



An
Bord
Pleanála

S. 4(1) of Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 2016

Inspector's Report ABP-305556-19

Strategic Housing Development

290 no. apartments, crèche, 4 no. retail units and 2 no. café units and associated site works.

Location

Citywest Shopping Centre,
Fortunestown, Dublin 24.

Planning Authority

South Dublin County Council.

Applicant

OBSF (I) Limited

Prescribed Bodies

Irish Water

IAA

TII

Observer(s)

See Appendix 1

Date of Site Inspection

11th December 2019

Inspector

Erika Casey

Contents

1.0	Introduction	4
2.0	Site Location and Description.....	4
3.0	Proposed Strategic Housing Development.....	4
4.0	Planning History	7
5.0	Section 5 Pre Application Consultation	8
6.0	Relevant Planning Policy.....	16
7.0	Third Party Submissions	21
8.0	Planning Authority Submission.....	25
9.0	Prescribed Bodies	30
10.0	Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Preliminary Assessment.....	33
11.0	Appropriate Assessment.....	33
12.0	Assessment.....	37
13.0	Recommendation	68
14.0	Draft Order	68

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This is an assessment of a proposed strategic housing development submitted to the Board under section 4(1) of the Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 2016. The application was received by the Board on the 4th October 2019 from OBSF (I) Limited.

2.0 Site Location and Description

- 2.1. The subject site (2.8ha) relates to lands directly adjacent to the Citywest Shopping Centre. The proposed site comprises of two separate parcels of land located to the north and south of the shopping centre, interlinked by an internal road, Citywest Plaza. A large residential scheme, incorporating a mix of duplexes 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. Fortunestown Luas station is located directly to the north of the site.

3.0 Proposed Strategic Housing Development

- 3.1 The proposed development provides for the construction of a mixed use residential development comprising: the construction of 6 no. blocks to accommodate 290 apartments comprising 106 no. 1 bed units, 133 no. 2 bed units and 40 no. 3 bed units, associated residential amenity facilities (339 sq. m.), a childcare facility (265 sq. m.), 4 no. retail units (284.6 sq. m.) and 2 no. café/restaurant units (205.8 sq. m.) on a site of 2.9ha.
- 3.2 A total of 153 no. car parking spaces (including 2 no. car club spaces) are proposed at surface level and existing basement level of the Citywest Shopping Centre to serve the development to include: the reallocation of 37 no. existing surface level spaces; 67 no. new surface level spaces and the reallocation of 49 no. spaces from commercial to residential use at existing basement level of the Citywest Shopping Centre. The proposed development will include the provision of a new vehicular ramp and pedestrian stairway and lift egress lobby (c. 21 sq. m.) to the Citywest

Shopping Centre basement car park at the existing southern/rear elevation and amendments to the layout and vehicular and pedestrian circulation at the basement. The proposal will include the reallocation of a further 29 no. existing car parking spaces at surface level within the site to serve their existing uses. The development will also include a total of 298 bicycle parking spaces to be provided within integrated cycle stores within the ground floor of each Block and external stands at surface level.

- 3.3 The proposed development will include elevational upgrades and the provision of a green wall at the southern/rear elevation of the Citywest Shopping Centre. The proposal will also include landscaped open spaces to comprise c. 2,110 sq. m. of residential communal courtyards, outdoor spaces, children’s play and outdoor gym and a single storey ESB substation and plant room of 27 sq. metres.
- 3.4 The development will include alterations to existing road alignments within the estate, removal of 2 no. existing bin storage areas (c. 24 sq. m.) to the west of the shopping centre and replacement with 1 no. bin storage area (c. 15 sq. m.) to the north east of Block D and the omission of 1 no. parking space within the existing public car park to the front of Citywest Shopping Centre.
- 3.5 The proposed development will also include hard and soft landscaping, pedestrian and cycle links, boundary treatments, public lighting, green roofs, integrated residential waste facilities within each block, an external bin storage area to serve commercial uses (c. 17 sq. m.) adjacent to Block E, an external bin storage area to serve the childcare facility (c. 8 sq. m.) to the rear of Block D, piped site wide services and attenuation tanks and all ancillary works and services necessary to facilitate construction and operation.
- 3.6 The heights of the blocks vary as follows:

Block	No. of Storeys
Block A	6 storeys
Block B	4 to 5 storeys
Block C	5 to 6 storeys
Block D	5 storeys
Block E	6 storeys
Block F	5 to 7 storeys

Submitted Documentation

3.7 In addition to the architectural, landscape and engineering drawings, the application was accompanied by the following reports and documentation:

- Application Form
- Statutory Notices
- Legal Letter regarding connection to foul sewer
- Letters to Prescribed Bodies
- Statement of Consistency
- Response to An Bord Pleanála Opinion
- Material Contravention Statement
- Environmental Impact Assessment Screening
- Social and Community Infrastructure Audit
- Part V Documentation
- Architectural Design Statement
- Schedule Document including Housing Quality Assessment
- Architectural Drawings
- Infrastructure Design Report
- Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment
- Traffic and Transport Assessment
- Outline Construction Management Plan
- DMURS Design Statement
- Engineering Drawing Pack
- Utility Briefing Note
- Public Lighting Report and Public Lighting Drawings
- Daylight and Sunlight Report
- Sustainability Report

- Inward Noise Assessment
- Operational Waste Management Plan
- Fire Safety Strategy
- Disability Access Strategy
- Landscaping Design Report
- Landscaping Drawing Pack
- Tree Survey Report
- Tree Survey Drawing Pack
- Photomontages and CGI's
- Building Lifecycle Report
- Aeronautical Assessment
- Screening Report for Appropriate Assessment
- Ecological Impact Assessment
- Archaeological Assessment
- Drawing Schedules

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1 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 detailed below:

Planning Authority Reference SD03A/0857

4.2 Permission granted in November 2004 for a mixed use retail/ commercial and residential development in separate buildings including:

- 380 residential units (13 no. 1 bed, 305 no. 2 bed, 57 no. 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 (2,999m²).

- Underground carpark 223 no. spaces and surface car parking 340 no. spaces.
- 2 offices (1,699m²).
- Crèche/ playhouse (375m²) (removed under SD05A/0582).
- Community hall, pub and restaurant (862m²).

4.3 The permission was subsequently extended under application reference SD03A/0857/EP and SD03A/0857/FEP.

Adjacent Lands

An Bord Pleanála Reference: ABP 302398-18

4.4 Permission granted by the Board in December 2018 for a Strategic Housing Development comprising 459 dwellings, vehicular access provided from new central section of Citywest Avenue including replacement roundabout, temporary pedestrian link to Fortunestown Luas stop and associated site works at Cooldown Commons and Fortunestown, Citywest, Dublin 24.

5.0 Section 5 Pre Application Consultation

Notice of Pre-Application Consultation Opinion – Ref. ABP-304454

5.1.1 A notice of pre-application consultation opinion was issued by the Board on 15th July 2019 under Section 6(7) of the Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 2016 following the submission of the application request on 15th May 2019.

5.1.2 The notice of Pre-Application Consultation Opinion states that the Board has considered the issues raised in the pre-application consultation process and, having regard to the consultation meeting and the submission of the Planning Authority, is of the opinion that the documents submitted with the request to enter into consultations **require further consideration and amendment to constitute a reasonable basis for an application** for strategic housing development. The matters included are as follows:

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.

Specified Information

5.1.3 Pursuant to article 285(5)(b)(i) and (ii) of the Planning and Development (Strategic Housing Development) Regulations 2017, the following specific information was requested:

1. The site layout plan, and all other accompanying plans, illustrating all areas relevant to the proposed development outlined within the site plan boundary.
2. 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.
3. 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)
4. 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.

5. 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.
6. Additional CGIs/ visualisations/ 3D modelling showing the proposed development relative to existing development in the vicinity.
7. Traffic Impact Assessment including the justification for public transport, surface car parking and additional vehicular access into the site.
8. Report on surface water drainage.
9. Social Audit detailing the justification for the crèche facility and the necessity for the provision of any further community/ medical facility within the site.
10. Details of public lighting.
11. Details of Part V provision clearly indicating the proposed Part V units.
12. A plan of the proposed open space within the site clearly delineating public, semi-private and private spaces.
13. A detailed phasing plan for the proposed development should be provided.
14. A site layout plan clearly indicating what areas are to be taken in charge by the Local Authority.
15. 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.

5.2 Applicant's Statement

5.2.1 Article 297(3) of the Regulations provides that where, under section 6(7) of the Act of 2016, the Board issued a notice to the prospective applicant of its opinion that the documents enclosed with the request for pre-application consultations required further consideration and amendment in order to constitute a reasonable basis for an application for permission, the application shall be accompanied by a statement of the proposals included in the application to address the issues set out in the notice.

5.2.2 In report titled "*Response to An Bord Pleanála Opinion*" submitted with the application, the applicant's agent outlines a response to the matters specifically required by the Board which is summarised as follows:

Architectural Response of Block E and F

- The approach to the development of the northern portion of the site was reconsidered. Whilst the retention of two separate building blocks was necessitated due to the presence of the Irish Water wayleave, the architectural design and form of the blocks was amended in order to more appropriately respond to the landmark status of the site as required by the LAP. The blocks are now presented in a curved format to mirror the façade of the Shopping Centre. To add visual interest, the concept of sliding blocks was added to provide a memorable architectural form. Important viewpoints are retained and enhanced with the shopping centre remaining clearly visible through the blocks.
- Blocks E and F form the entrance to the District Centre. The partial basement at Block E has been omitted to ensure a more positive relationship between the block and the streetscape at ground floor. Retail units are provided at ground floor level with opportunities for outdoor seating areas. The landscaping treatment will create a plaza type environment. It is considered that Blocks E and F provide a strong urban edge for the scheme. A simple palette of materials is proposed with large glazed elements and the use of brick with additional visual interest provided by aluminium panels and timber cladding.
- While the orientation of the proposed blocks E and F is relatively unchanged, the introduction of additional active ground floor uses provides a more positive relationship with Fortunestown Lane and the junction of Fortunestown Lane and Citywest Road. The previously proposed wall boundary treatment has been

removed in order to open up the blocks to the streetscape.

Architectural Response of Block A and Rear of the Shopping Centre

- The rear elevation of the shopping centre comprises aluminium panels which would not present an ideal visual appearance when viewed by residents within the proposed Block A. To improve the interface between the shopping centre and Block A, it is proposed to use a green living wall in order to enliven and enhance the rear elevation of the shopping centre.
- The existing rear entrance to the shopping centre will be enhanced through improved hard landscaping, planting and the provision of seating walls. The provision of a green link from the entrance to the site from Fortunestown Lane, towards the rear of the Shopping Centre and then towards the District Park to the south, will bring additional activity to the area and improved footfall to this underutilised part of the site.
- The ground floor of Block A includes a large residential amenity facility which aligns with the rear entrance to the shopping centre, further enhancing a sense of vibrancy and activity at this location.
- There are only 2 north facing apartments located at ground floor level of Block A. Both are significantly larger than the required minimum floor area and also have larger terraces. It is, therefore, considered that an appropriate level of amenity will be afforded to future residents by these larger unit sizes and generous private open space, in addition to the visual improvements presented by the green wall.

Car Parking and Access

- Car parking ratio has been reduced from 0.66 spaces per unit to 0.51 spaces per unit. The extent of parking is considered appropriate having regard to the location of the site in proximity to Fortunestown Train Station.
- Car parking has been reduced to allow for the provision of 2 green links comprising a mix of dedicated cycle lanes and pedestrian footpaths. These green links provide easy access through the site towards the District Park.
- The potential need for a second vehicular access to the site was examined. The Traffic and Transport Assessment demonstrates that an additional

vehicular access is not required. However, an additional access is proposed from Citywest Road for emergency vehicles and pedestrians/cyclists.

