



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-303146-18

Development

Change of use of the former Holy Faith convent building from institutional/convent use to residential use with additional floor, comprising 11 units; two apartment blocks comprising 60 units; eight dwellings; and a basement car park

Location

Former Holy Faith Convent Building, St. Brigid's Road, Killester, Dublin 5

Planning Authority

Dublin City Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

3930/18

Applicant(s)

MKN Property Group

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Refuse Permission

Type of Appeal

First Party

Appellant(s)

MKN Property Group

Observer(s)

Sean Haughey; A. Gannon; Carmel Brennan; Jonathon Boyne; Maria and Gerry Cleary; John McNamara &

Others; Bernadette & Eguene Duff;
Aodhan O Riordan; Tommy Martin;
Paul O'Connor & Others; Joan &
Gerry Warnock & Others; Stephanie &
Ian Maxwell; Peter & Jennifer Hanley;
Neil & Nicola Hardy; John Byrne;
Robert Drysdale; Yvonne Higgins &
Richard Murphy & Others; Peter
Cummins; Mary Kinnerney & Others;
Naoise O Muiri; Cristine Ni
Choisdealbha.

Date of Site Inspection

6th March 2019

Inspector

Una O'Neill

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	5
2.0 Proposed Development	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	6
3.1. Decision	6
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	7
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	7
3.4. Third Party Observations	8
4.0 Planning History.....	8
5.0 Policy and Context.....	8
5.2. Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022	8
5.3. Natural Heritage Designations	9
5.4. EIA Screening	10
6.0 The Appeal	10
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	10
6.2. Planning Authority Response	15
6.3. Observations	15
6.4. Observations from Prescribed Bodies.....	20
6.5. Further Responses.....	20
7.0 Assessment.....	22
7.2. Principle of Development	22
7.3. Layout and Density	24
7.4. Impact on the Convent Building	25
7.5. Public Open Space	29
7.6. Residential Amenity	30

7.7. Traffic..... 37

7.8. Water Services..... 39

7.9. Other matters 40

7.10. Appropriate Assessment..... 41

8.0 Recommendation..... 42

9.0 Reasons and Considerations..... 42

10.0 Conditions 42

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site is located to the eastern side of St. Brigid's Road in Killester, approx. 8km northeast of Dublin City Centre. The subject site is approx. 650m from Killester Dart Station and 1.3km from Harmonstown Dart Station.
- 1.2. The site, which has a stated area of 0.99 ha, comprises a vacant convent building dating from the 1930s, St. Marys Convent of the Holy Faith, which is currently unoccupied. The convent was previously used as a residential convent for the Holy Faith Order, with individual bedrooms at the upper level and communal living spaces/kitchen and a chapel room at ground level. The site has two vehicular accesses from St. Brigids Road. The southern-most access serves the convent itself and the northern-most access, which runs along the northern boundary of the site, is a right of way for use by St. Mary's Holy Faith Secondary School, located to the east/rear of the site. It is stated this access serves staff only parking in the school and pedestrian students, with the main vehicular entrance to the school from Brookwood Avenue. On the opposite side of St. Brigid's Road is St. Brigid's Girls National School. North of the site, fronting onto St. Brigid's Road, is an existing two storey dwelling and along the northern boundary is an access laneway serving the rear of dwellings to the north, which front onto Brookwood Road. South of the site is an existing detached bungalow with two storey extension, 1 St. Brigid's Road. A row of semi-detached bungalows (24-27 Abbeyfield) are to the south of no. 1, with a proposed pedestrian access between the boundaries of no. 1 and no. 24. Along the majority of the southern boundary of the site is a playing pitch in the grounds of St. Mary's Holy Faith Secondary School.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the following:
 - 71 apartment units in 3 blocks:
 - Block 1: Change of use of Holy Faith Convent into 11 apartments, 6 of which are duplex units (4 x 1 bed; 5 x 2 bed; 2 x 3 bed) with works including construction of an additional floor at roof level (third floor),

demolition of rear returns, provision of terraces/balconies on the north, south, east and west elevations.

- Block 2: Four storey block (3 storey plus setback) comprising 30 apartments (14 x 1 bed; 16 x 2 bed)
- Block 3: Four storey block (3 storey plus setback), comprising 30 apartments (14 x 1 bed; 16 x 2 bed)
- 75 space basement car park
- 8 x two storey 3-bed terraced houses in two blocks of four, with in-curtilage car parking

2.2. The application is accompanied by an Architectural Design Statement, Drainage Report, Heritage Assessment, Landscape Design Statement, Masterplan Report, Natura Screening Report, Transport Assessment Report, and a Planning Statement.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission REFUSED for the following reasons:

R1: The proposed development, in the absence of an overall masterplan for the contiguous Z15 zoned lands in the area, would materially contravene the Z15 zoning objective and associated policy, as set out in the Dublin City Development Plan 2016 – 2022 (as varied), and in such context would result in the piecemeal and un-coordinated development of these lands, which would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

R2: The proposed development, which would result in the substantial loss of the remaining presentational setting to St. Mary's Holy Faith Convent building, and the addition of a new 2nd floor to the existing St. Mary's Holy Faith Convent building, would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area and would lead to a loss of built heritage contrary to 16.10.17 of the 2016-2022 Dublin City Development Plan, which would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

R3: Due to the siting, scale, mass and height and proximity of the proposed 4-storey apartment Block 02 to proposed Block 01 – the converted Convent Building, it is considered that the proposed development will be visually overbearing to the outlook of the future occupants, thus undermining their residential amenity. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the provisions of the Development Plan Section 16.10 and to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

R4: The proposed development by reason of its scale, height and bulk, proximity to third party boundaries would undermine the development potential of adjoining zoned lands and would therefore result in the piecemeal and un-coordinated development of these lands, which would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

R5: It is considered that the development is premature pending submission of satisfactory information on: daylight, sunlight and micro-climate impacts; traffic management impacts; clarification as to whether trees to be removed are in the control of the applicant; and whether some of the northern boundary trees can be retained with some adjustment to the northern perimeter road.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planning Officer's report generally reflects the decision of the Planning Authority.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Division: No objection subject to condition.

Traffic and Roads Division: Request for further information.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

Over 80 observations were received. The issues raised are largely summarised within the third party observations hereunder.

4.0 Planning History

None.

5.0 Policy and Context

5.1. National Policy

- Project Ireland 2040 National Planning Framework (2018)
- Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DEHLG 2009) and the accompanying Urban Design Manual: A Best Practice Guide (DEHLG 2009)
- Sustainable Urban Housing, Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DHPLG, 2018)
- Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities (DOEHLG, 2007)
- Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DHPLG, 2018)
- Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS) (DECLG and DTTS 2013)

5.2. Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022

- **Zoning Objective Z15 Institutional & Community**, which seeks to ‘protect and provide for institutional and community uses and to ensure that existing amenities are protected’. Residential development is ‘open for consideration’ under this zoning objective. ‘With any development proposal on these lands, consideration should be given to their potential to contribute to the development of a strategic green network (see also Chapter 10 – Green

Infrastructure, Open Space and Recreation), and to the delivery of housing in the city'.

- There is a requirement for proposals on Z15 zoned lands to be accompanied by a masterplan that sets out a clear vision for the zoned lands, to provide for the identification of 25% of the lands for accessible open space and/or community facilities, in lieu of the 10% of public open space normally provided for in the development plan (does not apply if the footprint of the existing buildings > 50% of the total site area of the institutional lands).

- **Section 16.10.17** Retention and Re-Use of Older Buildings of Significance which are not Protected:

In assessing applications to demolish older buildings which are not protected, the planning authority will actively seek the retention and re-use of buildings/ structures of historic, architectural, cultural, artistic and/or local interest or buildings which make a positive contribution to the character and identity of streetscapes and the sustainable development of the city.

- **Section 16.7** Building Height:

Low Rise/Outer City- Maximum Height 16m/5 storeys for residential

- **Strategic Parking Zone 2** - the development is in close proximity to good public transport links. Car parking provision is restricted in Zone 2 on grounds of good public transport links. Residential car parking standard of 1 space /dwelling maximum applies.
- **Plot ratio and Site Coverage:** Plot ratio for Z15 lands: 0.5 – 2.5; Indicative site coverage for Z15 lands: 50%.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

The site is not located within or adjacent to a Natura 2000 site. There are a number of such sites within 15km of the site. The nearest Natura sites are the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024) approx. 2km south of the site; and North Dublin Bay SAC (000206), and North Bull Island SPA (004006), some 2.5km to the south east.

