



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP 304727-19.

|                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <b>Development</b>             | Installation of 3g artificial turf pitch for full size rugby and football over grass pitch. Ball stop fencing system (5 m high), 6/8 floodlighting columns floodlighting system to (18 m high) spectator hardstanding with fencing (1.2 m high) and hard standing for a maintenance access from carpark. |
| <b>Location</b>                | Gonzaga College, Sandford Road, Ranelagh Dublin 6.   |
| <b>Planning Authority</b>      | Dublin City Council.   |
| <b>P. A. Reg. Ref.</b>         | WEB 1065/19  |
| <b>Applicant</b>               | Fiachra Etchingham, Gonzaga College.   |
| <b>Type of Application</b>     | Permission   |
| <b>Decision</b>                | Grant Permission   |
| <b>Third Party Appellants</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Marion Bruton</li><li>2. David Crampton</li><li>3. Cathal and Triona Gibson</li></ol>   |
| <b>Observer</b>                | Anne Heffernan   |
| <b>Date of Site Inspection</b> | 22 <sup>nd</sup> August, 2019  |
| <b>Inspector</b>               | Jane Dennehy   |

# Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 1.0 Site Location and Description .....                        | 3  |
| 2.0 Proposed Development .....                                 | 3  |
| 3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....                          | 3  |
| 3.1. Decision .....  | 3  |
| 3.2. Planning Authority Reports .....                          | 4  |
| 3.4. Third Party Observations .....                            | 5  |
| 4.0 Planning History.....                                      | 5  |
| 5.0 Policy Context.....  | 5  |
| 5.1. Development Plan.....                                     | 5  |
| 6.0 The Appeals .....  | 6  |
| 6.6. Planning Authority Response .....                         | 11 |
| 6.7. Observations .....  | 11 |
| 6.8. Further Responses - David Crampton and Lance Graham ..... | 13 |
| 7.0 Assessment.....  | 14 |
| Site Selection. ....   | 14 |
| 8.0 Recommendation.....  | 18 |
| 9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....                            | 19 |
| 10.0 Conditions. ....  | 19 |

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The site of the proposed development is formed from the existing playing fields at Gonzaga College. The school buildings and tennis courts are at the northern end of the overall campus with the playing fields at the west, south and east and the pitch subject of the application is shown at the south western end. The playing fields are enclosed by boundary walling to a height of circa two metres with trees on the inner side along the west and south boundaries. To the west side on Park Drive, a cul de sac, there are detached Edwardian era houses with rear and front gardens some of which have been converted for use for off street parking. To the south and south east there is residential development. There is a pedestrian access gate on the campus boundary with Park Drive whereas the main school entrance is off Sandford Road to the east.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The application lodged with the planning authority indicates proposals for
- Installation of '3g' all weather, artificial turf pitch for full size, 112 metres in length x 78 metres in width rugby and football to be laid over an existing grass pitch in an east west orientation.
  - 6/8 floodlighting columns for a floodlighting system. (18 metres in height.) Three columns are to be erected on each side of the pitch.
  - A ball stop fencing system. (5 metres in height.)
  - Spectator hardstanding with fencing (1.2 metres in height.) and,
  - Hard standing for a maintenance access from carpark.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

By order dated, 31<sup>st</sup> May, 2019, the planning authority decided to grant permission subject to conditions which include the following requirements.

Condition No 2. Operation of floodlighting after 21.30 hours is not permitted.

Condition No 3. Restriction of use to use incidental to the school other than letting to third parties for up to twenty-five hours maximum per week.

Condition No 4: Additional planting to be carried out on the boundaries to the rear of Nos. 21, 22, 23, and 24 Park Drive in accordance with details to be agreed with the planning authority.

## 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

Concerns expressed in the planning officer report on the original application relate to potential for adverse impact of the pitch and associated facilities on visual amenities at Nos 22 – 24 Park Drive in particular with regard to the setback of the lighting columns from the common boundaries although it is accepted that overspill by the lighting into these properties would not occur. A request for additional information was issued to which a response was received by the planning authority on 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2019 according to which:

- Re-orientation or relocation of the pitch within the existing playing fields is not feasible;
- It is demonstrated in an accompanying technical document that the lighting system, in which LED technology (which minimises obtrusive lighting to residential properties) is used, is consistent with standard and guidance issued by the *Chartered Institute of Building Services Engineers – Lighting Guide 4: Sports Lighting (CIBSE LG4)* and Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP Guidance note for reduction of obtrusive light. GN01:2011. Compliance is achievable by use of higher mounting columns. Lux overspill to third party properties will not occur.
- Hours of operation and use by the school and third parties which include two evenings per week between September and May inclusive until 9pm.

