



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

**S. 6(7) of Planning and  
Development (Housing) and  
Residential Tenancies Act 2016**

**Inspector's Report on  
Recommended Opinion  
ABP-304454-19**

---

|                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Strategic Housing Development</b> | 296 no. apartments and associated site works.         |
| <b>Location</b>                      | Citywest Shopping Centre,<br>Fortunestown, Dublin 24. |
| <b>Planning Authority</b>            | South Dublin County Council                           |
| <b>Prospective Applicant</b>         | OBSF (I) Ltd.   |
| <b>Date of Consultation Meeting</b>  | 24 <sup>th</sup> of June 2019.                        |
| <b>Date of Site Inspection</b>       | 17 <sup>th</sup> of June 2019.                        |
| <b>Inspector</b>                     | Karen Hamilton  |

## 1.0 Introduction

Having regard to the consultation that has taken place in relation to the proposed development and also having regard to the submissions from the planning authority, the purpose of this report is to form a recommended opinion as to whether the documentation submitted with the consultation request under section 5(5) of the Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 2016 - (i) constitutes a reasonable basis for an application under section 4, or (ii) requires further consideration and amendment in order to constitute a reasonable basis for an application under section 4.

## 2.0 Site Location and Description

- 2.1. The subject site (2.8ha) relates to lands directly adjacent to the Citywest Shopping Centre. The proposal comprises of two separate sections, to the north and south of the shopping centre, interlinked by an internal road, Citywest Plaza. A large residential scheme, incorporating a mix of duplex and apartments, is located to the west of the site and both this development and the shopping centre share an access from Fortunestown Road.
- 2.2. Lands to the north of the site, along Fortunestown Lane, are landscaped and form part of the shopping centre development and are adjacent to the shopping centre car park and Mc Donald's. Those lands to the south, at the rear of the site, are located to the north of a two storey residential development, Verschoyle Drive, and east of a district park.

## 3.0 Proposed Strategic Housing Development

- 3.1. The proposed development would comprise of the following:
  - 6 no. blocks (A-F) ranging in height from 4-7 storeys to provide 296 no. apartment units consisting of:
    - 88 no. 1 bed units,
    - 168 no. 2 bed units,
    - 40 no. 3 bed units,

- Residential amenity (c.246m<sup>2</sup>) facilities in Block A (gym/lounge/meeting room),
- Childcare facility located in Block D (c. 265m<sup>2</sup>) 71 no. childcare spaces and outdoor play area c. 500m<sup>2</sup>,
- Café/ restaurant located in Block F (c. 112m<sup>2</sup>),
- Car parking (17 no. at semi-basement level Block E & 122 no. surface car parking, 38 no. existing spaces),
- 291 no. bicycle spaces with integrated cycle stores at surface level,;
- Landscaped open spaces (c. 1,500m<sup>2</sup> communal courtyards with play areas, outdoor gym c. 187m<sup>2</sup> and roof terrace to Block E of 250m<sup>2</sup>).
- ESB plant rooms and substations and ancillary works,
- Elevation upgrades to the southern/ rear elevation of Citywest Shopping Centre,
- Alterations to existing road alignments an omission of 2 spaces within the public car park.

## 4.0 National and Local Planning Policy

### 4.1. National

Having considered the nature of the proposal, the receiving environment, the documentation on file, including submission from the planning authority, I am of the opinion that the directly relevant section 28 Ministerial Guidelines are:

- ‘Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas’ (including the associated ‘Urban Design Manual’)
- ‘Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets’ (DMURS)
- ‘Childcare Facilities – Guidelines for Planning Authorities’
- ‘Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities’
- Urban Design and Building Heights, Guidelines for Planning Authorities

Other relevant national guidelines include:

- Project Ireland 2040, National Planning Framework.
- Framework and Principles for the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage Department of Arts, Heritage, Gaeltacht and the Islands 1999.

#### 4.2. Local

South Dublin County Council 2019-2022 is the statutory plan for the lands in question, the site is zoned as District Centre, where it is an objective *“To protect, improve and provide for the future development of District Centres and the area is contained within the Fortunestown LAP”*.