5.4. EIA Screening

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and its location in a serviced urban area, removed from any sensitive locations or features, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The first party grounds of appeal and the issues raised are summarised below. I note revised drawings were submitted and the following changes are noted:

Revised Drawings:

- The roof profile of the terraced dwellings 1-4 and 5-7 have amended from a standard pitched roof to a hipped roof.
- One parking space is provided for each dwelling, in place of previous proposal for 2 spaces.
- The rear terrace to apartment no.3 in the convent building has been relocated from the rear to the north side of the building resulting in the removal of a proposed ope on the rear elevation and an additional door from the living room to the terrace on the northern elevation.
- The windows within the stairwell/liftshaft to Block 2 have been relocated.
- Additional bicycle parking spaces have been added to the basement level.
- The pedestrian basement access now appears to be covered, as per the site plan.
- A landscaped roof is provided for over a section of the basement car park.
- The pathway to the rear of dwellings 5-8 has been repositioned so that it is no longer running along the boundary with 1 St. Brigid's Road.

The above design changes appear to have been made in response to issues raised within the DCC planner's report accompanying the decision.

Summary of Grounds of Appeal:

- A letter from the principal of St. Mary's Holy Faith Secondary School accompanies the appeal submission. It states the school was opened in 1967 and built on lands to the rear of the former convent. The former convent has never formed part of the school and was a private residence for members of the Holy Faith Order. The school is in separate ownership to the convent. The main access to the school is from Brookwood Meadow. Staff vehicular access for 45 staff is allowable via a right of way along the side of the convent site from St. Brigid's Road and student pedestrian access is also allowable via this route. This right of way is to be maintained and separate pedestrian and vehicular access-controlled gates are to be installed which will be controlled by the school. The school is satisfied with the MKN development proposed, subject to appropriate construction management.
- The appeal submission is accompanied by a Social Audit on Community Infrastructure; revised landscape plans; light study by ARC consultants; report by ARC Architectural Consultants on impact on the Holy Faith Convent building; and a Construction Management Plan.
- The principle of the development has been established by planning precedent, including the following similar developments in the area: Manor House View on Watermill Road adjacent to Manor House School; Ardilaun Court on Sybill Hill Road, Seascape on Clontarf Road and Verville Retreat on Vernon Avenue, all undertaken by the applicant, MKN Property Group.

Refusal Reason 1 – response:

- The convent and the school have always been functionally separate and the site area does not include part of the school's main playing pitch, which continues to be located outside of the application site. As per historic maps, the school was developed separately in the 1960s. The masterplan submitted with the application did consider the overall Z15 lands, as indicated on the map submitted which included the adjoining school and playing pitches outlined in green and which are indicated to continue in educational use. The

'Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas (2009) states a masterplan is only to be required for the landholding itself and not adjoining lands under separate ownership which bear no functional relationship to each other.

- Permission granted on other Z15 lands of relevance includes the lands at Carmelite Convent Griffith Avenue (ABP PL29N.246430), where a similar masterplan approach was undertaken and accepted by the Board.

Refusal Reason 2 – response:

- The existing convent building, while being renovated, will continue to be the focal point of the site, framed by the new apartment buildings. The new aspect will centre the front elevation of the convent building.
- The proposed building is being retained and not demolished as per section 16.10.17 of the development plan. The applicant's conservation architect does not agree that the proposed development would result in the substantial loss of the remaining presentation setting. The entrance gates and piers will be restored and moved on axis with the convent building to ensure the convent building will become the central focus of the new development. Precedent for adding levels on historic facades on buildings includes the former Point Depot Venue, the Westin, the Clarence and Davenport Hotels.

Refusal Reason 3 - response:

- Block 1 (convent building) and Block 2 will be at a distance of 11m from their nearest points and the distance increases to 14.7m to both rear returns. At their closest point is a first floor terrace serving a triple aspect apartment and the terrace shall be screened. The central rear section of Block 1 comprises a corridor.
- The quality of the landscaped space between blocks will add to the sense of character and residential amenity, providing for a courtyard feel.
- The overall height of Block 2 is 13m over 4 storeys, which is comparable to the height of amended Block 1 which is 10.5m over 3 storeys. Block 2 sits at a lower level than Block 1, with the ridge height of Block 2 being 44.65 OD and

Block 1 being 43.195 OD. There is an overall height difference of 1.5m between the Convent Block 1 and Block 2.

- Block 2 has an upper floor set back which reduces its bulk and massing, with a variation in the elevational treatment providing for a vertical reading.
- The height relative to the dimensions of the space will ensure the proposal is not overbearing.
- The overall height and plot ratio is in compliance with development plan policy and site coverage at 25% is below development plan coverage of 50%.
- Density is 79 dwellings per hectare.
- Precedents for adding to an existing building and construction of significant buildings within curtilage of a building include following developments: Dublin Landing on North Quays Dublin 1; Verville Clontarf (reg ref 6371/05) and more recent permission to build new apartment blocks to the front and rear; Sheiling Square Raheny; Scott's Church Lower Abbey Street.

Refusal Reason 4 - response:

- The masterplan approach has considered the adjoining lands in its approach.
- Examples of other schemes, where apartments overlooking playing pitches, include: Hazeldene Anglesea Road; Dunluce Anglesea Road; Manor House View Raheny; Mount St. Anne's Milltown; Bushy Park Development Terenure.

Refusal Reason 5 - response:

- A sunlight daylight analysis is now submitted to address refusal reason 5. It is noted that one was not originally undertaken given distance to third party lands and given the fact that daylighting for south and west facing apartments is not an issue for concern.
- The proposed development will not have a negative impact on surrounding properties and will meet standards for access to daylight within the apartments and sunlight to the amenity spaces.
- The roads section requested further information and did not recommend a refusal. A response to the issues raised is now included.

- The car parking arrangement has been amended to the terraced houses on St. Brigid's Road such that there is now only 1 space per dwelling, thereby reducing the number of traffic movements per property and supporting modal shift to public transport. An alternative option to address planning authority concerns is also proposed for an in-curtilage parking area to the rear of houses no. 1-4 in lieu of in-curtilage parking to the front. Parking for units 5-7 would also be provided to the rear in a courtyard setting. Parking to the front is the preferred option for the applicant.
- Access to the school car park was a condition of the sale of the site. This access is to be managed by a key fob or similar device to ensure this access is not used as for school pick up/drop off. The applicant is happy for a condition to this effect to be attached.
- The front boundary line of the dwellings has been set back by 80mm, to allow for an increase in the depth of the footpath to in excess of 4m wide. A revised surface material is proposed to highlight pedestrians crossing of entrance to drivers.
- CCTV cameras and a controlled access gate is now proposed to address pedestrian safety concerns raised. This will be monitored by the management company.
- 107 bicycle spaces are proposed in the basement area.
- Auto-track analysis indicates the site is fully accessible by fire tender vehicles. Bins will be brought to the front of the site by the management company on collection days to negate requirement for bin lorries to enter the site, which is an approach taken in the majority of managed developments.
- A detailed landscape pack is prepared as part of the grounds of appeal.
- The areas to the front of Blocks 1 and 2 and to the side and rear of Block 2 will be the main public open space areas. Open space represents 45% of the site area.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

None.

6.3. Observations

21 observations were received, the grounds of which are summarised as follows:

Zoning Objective

- The school was developed on what was once the convent lands. The school was built in the 1960s with the majority of the staff housed in the convent. As such the school, its playing fields and the convent were in the past all in the same complex.
- Land registry maps indicate the school and developers site in one landholding and playing pitches in a separate landholding, as per maps submitted in this observation. The playing pitches were originally part of Abbeyfield and forms part of a walk and it is assumed this area was transferred to the Holy Faith Trust Company by the Soldiers Trust, who built and managed Abbeyfield and facilities at that time. A 1950s photo, pre the school development, indicates a tree line that separated the school from that site. That tree line is not the line of the developer's site. The convent and school were not always separate plots. As such a masterplan for the whole site should be submitted as requested by DCC.
- The lack of a masterplan undermines the integrity of the Z15 zone.
- The letter submitted by the school is from the principal and not the Board of Management.
- The scale of development does not support the zoning objective of the site and constitutes overdevelopment.
- Z15 objective requires development at the perimeter of the site to have regard to the prevailing height. The surrounding dwellings are single and two storey and are located within a Z2 conservation area. The proposed development will be significantly higher and contrary to section 14.7 of the development plan. Permission for two storey extension and velux have been refused in the

Z2 area as this area is predominantly single storey in nature. The proposal is higher than adjoining Z2 and will impact negatively on Z2 area.