3.2.2. The planning officer indicated satisfaction with the proposals as indicated in the further information and a recommendation for a grant of permission subject to the requirements of the conditions referred to in paragraph 3.1 above.

### 3.3. **Other Reports.**

The report of the City Archaeologist contains a recommendation for inclusion of a monitoring condition.

The report of the Traffic and Drainage divisions indicate no objection subject to conditions of a standard nature.

### 3.4. **Third Party Observations**

- 3.4.1. The concerns raised in the third-party observations lodged with the planning authority, prior to the issue of the request for additional information, relate to potential for traffic generation and demand for parking on the school campus, noise nuisance and contentions as to insufficient information being available on the nature of use, including use by third parties, intensity and frequency of use.

## 4.0 **Planning History**

- 4.1.1. There is no record of recent planning history for the Gonzaga College campus. However, permission has been granted for additional classrooms, and extensions to the school buildings under P. A. Reg. Refs: 2986/07, 4739/5 and 1804/93.

## 5.0 **Policy Context**

### 5.1. **Development Plan**

The operative development plan is the **Dublin City Development Plan, 2016-2022** according to which the site location is within an area subject to the zoning objective: Z15: *“To protect and provide for institutional and community uses.”*

The adjoining area to the west is within an area subject to the zoning objective ‘Z2’: *Residential Conservation Area.*

The adjoining area to the south is within an area subject to the zoning objective Z1: *‘To protect, provide for and improve residential amenities.’*

According to section 14.8.14 it is the policy of the planning authority that abrupt transitions between prevailing heights, adjacent to lands zoned for residential use

should be avoided and that there should be regard for prevailing heights, aspects, daylight and sunlight access within the residential zoned lands.

Policies, objectives and standards for sports facilities and flood lighting are set out in Chapter 9, 10 and 12 and in particular, Sections 9.5.9, 10.5.8, Policy Objectives: S126, S127, G131 and SN 19.

The houses on Park Drive adjoining the western boundary of the application site are included on the record of protected structures.

## 6.0 The Appeals

6.1. Three third party appeals by residents of properties on Park Drive which adjoins the western boundary of the Gonzaga College sports fields have been lodged with the Board. Each appeal is outlined in brief below:

### 6.2. Appeal by Marion Bruton.

6.2.1. An appeal was received from DK Planning and Architecture on behalf of Ms Bruton of No 27 Park Drive on 26<sup>th</sup> June, 2019. It is stated that it is considered reasonable that Gonzaga College should provide improved sports facilities, but it is requested that permission be refused for the proposed layout of the pitches. According to the appeal:

- Due to proximity of the proposed pitch, especially the goalposts the high fencing behind the goal will be unsightly and its effectiveness is questionable.
- The proximity of the proposed support structures for the lighting to the Park Drive properties will be obtrusive, especially with a 'residential conservation area', will be detrimental to the setting of the protected structures on this road and will be a source of nuisance.
- The decision of the planning authority is inconsistent with the concerns indicated in the additional information request. In addition, there is ambiguity about the position proposed for the lighting columns. The section drawings B-B and C-C (Sportslabconsult. "*Gonzaga College New 3G Pitch Lighting System*" lodged on 8<sup>th</sup> May 2019) show the lighting columns located closer position to the western boundaries than the layout shown on a plan drawing.

- The use of the pitch for up to twenty-five hours per week as provided for under Condition No 3 attached to the planning authority decision is excessive and intensifies the adverse impact on amenities.
- The entrance gate to Gonzaga College on the boundary with Park Drive could be used. The associated traffic could lead to congestion on the local road network.