The Fortunestown LAP 2012 (extended 2017) is the appropriate plan for the area and objectives specific to the site and the proposed development are summarised below:

**Objective LUD 8:** To ensure no more than 10% of dwellings in any residential scheme are of one bedroom type.

**Objective LUD 10:** Ensure a minimum of 85% of all dwellings be provided as own door houses on their own site and that a maximum of 15% of all dwellings across the plan lands be provided as apartments/ duplexes with such dwellings limited to appropriate areas.

**Objective FC6b:** The minimum average floor area of all developments throughout the plan lands shall be 110m<sup>2</sup>.

**Objective FC7:** No further development shall be permitted until facilities within the District Park have been completed or nearing completion including children’s play facilities etc.

**Objective LUD2c:** Make provision for a library building or space in close proximity to the Citywest shopping centre.

## 5.0 Planning History

The site includes the Citywest Shopping Centre and the majority of recent permissions on the site relate to alterations to the commercial aspect. The parent permission for the shopping centre and associated dwellings is listed below:

### **Reg Ref SD03A/0857**

Permission granted for a mixed use retail/ commercial and residential development in separate buildings including:

- 380 residential units (13 one bed, 305 2-bed, 57 3-bed), and a mix of duplex units,
- Shopping centre (60% anchor foodstore, 40% drapery/textile & household goods)
- Office/ restaurant and medical on the first floor (2,999m<sup>2</sup>)
- Underground carpark 223 no. spaces and surface car parking 340 no. spaces
- 2 offices(1,699m<sup>2</sup>)
- Crèche/ playhouse (375m<sup>2</sup>) (removed under SD05A/0582)
- Community hall, pub and restaurant (862m<sup>2</sup>)

An EIS was submitted with this application.

## 6.0 Section 247 Consultation(s) with Planning Authority

Two Section 247 pre- application consultation meetings took place between the applicant and South Dublin County Council as summarised below:

### **1. SPP017/18 December 2018.**

Principle of Development: The use will most likely be Build 2 Rent (B2R) and if ownership maintenance would need to be detailed.

Water Service: Surface water management should be based on natural attenuation, IW should be consulted.

Roads:

- A second vehicular access would be required,

- Traffic lights would be required at the junction with Citywest Shopping Centre,
- Car park management measures such as charging should be kept open for consideration,
- The proposed parking ratio is acceptable,
- A Traffic Impact Assessment would be required,
- Dublin Bus should be contacted for additional bus stop.

Public Realm:

- A pedestrian link would be required to connect to the green link,
- Hedgerows should be retained, open space should be inclusive,
- The impact of SuDS and open space should be integrated and screening required for the proposed blocks to the front of the site.

Layout: Concern was raised over:

- The amenity value of Blocks E & F,
- The operation of commercial units,
- The layout at the rear of the site dominated by roads,
- The layout is over development of the site
- Block E & F should be rationalised in addition to re-configuration of the blocks to the rear of the site.

EIA: Thresholds for EIA should be addressed.

## **2. SHD1SPPP002/19 February 2019.**

General: Proposal for c. 332 units and associated use.

Planning History: A significant amount of planning history on the site has been provided which relates to the development of the shopping centre.

Development Plan: The guidance of the development plan and the Fortunestown LAP should be reflected in the proposal.

Design & Layout: There are concerns in relation to:

- the amenity value of Blocks E & F,

- the residential amenity pertaining to units facing the southern elevation of the shopping centre,
- treatment is required to the south elevation façade of existing buildings,
- treatment with Mc Donald's in terms of traffic and noise,
- corner site significance for streetscape and place making,
- accessibility throughout the site including the LUAS line,
- redesign of access road for traffic calming and pedestrian safety,
- Design rationale for the entire development including retail.

#### Landscaping:

- full landscape design rationale,
- 14% requirements within Fortunestown LAP, the scheme does not meet this,
- Rationale for under provision and compensatory measures,
- Planting enhancement for the carpark to the front of the site.