Open Space

- It is considered that the public open space requirements for the site have been met under the parent permission for the development of the Citywest Shopping Centre and subsequent linked permission for public park. The proposed development will enhance access to the District Park through the provision of two dedicated green links to the park and the improvement of passive surveillance over the area as a result of the increased footfall and residential blocks which will overlook the park area.
- In addition, high quality areas of communal open space are provided throughout the site providing a number of opportunities for active and passive recreation. Proposed open space amenities will include a toddler play area, seating areas, outdoor gym, green spaces and a play area for older children.
- The site's surface water management infrastructure has been designed in accordance with the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study and in consultation with South Dublin County Council Water Services section. SuDS methodologies include green roofs across all blocks, permeable paving, tree pits connected to road gullies, attenuation systems and flow control devices and separators.

Residential Amenity

- A detailed Sunlight and Daylight report undertaken. With regard to changes to the VSC for adjacent residential properties, the overall changes are described as minor to negligible with less than 1.5% of total windows experiencing a substantial adverse impact, while less than 4% of total windows would experience a moderate adverse impact and 11% of total windows experiencing a minor adverse impact compared to 85% of total windows experiencing a negligible impact.
- The daylight provision to proposed apartments is excellent with 99% of habitable units being well illuminated and in line with the minimum daylight factor. All existing and proposed amenity spaces also comply with BRE's 2011

guidance whereby 50% of the space will receive at least 2 hours of sunlight during the course of the day.

- The childcare facility is c. 265 sq. m. and will accommodate 71 no. children. The location of the facility within the ground floor of Block D has been selected due to its location away from the more active/commercial part of the site and its proximity to the District Park and set down facilities. The crèche will be constructed during the second phase of construction and is expected that it will be operational following first occupation of the scheme. It is considered that the childcare facility is appropriately sized and will provide sufficient flexibility.
- A Social and Community Infrastructure Audit has been undertaken. This concludes that there are no significant gaps in the existing social infrastructure provision serving the catchment area.

Specified Information

5.2.3 In response to the specified additional information requested by the Board the following is provided:

1. A Site Layout Plan (JA Drawing Ref. P-R-001) is enclosed.
2. Issue of 2nd vehicular access is addressed in the Traffic and Transport Assessment.
3. A Schedule of Accommodation and Housing Quality Assessment is provided.
4. Issue of residential amenity is addressed in the Social and Community Infrastructure Audit.
5. Building Life Cycle Report included.
6. Photomontage and CGI Booklet prepared.
7. A Traffic and Transport Assessment provided.
8. A report regarding surface water drainage is included in the Infrastructure Design Report.
9. A Social Audit and Residential Amenity Report prepared.
10. Details of public lighting provided.
11. Part V proposals including a schedule of accommodation, plans and indicative

costings with a letter from SDCC stating acceptability in principle of the proposal is submitted.

12. A plan of open spaces has been prepared.
13. Phasing plan included within the Outline Construction Management Plan.
14. It is not proposed that the scheme be taken in charge.
15. A Material Contravention Statement has been prepared.

6.0 Relevant Planning Policy

6.1. Project Ireland 2040 - National Planning Framework

- 6.1.1. The recently published National Planning Framework includes a specific Chapter, No. 6, entitled 'People Homes and Communities'. It includes 12 objectives among which Objective 27 seeks to ensure the integration of safe and convenient alternatives to the car into the design of our communities, by prioritising walking and cycling accessibility to both existing and proposed developments, and integrating physical activity facilities for all ages. Objective 33 seeks to prioritise the provision of new homes at locations that can support sustainable development and at an appropriate scale of provision relative to location. Objective 35 seeks to increase densities in settlements, through a range of measures including reductions in vacancy, re-use of existing buildings, infill development schemes, area or site-based regeneration and increased building heights.

6.2. Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines

- 6.2.1. Having considered the nature of the proposal, the receiving environment, the documentation on file, including the submissions 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 Standards for New Apartments – Guidelines for Planning Authorities' (updated 2018).
 - 'Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets'.
 - 'Childcare Facilities Guidelines for Planning Authorities'.

- ‘Urban Development and Building Heights – Guidelines for Planning Authorities’, (2018).

6.3. Local Planning Policy

South Dublin County Development Plan 2019-2022

- 6.3.1 Under the South Dublin County Council 2019-2022, the site is zoned as District Centre, where it is an objective *“To protect, improve and provide for the future development of District Centres”*.

Fortunestown Local Area Plan 2012-2018

- 6.3.2 The site is subject to the provisions of the Fortunestown LAP. The LAP has been extended until the 13th of May 2022. The vision for the plan is to ensure that any future development integrates with existing development and public transport facilities, while addressing local needs including parks, schools and community facilities and the opportunities created by the Luas Line A1 extension, the emerging community, the Citywest Shopping/District Centre and surrounding business parks. It is a specific goal to ensure physically integrated residential communities where existing and new neighbourhoods are knitted together.
- 6.3.3 Section 5.4.3 of the plan addresses community and civic facilities and states that throughout the plan lands these will take the form of community centres, community rooms, a library, youth cafes and park facilities including children’s playgrounds and sports facilities. It is detailed that the majority of such facilities will be located at the District Centre and nodal points where streets and pathways intersect. The plan sets out specific locations where such facilities should be provided and are further detailed on the overall framework map.
- 6.3.4 Guidance regarding dwelling mix is set out in section 5.4.6 of the plan. This notes that apartments/duplexes should be restricted only to areas that are within a 5 minute walking distance of the Luas. It is further detailed in section 5.5.4 of the plan that there shall be a maximum height limit of three storeys, with exceptions justifiable only in limited exceptional circumstances. Under section 5.4.1 of the plan it is stated that net densities of 30-50 dwelling per ha shall apply to the plan lands to facilitate the provision of own door housing. Objective LUD 8 requires that no more than 10% of dwellings in any residential scheme are of one bedroom type.

6.3.5 The Citywest District Centre is identified as an appropriate location for a landmark structure. With regard to landmark opportunities and gateway treatments, it is stated that such opportunities refer to sites where there is potential for a landmark building/structure to be developed. It is stated that these prominent sites need special design consideration and should promote a more legible urban environment. Such buildings/surfaces/treatments should be easily recognisable and should add to the sense of place and identify a manner that punctuates their location.

6.3.6 The plan identifies a series of frameworks and the site is located within the Fortunestown Centre – Central Hub. It is stated that the centre will form a central urban hub which four distinct neighbourhoods will emanate and through which these neighbourhoods will be linked. This neighbourhood will accommodate uses that entice people primarily on foot, by bicycle or by Luas to work, shop, visit, rest or engage in recreation. A series of objectives are set out including:

Objective FC4: *Ensure that any further development of the Fortunestown Centre include for a safe, direct and prominent cyclist and pedestrian link to the District Park to the rear (southwest) of the Citywest Shopping Centre.*

Objective FC5: *Ensure that an identifiable centre developed around the junction between Citywest Road and Fortunestown Lane/Way and the Fortunestown Luas stop with a vibrant mix of retail, service, civic, community and residential uses. Retail floorspace shall comply with the Retail Planning Guidelines.*

Objective FC6a: *Ensure that development of the Fortunestown Centre Neighbourhood shall, in consultation with the Planning Authority, include for the provision of a library building or space and a healthcare facility.*

Objective FC6b: *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 or particular locations such as Luas stops and landmark junctions and sensitively designed to contribute to the broader aesthetics of the area including the nearby mountains. The minimum average floor area of all developments throughout the Plan Lands shall be 110 sq. metres.*

Objective FC7: *That no further residential or commercial floorspace (office, retail, services etc.) will be permitted within the Fortunestown Centre until such time as the*

park facilities heretofore permitted within the site designated as the District Park (site to rear/south-west of Citywest Shopping Centre) have been completed or are nearing completion including children's play facilities, sports/outdoor recreational facilities, jogging track, sports building, car parking, paths and landscaping.

Objective FC8: *That the Fortunestown Centre will incorporate green through routes in a manner that forms a hub for a green structure/network to permeate the Plan Lands.*

6.4 Applicant's Statement of Consistency

6.4.1 The applicant has submitted a Statement of Consistency as per Section 8(1)(iv) of the Act of 2016, which indicates how the proposal is consistent with the policies and objectives of the Section 28 guidelines and the County Development Plan. The following key points are noted:

- The redevelopment of this underutilised site would contribute to compact growth. The development is consistent with the objectives of the NPF in seeking to consolidate and densify an urban area proximate to primary transport routes.
- The development meets the criteria for greater height in accordance with the Urban Development and Building Height: Guidelines for Planning Authorities.
- The application is accompanied by a Housing Quality Assessment which demonstrates compliance with the relevant standards set out in the 2018 Apartment Guidelines. Each apartment meets or exceeds the relevant standards for apartment size, internal area, dimensions, private open space, dual aspect etc.
- Design Statement demonstrates compliance with the Urban Design Manual: Best Practice Guide. The scheme is compliant with DMURS guidance which provides well designed streets which provide safe, convenient and attractive networks.
- A childcare facility is provided as part of the development and is located in proximity to the District Park. The facility will cater for c. 71 children and is in accordance with the Childcare Facility Guidelines.
- A Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment accompanies the application, carried out in accordance with the Planning System and Flood Risk Management –

Guidelines for Planning Authorities. The site is located in Flood Zone C.

- The RSES EMRA states that the new district at Fortunestown near the emerging town of Saggart/Citywest can occur in the short to medium term with a total capacity of 66,000 persons. The development is fully compliant with the intentions of the RSES EMRA as it will contribute to the development of Saggart/Citywest as a new district within a short walking distance of the Luas red line.
- The development will have a net density of 100 units per hectare and is located immediately adjacent to the Fortunestown Luas stop. The development provides an appropriate mix of unit types and sizes, supported by appropriate residential amenity facilities and communal open space and is considered consistent with the designation of Saggart/Citywest as an Emerging Moderate Sustainable Growth Town under the core strategy set out in the County Plan. This density proximate to public transport is also consistent with the vision and objectives of the Transport Strategy for the GDA.
- It is considered that due to the significant quantum of traditional housing stock within Citywest and the need to accommodate higher densities, a scheme providing for a mix of apartment typologies will contribute to the overall residential mix within the wider area and facilitate a range of household sizes.
- The subject site is located in a mixed use zone (District Centre), however, the Fortunestown LAP provides a height limitation of three storeys except in exceptional circumstances. Recent National Policy provisions seek to supersede prescriptive height guidance in appropriate locations. A Material Contravention Statement accompanies the application.
- The development has been designed in accordance with the standards set out in the Development Plan regarding design and layout. A total of 298 bicycle spaces are proposed and is considered appropriate having regard to the locational context of the site. The proposed car parking ratio is 0.53 spaces per unit. Based on the accessibility of the site by public transport, it is considered that the development is suitable to accommodate a reduced quantum of car parking.
- Refers to the parent permission for the Citywest Shopping Centre and

subsequent permission for a District Park permitted under SD09A/0347 and ABP Ref. PL06S.232955. The completed park measures 4.2 ha and it is considered that the open space obligations associated with the Citywest Shopping Centre site have been delivered.

- The delivery of the residential development will complete the mixed use zone. Complementary retail and café/restaurant uses are also proposed within the ground floors of Blocks E and F which will act as a gateway to the Citywest Shopping Centre. The high quality design approach will complement and enhance the existing District Centre environment while integrating sympathetically with the established residential neighbourhoods and the District Park adjacent to the site.
- The subject site comprises a significant amenity for the local area providing a range of retail, service and health related facilities. The proposal will contribute to the overall availability of social infrastructure within Citywest and Fortunestown.
- The development will provide a range of streets which will link to the surrounding areas via Fortunestown Lane, Citywest Road and Citywest Park. 2 no. green links will be provided within the scheme providing a mix of dedicated pedestrian and cycle lanes and shared surface lanes giving safe and convenient access from Fortunestown Lane towards the District Park along Citywest Drive and from Citywest Road through the rear of the site to the District Park. This is in line with Objective FC1, FC3 and FC8 of the LAP which encourages links to the surrounding neighbourhoods.