- The area adjoining was designated Z2 in 2005. This area is known as the Killester Garden Villages which encompasses Abbeyfield/The Demense/Middle thirds, a historic development built by a trust, ISSLT, for returning service men from the first world war in 1921. The infrastructure in the area was designed for horse drawn traffic and footpaths are unusually narrow.

Impact on the Convent

- The Convent is a landmark building and is a focal point for local residents. Given the angle of the building, its best view is alongside no. 3 St. Brigid's Road. The proposed layout negates the setting of a landmark building of architectural quality and its relationship with the public realm and the local community.
- The majority of the building will be obstructed by the proposed eight houses.
- With regard to the street aspect, the eight dwellings would represent over-development of the site. There is a need to protect the frontage/green space and the convent building's character. As well as this, the open space would have climate change benefits and would abate flooding on the site.
- The proposed amendments to the convent building and its setting amount to a loss of built heritage and would negatively impact the local streetscape. References by the applicant to city centre commercial developments is not comparative to this suburban location.
- The proposed additional floor detracts from and is not uniform with the original red brick design. The roof and chimney complements the building and must be retained. The proposed second floor setback and part of the third storey glazing and metal guard are obtrusive.

Residential and Visual Amenity

- The height and density of the apartment blocks will negatively affect existing properties in terms of overlooking and overshadowing with loss of trees which

provide natural screening. Block 2 is located 11m from the northern boundary of the site.

- Density is high and proposal makes no contribution regarding the provision of community facilities and/or social infrastructure.
- The proposed development will be significantly higher and contrary to section 14.7 of the development plan. The Abbeyfield area is zoned Z2 and is predominantly bungalow/low rise in form. The proposal would dwarf and overlook the existing low rise housing. The proposal undermines the Z2 zoning objective.
- 24-27 Abbeyfield will be affected in terms of overlooking from large south windows and balconies on the southwestern end of Block C.
- The outline of no. 1 and 24-27 are incorrect on the maps. Block C is closer than the stated 20m on the basis of satellite imagery. These dwellings are within the conservation zone.
- Block 3 will result in loss of trees in the southern section of the site. This has an impact also on habitats. The applicant states 38 of the 44 trees on site are to be removed.
- The proposal will result in overshadowing and overlooking of no. 3 St. Brigid's Road. House no.1 should be omitted to mitigate this. There are inconsistencies on the drawings submitted in relation to proposed house 1, with two different ridge heights given for the dwelling, ie 42.295mOD and 42.15mOD. The north elevation of proposed dwelling no. 1 has windows on the side elevation, which does not match the floor plans where no windows are indicated. The mass and bulk of proposed dwelling no. 1 relative to no.3 is excessive and will result in overshadowing. The house should be omitted, or the house should be reduced in size and scale. Alternatively the vehicular access should be relocated along the northern boundary and the dwellings moved further south. No. 3 St. Brigid's Road will also be overlooked from the Convent.
- The ridge height of no. 3 St. Brigid's Road is 40.882mOD. There are windows on its side elevation. Proposed dwelling no.1 is 3.8m from the gable of

existing dwelling no.3 and a separation to the site boundary of 1.48m. The proposed dwelling has an excessive depth of 14m, projecting 4.5m beyond the rear established building line. The proposed dwelling has an overall height of 9.29m and is capable of supporting accommodation at roof level. The proposal will result in overshadowing. Table 2.2 of the sunlight/daylight report notes that the change in sunlight access for zone 3 (which relates to no. 3) will be noticeable. The report states no. 3 will experience a noticeable and potential adverse reduction in sunlight access to windows during the period September to March, however it is noted that these windows do not face within 90 degrees due south and therefore do not have a reasonable expectation of sunlight within the meaning of the BRE guide. The impact is therefore stated to be moderate. The third party notes that the ARC report fails to show the shadowing effect on the front, rear and side fenestrations of no.3.

- The sunlight daylight analysis and letter from school were not submitted with the original application and should not be accepted at this stage.
- It is not clear if the sunlight-daylight analysis is based on the original submitted layouts or the amended layouts.
- Private open space for the proposed dwellings is substandard given scale of the dwellings and should be 70sqm in area.
- Precedent quoted in relation to other developments is not relevant to this site.
- Impact of construction traffic in terms of congestion, pedestrian safety, dust, noise and parking.

Traffic Impact

- Although there is a good public system, school and commuter traffic is very heavy on the narrow road between the R107 (Malahide Road) and the R109 (Howth Road). There will be significant additional traffic arising, with up to 75 additional vehicles on this small road, putting public safety in danger.
- A traffic survey commissioned by residents is included within one of the observations to the appeal.

- Traffic congestion around the schools will be increased with this development and will give rise to traffic hazard for pedestrians using the schools (primary and secondary) as well as cars and motorcyclists. St. Brigid's Road is a link between Malahide Road and Howth Road and the road is a bottleneck at school times.
- Existing footpaths are too narrow at 0.65m to 1.84m wide. The road is 5.8m wide. The proposal will result in a traffic hazard for pedestrians, particularly young children accessing the schools.
- Inadequate level of parking proposed will result in difficulties for surrounding area.
- Construction traffic will be problematic also.
- The laneway with a 'right of way' behind the houses on Brookwood Road was extinguished in 1995. This is a gated private laneway. There is access shown to this laneway which is not permitted.

Water Services

- The water service is deficient already in Killester and the proposed development will have a negative effect on this service. The area was without water for four months in 2010 and water was provided in tankers. Provisions had to be made for local schools also and some members of the public installed additional water tanks and pumps in their houses. From that time, renovations were carried out to the older houses in the area and additional water tanks were installed also.
- Since 2010 the water service has been unreliable, they are restricted in the times it can be used to wash clothes, and there are issues with water pressure. There are concerns about the impact of the proposed development on the water supply for the area. Where there is an inadequate supply, the proposed houses and apartments should not be permitted.
- Water pressure in the area is extremely low and has led to issues for dwellings in the area. The area has a history of water charges, drainage issues and flooding.

- The land between the development and Abbeyfield does not have drainage like most other developments, with surface water from houses and roads going through French drains in the adjoining playing fields. The proposal would destroy these French drains. Flooding is an issue in the area. Once excavation commences it will affect the drainage from the playing fields adjoining Block 3.
- There is a lack of information on the file in relation to foul sewer and surface waters. Irish Water states an existing 300mm pipe 'is thought to enter the site'.

6.4. Observations from Prescribed Bodies

6.4.1. An Taisce

- It is desirable that the setting of the structure be maintained and that the site is not overdeveloped in this regard.
- It is preferable that the existing pitched roof and chimney stacks to the former convent building are maintained. Policy CHC4 in relation to conservation areas applies.

6.5. Further Responses

The applicant submitted on the 31st January a response to the observations to the appeal, which is summarised as follows:

- Proximity of Block C:
 - An amended site layout plan is submitted showing separation distances from Block C to nearby properties. The updated plan reflects the up-to-date built status of these properties having regard to imagery taken from google maps and from a planning application made on no. 24 Abbeyfield.
 - The 3 properties, no. 1, no. 24 and no. 25 Abbeyfield are not located to the rear of Block C. The side gable of Block C is to the rear of no. 1.
 - The gable end of Block C is 19m from the rear ground return of 1 St. Brigid's Road and 27m from the first floor of the house; windows on the gable

elevation could be either opaque glazed or high level glazing should the Board wish to attach a condition in this regard.

- Block C is approx. 28m from the rear extension of 24 Abbeyfield and at an angle which is not capable of overlooking the property.
- Block C is approx. 30 from the rear boundary of 25 Abbeyfield and approx. 40m from the rear of that dwelling.
- The rear of Block C faces southeasterly and does not directly overlook no. 24 and no. 25.
- Existing trees to the rear of no. 25 also provide additional screening.
- Site Boundaries and Interpretations:
 - While they have a common folio, the Holy Faith Secondary School and the Convent are separate entities from an operational and management perspective and the convent never formed part of the secondary school's operation. The convent was a private residence for members of the Holy Faith Order. The school will not be affected materially and the right of way to the school is being maintained. The school will continue to have the ability to develop in the future within their own extensive grounds, should the need arise.
 - The masterplan did consider and include the combined school and convent site. The school lands are indicated and the masterplan highlights that it and its playing pitches are to be retained in educational use, as is the aim highlighted in the letter from the school submitted with the application. The letter to MKN from the principal which has been submitted with this application states the school has 335 students and has some capacity for expansion in terms of enrolment and/or sports facilities.
 - The applicant considers the masterplan is clear in it's vision for the combined sites of the convent and the school.