#### Roads, Access & Parking:

- Signalised junction for City West Shopping centre/ LUAS track may be required.
- Applicant has not incorporated a second site entrance as previously advised
- Applicant advised that the existing road has capacity for additional traffic,
- Increase in surface parking from 62 no. to 70 no. from previous preplanning

#### Crèche:

- Rationale required for the crèche,
- Phasing for construction plan, provision of crèche before the residential units,

#### Permeability and Accessibility:

- Demonstration of permeability and accessibility within the site in the context of adjoining lands.

## 7.0 Prospective Applicant's Case

7.1. Information which accompanied the pre-application submission included:

- EIAR Screening Statement
- Part V and Validation Letter
- Architectural Design Statement
- Infrastructure Design Report
- Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment
- Traffic and Transport Assessment
- DMURS Design Statement
- Engineering Drawing Pack
- Daylight and Sunlight Report
- Sustainability Report
- Utility Briefing Note
- Operational Waste Management Plan (OWMP)
- Fire Safety Strategy
- Accessibility Planning Report
- Landscape Design Rationale and Landscape Master plan
- Photomontages and CGIs
- Building Lifecycle Report
- Appropriate Assessment Screening
- Ecological Impact Statement
- Archaeological Assessment.



## 7.2. Statement of Consistency

The statement of consistency assesses the proposal in relation to the national and local policy for the area and notes that many of the policy contained in the LAP for the area pre-date national policy for new apartments, further discussed below.

## 7.3. Material Contravention

- Building Height (between 4 and 7 storeys proposed).

South Dublin County Development Plan 2016-2022, H9 Objective 4 directs all tall buildings (over 5 stories) to strategic and landmark locations in Town Centres, Mixed Use Schemes and Strategic Development Zones, subject to the LAP.

Fortunestown LAP includes a:

- 3 storey height restriction and,
- Table 5.3: Recommended density c. 50ha (density is 106ha)
- Objective LUD8: No more than 10% of dwellings in any one residential scheme are of one bedroom type,
- Objective LUD10: A minimum of 85% of all dwellings to have their own door and 15% of site may be apartment or duplex.
- Objective FC6b: A minimum average floor area of all development throughout the plan lands shall be 110m<sup>2</sup>.
- Objective FC7: No further residential or commercial floor space permitted within the Fortunestown Centre until such time as the park facilities permitted within the site designated as the District Centre (site to rear/ south-west of Citywest Shopping Centre) have been completed or nearing completion (children's play area, sports/ outdoor recreational facilities, jogging track, sports building, car parking and landscaping).

Justification for material contravention

- The LAP identifies a "District landmark" at the north east corner of the subject site,
- The proposed dwelling mix does not comply with the percentage for type although complies with SPPR 1 within the apartment guidelines,

- Density (106 proposed) complies with the sustainable residential guidelines,
- The National Planning Framework , 2040 and Draft Eastern & Midland Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy (RSES) aims to avoid urban sprawl by consolidating housing,
- The apartment guidelines provide clear guidance on the appropriate location for higher density development, which this site complies with.

## 8.0 Planning Authority Submission

The Planning Authority submission was received on the 13<sup>th</sup> of June 2019 and the issues are summarised under the headings provided for in the submission:

### Key Changes

- The applicant reduced the number of residential units from 332 to 296, mostly 2 bed units, from the previous S247 meetings.

### Material Contravention

- The proposal materially contravenes the development plan and the LAP based on the height, density, dwelling mix, lack of provision of library space (objective LUD2C) and a healthcare facility (objective LUD2a) within proximity to the Citywest Shopping Centre.

### Proposed Land-Uses

- All proposal are acceptable in principle within the district centre zoning.

### Crèche

- It is stated that the proposed crèche can cater for 71 no children, no further details are provided.
- Full consultation should be undertaken with the South Dublin Childcare Committee.
- The crèche should be included within a phasing plan.

## Social and Affordable Housing (Part V)

- Compliance with Part V would comprise of 12 no 1 bed units and 35 no, 2 bed units.
- Part V condition is required.