### **6.3. Appeal by Cathal and Triona Gibson.**

6.3.1. An appeal was received from Cathal and Triona Gibson of No 25 Park Drive on behalf of Ms Bruton of No 27 Park Drive on 26<sup>th</sup> June, 2019. They have no objection on principle to upgrading of the sports facilities by Gonzaga College. However, it is contended that the proposed development would affect the residential amenities of No 25 Park Drive due to noise and light pollution and adverse visual impact. The front elevation of the property faces towards the playing fields According to the appeal:

- The rationale provided by the application in the further information submission to the proposed change in orientation of the pitch to east west is not accepted. The ability to maintain three playing pitches is unaffected because there is an additional rugby pitch to the east side of the school.
- The lighting columns, at eighteen metres in height are twice the height of the houses. The necessity for a five metres high fence which will be visible from Park Drive is questionable as there are existing boundaries. The height should be reduced to 2.4 metres.
- Residential amenities will be affected by light spillage and noise from use of the pitch up to 9.30 pm at night as permitted under Condition No 3 attached to the planning authority decision. It is requested that a condition be attached with a requirement for the lights to be switched off by 6pm each evening which is consistent with the intended hours for training and matches for students at the school.

It is requested that permission either be refused or that conditions with the above requirements be attached.

#### 6.4. Appeal by David Crampton and Lance Graham.

6.4.1. An appeal was received from Dr. Diarmuid O'Grada on behalf of David Crampton and Lance Graham of No 24 Park Drive on 21st June, 2019. It is stated that the principle of sports facilities provision is accepted; that a balance must be achieved whereby residential amenities and architectural heritage are adequately protected and that there is scope within the landholding for appropriate revisions to be implemented.

According to the appeal:

- The planning authority decision to grant permission and the conditions attached are not consistent with the concerns which were raised with the intention of securing changes and an amended proposal for the development in the additional information request.
- The diminution in attainable residential amenities at the adjoining properties on Park Drive attributable to the proximity of the eighteen metres high lighting columns and their lamps would be excessive. The overbearing impact of the five metres high ball stop fence leads to material obstruction of daylight and sunlight access to east facing rear elevation windows. The concerns and the desirability of an increased distance and part modified fence height indicated the planning officer report and additional information request were not resolved in the decision to grant permission.
- If permission is granted it is requested that by condition, the five metres height should be reduced to forty metres of the entire seventy-eight metres length of the ball stop fence with the remainder being reduced to three metres in height, Effective control of light overspill is not possible and a lowering of the height of the light columns is necessary.
- If permission is granted it is requested that by condition the flood lighting be permitted for a three year period to allow for further assessment of the ongoing impact; that the lighting fixtures be designed, orientated, maintained and that it should have a lighting level such that spillage outside the boundaries is kept to a maximum of 5 lux as measured at any site boundary, for reasons relating to visual and residential amenity. Account has not been taken of the necessity for special care and protection against unsuitable new



development that has negative impact on amenity of architectural quality and the constrained layout of the Park Drive properties which are also included on the record of protected structures. Greater sensitivity is required with regard to encroachment of oversized structures or structures with an incompatible appearance. The planning authority decision fails to take these considerations into account.

- Having regard to the policies and objectives set out in section 9.5.8 of the CDP and Policy S126 and S127 whereby sensitive design for external lighting columns and related fixtures and minimisation of light spillage or pollution in the surrounding environment is required, the planning authority failed to apply the higher standards of protection which are required in 'Z2' zoned areas relative to 'Z1' zoned areas.

#### 6.5. Applicant Response

A submission was received from the applicant, Sports Labs Ltd., on 24<sup>th</sup> July, 2019 the contents of which are outlined below.

- The proposed lighting scheme will operate within acceptable boundaries: The proposed pitch is within 'environmental zone' category '3' of *Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP) Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light GN01:2011*. Category 3 provides for Light trespass into window is less than 10 lux pre-curfew and 2 lux post curfew. These standards are exceeded at Nos 24, 25 and 27 Park Drive. (Details of vertical luminance stated to be compliant with the ILP standards are provided.)
- A modern LED floodlighting system with slim unobtrusive columns and flat LED luminaires technology is used. Light is directed towards and downwards on to the playing surface causing minimal interference to local amenity.
- The image provided in the appeal on behalf of the occupants of No 24 Park Drive is a gross inaccurate representation of the proposed floodlighting and fencing structures post installation. Also, the extensive mature tree lined boundary was not included. These issues raise questions over the accuracy of the drawings included with this appeal.