7.0 Assessment

7.1.1. I consider that the relevant issues in determining the current appeal before the Board are as follows:

- Principle of development
- Layout and Density
- Impact on the Convent Building
- Public Open Space
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic
- Water Services
- Other Matters
- Appropriate Assessment

7.2. Principle of Development

7.2.1. The proposed development is located on lands zoned 'Objective Z15', which seeks to 'protect and provide for institutional and community uses and to ensure the existing amenities are protected'.

7.2.2. Residential development is 'open for consideration' within this zoning objective, and the development plan states that with any development proposal on these lands, consideration should be given to their potential to contribute to the development of a strategic green network and to the delivery of housing in the city. The development of Z15 zoned lands is subject to the preparation of a masterplan and the provision of 25% of the lands for open space and/or community uses, which has the potential to form part of a strategic green network. It is stated that the 25% of the public open space shall not be split up, unless site characteristics dictate otherwise.

7.2.3. Section 14.8.14 of the Dublin City Development Plan further states that where there is an existing institutional and/or community use, the following is required to be demonstrated:

- How the proposal is in accordance with and assists in securing the aims of the zoning objective
- How it secures the retention of the main institutional and community uses on the lands, including space for any necessary expansion of such uses
- How it secures the retention of existing functional open space e.g school playing fields
- The manner in which the nature and scale of the proposal integrates with the surrounding land uses

7.2.4. Dublin City Council are of the view that a masterplan has not been submitted and the observations to the appeal also note this and the inadequacy of the masterplan document submitted. The applicant argues that the masterplan submitted includes the secondary school in its consideration and complies with development plan policy in relation to Z15 lands. The masterplan does not include the school in the red line boundary as it is not in the applicant's ownership. It is stated that the Board has accepted a similar approach to this masterplan in other developments.

7.2.5. The applicant has submitted a document titled 'Masterplan Report' which includes a masterplan map showing the application site and the school lands, with the school lands indicated in green on one of the maps. While the applicant states the school and convent are separate, it is clear that the convent was developed first and its lands at some stage in the past (in the 1930s) were subdivided to allow for the development of the school site. I acknowledge, as stated, that they have always operated separately, with the convent building not utilised as a school facility for students, and the school has a right of way from St. Brigid's Road along the northern edge of the convent building. The convent is no longer used as a residence for members of the holy order. The school principal has stated in a letter submitted with the appeal response that the school has adequate lands for its needs.

7.2.6. The Masterplan Report submitted, in my view, constitutes a masterplan, addresses the contiguous Z15 zoned lands, and is adequate. I consider the refusal reason of a material contravention of the zoning objective to be unjustified and an erroneous interpretation of the development objectives in the development plan, given a masterplan has been submitted, and therefore the Board should not consider itself restrained by section 37(2). The main existing community uses are being retained on

the overall Z15 parcel of land, that is, the school to the east and the school to the west and I note that the previous use of the building as a residence for nuns is no longer required. The existing playing field associated with the school will remain and will not be impacted upon. While the observers contend it is not clear if a portion of the land adjoining the playing pitch was in the school ownership given the angle of the site boundary now erected, the applicant states that this area was not part of the playing pitch. Either way, the proposal will not reduce the area of the playing pitch itself, which will remain functional alongside the application site. The issues in terms of compliance with the requirement of 25% public open space and/or community use will be assessed further hereunder. I consider the principle of the proposed development to be appropriate at this location and generally in compliance with the zoning objective for the area, as set out in the operative Dublin City Development Plan.

7.3. Layout and Density

- 7.3.1. The site is an irregular rectangular shape, with road frontage of approx. 91m, reducing to a principal width of approx. 55m and a principal depth of approx. 119.8m. The convent building (referred to as Block 1) is positioned centrally within the site and is approx. 55m from the street. Two new apartment blocks (Blocks 2 and 3) are proposed to the side and rear of the convent/Block 1. I note that Block 3 to the south is referred to within some of the observations/responses as Block C - in the interests of clarity, I will refer to Block C as Block 3 in this report. The development comprises two sets of four terraced houses along the western edge of the site with St. Brigid's Road, with each dwelling served by an individual access onto the street. A central vehicular/pedestrian access will replace the northern most access points, with this access curving north in front of the convent building and run along the northern boundary of the site, where the existing access is located. The access road will serve the basement car park to the rear and also limited access for staff/students over an existing right of way to the school to the rear/east. A pedestrian only access with an access controlled gate is proposed to the southwest from St. Brigid's Road and this access runs between dwellings 1 St. Brigid's Road and 24 Abbeyfield. This access, which existed in the past, is currently overgrown and blocked. The

hardstanding area immediately to the front of the convent is to be changed to a green open space area, with an underground attenuation tank within this space.

- 7.3.2. The proposed density of development is 79 units per hectare. The plot ratio is stated to be 0.7 (recommended range of 0.5-2.5) and site coverage is stated to be 25% (allowable coverage of 50%).
- 7.3.3. The maximum height of the development is approx. 13.5m, which is below the height restriction of 16m, as set out within the development plan.
- 7.3.4. I note of number of observations consider the proposal to amount to overdevelopment of the site.
- 7.3.5. With regard to policy guidance, I note the appeal site is located on a zoned and serviced site within an urban area, in close proximity to a range of services and is proximate to a number of high quality public transport services, including the DART. It is an objective of the NPF to support the growth of cities versus their outward expansion through increase densities and better utilisation of existing sites within urban areas. Development at the density proposed is in my view acceptable, subject to compliance with the zoning requirement for 25% open space and further assessment of qualitative standards, as set out hereunder.

7.4. Impact on the Convent Building

- 7.4.1. With regard to refusal reason 2 as issued by the planning authority, the applicant argues that the building is not protected and is not within a conservation area. It is stated that the development approach maintains the convent building as a central part of the development and views of the building will be retained from the street between the two sets of terraced dwellings. It is contended that the addition of a floor will not detract from the character of the building and is overall supportive of the development plan policy in relation to retention and reuse of older buildings of significance which are not protected.
- 7.4.2. A number of observers raise concerns with regard to the proposal to construct houses to the front of the site, detracting from the character and setting of the convent building and its contribution to the streetscape. The Convent is considered a landmark building and is a focal point for local residents. Given the angle of the building, it is contended that its best view is alongside no. 3 St. Brigid's Road. It is

stated that the proposed layout negates the setting of a landmark building of architectural quality and its relationship with the public realm and the local community. Concerns are also raised in relation to the addition of a floor onto the convent and its impact on the character of this historic building.

- 7.4.3. The concerns raised in relation to the impact on the building are twofold - I will address hereunder the impact of the development on the character of the building itself with the addition of a floor at upper level and the impact of the development on the setting of the building from the streetscape.

Impact of Additional Floor on the Character of the Convent

- 7.4.4. Section 16.10.17 of the development plan states that the planning authority will actively seek the retention and re-use of buildings/structures of historic, architectural, cultural, artistic and/or local interest or buildings which make a positive contribution to the character and identity of streetscapes and the sustainable development of the city. I note the convent building is not protected, however I consider it is part of the historic built heritage of the area, it contributes to the streetscape, and is of value to retain. The applicant's proposal for reuse over demolition is therefore welcomed.
- 7.4.5. A heritage assessment of the building was submitted with the planning application. It is stated that the building was constructed in the 1930s and is of redbrick with limestone detailing around openings at ground level, limestone string courses, limestone cornicing, and a limestone break at the entrance with a moulded limestone pediment above. A limestone colonnade and steps form an open porch outside the front door. The building is in a miniature neo Georgian style, not uncommon of the period and generally used for official buildings. The modesty of the building is thought to reflect the ethos of the nuns who lived in it. The building was vacated by the last three nuns in 2018. It is proposed to convert the building into apartments and demolish what the heritage report terms 'confusing returns' to the rear of the building. There is a chapel at the southern end of the building which is to be converted into an apartment, the larger ground floor rooms will also be converted into apartments served by terraces and the cell-like nuns bedrooms (located off a central corridor at first floor level) will be converted into duplex units, linked with the new floor above. The heritage report states the convent 'does not have real heritage

value but it is worth keeping'. Internal photos of the existing building are included within the report.

- 7.4.6. The addition of the new floor onto the convent will involve the removal of the hipped roof and loss of traditional chimney stacks. The additional floor will result in a 0.2m increase in the overall height of the building and the floor will be set back 1.5m from the front elevation of the building. It is to be constructed of zinc and has a flat roof form. An additional report within the first party grounds of appeal from the conservation architect notes that the addition of a zinc clad second floor will change the character of the building, however it is stated that the principal elevational features of the building will remain and the second floor is simple and modern in design with the stated intent of minimising its visual presence. It is contended that there is considerable precedence to adding additional levels above historic facades (the Point Depot, the Clarence, the Westin and Davenport hotels, Air BnB). I note the proposed new floor will alter the character of the building, however I am of the view that given the main structure of the convent will be retained and given the set-back modern design of the additional floor, the proposed floor would not be so visually obtrusive as to warrant a refusal. I note that this is not a protected structure and the facilitation of an additional floor will support the long term retention and reuse of this building in a highly accessible urban location.