## Place making

- The lands at the front of the shopping centre are located at an important junction.
- Design and pedestrian permeability are important.
- Strong street frontages are required.
- Pedestrian linkages, particularly to the LUAS, should be demonstrated.
- The Fourtunestown LAP (figure 5.7) “Land use density Framework” has not been addressed:
- Block E & F have walls with minimum interaction with adjoining roads,
- Improved building frontages are required fronting onto Fourtunestown Lane/ Citywest Road,
- The proposed wall around Block E & F prohibit permeability,
- A café is provided on the ground floor of Block F although the remaining space comprises of storage etc.
- There remain concerns over the amenity of Block E & F, as discussed in pre-planning.

## Dwelling Mix

- Objective LUD8 of the LAP requires less than 10% for one bed room type (proposal 29.7%),
- The proposed development does not accord with the above objective of Objective LUD10 of the LAP.

## Density and Heights

- Gross Density is 106 units per hectare, LAP permits 50 units per hectare.

- The heights range from 4 to 7 storeys, LAP restricts heights to 3 storeys, except in limited circumstances.
- The Urban Height Guidance is noted.
- The applicant was advised the site is over-development, a robust rational for the approach is required particularly in respect to lands to the north (E & F) and Block A directly south.

#### Form and Massing

- A reduction in the form and massing of some of the blocks would enhance the visual impact:

Southern elevation of Block B,

Eastern elevation of Block F,

Northern elevation of Block E,

#### CGIs/ Photomontages

- Additional views from along Verschoyle Drive would be beneficial to illustrate the impact on opposing Block B.

#### Block F Ground floor elevation

- The inclusion of a largely blank elevation does not lend to the creation of quality place making.

#### Design

- All aspects should comply with the apartment guidelines.

#### DMURS

- 6m wide carriageways do not accord with DMURS or adequately provide for self-regulating low speed environment with design.
- Speed ramps are not supported to slow traffic down, enhanced street design to create safe, calm environment.
- Ramps to underground parking should be a gradient that vehicles do not excessively increase speed.

### Permeability and Accessibility

- Permeability from Block E & F from City West Road,
- There is no footpath leading from the roundabout west to Block E into E & F,
- Steps between A & B would compromise the universal accessibility and prevent mobility,

### Public Open Space

- There is significant concerns over the quantum and quality of public open space does not meet the 14% of the LAP as advised at pre-planning,
- Much of the public open space is not useable,
- The courtyard space is not determined to be part of the open space,
- A strip along the side of Block C is not of adequate quality,
- The open space for Block E & F would be subject overshadowing considering the location beside the blocks,
- Compensatory measures should be provided,
- There is no arborist report which should include a tree protection zone.

### Car parking

- Surface parking dominates the scheme,
- Landscaping measures to reduce the visual impact of the parking have not been incorporated into long strips with parking bays (up to 13 spaces) at Block D, A & F.

### Elevation upgrades to the southern/rear to the Citywest Shopping Centre

- There is significant concerns regarding the blank façade of the southern/ rear elevation to the shopping centre and impact on the north facing units within Block A.
- Ceader post and cladding are not significant changes to the elevation treatment, considering the distance from the side of the proposed apartments.
- Additional photomontages are recommended.

### Private Amenity Space

- All ground floor units should incorporate a 1.5m wide strip to the front (residential amenity)
- Compliance with the minimum standards from the development plan area required.

### Refuse and Bicycle Storage

- Concern in relation to the bin storage in Blocks A/B/ C & D and impact on residential amenity.
- Concern in relation to the sharing of bin store for residential and crèche/ café facilities.

### Landscape and open space

- An arborist tree plan is required for the tree protection zone.
- Green infrastructure policies from the development plan are applicable ( G 2 objective 1,2,9 & 13 and G6 objective 1, and HCL15 Objective 3)
- SuDS policies from the development plan are not supported.
- The attenuation tanks under the open space prevent support for sustainable water management and prevent tree planting within these spaces.
- No cross section/ details of the open space are provided (some are raised).
- The landscape plan does not clearly indicate what is private/ semi-private and public.
- It is unclear if SuDS have been integrated.
- The landscape plan should be altered to include tree planting.
- The lack of tree planting does not comply with DMURS.
- No details of children's play areas are included.
- The provision of play facilities does not comply with the Section 11.3.1 of the development plan.
- The play areas should incorporate forma/ informal play facilities, kick about areas, details of outdoor gym etc.