7.0 Third Party Submissions

7.1 A number of third party submissions were made – see Appendix 1. The issues raised overlap and can be summarised as follows:

Principle

- Good quality streets and spaces, good community and civic facilities and a network of usable green spaces as outlined in the LAP have not been delivered.
- Proposed floor areas are not in line with the LAP which recommend that a

minimum average floor area of 110 sq. metres be achieved.

- Unit mix is inappropriate and site should be developed for conventional housing. More 3 bed units required. Census data indicates that 3 bed units are needed. Development will not encourage families.
- Land should be used to extend shopping centre and provide a community centre.
- Similar high density apartments in Tallaght failed to create a vibrant community.
- Tallaght as the County Town should be the focus of future development.
- Apartment sizes should be increased.
- SHD is premature pending review of County Housing Strategy.

Legal and Procedural

- No details on the potential impact nor has any agreement been entered into with the owners of the management company in respect of 57 car parking spaces held under licence by apartment owners of Citywest Plaza (a number of which directly outside the complex have been turned through 90 degrees effectively halving the number of spaces available to widen the road).
- No detail on the potential impact nor any agreement in respect of 27 visitor spaces currently assigned to Citywest Plaza.
- No agreement entered into in respect two bin storage areas located directly outside the block. Note that the maximum horizontal distance from a residential unit to a waste receptacle should be not less than 20 metres.

Height and Density

- Density is excessive and contrary to the Fortunestown LAP which promotes 50 units per ha. Citywest is a distant suburb of Dublin. It is not an appropriate location for high density apartments.
- Risk that such high density apartments will be left vacant in the long term.
- Height is out of context with existing environment and contravenes the LAP which stipulates that 3 storeys is appropriate at this location.
- Consider that development is contrary to Height Guidelines as this is an outer

suburban area and is suitable for densities of 35 -50 units per ha.

- The site is not a strategic or landmark location.
- Development will have an adverse visual impact on then residents of Verschoyle Drive.
- Concern regarding impacts to Saggart Abbey from overlooking and overshadowing.
- The development will screen the existing shopping centre – an architectural land mark in the area. The centre acts as the communities gathering point and should be protected. Block E and F do not create a district landmark which promotes a more legible urban environment. The buildings dominate the streetscape, are not distinctive in their design and will have an adverse visual impact.
- Development will result in pressure for one off housing. If homes offer neither private spaces nor adequate services, than more people will want to live in one off houses.

Social Infrastructure

- Note that there are a number of developments underway in the Citywest area. The population is akin to a town but there is no commensurate level of amenities. There is no GAA pitch, Garda Station or Library. Population projections set out in the application are inaccurate.
- Consider that the area is already sufficiently served by retail facilities and that there is vacancy in the Citywest SC. There is a requirement for community facilities, not retail.
- Development should be phased with specific amenities provided at each stage. Planning contributions should be ringfenced to provide community infrastructure.
- Consider that development is contrary to DC zoning and should provide for additional community facilities.
- The development relies on the community park as the main recreational space and brings no additional open space to the community.

- Carrigmore Park has limited landscaping and issues of litter. It is often subject to antisocial behaviour and is poorly maintained.
- Concerns regarding delivery of secondary schools.

Traffic, Access and Parking

- The development will exacerbate existing traffic congestion in the area.
- Existing public transport is already at capacity. Luas line is not sufficient reason for increasing densities.
- Concerns regarding the quantum of parking proposed which is considered deficient and that this will lead to overspill parking to the surrounding road network causing nuisance to existing residents.
- Cycle paths/infrastructure in the area are inadequate.
- Concern regarding re-location of surface car parking spaces and that this will impact negatively on the residents of Citywest Plaza and also regarding potential impacts to basement car park.
- Concern regarding lack of boundary separating development from Saggart Abbey and that visitors of the development will drive and park in Saggart Abbey.
- The proposed single access to the proposed development adversely affects the Citywest Plaza residents.
- The development will result in an unsustainable reduction in the Shopping Centres car parking capacity which will give rise to traffic safety issues and adversely impact on traffic flow. The planning application indicates that 153 no. car parking spaces will be provided to serve the development. However, only 67 of these are new spaces and the remaining spaces will be reallocated from existing surface and basement car parking spaces. The development reduces the shopping centres basement car park capacity by 65 spaces. A further 16 spaces at surface level will be utilised by the apartment development resulting in a total loss of 81 spaces to serve the shopping centre. The reduction in the shopping centre car parking capacity combined with the undersupply of parking to support the proposed development will put the shopping centre's surface and

basement car parks under significant pressure.

Biodiversity

- Development is removing one of the central green spaces in Citywest. Parks and walkways identified in the Fortunestown LAP have not been delivered.
- Concerns regarding impact on hedgerows and local streams.

Other

- Concerns regarding increase in antisocial behaviour and that sense of community will be eroded. Development will result in a transient community.
- Concern regarding fire safety of higher apartment blocks.
- Flood risk a concern.
- Lack of play facilities for older children.
- Concern regarding loss of bin storage space.
- Baldonnell Aerodrome height restriction.

8.0 Planning Authority Submission

8.1 Overview

8.1.1 The Planning Authority, South Dublin County Council has made a submission in accordance with the requirements of Section 8(5)(a) of the Act of 2016 which was received by the Board on the 28th November 2019. The planning and technical analysis in accordance with the requirements of Section 8(5)(a)(ii) and 8(5)(b)(i) may be summarised as follows.

8.2 Planning Opinion

Council Policy

- The development fails to comply with the Fortunestown LAP in relation to building height, density and dwelling mix.
- It is considered that the site more accurately fulfils the description of an 'intermediate urban location' rather than a 'central and/or accessible urban location'. Such sites are appropriate for development of 45 dwellings/ha or higher. The PA assessment is that the district centre site might rely too heavily

on the Luas as justification to double the density in the LAP which was adopted after the extension of the Luas red line to Saggart.

- No study has been submitted regarding existing usage/capacity of the Luas at peak travel times. If no capacity exists, it is likely that car usage will rise and result in congestion. In the local context, the density of 50 dwellings per ha proposed in the LAP is considered appropriate.
- The PA does not accept that all necessary criteria in section 3 of the Urban Development and Building Heights – Guidelines for Planning Authorities have been met, particularly in relation to public transport and urban design. The PA consider the density too high and that development should be capped at 3 storeys.

Design and Layout

- Note that Block E and F have been redesigned to reduce the massing and provide more active frontage at ground level and in the case of Block F, achieve a design that matches the sites designation for a landmark building. The revised scheme provides for additional permeability through Blocks E and F from the shopping centre and Fortunestown Lane. The ground floor elevations have been improved to reduce the imbalance between active and inactive elevations.
- In the absence of any consideration of development on the existing surface car park of Citywest Shopping Centre, the proposed development of Blocks E and F would take place on a site which is physically constrained and would result in substandard residential amenity due to the poor quality communal amenity space, high noise levels and juxtaposition of character between these high density urban blocks and the forecourt of the shopping centre, which is and would remain suburban in nature. This is considered to constitute very poor urban design. The provision of Blocks E and F is considered to be overdevelopment of the lands. The PA recommended that Blocks E and F are omitted from the proposed development, pending a future application which takes a holistic approach to the development around the shopping centre.

- The revised scheme features communal open space at ground level which has limited potential due to their shape and context. The roof terrace at 5th floor level would provide additional amenity space in a more private environment. Much of the open space is incidental and would not appear to have adequate privacy. The Noise Impact Assessment notes that these spaces would not comply with the related environmental standards.
- It is the opinion of the PA that the living wall would provide an appropriate screen to the shopping centre and that this would improve the residential amenity of Block A. Concerns that Block A constitutes overdevelopment. The quantity and quality of communal amenities for Blocks A, B and C should be considered taking into account the scale of the central communal amenity space between the blocks.
- It is considered that a number of units described as dual aspect in the HQA are in effect single aspect units. In Blocks A, units 01 and 10 on floors 1-6 are considered to be essentially single aspect, as well as unit 01 at ground level. This amounts to an additional 13 single aspect units in Block A. The units in Block A are of particular concern because they would be north facing and would not enjoy good views. The PA recommends the internal configuration of Block A be reconfigured to eliminate north facing single aspect units.
- Concern regarding the visual impact of Block B on the adjoining houses to the south east. PA of the view that Block B should be reduced in scale and that the third floor be omitted from the development.
- It is considered that the proposed development is still dominated by surface car parking to the detriment of amenity spaces, streetscape and potential character of the development.
- The north south street through the development is an important link between residential lands and the District Park to the south west. The north south street suffers from the orientation of Blocks A, C and D which fail to provide a strong urban edge along this key link street. There is an absence of strong street definition and the area would read as a series of car parks, parking bays and very small amenity spaces. The PA would consider this to be a missed opportunity to positively define the streetscape. The north south street is

lacking in urban character and the PA recommends that the development requires significant reconfiguration at street level to provide an inviting street environment.

- The PA acknowledge that no public open space is proposed due to the provision in the past of play facilities to the south west of the site. It is the opinion of the PA that the site does not require 14% of public open space. It is recommended that facilities in the District Park to the south west be upgraded. The PA recommends a contribution in lieu of the usual requirement to provide public open space on site to be applied by condition.

Roads, Access and Parking

- It would be undesirable to construct a development of this scale with a single access point. The development may generate significant traffic and the proposed single access point is vulnerable should it become blocked due to a road traffic collision etc. The Roads Department would consider that a second two way vehicular access point is necessary for this development, and that the emergency only access to the southeast of the site should be openable to traffic.
- The resultant through road should be constructed to be 6.0m wide and to provide vehicular permeability through the scheme. An appropriate amount of traffic calming features should be provided along the route in accordance with DMURS to provide a safe walking and cycling environment and also to prevent drivers avoiding the Citywest Road/Fortunestown Lane signalised junction and rat running through the development.
- It would be desirable to have a third link to the south west into the existing Carrigmore residential development. Preferably this link should be via the access road south west of Block D. This would require the omission of a substantial portion of the car parking area at the south west corner of the site.
- Car parking provision is acceptable given the proximity to public transport. Bicycle parking provision also acceptable. Pedestrian and cycling links are well catered for in the proposed development.
- It is estimated that the impact of the proposed development on the local road

network will be more significant should Citywest Avenue not be constructed, which will increase traffic on the Fortunestown Lane link from the 40% used in the analysis to 100% as at present. Therefore, the proposed development may have a greater than 20% impact on the local road network, should Citywest Avenue link not be completed. Request that further analysis of this scenario is carried out by the applicant.

- There is a question of capacity at this site. The PA seek a reduction in surface level car parking and a holistic approach to the redevelopment of the site which would include a reduction of car parking to the front of the shopping centre and additional parking set aside at basement for the residents. This loss of parking could be a viable option in the context of the ongoing development of Fortunestown and the transition to a walkable district centre. However, competing planning requirements would reduce parking so dramatically at this site that it may signal that the development too high density for this location.

Services and Drainage

- Surface water attenuation for the 1 in 100 year rainfall event for Catchment C is undersized by 63%. The applicant shall submit a drawing in plan clearly showing that the total surface water attenuation provided in Catchment C is increased by 63%.
- No objection to Food Risk Assessment.
- It is clear from the Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment lodged with the application, that the route of a culverted stream, may pass very close to the north east corner of the site in close proximity to Block F. The PA recommends that in the event of a grant of permission the applicant should carry out a survey of the culverted stream. Should the survey reveal that the stream would be too close to Block F, an alternative approach to development at that location should be subject of a separate planning application.

8.3 Recommended Conditions

- 8.3.1 The Planning Authority recommends the imposition of 28 conditions. The majority are standard in nature. Of note are the following:

Condition 2: Phasing and vehicular connection to Carrigmore Green.