- The purpose of the ball stop fence is to prevent balls from the pitch from ending up in the gardens of the adjoining properties. The proposed wire weld mesh fencing panels for the perimeter fencing has 200 mm x 50 mm apertures within x 6 mm diam. wire, with 100 mm square hollow metal posts at 3 metre centres in green. As the fence is open there is no shadow effect and the green colour blends with the environment; it is lower in height than the adjoining houses and screening is provided by the mature trees on the boundary.
- A comprehensive options appraisal was undertaken for the feasibility study to determine the optimal location for the pitch and the cover letter and feasibility report contain the details.
- With regard to the claim as to adverse visual impact of No 25 Park Drive, there are substantial surrounding features between the property and the site which minimise any potential visual impact.
- The comments as to proximity of the lighting columns to the boundary at No 24 Park Drive are inaccurate. Column L3 is the closest and is at 28.1 metres from the nearest property interface, at No 23 Park Drive. Disruption to adjoining properties is minimised.
- Gonzaga College requires three playing pitches for its sports programme and the proposed artificial pitch complies with World Rugby standards which allow for certification for the hosting of competitive matches. The pitch location was selected following a detailed feasibility study having regard to IRFU requirements following consideration of three options. A topographical survey was undertaken to confirm accuracy of dimensions.
- This proposed artificial pitch 'futureproofs' the need for retention of space at the north east of the playing fields by the college for an additional access route from lands at the end of Abbeyfield Road. It will minimise congestion in the area of the shared access to Sandford National School.
- It is not intended that the pitch be operated as a commercial facility. The pitch will be used by the school for training and matches up to 5pm on week days and for matches and training between 11 am and 3 pm at weekends during the rugby season. There is to be a reciprocal arrangement, during the

rugby season whereby Lansdowne RFC will use the pitch on two nights per week, (when required) until 9.p.m. The school's playing fields are also available, free of charge to local organisations in the community for occasional use. Floodlight use is required on two evenings per week between September and March. This is less than the operational hours for the floodlight that would be permitted under Condition No 2 of the decision to grant permission.

- In order to address the concerns of the appellant parties, the applicant is willing to introduce the following mitigation measures into the proposed development:

Fit baffles to the light luminaires to reduce light trespass,

Reduce the height of the fence and install a high ball netting stop instead,

Provide landscaping and planting to reduce the impact of the fence and the lights.

The applicant will carry out additional planting on the boundary adjacent to Nos 23-24 Park Drive inclusive.

- It is also stated that owing to the capita costs involved for the floodlighting system, a planning review in three years is not accepted as an option.

In addition, it is contended that as the wrong photographs and lists of issues are in the appeal of Doyle Kent it is rendered lacking in credibility.

## 6.6. Planning Authority Response

- 6.6.1. There is no submission from the planning authority on file

## 6.7. Observations

- 6.7.1. An observation was received from Dr. Anne Heffernan of No 23 Park Drive on 12<sup>th</sup> July, 2019 according to which the pitch should be relocated at least ten metres further from the boundary wall. It is submitted that:

- The pitch would be five metres from the rear boundary wall of No 23 Park Drive and five to ten metres from the rear windows of the Park Drive houses due to their short rear gardens.
- The proposed five metres' high fence which would be so close to the rear elevation windows would adversely affect the setting of the houses on Park Drive which are protected structures and visual and residential amenities. The fence would be overbearing and would create a shadow effect on the gardens.
- Cross section drawings were not included with the application and contextual drawings of the fencing, floodlighting indicating their scale and proximity to the rear gardens of the Park Drive properties requested from the applicant by the planning authority were not provided.
- The offer by the applicant to reduce the five metres height of the fence length to forty metres with the height of the remainder of the seventy-eight metres to three metres should be formalised. It is requested that this modification be imposed if permission is granted so that the impact of the fence can be reduced.
- The hours of use of the pitch should be restricted to a greater degree than allowed for in the planning authority decision with use not being permitted at weekends and up to 9pm on weekdays only. It is requested that this requirement be imposed if permission is granted so that light and noise pollution can be minimised.
- The validity of the applicant's statement that the pitch could not be moved eastwards because it would be possible to retain three pitches on the grounds is questionable from a planning perspective. The pitch can be positioned further to the east. It is requested that a requirement for repositioning of the pitch providing for an additional ten metres separation distance from the western boundary be imposed on the applicant if permission is granted.

## 6.8. Further Responses - David Crampton and Lance Graham

- 6.8.1. A further submission was received from Diarmuid O'Grada on behalf of **David Crampton and Lance Graham** on 9<sup>th</sup> July, 2019.

