. Building no. 2 as constructed differs significantly from that permitted. Permission was previously refused under Application Reference 17/662 for the retention of this building due to concerns regarding its design and visual impact. The current application seeks

retention of this building and to overcome the previous refusal by making some alterations and amendments to the northern and south western facades.

7.4.2 Under the parent permission Building no. 2 was described as follows:

“This building is situated on an angle of importance on the lower development zone, when approached from the eastern end of the R774 road. Once the end of the building is defined, by way of a solid structure, its glazed elevation stretches the entire length of the façade, giving full visibility into the internal spaces of the building. The architectural elements, are, again similar, as with other buildings in the proposed development – full height glazed curtain walling with steel supports extending out to form a canopy effect over the entire length of the building. There are also feature windows clad in metalwork, perforating the wall of glass. The scale of this unit, when seen in context with the rest of the buildings in an overall setting and parameters of this site, works well in terms of visual impact, scale and mass level.”

7.4.3 A detailed landscape and visual impact assessment and photomontages accompanied the parent application. With regard to Building no. 2, the assessment noted that its siting was in a more exposed area at a higher ground level and that dense woodland planting would be required to screen the new building units to minimise their visual impact.

7.4.4 Concerns have been raised by both observers regarding the architectural quality of the proposed building for retention and its visual impact. I would concur with the view of the observers that the current design of Building no. 2 is significantly different and inferior to that previously approved. Whilst some effort to alleviate the visual monotony of the facades is proposed by the inclusion of red pop out panels and some limited additional fenestration, the appearance of the building remains largely functional and industrial in appearance. The extensive glazing and canopy feature of the permitted building are completely omitted and in this context, I have significant concerns regarding the monolithic appearance of the building and its visual impact, particularly when viewed from the Southern Access Route (R774).

7.4.5 In the assessment of the parent permission, the Planner’s Report noted that the development would result in permanent, dramatic, short range views towards the site, particularly along the Southern Access route on completion. The report noted

that the proposed planting in conjunction with maintenance of existing and proposed vegetation would help ameliorate the impact on views to some extent.

- 7.4.6 It is evident that the development under the parent permission was permitted on the basis of its high quality design and landscaping proposals. It was an integrated design response to this highly exposed and visible site incorporating high quality materials, extensive glazing and screen planting. I consider the proposed modifications to the façades to be tokenistic and do not address the fundamental departure from the development as permitted. I also consider that the development, due to its design and materials will appear incongruous with the remainder of the development as permitted. It is also noted that under the parent permission a landscape masterplan was proposed. To date there has been some limited planting along the northern boundary with the R774. There is a general paucity of detail regarding the landscape proposals under the current application. There are no details regarding the species and age of tree planting proposed. No details of hard and soft landscaping around the subject unit are provided.
- 7.4.7 The objectives and policies of the current County Development Plan make specific reference to the need for high quality design for such employment developments. The zoning objective explicitly references that development should be of the “*highest standard of architectural design*”. This is also reflected in objective EMP 11. Appendix 1 of the plan regarding design standards for business, commercial and employment developments specifically references the need for uniformity in design for such developments.
- 7.4.8 Having regard to the foregoing, I consider that due to the location of the building at a highly visible location, that the development would have a significant visual impact, would be contrary to the objectives and policies of the County Development Plan and would set an undesirable precedent for the treatment and design of the other permitted buildings in the development. I recommend that the development should be refused on this basis. It is noted that this reason for refusal has not been raised by the Planning Authority. However, having regard to the planning history of the site and objections raised by the observers to the appeal, I consider that it is reasonable to refuse the development on this basis.