Condition 3: Omission of Block E and F; re-orientation of blocks A, C and D to provide a strong urban edge down both side of the north south street through the site; vehicular connection to Carrigmore Green, vehicular connection to Citywest Road should be capable of being used for emergency access; internal configuration of Block A shall be revised to remove any north facing single aspect units, specifically units 1 and 7 at ground level and units 1 and 10 on each other level; third floor of Block B shall be omitted; revised design of car parking arrangements to remove excessive surface car parking; remove car park to the south of Block D which will facilitate a vehicular connection to Carrigmore Green.

Condition 16: Prior to commencement of development, the applicant, developer or land owner shall undertake a survey to verify the precise location of the culverted stream at the north east corner of the subject site, and submit a drawing clearly showing the location of the culverted stream in relation to the proposed Building F. The drawing must clearly show that a minimum clear distance of 3m is maintained between the external wall and all structure on site, including overhanging structures. Where the depth to invert the culverted stream exceed 3m, the boundary of the clear distance shall not be within the 45 degree line of influence form the base of the culvert trench as per GDSDS requirements. If the survey reveals that the permitted building, Bock F is too close to the culverted stream, the building shall be omitted from this development and a revised proposal for this building shall be the subject of a separate planning application.

Condition 23: Bat survey.

9.0 Prescribed Bodies

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

1. Irish Water
2. TII

3. Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport
4. Irish Aviation Authority
5. Department of Defence
6. Department of Communications, Climate Action and Environment
7. South Dublin County Childcare Committee

9.2 Submissions were received from the following prescribed bodies with a summary of the response outlined under each:

Irish Water (25.10.2019)

- Based on the details provided by the developer and the Confirmation of Feasibility, IW confirm that subject to a valid connection agreement being put in place between IW and the developer, the proposed connection(s) to the IW network(s) can be facilitated.

Irish Aviation Authority (17.10.2019)

- The applicant/developer should engage with the Property Management Branch of the Department of Defence in relation to the development to consider the impact on the obstacle limitation surface and flight procedures for Casement Aerodrome.
- In the event of planning consent being granted, the applicant should engage with the Property Management Branch of the Department of the Defence, Weston Airport Management and the HSE to ensure that any crane operations do not impact on flight procedures at any of the aforementioned aerodromes and also with regard to the helipad operations at Tallaght Hospital. The applicant should contact the Irish Aviation Authority of intention to commence crane operations with a minimum of 30 days prior notification of their erection.

TII (04.11.2019)

- A demolition and/or construction method statement shall be submitted for the written agreement of the PA with written approval by TII. The method statement shall resolve all Luas interface issues and shall contain:
 - (i) identify all Luas alignment interfaces;

(ii) contain a risk assessment for works associated with the interfaces and
(iii) mitigation measures for unacceptably high risks.

- A vibration and settlement monitoring regime for Luas track infrastructure shall be submitted for the written agreement of the PA with written approval by TII. This monitoring regime shall be undertaken strictly in accordance with the TII 'Code of engineering practice for works on, near, or adjacent the Luas light rail system and shall contain inter alia the proposed regime operation and mitigation response. The monitoring regime is required to ensure the track rail alignment remains within tolerance and shall wholly be carried out at the developer's expense.
- The applicant should ensure that there is no adverse impact on Luas operation and safety.
- The proposed development falls within an area set out in a Section 49 Levy Scheme for Light Rail.

9.3 A submission was also received from Inland Fisheries Ireland which can be summarised as follows:

Inland Fisheries Ireland (04.11.2019)

- Comprehensive surface water management measures must be implemented at the construction and operational stage to prevent pollution to the Camac catchment. A maintenance policy to include regular inspection and maintenance of the SUDS infrastructure and the petrol/oil interceptors throughout the operational stage should be a condition of any permission.
- All construction should be in line with a detailed site specific Construction Environmental Management Plan.
- In an effort to protect and enhance biodiversity, tree stands, hedgerows and ditches should be retained. With regard to the watercourse that flows along the southern portion of the site, possible infilling/culverting should be avoided.
- It is consistently reported that Ringsend WWTP is overloaded. While additional capacity is under construction, any additional loading to the current plant is premature until the upgrade is commissioned.

10.0 **Environmental Impact Assessment (EIS) Preliminary Assessment**

- 10.1 The applicant has submitted an EIA Screening Report. The proposed development is below the thresholds of a mandatory EIAR. It is also considered that a sub threshold EIAR is not required in this instance. I refer the Board to the EIA Screening Determination on file.
- 10.2 The current proposal is an urban development project that would be in the built up area but not in a business district. It is, therefore, within the class of development described at 10(b) of Part 2 of Schedule 5 of the planning regulations, and an Environmental Impact Assessment would be mandatory if it exceeded the threshold of 500 dwelling units or 10 hectares. The proposal is for 290 residential units on a site of 2.9 ha. The site area is significantly below the stated threshold of 10 hectares and the number of units significantly below the threshold of 500 units.
- 10.3 As per section 172(1)(b) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), EIA is required for applications for developments that are of a class specified in Part 1 or 2 of Schedule 5 of the 2001 Regulations but are sub-threshold where the Board determines that the proposed development is likely to have a significant effect on the environment. For all sub-threshold developments listed in Schedule 5 Part 2, where no EIAR is submitted or EIA determination requested, a screening determination is required to be undertaken by the competent authority unless, on preliminary examination it can be concluded that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. This preliminary examination has been carried out and concludes that, based on the nature, size and location of the development, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The need for EIA is, therefore, precluded and a screening determination is not required.

11.0 **Appropriate Assessment**

- 11.1 An AA Screening Report was submitted with the application. The report describes the development and identifies that the site is not located within or directly adjacent to any Natura 2000 sites. It is noted that discharge of surface water will be to an existing surface water sewer and that ultimate outfall will be to the River Camac. The Camac is a tributary of the River Liffey which in turn enters the Irish Sea at Dublin Bay. The Screening Report considers the following designated sites for screening purposes:

- The South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA – Site Code 4024
- The South Dublin Bay SAC – Site Code 0210
- Poulaphouca Reservoir SPA – Site Code 4063
- North Dublin Bay SAC – Site Code 0206
- North Bull Island SPA – Site Code 4006

Site (site code)	Qualifying Interests
<p>North Dublin Bay SAC (000206)</p>	<p>Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140]</p> <p>Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210]</p> <p>Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310]</p> <p>Atlantic salt meadows (<i>Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritima</i>) [1330]</p> <p>Mediterranean salt meadows (<i>Juncetalia maritimi</i>) [1410]</p> <p>Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]</p> <p>Shifting dunes along the shoreline with <i>Ammophila arenaria</i> (white dunes) [2120]</p> <p>Fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation (grey dunes) [2130]</p> <p>Humid dune slacks [2190]</p> <p><i>Petalophyllum ralfsii</i> (Petalwort) [1395]</p>
<p>South Dublin Bay SAC (000210)</p>	<p>Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140]</p> <p>Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210]</p> <p>Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310]</p> <p>Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]</p> <p>The NPWS has identified a site-specific conservation objective to maintain the favourable conservation condition of the Annex I Habitat Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140], as defined by a list of attributes and targets.</p>
<p>North Bull Island SPA (004006)</p>	<p>Light-bellied Brent Goose (<i>Branta bernicla hrota</i>) [A046]</p> <p>Shelduck (<i>Tadorna tadorna</i>) [A048]</p> <p>Teal (<i>Anas crecca</i>) [A052]</p> <p>Pintail (<i>Anas acuta</i>) [A054]</p> <p>Shoveler (<i>Anas clypeata</i>) [A056]</p>

	<p>Oystercatcher (<i>Haematopus ostralegus</i>) [A130]</p> <p>Golden Plover (<i>Pluvialis apricaria</i>) [A140]</p> <p>Grey Plover (<i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>) [A141]</p> <p>Knot (<i>Calidris canutus</i>) [A143]</p> <p>Sanderling (<i>Calidris alba</i>) [A144]</p> <p>Dunlin (<i>Calidris alpina</i>) [A149]</p> <p>Black-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa limosa</i>) [A156]</p> <p>Bar-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa lapponica</i>) [A157]</p> <p>Curlew (<i>Numenius arquata</i>) [A160]</p> <p>Redshank (<i>Tringa totanus</i>) [A162]</p> <p>Turnstone (<i>Arenaria interpres</i>) [A169]</p> <p>Black-headed Gull (<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>) [A179]</p> <p>Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]</p>
<p>South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024)</p>	<p>Light-bellied Brent Goose (<i>Branta bernicla hrota</i>) [A046]</p> <p>Oystercatcher (<i>Haematopus ostralegus</i>) [A130]</p> <p>Ringed Plover (<i>Charadrius hiaticula</i>) [A137]</p> <p>Grey Plover (<i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>) [A141]</p> <p>Knot (<i>Calidris canutus</i>) [A143]</p> <p>Sanderling (<i>Calidris alba</i>) [A144]</p> <p>Dunlin (<i>Calidris alpina</i>) [A149]</p> <p>Bar-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa lapponica</i>) [A157]</p> <p>Redshank (<i>Tringa totanus</i>) [A162]</p> <p>Black-headed Gull (<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>) [A179]</p> <p>Roseate Tern (<i>Sterna dougallii</i>) [A192]</p> <p>Common Tern (<i>Sterna hirundo</i>) [A193]</p> <p>Arctic Tern (<i>Sterna paradisaea</i>) [A194]</p> <p>Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]</p>
<p>Poulaphouca Reservoir SPA (4063)</p>	<p>Greylag Goose (<i>Anser anser</i>)</p> <p>Lesser Black-backed Gull (<i>Larus focus</i>)</p>

- 11.2 The site is located in an established urban area and does not contain any habitats listed under Annex I of the Habitats Directive. Due to the distance separating the site and the identified SPA's/SACs, there is no pathway for loss or disturbance of important habitats or species associated with these Natura 2000 sites.
- 11.3 There is a hydrological link between the development site and Natura 2000 sites in Dublin Bay via surface and wastewater pathways. During the construction phase, it is anticipated that there will be no significant effects to the SPA/SAC in Dublin Bay from pollution or contamination due to the scale of the project and significant separation distances involved. During the operational phase, attenuation and SuDS are incorporated into the scheme to ensure no negative impact to the quality or quantity of run off to the surface water drainage network. In terms of pollution arising from wastewater discharge, it is detailed that additional loading to the Ringsend Wastewater Treatment Plant arising from the development is not considered to be significant having regard to the fact that there is no evidence that pollution through nutrient input is affecting the conservation objectives of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA and furthermore, that the upgrading works at the plant will address future capacity. Given that negative effects are not considered likely to arise, there are no projects, which acting in combination with the current proposal, can result in significant effects to Natura 2000 areas. It is, therefore, considered that there will be no potential for significant effects on any European site and, therefore, potential effects on European sites can be excluded at Stage I screening.

AA Screening Conclusion

- 11.4 I note the AA Screening Report submitted by the applicant, dated September 2019, which concludes that there will be no potential for significant effects on any European site and, therefore, potential effects on European sites can be excluded at a preliminary screening stage.
- 11.5 I note the urban location of the site and the nature of the development. It is reasonable to conclude on the basis of the information available, which I consider adequate in order to issue a screening determination, that the development, individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to have a significant effect on the above listed European sites, or any other European site, in

view of the sites' Conservation Objectives, and a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not, therefore, required.