- The open space areas do not support climate change or good biodiversity through the range of species.

#### Roads, Access & Parking

- One single access point from Fortunestown Lane which is undesirable.
- The second “emergency only” access onto City West Road should be open for all traffic and electronic rising facility could be integrated.
- The through road should be constructed at 6.0m to provide vehicle permeability.
- Full Height curbs are required to prevent illegal parking.
- A total of 276 cycle spaces are provided (108 required).
- Electric charging for 10% of car parking spaces is required.

## 9.0 Submissions received

### Irish Water

Irish Water has issued a Confirmation of Feasibility (CoF) for this development of 300 residential units.

The proposed development, as assessed for the CoF, is a standard connection requiring no network or treatment plant upgrades for water or wastewater by either the customer or Irish Water. No third party consents are required for these connections to take place.

Therefore, based on the CoF, Irish Water confirms that subject to a compliant water and wastewater layout and a valid connection agreement being put in place between Irish Water and the developer, the proposed connections to the Irish Water network can be facilitated.

## 10.0 The Consultation Meeting

- 10.1. A Section 5 Consultation meeting took place at the offices of An Bord Pleanála on 24<sup>th</sup> of June 2019, commencing at 11.30am. Representatives of the prospective

applicant, South Dublin County Council and An Bord Pleanála were in attendance. An agenda was issued by An Bord Pleanála prior to the meeting:

10.2. The main topics for discussion at the tripartite meeting were as follows:

- Architectural response of the buildings to the site context and external material rationale,
- Development Strategy for the site,
- Crèche Rationale,
- Car parking and Access,
- Site Service,
- Any other matters.

10.3. In relation to the **architectural response of the buildings to the site context and external material rationale**, An Bord Pleanála representative sought further elaboration/ discussion/ consideration on the following:

- The proposed layout of Blocks E & F, north of the site, the treatment at a main interface which is representative of the designation of the site for the location of a “District Landmark”,
- The treatment of the ground floor of Blocks E & F, both towards the shopping centre and along Fortunestown Lane.
- The use of space surrounding Blocks E & F and the provision of a strong urban edge.
- Elevation treatment and finishes of all proposed blocks and the relationship with the surrounding environment.
- The elevation treatment and design of the interface between the rear of the shopping centre and the residential development, in particular Block A.

10.4. In relation to the **development strategy for the site**, the layout and interfaces with surrounding areas and the proposed connectivity and permeability throughout the site, An Bord Pleanála representative sought further elaboration/ discussion/ consideration on the following:



- The need for appropriate elevation design and boundary treatment between the proposed development and the adjoining residential estates, Vershoyle Drive and Craigmore.
- The provision of enhanced connectivity and permeability throughout the site, utilising City West Drive as a strategic link, including high quality landscaping integrated within the design.
- The provision of enhanced connectivity and permeability to the District Park and City West Plaza, focusing on shared surface, pedestrian and cycling routes and integration of high quality landscaping.

10.5. In relation to **development standards**, An Bord Pleanála representative sought further elaboration/ discussion/ consideration on the following:

- Sunlight and Daylight analysis for existing and proposed residential units, in particular illustrating the impact on Craigmore apartments and the daylight to those units within proposed Block B.
- Details of the proposed floor areas in the context of the minimum standards set out in 'Sustainable urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities' (2018).
- The rationale for the location and size of the crèche including an audit of the permitted crèches within the vicinity of the site and coordination with South Dublin County Childcare Committee.

10.6. In relation to **open space provision and public realm**, An Bord Pleanála representative sought further elaboration/ discussion/ consideration on the following:

- The provision of appropriate play facilities throughout the site.
- The principles of a previous permission, for the promotion of activities within the adjoining District Park, interface between Block C and the park and the integration of enhanced open space provision along the boundary.
- Confirmation on the potential for taking in charge and the implications for permeable paving as circulation space, integrating with open space areas.
- The proposal for surface water attenuation on the site and the integration of SuDS within the overall scheme.