It is stated that the Appellant Party supports the appeals by the other third parties in particular with regard to the protected structure status of their properties and the 'Z2': (residential conservation area) zoning objective for the area and with regard to options open to the applicant within the landholding for modifications to the proposed development that would be feasible.

- 6.8.2. A further submission was received Diarmuid O'Grada on behalf of **David Crampton and Lance Graham** on 9<sup>th</sup> August, 2019.

According to this submission the applicant's response and its reliance on studies does not address the concerns of the appellant parties. It is indicated that it is considered that there proposed development lacks any regard for the planning context, especially the "Z2" zoning objective. The initial statement as to inadequacies and lack of clarity in the application drawings and the appeal grounds are reiterated in the submission. It is pointed out that the primary concern is Lighting Column L3 and the perimeter fence which it is claimed does little to screen off the light spill, would transmit noise and is unsightly.

The request in the appeal, that in the event that permission is to be granted and not refused, the following requirements should be included, by condition is repeated.

They are:

Limitation of the duration of the grant of permission to three years;

Use of lower lighting columns,

located at a greater separation distance from the boundary and,

restriction on use of the pitch to no later than 9 pm on Mondays to Fridays only.

## 7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. The issues raised in the appeals which are central to the determination of the decision can be considered under the following sub-headings:

Site Selection.

Lighting Columns and Floodlighting system.

Ball stop fencing system.

Traffic Generation on Park Drive.

Nature of Use

Duration of Grant of Permission

Environmental Impact Assessment

Appropriate Assessment

However, at the outset, as remarks have been raised with regard to the information available on the application drawings in the third party submissions observations on the adequacy of the application documentation follow below.

### 7.2. **Application documentation.**

7.2.1. It is agreed that the planning application drawings, which were lodged electronically with the planning authority on 13<sup>th</sup> February, 2019 and the further information submission lodged electronically on 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2019, according to the planning authority's website through the application was lodged lack clarity leading to some confusion and potential for misinterpretation of the details. Notwithstanding these deficiencies the application documentation, was accepted and validated at application stage by the planning authority and it is considered that the opportunity for participation by third parties in the planning process has not been compromised over these issues.

### 7.3. **Site Selection.**

7.3.1. Although the submissions of the applicant do not include a copy of the comprehensive feasibility study to which it refers, (a brief statement only being available in the appendices attached to the response to the appeal) it is considered that the applicant has provided a satisfactory case to justify the location selected for the proposed development, in the area of one of the three existing pitches, having

regard to its sports facilities' requirements especially in relation to rugby and having regard to the future plans to construct a new alternative entrance to the college campus off Abbeyfield. The development at the outset is therefore regarded as being acceptable in principle, bearing in mind the planning context as provided for in the CDP and in particular the zoning objective ("Z15") and the zoning objectives of the adjoining lands. ("Z1" and "Z2")

#### **7.4. Lighting Columns and Floodlighting system.**

- 7.4.1. It is considered that it is satisfactorily demonstrated in the further information submission and the response to the appeal, that the lighting design complies with the standards provide for in *Institute of Lighting Professionals: (ILP) Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light GN01:2011*. It is identified that the site context is classifiable as Environmental Zone "E" in respect of (UK) requirements relating to maximum light intrusion to windows. It is noted also that the design is guided by the recommendations and standards within *Chartered Institute of Building Services Engineers – Lighting Guide 4: Sports Lighting (CIBSE LG4)* It is considered reasonable that the applicant should seek to demonstrate compliance with the relevant criteria for the proposed development within these (British) standards.
- 7.4.2. The structures, both the lighting columns are located at a significant distance from the boundary with and the rear facades of houses on Park Drive. It is noted that , Light L3 is shown in the copies of section drawings attached to one of the appeals (assumed to be at a scale of 1:100) at twenty metres from the boundary whereas on the site plan lodged with the application at a scale of 1:200 on Drawing 400 it is shown at twenty eight metres distance from the boundary. This distance corresponds with the statement in the in the response to the appeal that this separation distance is twenty-eight metres. This matter can be resolved by condition, should permission be granted.
- 7.4.3. Given their slenderness, notwithstanding the 18.3 metres height, as shown in the specification drawings and, given the minimum separation distance of twenty-eight metres from the west boundary with the Park Drive properties, it is not accepted that the lighting columns would unduly adversely affect the setting and context of the protected structures or the streetscape views. Existing and proposed additional

screen planting on the inner side of the boundary would further ameliorate any potential impact.