12.0 **Assessment**

12.1. The following are the principal issues to be considered in this case:

- **Principle**
 - Legal
 - Zoning
 - Density
 - Unit Mix
 - Height
 - Material Contravention
- **Architectural Approach and Urban Design**
 - Overall Architectural Approach
 - Public Realm, Connections and Permeability
- **Residential Amenity**
 - Internal Standards
 - Noise
 - Sunlight and Daylight
 - Visual Impact
 - Open Space
- **Traffic and Access**
 - Access and Traffic
 - Car Parking Strategy
 - Cycle Parking
- **Site Services and Flooding**
 - Water Supply

- Foul Drainage
- Surface Water Drainage
- Flooding
- **Other Matters**
 - Crèche/Social and Community Infrastructure
 - Biodiversity
 - Archaeology
 - Aeronautical Impacts
 - Bin Storage
 - Fire Safety

12.2 Principle

Legal

- 12.2.1 Some concerns have been raised by the Citywest Plaza Management Company regarding the re-organisation and reallocation of parking spaces within the wider Citywest Shopping Centre development. It is contended that the applicant has not entered into any agreement with the owners of the Management Company regarding parking spaces held under licence by apartment owners of Citywest Plaza. Objections are also raised regarding amendments to bin storage arrangements.
- 12.2.2 Whilst the matter of parking provision and bin storage will be assessed further under sections 2.6 and 2.7 below, I am satisfied that any disagreement regarding the legal entitlement to use the subject parking spaces and amend bin storage is a legal matter between the applicant and other third parties and it outside the scope of this assessment.
- 12.2.3 In considering this matter, the Board should have regard to section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) which states '*A person shall not be entitled solely by reason of a permission under section 37(g) to carry out any development*'. This subsection makes it clear that the grant of permission does not relieve the applicant of the necessity of obtaining other permits or licences which statutes or regulations or common law may necessitate. Accordingly, I do not

consider that these matters are reasonable and substantive grounds for refusal of the proposed development.

Zoning

12.2.4 The subject site is zoned District Centre under the current South Dublin County Development Plan, where it is an objective *“To protect, improve and provide for the future development of District Centres”*. ‘Residential’ and ‘shop local’ are permissible uses under this objective. The site is also within the Fortunestown LAP administrative area where it is identified as forming part of Fortunestown Centre – Central Hub. It is stated that the centre will form a central urban hub which four distinct neighbourhoods will emanate and through which these neighbourhoods will be linked. I consider that the proposed residential use with ancillary commercial and retail uses is consistent with the objectives for the site and will effectively consolidate the District Centre.

Density

12.2.5 The proposed development has a density of c. 100 units per ha. Concerns have been raised by a number of parties regarding the density proposed and that it contravenes the objectives of the LAP which promote densities of 30-50 dwelling per ha. The Planning Authority have stated in their submission that they consider the site comprises an ‘intermediate urban location’ rather than a ‘central and accessible location’ as described in the 2018 Building Height Guidelines. They consider that the scheme constitutes overdevelopment of the site and that the justification for the density predicated on the Luas is not appropriate given capacity issues with the line and the distance of the site from the city centre. The PA are of the view that development would be a material contravention of the LAP and that development should be at a maximum of 50 units per ha.

12.2.6 The Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas provide guidance on appropriate densities and state increased densities should be promoted within 500 metres walking distance of a bus stop or within 1km of a light rail stop or rail station. It notes that in general minimum net densities of 50 dwellings per hectare, subject to appropriate design and amenity standards, should be applied within public transport corridors with the highest densities being located at rail stations. The subject site is located in immediate

proximity to the Fortunestown Luas line station, and in this context, is an appropriate location for higher densities. I also note that the Citywest Shopping Centre is proposed as a new bus interchange under the BusConnects proposals. Under the proposals, Dublin bus routes 65B and 77a will be replaced by a new route W8 between Citywest and Tallaght which is also proposed to provide a direct service to Maynooth and Celbridge. Improved service frequencies are also proposed to destinations to the east via a number of new routes. The existing 77x bus route will be replaced by a new orbital route (S6/S7) which will provide direct frequent services between Tallaght and UCD. I consider that the development complies with the guidelines and will ensure the efficient use of lands well served by public transport.

- 12.2.7 The density of 100 units per ha would also comply with the broad objectives of the National Planning Framework (NPF) which encourages the densification of existing settlements. Objective 35 specifically encourages increased densities. There is also an objective to prioritise alternative modes of travel to the car (Objective 27) which would further support the proposal.
- 12.2.8 The appropriateness of density must also be viewed in the context of the Core Strategy set out in the County Plan and the provisions of the Eastern and Midland Regional Assembly RSES. The County Plan identifies Saggart/Citywest as an Emerging Moderate Sustainable Growth Town. The RSES EMRA states that the new district at Fortunestown near the emerging town of Saggart/Citywest has a short term population capacity of 45,000 and a medium term capacity giving a total capacity of 66,000 persons. Having regard to the evolving role and function of Citywest, it is important to ensure that appropriate and sustainable densities are promoted particularly in such close proximity to the Luas.
- 12.2.9 I also note that the Board has previously granted a Strategic Housing Development at Fortunestown (ABP – 302398-19) which had a density of 83 units per ha and in this context, I consider the proposed density of 100 units per ha consistent with this precedent. Whilst, anecdotal evidence would suggest the Luas is congested at peak hours, I also note the strategic location of the subject site in proximity to other employment nodes including Citywest, Baldonnell, Kingswood, Cookstown etc. and in this regard, it is envisaged that future residents of the development will also utilise other modes of transport. Accessibility of the site will also be significantly enhanced under the BusConnects proposals should that come to fruition.

12.2.10 I am satisfied having regard to the fact that the site is located immediately adjacent to a light railway stop and is adjacent to the existing district centre with a range of social, retail and community facilities, that a higher density is appropriate, would provide the critical mass of population to support existing and future services and facilities and makes an appropriate and sustainable use of these strategic, residual, brownfield lands.

Unit Mix

12.2.11 The proposed development comprises solely of apartments and includes a mix of 1 (38%), 2 (47.5%) and 3 (14.5%) bed units. The Local Area Plan requires that 85% of the homes in the area should be own door units and that no more than 10% of units should be one bed. However, section 2.4 of the Guidelines on the Design of New Apartments 2018 notes that sites within 10 minutes walk of Luas stops are generally suitable for high density development that may consist wholly of apartments. The development would be consistent with this provision. Furthermore, SPPR1 of the guidelines states that statutory plans may only specify a mix of housing types after an evidence based housing needs assessment has been completed and incorporated into that development plan. The matter of material contravention is addressed further below.

12.2.12 I note concerns have been raised by a number of parties regarding the high percentage of 1 and 2 bed units and that there should be a greater percentage of 3 bed units. However, having regard to the location of the site in a suburban area characterised by large concentrations of low density suburban housing, I consider the housing mix appropriate. The housing mix is also in accordance with the guidance set out in the National Planning Framework which notes *“that apartments will need to become a more prevalent form of housing, particularly in Ireland’s cities. This is underpinned by on-going population growth, a long-term move towards smaller average household size, an ageing and more diverse population, greater mobility in the labour market and a higher proportion of households in the rented sector.”*

12.2.13 It is further detailed *“in Dublin City, one, two and three person households comprise 80 percent of all households. Yet, the stock of housing in Ireland is largely comprised of detached and semi-detached houses with three to four bedrooms.”*

12.2.14 In this context, I am satisfied that the proposed housing mix will provide for greater diversity and choice in the Citywest area and reflects changing demographic requirements. I note concerns raised by some of the observers that the proposed housing mix will result in a transient population with consequential anti-social behaviour. Such concerns are in my view anecdotal. I am satisfied that the development will provide appropriately managed apartment blocks with a suitable range of unit types and mix.

Height

12.2.15 The proposed development ranges in height from 4 to 7 storeys. The LAP stipulates that heights of three storeys are acceptable in the LAP area except in exceptional circumstances. The PA have raised a number of objections to the proposed height and state that it should be capped at 3 storeys. The National Planning Framework under objective 13 applies performance criteria rather than quantitative limits in respect of planning standards in urban areas including those relating to height. This approach is also adopted in the Urban Development and Building Heights: Guidelines for Planning Authorities which sets out a number of criteria which should be satisfied in terms of proposals for greater height.

12.2.16 The height of the development allows it to achieve a suitable density, whilst also ensuring that the development has an appropriate urban form and presence along the key road frontages surrounding the site. Whilst the matter of urban design and architectural quality is discussed further below, the height of the development in my view helps achieve a sense of place and improve the legibility and visual interest of the District Centre. I note that the applicant in their Statement of Consistency has assessed the proposal against the criteria set out in section 3.2 of the Height Guidelines and having regard to the strategic location of the site, there is a cogent case for increased height at this location. I am satisfied that a development of this height and scale is appropriate at this location and consistent with the broader policies supporting densification of core urban areas as noted above.

Material Contravention

12.2.17 The applicant has set out that the proposed development contravenes the South Dublin County Development Plan 2016-2022 in relation to height parameters and also contravenes the Fortunestown LAP 2012 (extended in 2017) with regard to its

policies and objectives on density, height, unit mix and average floor areas. The applicants have submitted a statement of Material Contravention in accordance with Section of 8(1)(iv) of the Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 2016. This considers whether the Board may grant permission for the development having regard to the criteria set out in section 37(2)(b) of the 2000 Planning Act, which applies to applications for strategic housing development that contravene either a Development Plan or Local Area Plan under section 9(6)(c) of the Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act, 2016.

12.2.18 Section 37(2)(b) of the Act of 2000 (as amended) states that where a proposed development materially contravenes the Development Plan, the Board may grant permission where it considers that:

(i) the proposed development is of strategic or national importance,

(ii) there are conflicting objectives in the development plan or the objectives are not clearly stated, insofar as the proposed development is concerned,

or

(iii) permission for the proposed development should be granted having regard to regional spatial and economic strategy for the area, guidelines under section 28, policy directives under section 29, the statutory obligations of any local authority in the area, and any relevant policy of the Government, the Minister or any Minister of the Government,

or

(iv) permission for the proposed development should be granted having regard to the pattern of development, and permissions granted, in the area since the making of the development plan.

12.2.19 It is set out by the applicant that National policy including the NPF, the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments and the Urban Development and Building Heights, Guidelines for Planning Authorities as well as regional guidance under the Eastern and Midland Regional Assembly Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy provides justification for the proposed increased density and building height within the subject scheme due to the strong encouragement of higher densities on appropriately zoned and serviced land adjacent to town centres,

employment hubs and high quality public transport. It is also detailed that the County Development Plan provides a number of policies and objectives which seek to provide for higher residential densities and ensure the efficient use of zoned lands and that these are contrary to the height and density limitations set out in the County Plan and LAP.

12.2.20 The applicant notes that the 'Urban Development and Building Heights – Guidelines for Planning Authorities' adopted in 2018 establishes the principle for the re-examination of height limits and is to be considered over the Development Plan height limits on a site specific contextual basis. The guidelines provide the ability through SPPR 3 for the Board to grant permission for a building height (notwithstanding where this breaches a cap set by a Development Plan) where this is justified. Reference is also made to section 2.11 of the Guidelines which identifies examples of locations with potential for comprehensive urban development which includes low density urban shopping centres and that this is wholly applicable to the subject site which represents a serious underutilisation of zoned and serviced land within a District Centre environment. It notes that increased height at this location is also justified having regard to the sites proximity to public transport and its positive contribution to placemaking and legibility. The applicants provide an assessment in the Statement of Consistency of how the development complies with the criteria for assessing building height at the scale of the city/town; district/neighbourhood/street; and scale of the site/building.

12.2.21 It is detailed that the development would contravene policies and objectives in the LAP regarding housing mix. The LAP stipulates that no more than 10% of dwellings in any residential scheme should be of the one bedroom type and that it should be ensured that a minimum of 85% of all dwellings be provided as own door houses on their 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. It is outlined that the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2018) contain SPPR 1 relating to dwelling mix requirements which takes precedence over the policies and objectives of the County Development Plan/LAP. It notes that a unit mix may be specified within statutory plans, however, this must be subject to an evidence based Housing Need and Demand Assessment which has not been undertaken for the LAP. It is

considered that in the interests of providing a sustainable density and the overall mix of units in the LAP area that the proposed housing mix in the development is appropriate.