Impact of Proposed Dwellings on the Setting of the Convent

- 7.4.7. The convent building is set back approx. 55m from St. Brigid's Road. I consider the existing building, in terms of its setting makes a positive contribution to the streetscape and to the character and identity of the area.
- 7.4.8. The positioning of the terraced dwellings to the front of the convent building will obscure to a significant degree the current views of the building as one travels along St. Brigid's Road. I note the existing building is angled toward St. Brigid's Road and is aligned with the opposite cul-de-sac of School Avenue. It's presence is particularly dominant/visible as one travels south along the St. Brigid's Road, with it being more limited as one travels north due to the curve in the street and the setback/angle of the building. The proposed central vehicular access to the development is stated to be aligned to the centre of the building, however, given the building is angled toward the street, the proposed entrance does not, in my view, maximise upon the view of

the building. Its contribution to the streetscape would be extremely limited as a result of the positioning of the proposed dwellings and the entrance.

- 7.4.9. While the applicant argues that there are precedents of other newer developments being built on the grounds of historic buildings, I would note that each application is assessed on its own merits and is not directly comparable in terms of site context and the scale of buildings/sites. Having said that, I would note that in a number of the cases quoted, new buildings and apartments were constructed to either side of, but not to the front of, the historic buildings in question, such as Shieling Square (with its historic building setback c.54m from the street); and Auburn House (setback c.43m from the street). Where buildings are built along the front of sites comprising historic buildings, eg Bushy Park House, these sites tend to be greater in scale with the historic building positioned deeper within the site and having limited presentation toward/visibility from the street, with sufficient separation distances between the new development and historic building to allow it to contribute to the character of the new development, as opposed to the street.
- 7.4.10. In this instance, the area to the front of the convent building is not, in my view, so significant in depth (approx. 55m from the street) as to allow for a sufficient separation between the proposed dwellings and the existing building to support its setting within the scheme, and the current layout does not support the building contributing in a meaningful way to the streetscape. I am of the view that given the angle of the building toward the street, there is space on site to accommodate dwellings 5-8, however, proposed dwellings 1-4 should be omitted to allow the existing building retain a setting and visibility from the street, and to continue to contribute in a positive way to the character and history of the area. Should the Board be minded to grant permission, I recommend dwellings 1-4 be omitted from the proposed development. I refer to other issues hereunder in this report regarding houses 1-4 and impact on the amenity of the area and future residents.

Apartment Blocks and Visual Impact on Convent

- 7.4.11. Having considered the positioning of the new apartments blocks to the side and rear of the convent, behind its front building line, and having considered the separation distances and depth of the site from the street, in addition to the overall height differences between the convent and the new blocks, I am of the view that the site is

of sufficient scale to visually accommodate the additional development of the apartment blocks, while supporting the character and context of the redeveloped convent and the distance between the convent/Block 1 and Block 3 in this regard is adequate and does not warrant a refusal of permission.

7.5. Public Open Space

- 7.5.1. Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 requires that 25% of Z15 lands be retained as public open space/in community use. The applicant states that a central open space area has been created in the scheme, which equates to 32,000sqm/32% of the lands within the red line boundary. It is further stated that overall 45,000sqm/45% of the site area will be given over to open space. A revised drawing was submitted with the grounds of appeal titled 'Communal Open Space', which relates to the area to the front of the convent building, to the south of the building in front of Block 3, the space between the blocks, the strip to the east of Block 2 and the pedestrian access route along the southern edge of the site. The plan states that this area is 3200 sqm, ie 32% of the site. The plans submitted do not differentiate between public open space, communal open space, and access/residual strips.
- 7.5.2. From a review of the drawings submitted, I consider the main public open spaces are the green area to the front of the convent (approx. 960sqm in area by my calculation) and the green with a small play area to the northwest of Block 3 (approx. 500sqm in area). I consider that the remaining elements of landscaping to the rear and between blocks, while of landscape and amenity value, are residual/semi-private/communal in nature and therefore should not be included within the calculation of accessible public open space. I assess separately hereunder the issue of communal space. Public open space provision is therefore in the region of 1460sqm, which equates to approx. 14% open space and not the 32% stated by the applicant. This is below the 25% required for Z15 zoned lands.
- 7.5.3. Should the Board be in agreement with my previous assessment recommending the omission of the proposed terrace of four dwellings 1-4 south of 3 St. Brigid's Road for reasons relating to the setting of the convent, then an additional area of approx. 1000sqm would be provided which could be incorporated as public open space, which would result in an overall area of approx. 25% accessible open space. I would consider this revised level of open space provision to be acceptable and more

supportive of the Z15 zoning objective, as well as supportive of green infrastructure policies, with an improved level of accessibility to such a space to the front of the site by the wider community.

7.6. Residential Amenity

- 7.6.1. I have considered the design of the development with regard to the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, as well as the impact of the design on future residents of the scheme.

Amenity of Neighbouring Residential Properties to the South

- 7.6.2. Concerns are raised within the submitted observations in relation to the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of neighbouring dwellings south of the site, which front onto St. Brigid's Road. Specific concerns relate to overdevelopment, overlooking, loss of privacy, visual overbearance, and overshadowing.
- 7.6.3. Block 3 is located along the southern boundary of the site adjoining the existing playing fields associated with St. Mary's Secondary School. The building presents its side elevation to the rear boundary of 1 St. Brigid's Road and is in proximity to the rear boundaries of 24-27 Abbeyfield, with a pedestrian access along the boundaries of no. 24 and no.1.
- 7.6.4. Block 3, which comprises four storeys with an overall height of 13.35m (14.25m if lift overrun is included), is positioned 2.2m at its closest point to the rear boundary of 1 St. Brigid's Road and approx. 5m at its furthest point. 1 St. Brigid's Road appears as a bungalow when viewed from the front, however it has been extended and is a full two storey to the rear with an additional two storey rear return. The neighbouring dwellings to the south are bungalows. 1 St. Brigid's Road has a rear garden depth of approx. 15-24m, with the rear most element of the dwelling being 19m from the gable of apartment Block 3. The gable end of the building comprises one window per floor serving a living room (and an ensuite at the upper level) and there are attached balconies to the southern elevation with a terrace at the third floor level on the southern and northern elevations. I note that the upper floor of the apartment building is recessed on the northern and southern side but is not recessed at the gable ends.

- 7.6.5. Given the proximity of this 4 storey building to the rear boundary with 1 St. Brigid's Road, in addition to the close proximity of the terraces at the upper level on the northern and southern elevations, I consider the height of the apartment building would be visually dominant and overbearing when viewed from the rear of 1 St. Brigid's Road, would result in overshadowing, and would result in significant disamenity to that dwelling due to the close proximity of the terraces at the upper level.
- 7.6.6. While I consider the site given its scale and individual identity can cater for increased heights of four stories without impacting on the character of the adjoining conservation area or the school, I consider that a step down in height at the boundary with 1 St. Brigid's Road is required to mitigate impacts in terms of overbearance and increased perception of overlooking. Should the Board be minded to grant permission, I recommend the omission of apartment 71 from Block 3 and a condition in relation to the design of the end of the terrace to apartment no. 70. I note the balconies below this on the southern elevation are a mix of recessed and externally designed balconies. I consider the apartments with the external balconies closest to this boundary should be redesigned to incorporate recessed balconies, that is those balconies serving apartment no.s 57 and 65, in order to protect the residential amenity of no. 1. I note that these apartments are two bed units and a redesign may result in an amendment of the apartment type. A condition in relation to the final design is recommended. With regard to the other balconies and windows on this elevation and potential impact on dwellings 24-27 Abbeyfield, I am of the view, given the distance to the boundaries of 24-27, the distances from the rear elevations of the dwellings themselves, and the angle of the building relative to those sites, that the height of the apartment block and its design will not result in significant overlooking or loss of privacy to those dwellings.
- 7.6.7. I do not consider overlooking of the schools playing pitches to be an issue for the school or for future residents nor do I consider the proximity to this boundary will hinder the development potential of the adjoining school site as suggested by refusal reason 4, issued by the planning authority. I note the playing fields are in use by the school and are required to be retained, as per the Z15 zoning objective.
- 7.6.8. I note the position of the playground area close to the northern elevation of Block 3 and in close proximity to the trees to be retained. To protect the amenity of future

residents from noise nuisance arising from the playground and to ensure as little impact on trees to be retained as possible, I consider that should the Board be minded to grant permission, and be in agreement with my previous recommendation in relation to the omission of dwellings 1-4, the proposed playground should be relocated to the front of the site in the area of dwellings 1-4. This has the added benefit of being easily accessible to the public, which is a requirement of the Z15 zoning objective.