- 7.4.4. When unlit, the columns would not be visually conspicuous whereas during the limited periods when the pitch is in use at night-time any adverse impact would be insignificant, the noise from the pitch during matches and practice sessions being more predominant. This is due to the luminaire design, and the additional mitigation measure which is to fit baffles to them providing for control of overspill and downward focus as indicated in the specifications, facilitated by the eighteen metres height of the columns, In this regard, it should be borne in mind that outdoor sports playing fields use is the extant use of the lands adjoining the residential properties, notwithstanding material change attributable to the proposal for the artificial pitch and floodlighting system.

**7.5. Ball stop fencing system.**

- 7.5.1. On review of the lodged plans and section drawings indicating the relationship to No 23 Park Drive, it is noted that the ball stop fencing system, would interfere with views across the playing fields, from the upper floor rear elevation windows of the adjoining properties of Park Drive. It should however be borne in mind that there is no entitlement within the planning code to retention of views from vantage points within private properties.
- 7.5.2. It is considered that the proposed position of the ball stop fencing system is at a sufficient distance from the boundary with the adjoining properties including that of the side garden space and side curtilage of No 24 across which there are also views from the front of No 25 Park Drive. Furthermore, the coverage along the inner side of the western boundary wall by mature trees is effective in mitigating the visual impact of the ball stop fencing system in views from these properties at ground floor level and from within the rear gardens. The applicant has confirmed a willingness to implement additional planting and the planning authority attached a condition to this effect to its decision to grant permission. Subject to a similar requirement, should permission be granted, so that any breaks or gaps in the existing mature planting are eliminated, it is considered that the proposed development is acceptable to this end.
- 7.5.3. With regard to the contentions as to overshadowing, it is of note that the proposed ball stop fencing system is on lands to the east, of the residential properties which



are separated by the existing boundary wall and mature trees. It is considered that any additional overshadowing of these properties that would be directly attributable to the ball stop fencing system in early morning time would be insignificant and non-existent later in daytime to evening hours.

- 7.5.4. While the applicant has indicated a willingness to provide for an alternative option which is to reduce the height over part of the length of the ball stop fencing and install netting instead such a requirement is not considered fully warranted from a planning perspective. Imposition of a condition with a mandatory requirement to that end is considered inessential.

#### **7.6. Traffic Generation on Park Drive.**

- 7.6.1. There is a pedestrian entrance gate opening onto Park Drive on the west side boundary and it is noted that there are no proposals for changes to this entrance. The contention by one of the Appellant parties that use of this pedestrian entrance for access to the playing fields would result in excessive demand for on street parking and traffic congestion on Park Drive is not accepted. Park Drive is a *cul de sac* along which there is ample supply of public paid parallel parking available for all road users on both sides of the carriageway.

#### **7.7. Nature of use.**

- 7.7.1. With regard to the nature and extent of the intended use for the proposed pitches, it is considered that the applicant has provided sufficient information to demonstrate that it is not the proposed development be operated as a commercial entity. The nature and extent to which the facilities would be available for third party use is reasonable and consistent with the zoning objective.
- 7.7.2. To this end it is recommended that the hours of use for the pitch (including the flood lighting system) provided for under Condition No 2 attached to the planning authority decision be revised to allow for use up to 2100 hrs Mondays to Fridays and up to 1900 hrs on Saturdays and Sundays. It is not considered that any further restriction is warranted, and it is noted that these restrictions accommodate the applicant's requirements for night time use of the proposed pitch twice a week and between 1100 hrs and 1500 hours on Saturday and Sundays.

## **7.8. Duration of Grant of Permission.**

- 7.8.1. In view of the foregoing, it is not considered necessary for an opportunity for further planning review as requested in one of the appeals to be provided for by restriction on the duration of the grant of permission. The proposed development is subject to implementation in accordance with the conditions attached, if permission is granted and is also subject, if required, to the requirements of the enforcement provisions which have a statutory basis.