12.2.22 I note the Material Contravention statement and the arguments put forward by the applicant in favour of the development. I conclude that the Board can grant permission for the development having regard to the National Planning Framework (particularly objectives, 11, 27 and 35); the 2018 Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines for Planning Authorities; and the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2018). The development in my view, would comply with the NPF and guidelines. It would provide for appropriate height and density on a strategically located brownfield site immediately adjacent to the Luas and existing District Centre. The proposed development is in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area and I am satisfied that the Board is not precluded from granting permission in this instance with regard to the provisions of section 37(2)(b) (iii).

12.2.23 I note that the opinion from the PA also states that the development contravenes objective LUD2C of the LAP which states *“make provision for a library or space, within or in close proximity to the Citywest Shopping Centre”*. This requirement is also reflected in Objective FC6a of the LAP which states that development of the Fortunestown Centre Neighbourhood shall, in consultation with the PA, include for the provision of a library building.

12.2.24 The matter of social infrastructure is addressed further below in section 2.7.

However, I note that the report from the PA makes no reference as to the feasibility of providing a library building in the Citywest Shopping Centre. As highlighted by the applicant, the recently published South Dublin Library Development Plan 2018-2022 does not identify a need for a new library building within the Citywest/Fortunestown area. The provisions of policy LUD2C and objective FC6a are in my view not prescriptive and the policy/objective is somewhat aspirational rather than specifying a definitive limitation or requirement. It is considered that in this instance, the term material contravention has been used by the Planning Authority erroneously. The development in my view, would not preclude the development of a library in close proximity to the Citywest Shopping Centre on an alternative site, should the requirement for such a facility come to be realised at a later stage.

12.3 Architectural Approach and Urban Design

Overall Architectural Approach

Introduction

12.3.1 The subject development comprises two distinct land parcels located to the north and south of the existing shopping centre. A number of concerns were raised during the pre-consultation phase regarding certain aspects of the development, notably the design and expression of Block E and F; the architectural response of Block A and its relationship with the rear of the shopping centre; the extent of surface car parking; integration of high quality pedestrian and cycle through routes; quality of open space and the provision of a strategic link through the site and integration with the District Park to the south.

Block E and F

12.3.2 Block E and F are located to the north of the shopping centre and are located on a constrained site bound by Fortunestown Lane to the north, Citywest Road to the east and the existing surface car park serving the shopping centre located to the south. It is an important site in urban design terms as it provides strong urban edge at a pivotal entrance point to the Citywest District Centre. It is identified as a potential location for a 'District Landmark' development under the LAP. The Opinion issued by the Board in respect of the pre application consultation request noted that further consideration was required in respect of the design and configuration of the layout of these blocks, their orientation and use of external materials.

12.3.3 It is detailed in the applicant's Architectural Design Statement that a number of amendments were made in response to the issues raised. The configuration of Blocks E and F was changed to create a sense of two curved blocks sliding past one another. The blocks however, remain separated due to the presence of an Irish Water wayleave running through the site. It is detailed that the two blocks, 6 and 7 storeys in height, respond to the form of the shopping centre, unify the space and respond more appropriately to the landmark status of the site. Views through the blocks to the shopping centre are retained. Other amendments include the omission of the partial basement in Block E to ensure a more positive relationship with the streetscape at ground floor. Retail units are also provided in Block E to create enhanced vitality and animation. Block F incorporates a glazed circular kiosk to

create feature. Active ground floor uses including a retail units and café/restaurant unit are provided.

- 12.3.4 In terms of materials and finishes, a simple palette is proposed with large glazed elements and brick. Aluminium panels, timber cladding and staggered steel balconies add visual interest. Boundary treatment has been removed in order to open up the blocks to the streetscape.
- 12.3.5 I am generally satisfied that the design and disposition of blocks E and F provides a satisfactory architectural response having regard to the context and location of the site. The form of the blocks and active ground floor uses create a more defined urban edge to the site and positive relationship to the streetscape. The Opinion from the PA acknowledges that the alterations made since the pre application stage achieves a design that matches the site designation as a landmark building, provides for additional permeability and reduces the imbalance between active and inactive elevations.
- 12.3.6 Concerns are however, raised by the PA regarding the residential amenity of the blocks. It is detailed that due to the constrained nature of the site which is sandwiched between Fortunestown Lane and the existing surface car park serving the shopping centre, that the development would result in substandard residential amenity for future occupants due to poor quality communal amenity space and the juxtaposition of character between these high density urban blocks and the forecourt of the shopping centre which remains suburban in character. The PA reports notes that there is a lack of consideration of an intervention to the shopping centre car park which would expand the available lands for Blocks E and F.
- 12.3.7 Whilst I would concur with the PA that a more holistic approach to the development of this site would be desirable, this must be balanced with the realities of developing an infill site in conjunction with an existing and established commercial operation having regard to existing legal, commercial and contractual obligations. The site is significantly constrained by the presence of the existing Mc Donalds drive through along its southern boundary and I note that objections have been raised by existing commercial tenants and management company regarding loss of commercial parking spaces which may inhibit the redevelopment of the surface car park associated with the shopping centre.

12.3.8 I would however, concur with the PA view that the quality of much of the communal open space is questionable and I have concerns regarding the extent of car parking proposed immediately adjacent to the blocks, particularly the 29 spaces proposed to the immediate south of Block E. This parking coupled with the fact that the access road serves the Mc Donalds drive thru creates a car dominant environment. I consider that these parking spaces should be omitted. This would allow for an improved interface and buffer between the apartment blocks and the service road accessing the Mc Donalds drive thru and create a more appropriate public realm and outlook. This can be addressed by condition. The matter of parking is addressed further in section 2.6 below. With regard to communal open space, I note the proposal to provide a roof terrace which will provide an amenity to future residents and also the proximity of the site to the District Park.

12.3.9 The Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment submitted by the applicant identifies the presence of a culverted stream in close proximity to Block F and that this is culverted through the existing roundabout located to the north east of the site. Concerns are raised by the Environmental Services Department regarding the presence of the stream and its potential impact on the siting of Block F. It is stated that the precise location of the stream cannot be verified. They recommend that in the event of a grant of permission, the applicant should carry out a survey of the culverted stream at the north east corner of the site prior to the commencement of construction. Should the survey reveal that the stream would be too close to Block F, an alternative approach to development at that location should be subject to a separate planning application. It is also detailed that a minimum clear distance of 3m should be maintained between the external wall of the culverted stream and all structures on site, including overhanging structures. Where the depth to invert of the culverted stream exceeds 3m, the boundary of the clear distance shall not be within the 45 degree line of influence from the base of the culvert trench as per GDSDS requirements.

12.3.10 The documentation submitted by the applicant (Fig. 1.2 of the SSFRA) indicates that the stream impinges on the north east boundary of the site. I am satisfied however, that if Block F did impinge upon the stream, that this could be addressed by a slight re-positioning of the block westwards or by way of an engineering solution. I am

satisfied that this issue can be addressed by way of condition and that a separate future application for the re-location of Block F is not warranted.

Blocks A, B, C and D

12.3.11 Blocks A, B, C and D are located to the north of the site. Concerns were raised during the pre-application consultation stage regarding the interface of Block A and rear elevation of the shopping centre and the need for the 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 the plaza. In response, the applicants now propose to incorporate a green living wall to the rear elevation of the shopping centre to enliven its appearance. Hard landscaping, planting and the provision of seating walls will also be incorporated. The ground floor of Block A includes a large residential amenity facility which aligns with the rear entrance to the shopping centre, further enhancing activity at this location. I consider that the proposed green living wall is a significant improvement on the existing treatment of the rear of the shopping centre and will improve the amenity and outlook of apartments in Block A.

12.3.12 I note concerns have been raised by the PA regarding the quality of the communal open space on the internal residential courtyard between Blocks A, B and C. Having regard to the height of the blocks surrounding it, this space is unlikely to have a high level of sunlight and daylight penetration, although the sunlight and daylight analysis indicated that it will receive 2 hours of sunlight on the 21st of March in accordance with the BRE guidance. However, I note the proximity of these blocks to the District Park, and in this context, I consider the quality of the communal space satisfactory. The proposed crèche is located in Block D which I consider an appropriate location having regard to the proximity of this block to the public park. Overall, I consider that these blocks provide a satisfactory architectural response to the site.

Connections, Permeability and Public Realm

12.3.13 During the pre-application consultation stage, it was requested that further consideration be given to the reduction of surface car parking and the integration of high quality pedestrian and cycle through routes enhanced with landscaping. It is detailed by the applicant that surface parking has been reduced to allow for the provision of 2 green links through the site comprising a mix of dedicated cycle lanes and pedestrian footpaths and that these links provide easy access to the District

Park. A shared green route is now provided along the southern boundary of the site linking to the District Park which is considered acceptable.

12.3.14 Significant concerns have been raised by the PA regarding the proposed north south link through the site and it is considered that the layout does not provide an inviting layout for pedestrians and cyclists and lacks strong urban edges with active frontage. In particular, it is noted that the orientation of Blocks A, C and D fail to provide a strong urban edge and that the street would read as a series of car parks, parking bays and small amenity spaces. It has also been raised by the Road Department that it would be desirable to have vehicular access to the Carrigmore Estate to provide permeability from this residential area and access to the District Park amenity.

12.3.15 Whilst is note the amendments made to the layout and reduction in the extent of surface parking from the pre application stage, I also have significant concerns regarding the layout of the north south street, particularly at its southern end adjacent to the District Park. The applicant has retained the existing parking and road layout to the immediate west of Blocks A and C. This results in a poorly conceived layout dominated by surface parking which fails to provide an appropriate interface and connectivity with the public park. The treatment of the public realm in this area is also poor, with an isolated outdoor gym located on an island surrounded by roads and parking.

12.3.16 Whilst I note that the matter of a future connection to Carrigmore Green was not specifically raised during the pre application meeting, I would concur with the PA that the development should provide the opportunity for a future connection with the Carrigmore Estate to the west. This would allow for enhanced pedestrian, cyclist and vehicular links with the wider lands in the LAP area, including those at Boherboy located further south. The existing access road to the surface parking area in the park is closed off by a barrier and it is unclear as to whether this car park is actively used. In my view, the applicant should liaise with the Planning Authority and the road layout and parking area to the south of Block D should be reconfigured to provide for a future potential vehicular, pedestrian and cyclist link to Carrigmore Green to the west. This may result in a reduction of car parking and an amended layout to the existing access serving the surface car park located in the park. With

these amendments, I am satisfied that enhanced connections and permeability through the development to the public park will be created.

12.3.17 Whilst I note the concerns of the PA regarding the orientation of the Blocks and that they do not create a strong urban edge to the street, I consider that the interface between the north south street and blocks A, B and C generally satisfactory with the angled facades and views through to the courtyard creating a pleasant aspect. However, I concur that the streetscape and interface could be improved through the omission of the 12 parking spaces located to the immediate west of the outdoor gym and for this area to be incorporated into an appropriate hard and soft landscaped area forming part of the amenity area serving the apartment blocks. This would reduce the dominance of the surface parking and enhance the open space and setting of the blocks.

Conclusion

12.3.18 In conclusion, I am satisfied that the development provides an appropriate architectural response to the site. The quality and design of the buildings has improved and the issues raised in the pre application consultation opinion largely addressed. The site is constrained by existing parking and road layouts. However, I am satisfied that the development responds to its context and with the further reduction of surface parking to be addressed by condition, will provide an appropriate public realm with adequate connections and permeability through the site.

12.4 Residential Amenity

Internal Standards

12.4.1 A Housing Quality Assessment accompanies the application setting out how the development complies with the 2018 Apartment Guidelines. All of the apartments meet the minimum sizes required under SPPR 3 of the guidelines and 148 (51%) of the units exceed the minimum requirement by 10%. All of the units meet or exceed the minimum size thresholds for storage and private amenity space. It is detailed that 57% of the units are dual aspect, complying with SPPR 4 of the guidelines.