10.7. In relation to **car parking requirements and vehicular access** into the site, An Bord Pleanála representative sought further elaboration/ discussion/ consideration on the following:

- The requirement for a quantum of 0.66 spaces per residential unit and the reduction in surface car parking, integrating high quality public realm which promotes pedestrian and cycling movements.
- The potential use of basement parking within the shopping centre, the inclusion of all proposed development within the red line and the implications of basement parking and taking in charge.
- The requirement for a second vehicular access into the site, from Citywest Road, in light of any reduction in car parking provision.

10.8. In relation to **additional requirement of site services** within the site, An Bord Pleanála representative sought further elaboration/ discussion/ consideration on the following:

- Analysis of the requirements for compliance with LUD2a & LUD2b relating to medical and library services on the site and the provision of a social audit.

10.9. In relation to any other matters, An Bord Pleanála representative sought further elaboration/ discussion/ consideration on the following:

- Appropriate treatment of Block A and consideration for a high quality upgrade of elevation treatment at the rear of the shopping centre.
- Inclusion of external materials for the proposed plaza at the rear of the shopping centre within a Building Lifecycle report.

## 11.0 **Assessment**

Based on the entirety of the information before me, it would appear that the proposed development falls within the definition of Strategic Housing Development, as set out in section 3 of the Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 2016.

I have examined all of the information and submissions before me including the documentation submitted by prospective applicants, the submissions of the planning authority and the discussions which took place at the tripartite meeting. I have had regard to both national policy, via the section 28 Ministerial Guidelines and local policy via the statutory plans for the area.

## **Conclusion**

Having regard to the above, I recommend that the Board serve a notice on the prospective applicant, pursuant to Section 6(7)(b) of the Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 2016, stating that it is of the opinion that the documentation submitted with the consultation request under section 5(5) of the Act **requires further consideration and amendment** in order to constitute a reasonable basis for an application under section 4 of the Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 2016.

I recommend that the prospective applicant be notified, pursuant to article 285 (5)(b) of the 2017 Regulations, that specified information (as outlined hereunder) be submitted with any application for permission that may follow. I believe the specified information will assist the Board at application stage in its decision making process. I am also recommending that a number of prescribed bodies (as listed hereunder) be notified by the prospective applicant of the making of the application.

## **12.0 Recommended Opinion**

The Board refers to your request pursuant to section 5 of the Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 2016. Section 6(7) (a) of the Act provides that the Board shall form an opinion as to whether the documents submitted with the consultation request (i) constitute a reasonable basis for an application under section 4 of the Act, or (ii) require further consideration and amendment in order to constitute a reasonable basis for an application under section 4.

Following consideration of the issues raised during the consultation process, and having regard to the opinion of the planning authority, **An Bord Pleanála is of the opinion that the documentation submitted requires further consideration and**

**amendment to constitute a reasonable basis for an application for strategic housing development to An Bord Pleanála.**

1. Architectural Response of Block E & F

Further consideration and/or justification of the documents as they relate to design and expression, in particular, of Block E & F. In this regard, the prospective applicant should satisfy themselves that the design strategy for the site as it relates most importantly to the designation in the development plan, as a “District Landmark”, is the optimal architectural solution for this strategic gateway site. The proposed development shall have regard to inter alia, national policy including the 12 criteria set out in the Urban Design Manual which accompanies the Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas, 2009. In this regard further consideration is required for the design and configuration of the layout particularly in respect of the nature and scale of the built form, the use of external materials which respects the receiving environment and the orientation of blocks as they address the Fortunestown Lane, the junction of Fortunestown lane and City West Road and the existing commercial development on the associated land holding. Further consideration of these issues may require an amendment to the documents and/ or design proposals submitted.

2. Architectural Response of Block A and rear of the shopping centre.

Further consideration and/or justification of the documents as they relate to the elevation treatment of the rear of the shopping centre and Block A. In this regard, further consideration for the treatment of the shopping centre onto a proposed plaza along the north, integration of appropriate screening to the rear of the shopping centre and the treatment of the ground floor of Block A, relative to the shopping centre and plaza, is required. Further consideration of these issues may require an amendment to the documents and/ or design proposals submitted.