7.5 HGV Access and Parking

- 7.5.1 One of the reasons for refusal relates to inadequate car parking to serve the development. It is stated by the appellants that the use of two of the units will be warehousing and, therefore, the parking standard for this land use are applicable. It is noted however, at Further Information Stage, the applicant was specifically requested to clarify the nature of the intended uses of each of the 3 units. It was clarified at this stage that one of the units would be a commercial vehicle testing centre and the remaining two units would be light industrial.
- 7.5.2 Table 7.1 of Appendix 1 sets out parking standards. No standard for light industrial use is provided. The development comprises 1,926 of light industrial development including ancillary offices. Based on the manufacturing car parking standard (3 spaces per 100 sq. metre), there would be a requirement for 57 no. spaces. Based on the warehouse standard (1 space per 100 sq. metres), there would be a requirement for c. 20 spaces. The Planning Authority in their assessment considered the development to be more akin to a manufacturing operation. Having regard to the nature of the proposed development, I am satisfied that a higher parking ratio is appropriate.
- 7.5.3 To address the issue of under supply of parking, a revised drawing (site layout 2) is submitted with the appeal indicating that 42 no. car parking spaces can be achieved on the site. I consider this an appropriate level of parking to serve the development and overcomes the reason for refusal imposed by the Planning Authority regarding in adequate parking. If the Board are minded to grant permission for the development, I recommend a condition is imposed requiring parking provision in accordance with this drawing.
- 7.5.4 With regard to the concerns regarding HGV movements associated with Building 3 and potential impacts on the parking provision to serve Building 2, autotrack analysis has been submitted indicating that these movements can be achieved without any impact on the car parking spaces. On this basis, I am satisfied that a refusal on the basis of traffic hazard and obstruction of road users is not warranted.

7.6 Surface Water Attenuation

- 7.6.1 In order to achieve the required higher parking standards on the site, however, the applicant proposes to provide ground water storage under the road in a holding tank to facilitate the surface water run off from the development in lieu of a pond. Under the parent permission (08/1542) it was detailed that the design of the attenuation and long term storage for the site was carried out in accordance with the GDSD. The 100 year attenuation volume was calculated using Qbar (growth) outflow rate from the site as 570 cubic metres to be stored in a dry retention basin located at the eastern corner of the site.
- 7.6.2 Concerns were raised by the Planning Authority in their assessment of the current proposal regarding the adequacy of the attenuation proposals. It is evident from the appeal submission that the proposed attenuation measures with a capacity of 150 cubic metres are designed to serve Unit 2 in isolation. It is stated that the attenuation tank will combine seamlessly with the proposals put forward under Plan Ref. 08/1452. However, as the attenuation basin was the key attenuation measure to serve the entire development, it is unclear if it is to be removed to facilitate the required additional car parking, how the surface water drainage for the entire site will be managed.
- 7.6.3 It is noted that the submission of Inland Fisheries Ireland highlighted the sensitivity of the Kilpedder stream and the need for a comprehensive suite of surface water management measures to be implemented to prevent any pollution to this waterbody. The proposal to provide an attenuation tank to serve building 2 in isolation of a comprehensive attenuation strategy for the entire site is in my view piecemeal. Furthermore, it is noted that no detailed calculations have been submitted to support the attenuation strategy proposed.
- 7.6.4 The current application seeks amendments to the parent permission in its entirety and is not a stand-alone application. Whilst only 1 building has been constructed to date, it is not in my view appropriate to permit an attenuation strategy for Building 2 in isolation. This in my view is an ad-hoc approach and an integrated and compressive solution for the entire site is required.

7.7 Appropriate Assessment

7.7.1 Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, amendments to a previously permitted development, and the distance 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.

8.0 Recommendation

8.1. It is recommended that permission be refused permission for the reasons set out below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the size, height, scale and elevational design of the building to be retained, its location at a highly visible and prominent location adjacent to the Southern Access Road R744 at a gateway point to Greystones/Delgany, and the objectives of the Development Plan including objectives EMP 11 and 12 which require a high level of architectural design for such developments, it is considered that the building to be retained is seriously injurious to the visual amenities of the area, would be incongruous with the design of the other buildings permitted in the employment park and would be contrary to the objectives of the Wicklow CDP 2016-2022. The development to be retained would be contrary to proper planning and sustainable development.
2. On the basis of the information on the file, insufficient evidence is submitted to demonstrate that the surface water attenuation proposals can meet the needs of the overall development. The development would thus be prejudicial to public health and have a potential adverse impact on the water quality of the Kilpedder Stream. The proposed development to be retained would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Erika Casey
Senior Planning Inspector

27th June 2018