12.4.2 I note concerns have been raised by the PA regarding the extent of north facing single aspect units in Block A. It is stated that units 1 and 10 on floors 1 to 6 are considered to be essentially single aspect as is unit 01 at ground level which

amounts to an additional 13 single aspect units in Block A. It is acknowledged by the applicant that there are 2 north facing apartments located at ground floor level in Block A. These one bed units are 57 and 53.4 sq. metres respectively and both have terraces of 7 sq. metres. It is stated by the applicant that it is considered that an appropriate level of amenity will be afforded to future residents by these larger unit sizes and generous private open space, in addition to the visual improvements presented by the green wall. Units 1 and 10 on the remaining floors are also typically larger than a normal 1 bed unit at 57.1 sq. metres and have larger balconies of 7 sq. metres. Having regard to the small number of these units in the context of the wider scheme and their more generous size and larger terraces/balconies, I am satisfied that they will afford a sufficient degree of amenity.

12.4.3 The standards for aggregate living area and bedroom area and room widths are complied with. No block has more than 12 apartments being served by a single core and indeed a number of the blocks have 2 cores, thus serving lesser units. A building lifecycle report has been submitted in accordance with section 6.13 of the guidelines. Internal residents amenity areas are also provided in Block D (93 sq. metres) and Block A (246 sq. metres). I am satisfied that the development is generally in compliance with the guidelines and would provide an acceptable standard of accommodation for future occupants.

Noise

12.4.4 Concerns have been raised by the Planning Authority regarding the amenity of the blocks, particularly Block E and F due to adverse noise impacts, particularly from the Luas. A Noise Impact Study accompanies the application. Mitigation measures are proposed during the construction phase to minimise potential impacts. Operational plant noise thresholds have been specified to ensure that no negative impact occurs at the nearest noise sensitive receivers, particularly at night.

12.4.5 A cumulative mechanical noise criteria has been set so as to achieve required internal noise levels in apartments within the development. With regard to inward noise impact, the report states that particularly for Blocks E and F, with specification of appropriate acoustic double glazing elements and ventilators, intrusive noise levels are predicted to be in line with the recommended design goals. I recommend a suitable condition in this regard.

12.4.6 The report acknowledges that the majority of the amenity spaces will experience noise levels greater than 55dB $L_{Aeq,16hr}$. It is stated that as per BS 8233, where predicted noise levels are above this range, this is somewhat offset by the convenience of proximity to transport infrastructure and community infrastructure. Having regard to the location of the site immediately proximate to the Luas and the existing District Park, this is considered acceptable.

Sunlight and Daylight

Internal

12.4.7 The sunlight daylight assessment indicates that 98.7% of habitable rooms in the development are well illuminated and in line with minimum daylight factor with the rest of units achieving daylight factor borderline to the target. The units that do not comply with the standard are primarily bedrooms. Only 4 living rooms are below the standard and marginally so.

External

12.4.8 A daylight/skylight analysis of properties in the vicinity of the site was undertaken. It determined that changes to VSC values are minor to negligible. The principle impacts are described as follows:

- The impacts on VSC levels for a small number of windows to the front of Fortunestown Apartment Block 1 are considered minor. However, 4 out of 39 windows would experience less than 37% reduction in VSC meaning moderate adverse impact. In Fortunestown Apartment Block 2, 4 out of 32 windows would experience a minor to moderate adverse impact. These windows however, are likely to serve bathroom or utility rooms where there is a low level requirement for daylight.
- The impact on the front of Carrigmore Apartment Blocks 1 and 2 are considered negligible. The windows to the rear of Apartment Block 2 experience more than 40% reduction in VSC which is a substantial adverse impact. It is considered likely however, that the affected windows are rooms where there is a low level requirement for daylight and are primarily for ventilation purposes.

- A small number of windows to the rear of the Citywest Apartment Block experience a minor reduction. The affected windows located to the rear of the building are located in what appear to be bathrooms and, therefore, require a lower level of daylight.
- Less than 1.5% of total windows would experience a substantial adverse impact, while less than 4% of the total windows would experience a moderate adverse impact and 11% of total windows experience a minor adverse impact comparing to 85% of total windows experiencing a negligible impact.

12.4.9 The report concludes that the most notable impact observed was to the Fortunestown Apartment Building 1 and Citywest Apartment building, which could be considered to be minor given the large number of windows experiencing negligible impact. Whilst more substantial adverse impacts are identified for the Carrigmore Building Block 2, it is determined that the impact is to bathrooms which have a low level requirement for daylight.

12.4.10 In terms of overshadowing, shadow diagrams are provided. These indicate that generally overshadowing impacts are not significant. The images indicate that there is a minor shading impact to the rear of Fortunestown Apartment Block 2 as a result of the proposed development. The most significant impact on the front of Fortunestown Apartment Block occurs during December where there is little access to daylight. It is noted that there is no overshadowing of the residential units along Verschoyle Drive due to the fact that there is a significant separation distance between the development and these houses and they are north facing.

12.4.11 The assessment for external amenity spaces indicates:

- The open space situated between the Carrigmore Apartment blocks continues to receive at least 2 hours of sunlight on the 21st of March.
- The Citywest playground continues to receive at least 2 hours of sunlight and is less than a 20% reduction relative to its former condition.
- There is no change in sunlight impact on balconies situated with Carrigmore Apartment Blocks.
- More than half of all of the proposed amenity spaces within the proposed development receive at least 2 hours of sunlight on the 21st of March.

Conclusion

12.4.12 I am satisfied that the proposed apartments will have a sufficient degree of sunlight and daylight and provide an appropriate level of amenity for future residents. The development will result in some minor overshadowing impacts to adjoining properties resulting in a reduction in daylight. Generally however, the impacts are minor and where more adverse impacts are predicted this is generally to non-habitable accommodation where requirements for a high level of daylight are not necessary. On constrained urban sites such as this, a balance must be struck between the protection of amenities of adjacent properties and achieving a development of sufficient scale and density. In this regard, I am satisfied that the development will have not have a material adverse impact in terms of sunlight and daylight

Visual Impact

12.4.13 I note the concerns raised by third parties regarding the visual impact of the development, particularly when viewed from Vershoyle Drive. The development will significantly change the view from these houses due to its scale and height. However, at present the site comprises disused scrubland and views are towards the blank rear façade of the shopping centre. I consider that the development will make effective use of these brownfield lands. Landscaping treatment along the northern boundary will be retained and improved, and the green route will provide an enhanced amenity for local residents. The blocks are set back a considerable distance from the residential properties along Vershoyle Drive, and as detailed above, there will be no overshadowing impacts. I do not consider that the development will have a material adverse visual impact on the amenities of the area.

12.4.14 The Planning Authority express particular concerns regarding the scale of Block B and suggest that this be reduced to 3 storeys. The height of Block B ranges from 4 to 5 storeys. I do not concur that a further reduction in height is warranted as this would represent an unsustainable and inefficient use of these lands.

Open Space

12.4.15 In terms of public open space, it is detailed by the applicant that it is considered that the public open space requirements for the site have been met under the parent permission for the development of the Citywest Shopping Centre and associated residential development (Reg. Ref. SD03A/0857) and subsequent linked permission

for a public park (Reg. ref. SD08A/0347). It is noted that the latter permission was sought as a result of Condition 4 as placed on the parent permission, which required the submission of a programme of works for the provision of recreational amenities for the area. Although the majority of the residential development (380 no. units) did not proceed, permission was received for a public park which has been completed and is located to the south west of the site.

12.4.16 The development does not propose any further additional public open space. The PA note that the development of amenities under SD08A/0347 reflects an earlier condition of a permission attached to the shopping centre development and that the imposition of such a condition enabled the shopping centre to be constructed on lands partially zoned for open space. It is recommended that facilities in the District Park to the south west be upgraded in tandem with the proliferation of residential development on surrounding sites. To that extent, The PA recommend that a contribution in lieu of the usual requirement to provide public open space on site be applied by condition.

12.4.17 Whilst I note that the applicants case that public open space provision has been previously been provided for in the District Park, I consider in this case, it is reasonable to impose a condition that a contribution in lieu of public open space is provided. The District Park is lacking in amenities and would benefit from upgrading and the development of additional recreational facilities. It has been subject of vandalism in recent years and antisocial behaviour. The development as proposed is urban and dense and the communal areas of open space proposed are lacking in amenity due to their aspect and proximity to internal and external roads. In this context, the levy is considered reasonable. This is addressed by condition.

Conclusion

12.4.18 In conclusion, I am satisfied that the proposed apartments will provide a satisfactory level of amenity for future occupants and generally are compliant with the qualitative and quantitative standards set out in the 2018 Apartment Guidelines. It is acknowledged that the development may experience some adverse noise impacts due to their proximity to the Luas and Fortunestown Lane. However, with the installation of appropriate noise insulation measures, this will be mitigated to some degree. The development will result in some overshadowing and loss of daylight to

adjoining properties. I do not consider however, that these impacts will be material and those windows most adversely affected primarily serve non habitable accommodation. The development will result in a significant alteration to the views from properties along Vershoyle Drive. I am satisfied however, that the site is adequately screened and the set backs are to such an extent that such impact will not be materially adverse. The development will not provide any public open space. It is considered that a contribution in lieu of public open space is warranted having regard to the existing condition of the existing District Park which is in need of upgrade and enhancement.

12.5 **Site Services, Surface Water and Flooding**

Site Services

- 12.5.1 An existing 225mm diameter foul sewer traverses the northern portion of the site which ultimately discharges into an existing foul sewer running north along Citywest Road. It is proposed to discharge foul drainage flows from the proposed development to the existing foul sewer network. Legal documentation has been submitted with the application stating that the applicant has the necessary legal consent to connect to the existing foul sewer running along Citywest Road. It is noted that to accommodate one of the blocks – Block F, it will be necessary to divert the existing foul sewer which traverses the northern portion of the site. A diversion agreement with Irish Water will be entered into for the execution of this diversion.
- 12.5.2 In terms of water supply, an existing 1200mm diameter bulk water main traverses the site. A set back as required by Irish Water from this watermain has been provided. Existing twin watermains (600mm diameter) run along the southern boundary of the southern portion of the site. An existing 160mm diameter watermain is located within the northern portion of the site and is expected to provide a suitable connection for the proposed development. Similarly, existing 100mm diameter and 160mm diameter water supply pipelines are located in the vicinity of the southern portion of the site and are expected to provide a suitable connection for the proposed development.

Surface Water

- 12.5.3 Existing surface water drains are located within the northern portion of the site and along the western side of Citywest Shopping Centre and it is proposed to discharge

attenuated flows from the site to this existing drainage network. The proposed surface water drainage network will collect surface water run off from the site via a piped network prior to discharging off site via the attenuation tank, flow control device and a full retention fuel separator. Surface water run off from the site's control road network will be directed to the proposed pipe network via conventional road gullies or tree pits with overflow to conventional road gullies. Surface water run off from apartment roofs will be captured by green roofs prior to being routed to the piped surface water drainage network. The surface water management infrastructure has been designed in accordance with the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study.

- 12.5.4 A number of SuDS measures are incorporated into the design including permeable paving in the car parking spaces, green roofs, tree pits connected to road gullies as well as attenuation.
- 12.5.5 Concerns have been raised by the Environmental Services Department regarding the surface water attenuation for the 1 in 100 year rainfall event for Catchment C. It is stated that this is undersized by 63% and it is recommended that a drawing is submitted clearly showing the total surface water attenuation provided for Catchment C is increased by 63%. I am satisfied that this matter can be addressed by way of condition.

Flooding

- 12.5.6 A Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted with the application. The site is considered to be located in Flood Zone C. The report concludes that the development is considered to have the required level of flood protection up to and including the 100 year return event. The Environmental Services Department raise no objections to the issue of Flood Risk. The matter of the potential impact of the development on the culverted Baldonnell Upper Stream is addressed above in section 12.2.