- 7.6.9. I note the pedestrian access between dwellings no. 1 and no. 24 forms part of the site and this access was open in the past with bollards allowing pedestrian access. It is not clear when this access became disused. I consider the proposal to re-establish this access for the residents of the scheme only appropriate and the provision of a pedestrian gate accessible by residents only at this location is in the interests of safety and security of users as well as dwellings no. 1 and no. 24.

Amenity of Neighbouring Residential Properties to the North

- 7.6.10. At present the northern boundary of the site is defined by an access road (right of way) to the school site to the rear/east of the site. As noted previously, the applicant proposes to alter the eastern end of this route and in its place proposes 4 dwellings, numbered 1-4, neighbouring an existing dwelling, 3 St. Brigid's Road. The dwellings have an overall height of 9.3m, are 5.6m wide and 14.3m deep, with a hipped roof for the end of terrace dwellings. The dwellings are 3 bed with the internal stairs providing full access to the attic level, which has an internal floor to ceiling height of 2.4m, allowing for this level to be easily converted to a habitable room. I note that the proposed dwellings are quite deep and the proposed dwelling no. 1 would extend 4.5m beyond the existing rear extent of 3 St. Brigid's Road.
- 7.6.11. Concerns have been raised in the observations in relation to the impact of the proposed housing on 3 St. Brigid's Road, to the north, specifically in relation to overshadowing, loss of light and overbearance. Refusal reason 5 as issued by the planning authority, related to a lack of information submitted, including the lack of a sunlight daylight analysis. This has now been submitted as part of the grounds of appeal and I note this has been circulated to all parties, which I consider acceptable.
- 7.6.12. The applicant has revised the design of the dwellings in the appeal. The dwellings, which were pitched roof in design, now have hipped roofs. While it is not stated why

this design change has been introduced, I note that the overall height and depth of the dwellings was raised as an issue in the planner's report. I note that the sunlight daylight analysis submitted does not incorporate the revised design, which I consider would improve upon the level of overshadowing given the hipped roof design.

- 7.6.13. Proposed dwelling 1 will, nonetheless, result in increased overshadowing on 3 St. Brigid's Road, given it is positioned south of that dwelling and given its height and depth. The side elevation of 3 St. Brigid's Road, being an end of terrace dwelling has side windows and a side dormer. The sunlight daylight analysis states that the rear facing windows of no. 3 St. Brigid's Road have a potential to experience a significant reduction in sunlight during the period from September to March. The proposal is not predicted to impact adversely on sunlight access to the rear garden of no. 3, with slight to moderate additional overshadowing of the garden. While it is reasonable to expect some level of overshadowing from neighbouring dwellings within an urban location, it is my view that in this instance, given the Z15 zoning objective of the adjoining site, further consideration must be given to protecting the impact of the development on this dwelling.
- 7.6.14. The occupant of 3 St. Brigid's has stated in their observation that their preference is for the access road/right of way as it exists along the boundary of their site be retained in its current position, or alternatively dwelling 1 should be omitted/reduced in scale. Given the issues I have previously discussed in relation to the impact of dwellings 1-4 on the setting of the convent, public open space issues, and non-compliance with private open space standards (discussed hereunder), I consider it appropriate that dwellings 1-4 be omitted from the scheme and the existing access road be maintained in its current location with some modifications allowable to bring it up to standard to serve the new apartments proposed. This would address the impact of the development on 3 St. Brigid's Road and also allow for possible further retention of additional trees along this section of the site.
- 7.6.15. Should the Board not be minded to omit dwellings 1-4, I consider it reasonable that a condition be attached to any grant whereby proposed dwelling no. 1 is reduced in depth so that the two storey body of that dwelling is in line with 3 St. Brigid's Road, which would result in an approx. reduction in the depth of proposed dwelling no. 1 by 4.5m.

Private Open Space - Houses

- 7.6.16. I note the Dublin City Development Plan states a minimum standard of 10sqm of private open space per bedspace should normally be applied. Generally, up to 60-70sqm of rear garden area is considered sufficient for houses in the city.
- 7.6.17. Proposed dwelling 1 has a garden of 68sqm; no. 2 has 45sqm; no. 3 has 41sqm; and no. 4 has 45sqm. The required minimum private open space for dwellings 2-4, which have 5 bedspaces per dwelling, falls below the minimum requirement of 50sqm. I further note that the attic level has been designed to be able to cater for a habitable room, which could result in an additional 2 bedspaces. It is my view, as noted above, that dwellings 1-4 should be omitted from the development for reasons relating to the impact on the convent building, impact on 3 St. Brigid's Road and also as discussed here due to the substandard provision of private open space.
- 7.6.18. I note proposed dwellings 5-8 provide for 54sqm and above. The dwellings meet the minimum private open space standards for the number of bed spaces shown. However, given the restricted site sizes relating to dwellings 5-8, should the Board be minded to grant permission and retain these dwellings, it would be reasonable to include a condition removing exempt development provisions in this instance to ensure impacts of any future extension above what is permitted is fully considered, particularly with regard to the potential for additional accommodation at attic level already designed into the dwellings.

Proximity of Block 2 and Impact on Apartments within Convent

- 7.6.19. In response to refusal reason 3 as issued by the planning authority, the applicant considers the siting, scale, mass and height of Block 2 relative to Block 1 is appropriate. It is stated that the internal design of the apartments within the convent with a hallway to the rear central block reduces potential of overlooking, furthermore while there is a first floor terrace close to one of the apartments within the convent, it is noted the apartment in the convent has a triple aspect and the proposed balcony in the apartment in Block 2 will be screened.
- 7.6.20. The convent is u-shaped and its northern arm is 11m at its closest point to Block 2, therefore overlooking and outlook is a consideration. I note the central block of the convent is 14.7m from Block 2 with a hallway along the rear elevation, therefore there are no issues from this section of the building in terms of overlooking. While

the apartments in the northern arm/return of the convent are close to Block 2, I consider that design solutions have mitigated to a sufficient degree direct overlooking and given the orientation of the buildings on the site in terms of the path of the sun, the level of sunlight/daylight into opposing apartments will not be so significantly impacted upon as to raise serious concern in terms of residential amenity of future residents. I also note the applicant in the grounds of appeal has relocated the rear ground level terrace to the side of the convent, and omitted the associated ope from the rear elevation, thereby reducing the level of opes directly facing Block 2 and allowing greater perception of space at ground level between the two buildings.

Conclusion

7.6.21. Overall, I consider the site is set apart from its neighbouring properties in terms of its design and is of sufficient scale to set its own character. I consider that, subject to conditions, the proposed development will not be seriously injurious to the amenity of existing residents or future residents within the scheme and is appropriate for the site context on this highly accessible serviced urban site.

Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Design Standards for New Apartments (March 2018)

7.6.22. The Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Design Standards for New Apartments (March 2018) contain several specific planning policy requirements (SPPR) with which the proposed apartments must comply. Schedules were submitted to demonstrate compliance with the standards. I have reviewed the schedules submitted and the plans against the 2018 guidelines.

7.6.23. The minimum floor areas specified in the guidelines are as follows: 45sqm for a one-bedroom unit, 73sqm for a two-bedroom four person unit and 90sqm for a three bedroom unit). There is a two-bed three person category whereby the minimum floor area is 63sqm. The guidelines states that no more than 10% of the total number of units in any private residential development may comprise this category of two-bedroom three-person apartment. The total number of two-bed units proposed in this scheme is 32 with 4 of these being two bed three-person type units – two are located at ground level in each of Block 2 and Block 3. The total number of apartments in the

scheme is 71, therefore these 4 apartments represent 6% of the scheme and are acceptable.

7.6.24. 24 of the apartments within the overall scheme are single aspect. None of these are north facing. This is acceptable.

7.6.25. Room sizes and storage spaces appear to be in line with the standards set out in the guidelines, as per the schedule submitted.

7.6.26. It is a specific planning policy requirement that ground level apartment floor to ceiling heights shall be a minimum of 2.7m and this is proposed.

Private Open Space - Apartments

7.6.27. As per the Guidelines, private amenity space for a one bed unit is 5sqm, for a two bed three person unit it is 6sqm, for a two bed four person unit it is 7sqm and for a three bed unit it is 9sqm.