3. Car parking and Access

Further consideration and/or justification for a reduction in the provision of surface car parking, integration of high quality pedestrian and cycle through

routes, enhanced with landscaping. In light of any reduction in surface car parking and/or provision of alternatives, further consideration and/or justification for a second vehicular access through the site from Citywest Road, will be provided for in any Traffic Impact Assessment.

4. Open Space

Further consideration and/or justification of the documents to satisfactorily indicate the provision of high quality open space provision, incorporating a strategic link through the site and integration with the District Park to the south. Further consideration in the documents indicating the integration of surface water proposals which respect the nature and form of the proposal and support the integration of Surface Water Drainage Systems (SuDS).

5. Residential Amenity

Further consideration and/or justification of the documents as they relate to the impact of shadow projection on existing residential properties in the vicinity of the site and the daylight provision for the proposed apartments. Consideration and/or justification should also be provided for the location and quantum of the crèche, included within a phasing plan, and the requirement for future community services within the Citywest campus.

Pursuant to article 285(5)(b)(i) and (ii) of the Planning and Development (Strategic Housing Development) Regulations 2017, the prospective applicant is hereby notified that the following specific information should be submitted with any application for permission:

- The site layout plan, and all other accompanying plans, illustrating all areas relevant to the proposed development outlined within the site plan boundary.
- Having regard to any alterations in the Transport Impact Assessment and any reduction in the provision of car parking on site, the prospective applicant should demonstrate the requirement and/or suitability of a second vehicular access for the proposed development from Citywest Road.
- A detailed schedule of accommodation which indicates consistency with relevant standards in the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities' (2018)

- A report that addresses issues of residential amenity (both existing residents of adjoining development and future occupants). Full and complete drawings including levels and cross sections showing the relationship between the development and nearby residential properties should be submitted. This should include a daylight/ sunlight analysis and a noise assessment, and should detail any mitigation measures proposed, if considered necessary.
- A Building Lifecycle Report in accordance with section 6.3 of the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments (2018), including all alterations to the shopping centre elevation.
- Additional CGIs/ visualisations/ 3D modelling showing the proposed development relative to existing development in the vicinity.
- Traffic Impact Assessment including the justification for public transport, surface car parking and additional vehicular access into the site.
- Report of surface water drainage.
- Social Audit detailing the justification for the crèche facility and the necessity for the provision of any further community/ medical facility within the site.
- Details of public lighting.
- Details of Part V provision clearly indicating the proposed Part V units.
- A plan of the proposed open space within the site clearly delineating public, semi-private and private spaces.
- A detailed phasing plan for the proposed development should be provided.
- A site layout plan clearly indicating what areas are to be taken in charge by the Local Authority.
- Where the applicant considers that the proposed strategic housing development would materially contravene the relevant development plan or local area plan, other than in relation to the zoning of the land, a statement indicating the plan objective (s) concerned and why permission should, nonetheless, be granted for the proposed development, having regard to a consideration specified in section 37(2)(b) of the Planning and Development Act 2000. Notices published pursuant to Section 8(1)(a) of the Act of 2016

and Article 292 (1) of the Regulations of 2017, shall refer to any such statement in the prescribed format.

Pursuant to article 285(5) (a) of the Planning and Development (Strategic Housing Development) Regulations 2017, the prospective applicant is informed that the following authorities should be notified in the event of the making of an application arising from this notification in accordance with section 8(1)(b) of the Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 2016:

1. Irish Water
2. Transport Infrastructure Ireland
3. Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport
4. Irish Aviation Authority
5. Irish Air Corps (Baldonnel Aerodrome)
6. Department of Energy Regulation
7. South Dublin County Childcare Committee

**PLEASE NOTE:**

Under section 6(9) of the Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 2016, neither the holding of a consultation under section 6, nor the forming of an opinion under that section, shall prejudice the performance by the Board, or the planning authority or authorities in whose area the proposed strategic housing development would be situated, of any other of their respective functions under the Planning and Development Acts 2000 to 2016 or any other enactment and cannot be relied upon in the formal planning process or in legal proceedings.

---

Karen Hamilton  
Planning Inspector

---

15<sup>th</sup> of July 2019