## **7.9. Environmental Impact Assessment Screening.**

- 7.9.1. Having regard to the nature 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. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

## **7.10. Appropriate Assessment Screening.**

- 7.10.1. Having regard to the small-scale nature of the proposed development and, to the serviced inner suburban location, no Appropriate Assessment issues proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

## **8.0 Recommendation**

Sports playing facilities, sports halls and associated facilities such as parking and lighting for pitches tend to be located in areas surrounded by residential development. Ideally, a balance should be arrived whereby the sports use is not compromised while simultaneously the attainable residential amenities of properties in the adjoining areas are not unduly affected. The outcome, should permission be granted, as is recommended, is considered a reasonable balance between facilitation of appropriate current and future use of the school campus grounds, having regard to the “Z5” zoning objective applicable to the application site lands and the consistency with the zoning objectives for the residential area to the west, subject to the zoning objective ‘Z2’: and the residential area to the south, subject to

the zoning objective “Z1” to *protect, provide for and improve residential amenities*. Draft Reasons and Considerations and conditions follow.

## 9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the extant use of the lands within which the site is located, to the nature and design for the proposed development and to the zoning objective, ‘Z15’ *To protect and provide for institutional and community uses.*” and the associated provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan, 2016-2022, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not adversely affect the integrity, setting and context of the adjoining properties to the west which are included on the record of protected structures or the architectural character, visual and residential amenities of Park Drive on which these properties are located and which is subject to the zoning objective: Z2: *“To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas”*. 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 submitted on 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2019 except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

**Reason:** In the interest of clarity.

2. Prior to the commencement of the development the applicant shall submit and agree in writing with the planning authority, plan, section and elevation

drawings showing the pitch layout and position of the lighting columns and ball stop fencing system. The lighting columns shall be positioned at a minimum distance of thirteen metres from the western side boundary and the ball stop fencing system shall be positioned at a minimum distance of 6.2 metres from the western site boundary.

**Reason:** In the interest of clarity.

3. The following requirements shall be provided for and adhered to in the in the development on an indefinite basis:

(a) All floodlighting columns, including Column LS3 shall be positioned at a minimum of twenty-eight meters separation distance from the western boundary with the residential properties on Park Drive.

(b) Luminaires shall be designed and fitted in accordance with the specification details on '*Datasheet TLC-LED-1150 – Luminaire and Driver*' and '*Preliminary Foundation and Pole Assembly Drawing*' submitted to the planning authority on 13th February, 2019 and shall be fitted with bafflers. Lighting spillage, if any from the proposed floodlighting system shall not exceed a maximum of 5 lux on the outer side of any site boundaries, as measured at any site boundary.

(c) Supplementary planting shall be carried out along the inner side of the western site boundary with Nos 21-24 Park Drive inclusive to the satisfaction of the planning authority.

**Reason** In the interest of clarity and the residential amenities of the surrounding area.

4. The use of the artificial pitch including the flood lighting system shall cease at or before 2100 hrs on Mondays to Fridays and 1900 hrs Saturdays and Sundays.

**Reason:** In the interest of clarity and the public and residential amenities of the surrounding area.

5. Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services and shall incorporate drainage on a separate system with separate connections to the foul and surface water systems and Sustainable Drainage Systems for management of surface water.

**Reason:** In the interest of public health.

6. Hours of work during the construction period shall be confined to 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, excluding bank holidays and 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances subject to the prior written agreement of the planning authority.

**Reason:** In the interest of residential amenity.

- 7 The developer shall facilitate the preservation, recording and protection of archaeological materials or features that may exist within the site. In this regard, the developer shall -

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

(b) employ a suitably-qualified archaeologist who shall monitor all site investigations and other excavation works, and

(c) provide arrangements, acceptable to the planning authority, for the recording and for the removal of any archaeological material which the authority considers appropriate to remove.

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

**Reason:** To conserve the archaeological heritage of the site and to secure the preservation and protection of any remains that may exist within the site.

- 8 All necessary measures shall be taken to prevent spillage or deposit of clay, rubble or other debris on adjoining roads during the course of the site works.

**Reason:** In the interest of public amenity orderly development and traffic safety.

- 9 The construction the proposed development shall comply with British Standard 5228 ' *Noise Control on Construction and Open Sites - Part 1. Code of practice for basic information and procedures for noise control.*'

**Reason:** To ensure a satisfactory standard of development, in the interests of residential amenity.

**Jane Dennehy**  
Senior Planning Inspector  
11<sup>th</sup> September, 2019.