7.6.28. With regard to Block 1, all the apartments at ground level are served by terraces and the duplex units are served by roof terraces, with one unit to the rear served by a first floor terrace. This block complies with private amenity space standards.

7.6.29. With regard to Blocks 2 and 3, all the apartments at first and second level to the two bed units are labelled on the drawings as being served by 5sqm balconies. The schedule states the space is 7sqm, which is the minimum standard. However when measured based on the dimensions given on the drawings, they are 6.75 sqm. The one bed apartments are stated on the drawings to be served by a 4.8sqm balcony. The minimum standard required is 5sqm for one bed units. While the balconies are marginally smaller than the minimum amounts, they are still below that standard and this in my view is unacceptable in the design of a new building. I consider this issue could, however, be readily rectified by way of condition. The apartments at ground and roof level in both blocks are adequately served.

Unit Mix - Apartments

7.6.30. The proposed mix will be 45% 1 bed units, 52% 2 bed units, and 3% three bed units. I consider the mix adequate considering the level of low density detached and semi-detached houses characteristic of this area.

Communal Open Space – Apartments

- 7.6.31. Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments (2018) require communal open space to be provided at a rate of 5sqm for a 1 bed apartment, 6 sqm for a two-bed three-person apartment, 7sqm for a two-bed four-person apartment and 9sqm for a three-bed apartment. I calculate the communal open space requirement for the scheme to be 433sqm. No specific calculation for communal open space has been put forward by the applicant, rather the entire green area around the site has been calculated as communal, including the access path to the site from the southwest to the rear of the Block 3, which in my opinion does not constitute communal open space. I consider the area of communal/semi-private open space to be that area between Block 1 and Block 2 and to the east of Block 2. This area appears to be approx. 500sqm in area and the overall provision is therefore considered acceptable.
- 7.6.32. The Guidelines on Design Standards for New Apartments require in a scheme of 25 or more apartments with two or more bedrooms the provision of small play areas (85-100 sqm in area) for the specific needs of toddlers and children up to the age of six. A play area approx. 98sqm in area is indicated to the northwest of Block 3. I consider it's proximity to the block could result in noise nuisance. Should the Board be minded to omit dwellings 1-4 (as discussed previously in this report), I consider the relocation of the play area to that area, away from boundaries with existing and proposed dwellings, would be preferable.

7.7. Traffic

- 7.7.1. Concerns have been raised in relation to the ability of St. Brigid's Road, which serves two schools, to accommodate the additional level of traffic that this development will generate. Concerns are also raised in relation to the design and layout of parking for the dwellings to the front of the scheme and potential conflicts with the high level of school children in the area.
- 7.7.2. I note the traffic division of Dublin City Council requested further information, which was never issued given the decision of the planning authority to issue a refusal. The traffic division was overall satisfied with the transport assessment report which indicated that existing junctions can accommodate the proposed additional traffic. The applicant in their appeal submission has proposed changes to the layout to address the concerns raised by the traffic division in their report, specifically in

relation to the parking and access to the proposed dwellings. The traffic division indicated there is serious concern regarding the proposal to provide each of the 8 houses with an individual vehicular access. It states that it is considered undesirable to introduce several new vehicular accesses along this stretch of road, some of which would be located opposite an existing junction. The applicant was requested to consider the removal of the vehicular entrances, with car parking to the rear of the houses or a single vehicular access to courtyard parking to be considered.

- 7.7.3. The applicant in response to the appeal has suggested a revised parking arrangement of one parking space to the front of each dwelling to address the concerns raised or alternatively a revised layout with the parking to the rear. The applicant states their preference is for parking to the front.
- 7.7.4. The reduction to one space per dwelling is in accordance with development plan parking policy for this area, which comes within Parking Zone 2. The development plan states these zones are a focus for integrated land-use/transportation and generally allow for higher densities, therefore one parking space per dwelling is indicated as the maximum parking requirement. I note that the majority of dwellings on this street have off-street parking provision within their front gardens. I note that concerns are raised in relation to conflicts with school children given the presence of a primary school on the opposite side of the street and pedestrian access for students through this site to the secondary school to the east, however, I do not consider the addition of these eight dwellings with individual vehicular access off St. Brigid's Road will result in traffic conflicts or hazards given the existing practice of parking within front gardens in this area. Furthermore, should the Board be minded to omit proposed dwellings 1-4 as previously discussed, this would eliminate the proposal for accesses opposite the cul-de-sac opposite the scheme. Parking on street is not provided for along this section of the street with high footpaths acting as a deterrent, as is the 5-5.5m width of the street, which is appropriate for a local street. I note that traffic is at its peaks at school times, however, these are limited peaks across the day, which I do not envisage this development will contribute significantly to. Any traffic management issues outside the site associated with the schools at school times is a matter for the planning authority to manage in conjunction with the schools.

- 7.7.5. I consider the provision for a gated entrance at the boundary with the school adequately addresses issues in terms of potential through-routes here and the provision of a gated pedestrian entrance at the southwestern entrance to the development addresses safety concerns here. The proposed improvement to the entrance for pedestrians as submitted in the revised layout is acceptable and a condition in relation to footpath finishes, specifically at the crossing of the entrance, would address concerns raised in this regard.
- 7.7.6. I have also reviewed the revised layout submitted in relation to the option for rear vehicular access to dwellings 1-4 and 5-8. The proposal in relation to dwellings 1-4 allows for parking within the rear garden. This is not appropriate given the impact on the quality of private open space available to future residents, with the private open space in two of the gardens reduced to 21sqm. The impact on the public realm and potential for conflict with pedestrians and visibility given high boundary walls/hedges is also a concern. This solution is not in my view appropriate. I note that a communal parking arrangement of three spaces is proposed to the rear of dwellings 5-8. This arrangement has no impact on garden sizes/amenity and would be a feasible option, however, overall I consider the proposal for parking directly from the street, as examined above, to be acceptable.
- 7.7.7. With regard to construction traffic, I consider a condition is desirable to ensure traffic is managed appropriately particularly given the number of schools in the immediate area. Standard construction management practices will also ensure impacts in terms of dust and noise are managed.

7.8. **Water Services**

- 7.8.1. A number of water services issues are raised by third parties, particularly in relation to water supply and surface water run-off. I note some of the submissions include a question issued to the Dublin City Council North Central Area Committee Meeting in 2010 and a response from management of Dublin City Council. The response highlights a series of works undertaken/proposed to be undertaken in the area and longer term works planned to alleviate water pressure issues and water supply issues in the wider area, which have arisen due to the age of the network and wider water supply constraints in the city.

- 7.8.2. I note no report has been received from Irish Water. The applicant has submitted a Drainage Report within which it states information in relation to existing water supply, surface water and foul drainage services, with reference to Irish Water records.
- 7.8.3. The proposed development will be subject to a connection agreement with Irish Water whereby a connection can only be given where there is capacity. Issues arising to be resolved in relation to water pressure for older residences and supply issues to the city are outside the remit of this development to resolve, as noted in the response from DCC in 2010 whereby wider works to be undertaken in the Fairview area and in Fingal County Council area were referenced. I recommend a condition be attached to any grant of permission to address the issue of water supply.
- 7.8.4. With regard to surface water, it is noted that there is an existing surface water connection on St. Brigid's Road and also within the grounds of St. Mary's playing fields to the rear. It is proposed to connect into the surface water drainage network on St. Brigid's Road. I do not consider the proposal will affect the french drains within the area of the playing fields, which was raised as a concern by observers, as no works are proposed within the area of the playing fields. A surface water attenuation tank is proposed in the green area to the front of the convent building and permeable paving to terraced parking area is proposed within the scheme. The Drainage Division of Dublin City Council has overall no objection to the proposal in relation to surface water, however, it was requested that the developer assess the feasibility of a more comprehensive use of sustainable drainage systems for management of surface water by providing for a more integrated approach with the landscaping proposals. Should the Board be minded to grant permission, this issue could be addressed by way of condition and I am of the opinion that the omission of dwellings 1-4 on the northwest section of the site will aid in the support of a more comprehensive approach to SUDS.

7.9. Other matters

Trees

- 7.9.1. An arboriculture report has been submitted with the application. It is noted that trees on the site are dominated by two groups of Monterey Cypress located toward the northern and southern boundaries, which are both linear plantings which have had

no effective management. They are stated to be of poor quality with limited value as trees for retention. Seven trees across the site are identified as being of landscape potential within an appropriate setting, with the remaining trees of low to moderate value. It is stated that some category B trees and larger shrubs could provide an element of maturity to the landscape proposals for the site.

- 7.9.2. Of the seven trees identified as being of landscape value, one is proposed to be retained on the northern side of the convent building. Four of the Monterey cypress trees located north of Block 1 are proposed to be retained for landscape setting purposes, albeit I note they are of low quality and value. I note the tree protection area of one tree in particular may be compromised by Block 1 and all may be compromised by the proposed reinforced grass paving. It is therefore important that tree protection measures are put in place prior to commencement of development. Should the Board be minded to omit dwellings 1-4 from the scheme and retain the existing access/right of way in its current location, it may be possible to retain additional trees along the northern boundary, subject to any redesign of the entrance route as it exists being required. The applicant proposes replacement planting of trees across the site and of hedgerows along the boundaries. I consider that given the limited value of existing trees on site, that the overall approach to landscaping proposed is acceptable.

7.10. Appropriate Assessment

- 7.10.1. There are a large number of Natura 2000 sites within 15kms of the site. The nearest Natura sites are the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024) approx. 2km south of the site; North Dublin Bay SAC (000206), and North Bull Island SPA (004006), some 2.5km to the south east and separated from the subject site.
- 7.10.2. There are limited relevant pathways between the development and Natura 2000 sites and I am satisfied that standard construction management practices would be sufficient to avoid an indirect effect on water quality during construction. I consider that adequate attenuation is proposed within the site during the operational phase and therefore the potential for impact on water quality within designated sites is remote. In addition, the proposal for connection to the public foul network would ensure no impacts from wastewater.

7.10.3. It is reasonable to conclude that on the basis of the information on the file, which I consider to be adequate in order to issue a screening determination that the proposed development, individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to have a significant effect on European Site No. 004024 (South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA), 004024 (South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA), 000206 (North Dublin Bay SAC) and 004006 (North Bull Island SPA), or any other European Site, in view of the site's conservation objectives, and that a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not therefore required.

8.0 Recommendation

8.1. It is recommended that permission is granted.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022, the zoning objective of the site, Z15, which supports the delivery of residential development, and the location of the site in a highly accessible serviced urban area, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity and has had due regard to the historic context of the site. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance 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, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by An Bord Pleanála on the 3rd day of December, 2018, 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
----	--

	<p>development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The proposed development shall be amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The northern access road and public right of way shall be retained in its current location and its width/route amended, where required, in order to adequately serve the proposed development. Additional trees suitable for retention in this area shall be identified and adequate measures put in place for their preservation. (b) Proposed dwellings 1-4 shall be omitted and the remaining area incorporated into the scheme as public open space. (c) The proposed playground shall be relocated within the revised open space area, as per (b) above and shall be located away from the boundaries with existing and future dwellings/apartment units. (d) Apartment 71 shall be omitted from Block 3 and the end of the terrace to apartment no. 70 at its western side shall comprise a 1.8m obscure glazed boundary (or other similar agreed treatment). (e) The balconies serving apartments 57 and 65 in Block 3 shall be omitted and a revised design incorporating a recessed balcony with revised floor plans for the related apartments shall be submitted. (f) Revised drawings for Blocks 2 and 3 shall be submitted which shall ensure all balconies meet the minimum standards required as set by the Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Design Standards for New Apartments (March 2018). <p>Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of protecting the setting and character of the existing historic building on site and the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.</p>

3.	<p>This permission is for 70 apartment units and 4 houses only.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of clarity.</p>
4.	<p>Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed development, including boundary treatments, shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. No entrance gates across the vehicular entrance from St. Brigid's Road shall be permitted, with entrance gates only permitted at the entrance to the school site positioned at the northeast boundary of the site. A gated pedestrian entrance shall be maintained at the southern pedestrian entrance into the site from St. Brigid's Road, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity</p>
5.	<p>The site shall be landscaped, using only indigenous species, 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:</p> <p>(a) A plan to scale of not less than [1:500] showing –</p> <p>(i) The species, variety, number, size and locations of all proposed trees and shrubs to be planted.</p> <p>(ii) Details of screen planting and treatment/finishes of all external ground surfaces and boundaries.</p> <p>(iii) Hard landscaping works, specifying surfacing materials, furniture, and finished levels.</p> <p>(b) Specifications for mounding, levelling, cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment.</p> <p>(c) A timescale for implementation of planting and landscaping.</p> <p>(d) Protection and enhancement measures for all existing trees to be retained. Storage of materials shall not be permitted inside the line of tree protection measures. The retention of trees shall be maximised within the site over and above that originally proposed particularly to the north side of</p>

	<p>the site alongside the access route/right of way.</p> <p>(e) The areas of open space shown on the lodged plans shall be reserved for such use and the developer shall provide for a small play area (85-100 sqm in area) for the specific needs of toddlers and children up to the age of six, to be located within the open space.</p> <p>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 three years from the completion of the development, shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of amenity, ecology and sustainable development.</p>
6.	<p>Notwithstanding the provisions of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, or any statutory provision amending or replacing them, no advertisement signs (including any signs installed to be visible through the windows), advertisement structures, banners, canopies, flags, or other projecting elements shall be displayed or erected on the buildings or within the curtilage of the site, unless authorised by a further grant of planning permission.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the visual amenities of the area.</p>
7.	<p>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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.</p>
8.	<p>No additional development shall take place above roof parapet level, including lift motor enclosures, air handling equipment, storage tanks, ducts or other external plant, telecommunication aerials, antennas or equipment, unless authorised by a further grant of planning permission.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the residential amenities of property in the vicinity and</p>

	the visual amenities of the area.
9.	<p>The developer shall comply with the following road requirements:</p> <p>(a) The car parking spaces shall be permanently allocated to the residential units within the development and shall not be sold, rented or otherwise sub-let or leased to other parties.</p> <p>(b) At the vehicular access point to the development, the public footpath shall be continued at a raised level across the site entrance and exit, but shall be ramped and dropped as necessary to facilitate car entry/exit. Measures shall be implemented including contrasting materials, signing and road markings to ensure that vehicles entering/leaving the development are aware that pedestrians/cyclists have priority across the site entrance and that vehicles must yield right-of way.</p> <p>(c) The developer shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority in relation to the design of the individual access points to the proposed dwellings from St. Brigid's Road.</p> <p>(d) All costs incurred by Dublin City Council, including any repairs to the public road and services necessary as a result of the development, shall be at the expense of the developer.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and orderly development.</p>
10.	<p>The attenuation and disposal of surface water, provision of additional comprehensive SUDS measures, and permeable paving throughout the development, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health.</p>
11.	<p>The applicant or developer shall enter into water and/or wastewater connection agreement(s) with Irish Water prior to the commencement of this development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health.</p>
12.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1800 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400</p>

	<p>hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays.</p> <p>Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>
13.	<p>Proposals for an estate/street name, house numbering scheme and associated signage shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, all estate and street signs, and house numbers, shall be provided in accordance with the agreed scheme No advertisements/marketing signage relating to the name(s) of the development shall be erected until the developer has obtained the planning authority's written agreement to the proposed name(s).</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of urban legibility.</p>
14.	<p>If, during the course of site works archaeological material is discovered, the City Archaeologist shall be notified immediately. It is obligatory under the National Monuments Amendment Act 1994 that such is brought to the attention of the National Monuments Service, Department of the Environment, Heritage & Local Government, and the National Museum of Ireland. In the event of an archaeological find on site, the City Archaeologist (in consultation with the National Monuments Service, Department of the Environment, Heritage & Local Government) shall determine the further archaeological resolution of the site.</p> <p>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.</p>
15.	<p>A plan containing details for the management of waste (and, in particular, 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</p>

	<p>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.</p> <p>Reason: To provide for the appropriate management of waste and, in particular recyclable materials, in the interest of protecting the environment.</p>
16.	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) location of the site and materials compound including areas 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

	<p>bunds shall be roofed to exclude rainwater;</p> <p>(k) off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste and details of how it is proposed to manage excavated soil; and</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>A record of daily checks that the works are being undertaken in accordance with the Construction Management Plan shall be available for inspection by the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of amenities, public health and safety.</p>
17.	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
18.	<p>The management and maintenance of the proposed development following its completion shall be the responsibility of a legally constituted management company, or by the local authority in the event of the development being taken in charge. Detailed proposals in this regard shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the satisfactory completion and maintenance of this development.</p>

19.	<p>Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company, or other security to secure the provision and satisfactory completion of roads, footpaths, watermains, drains, open space and other services required in connection with the development, coupled with an agreement empowering the local authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory completion of any part of the development. The form and amount of the security shall be as agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of agreement, shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the satisfactory completion of the development.</p>
20.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</p> <p>Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.</p>

Una O'Neill
Senior Planning Inspector

3rd April 2019