Conclusion

- 12.5.7 The submission by Irish Water raises no objection to the water supply and foul drainage proposals. Concerns have been raised by the Environmental Services Department regarding the adequacy of the attenuation design and capacity for catchment area C and also the potential impact of the development on a culverted

stream running to the north east of the site. I am satisfied that these issues can be addressed by way of condition.

12.6 Traffic, Access and Parking

Access

- 12.6.1 It is proposed to access the development via a single vehicular access from Fortunestown Lane at the existing entrance to the Citywest Shopping Centre. A second access is provided to the east onto Citywest Road. This second access will normally be closed to vehicular traffic and removable bollards are proposed. This access will be used for emergency vehicles only as well as for pedestrians and cyclists.
- 12.6.2 Concerns have been raised by the Roads Department regarding the appropriateness of one access point to a development of this scale. It is considered that the development may generate significant traffic and the proposed single access is vulnerable should it become blocked. It is considered that a second two way vehicular access point is necessary and that the emergency only access to Citywest Road should be openable to traffic.
- 12.6.3 It is stated by the applicant that the Traffic Impact Assessment demonstrates that the development will operate successfully without the need for a second access. It is also noted that a second access permanently open to traffic may encourage motorists to take a short cut through the residential scheme to access Fortunestown Lane. I note that the PA report recommends that the through route should be constructed to be 6.0m wide but that traffic calming measures should be implemented to prevent rat running through the scheme. There is an acknowledgement, therefore, that motorists taking short cuts may occur. On balance, I am of the view that the creation of a second vehicular through route through the development would be undesirable from a residential amenity perspective. I note the bollards are removable and that emergency vehicle access can be facilitated. It would be desirable to reduce traffic movements along the access roads serving apartments A, B, C and D. In this regard, I am satisfied that a second permanent vehicular access is not warranted.

Car Parking

- 12.6.4 The existing Citywest development is served by a large basement and surface car park. No clarity is provided as to the extent of existing parking provision on the site to serve the existing commercial and residential elements of the existing Citywest development, although it is understood that there are at least 350 no. spaces at basement level.
- 12.6.5 It is detailed that car parking to serve the development will be located at basement and surface level. 153 spaces are proposed comprising 104 spaces at surface level and 49 spaces at basement level. The spaces at surface level comprise 67 new spaces and 37 existing spaces re-allocated to the development. The spaces at basement level are re-allocated from the commercial parking.
- 12.6.6 The new spaces are primarily proposed to the east of Block E (29 spaces) and 36 no. spaces to the north of blocks A, B and C along the street. It is also proposed to retain the 37 no. spaces located at the southern end of the north south street to serve the apartments. Further perpendicular spaces along the north south street are to be converted to parallel parking and re-allocated to the development.
- 12.6.7 The Board will note my previous concerns in urban design terms regarding the appropriateness of the 29 spaces to the east of Block E and also the 12 spaces located to the west of the outdoor gym. I recommend that these spaces are omitted which reduce the extent of surface parking serving the development to 63 spaces. I note that the amendments to the layout of the parking area to the south of the site may also reduce further the extent of surface parking. The total number of spaces serving the residential element would, therefore, be approximately 112 spaces. This equates to a ratio of c. 0.38 spaces per unit. Having regard to the strategic location of the site within the District Centre and immediately adjacent to the Luas this reduction in car parking is considered acceptable. The development also proposes 2 no. car share spaces to improve mobility options. I also note that it is detailed in the Transport Assessment that the residential car parking spaces will not be allocated to individual apartments, but will be allocated to support the requirements/needs of individual residents via a management company. It will not be possible to purchase a car parking space on a permanent basis. This arrangement will ensure that

prospective tenants of the scheme are fully aware of the parking regime on the site and in this context, a further reduction in provision can be justified.

- 12.6.8 I note the concerns raised by some of the observers that the development will result in a reduction in the number of spaces serving the shopping centre and that this will put the shopping centres surface and basement car parks under significant pressure. I consider however, that the existing Citywest Shopping Centre is served by extensive surface and basement parking and in this context, the reduction in existing capacity is considered unlikely to have a material adverse impact.

Bicycle Parking

- 12.6.9 The proposed development provides for a total of 298 bicycle parking spaces. 166 of the spaces will be within the footprint of the apartment blocks and 132 at surface level close to the main block access locations. It is noted that the provision is 188 spaces higher than the development plan minimum. No concerns regarding the level of cycle parking provision has been raised by the PA. I am satisfied that the quality and quantity of provision is acceptable.

Traffic Impact

- 12.6.10 The traffic impact of the development is assessed in the Traffic and Transport Assessment. Traffic surveys were undertaken in March 2018 at a number of local junctions in order to inform the analysis. Vehicle trip rates are predicted using the TRICS database. It is stated that the assessment assumes that the Citywest Link Road will be in place by the opening year 2021 and that 60% of existing east-west traffic on Fortunestown Lane will be reassigned to the new Citywest Avenue Link Road. Committed development is considered in the assessment and traffic growth rates are derived from TII central growth rates.
- 12.6.11 Network impact is addressed in section 5.9 of the report. The analysis demonstrates that the development will generate a subthreshold impact upon all of the junctions during the AM and PM peak hours during all adopted design years. During the AM peak, with the exception of one junction, the subthreshold impacts range from not significant to imperceptible, whilst the impacts at Junction F (Citywest Drive/Citywest Shopping Centre (Site Access)/Committed Development 6 are classified as slight. During the PM peak hour, with the exception of Junction F, the subthreshold impacts

range from Not Significant to Imperceptible whilst impacts at Junction F are classified as Slight.

12.6.12 ARCADY analyses is also carried out on the operational capacity of the Fortunestown Lane/Citywest Shopping Centre access roundabout during the AM and PM peaks. The 2021 opening year ARCADY results indicate that the existing roundabout junction will operate well within capacity. The introduction of the subject development traffic in the 2021 opening year results in a negligible increase in the maximum RFC values during the AM peak (0.03 increase) and PM peak (0.01 increase) hours. A Mobility Management Plan will be implemented to encourage sustainable travel practices for all journeys to and from the proposed development.

12.6.13 I note concerns have been raised by the Roads Department of South Dublin County Council that the assessment assumes the completion of Citywest Avenue which is outside the control of the applicant. It is stated that if this road is not constructed, this will increase traffic on the Fortunestown Lane link from the 40% used in the analysis to 100% as present. Therefore, the proposed development may have a greater than 20% impact on the local road network should the link not be completed. I acknowledge the concerns of the PA and concur that a more robust assessment would have also considered a scenario where the Citywest Link Road was not completed by the year of opening. Notwithstanding this, on balance, having regard to the central and accessible location of the site; the existing and proposed public transport accessibility including the Luas and proposed Bus Connects Interchange; the low car parking ratio associated with the development; the mobility management measures to be implemented including the car share proposals; the generally slight to imperceptible impacts to local key junctions identified in the assessment; I consider that the proposed development is unlikely to have a material adverse impact on the local road network and in this regard, a refusal on the basis of traffic impact is not warranted.

Conclusion

12.6.14 In conclusion I am satisfied that the development provide appropriate access arrangements to the site. I consider that a second full vehicular access would not be desirable from a residential amenity perspective and the access to Citywest Road will facilitate pedestrian and cyclist permeability as well as emergency vehicle

access. Having regard to the scale and nature of the development and its strategic location, I consider that traffic impacts associated with the scheme are unlikely to be material. The extent of surface car parking is considered excessive and a condition recommending the omission of some of the surface spaces is recommend. This will improve the public realm and quality of the pedestrian and cyclist environment. The reduction in car parking is considered appropriate in the context of the site's excellent public transport accessibility. Bicycle parking is considered acceptable and the scheme has generally be designed in accordance with the principles of DMURS.

12.7 Other Matters

Crèche/Social and Community Infrastructure

- 12.7.1 Significant objections are raised by third parties regarding the lack of community and social infrastructure. It is detailed that the Fortunestown/Citywest area has been subject of significant population growth over the last number of years but that there has not been a commensurate growth in facilities or amenities. It is detailed, that despite the area having a large population, there is no library, Garda Station, community facilities etc.
- 12.7.2 In terms of social infrastructure, the proposed development provides a crèche facility designed to cater for 71 children. It is set out in the application that based on the requirement to provide 1 no. crèche facility catering for 20 no. childcare spaces per 75 dwelling units, this results in the need for a 30 no childcare spaces on the site. The development will, therefore, provide over and above the immediate needs of the scheme. A full assessment of the proposed crèche in the context of existing and planned childcare services in the catchment area is provided. I am satisfied that the crèche is of sufficient scale to serve the proposed development. The development also provides for additional amenities within the scheme for the benefit of future residents including a cinema room, lounge room, meeting room and gym. Additional café/restaurant and retail units are incorporated into the development which will help reinforce the role and function of the district centre.
- 12.7.3 Guidance regarding community and civic uses is set out in section 5.4.3 of the LAP. It is stated that such facilities throughout the plan lands will take the form of community centre, community rooms, a library, youth cafes and park facilities. It is stated that the majority of such facilities will be located at the District Centre and

nodal points where streets and pathways intersect. Figure 5.7 sets out the Land Use and Density Framework and identifies suitable locations for key social infrastructure including schools, a Garda station, library etc. The District Centre is identified as a location for a library facility. Under Objective FC6a of the LAP, it is also stated that the Fortunestown Centre shall, in consultation with the Planning Authority, include for the provision of a library building or space and a healthcare facility and these facilities shall be located within or in close proximity to the Citywest Shopping Centre.

12.7.4 The applicant has submitted a Social and Community Infrastructure Audit which includes a survey of facilities and amenities within a 2km radius of the site. The audit provides detail regarding education facilities and services, community and health facilities, childcare services, retail services, cultural facilities, sport and recreation amenities and open space. In terms of the objective in the LAP regarding a library at Citywest, it notes that the recently published South Dublin Library Development Plan 2018-2022 does not identify a need for a new library building within the Citywest/Fortunestown area and that library facilities are currently provided via a mobile service which operate from the centre once a week. Branch libraries are located in Tallaght, Clondalkin and Lucan. In terms of health facilities, the audit notes a number of medical centres in the vicinity of the site. In conclusion, I am satisfied that the site and its catchment is generally well served by social infrastructure and that the development will help reinforce and consolidate the role of this existing District Centre providing the critical mass of population to support the development of further such facilities and amenities.

Biodiversity

12.7.5 Concerns have been raised by a number of parties regarding the loss of a central green space in Citywest and potential ecological impacts of the development. In support of the development, the applicants have submitted an Ecological Impact Statement which includes a flora and fauna survey.

12.7.6 The subject lands comprise residual parcels of land associated with the development of the Citywest Shopping Centre. The site is generally considered to have a habitat of low biodiversity value. There is a hedgerow and drainage ditch located to the south of the site. No invasive species were noted during the survey. In terms of

fauna, there is no suitable habitat on the lands for otter, nor is there any evidence of badger activity. Features on the site are sub optimal for bat roosting with no buildings or old trees present. No evidence of any mammal was recorded during the survey.

- 12.7.7 The Baldonnell Stream is located in proximity to the northern part of the site and the Corbally Stream is located in close proximity to the south of the site. The site is located within the Camac River system. The River Camac holds populations of brown trout. Drainage ditches running through the site are of low significance in terms of their fisheries habitat but are nevertheless hydrologically linked to the wider catchment.
- 12.7.8 During the construction phase, the existing hedgerow will be removed. This feature is not particularly high quality and its loss will not be significant. The impact is considered minor negative. It is recommended that the removal should not take place during the nesting season. There is potential for pollution of watercourses during the construction phase from silt and other toxic substances. It is envisaged however, that such potential impacts could be mitigated through appropriate construction management measures.
- 12.7.9 During the operational phase there is also potential for pollution from surface water run off. SuDS will be incorporated into the design and run off will be maintained at a greenfield rate. Inland Fisheries Ireland recommend that comprehensive surface water management measures must be implemented at the construction and operational stage to prevent pollution to the Camac catchment and that a maintenance policy to include regular inspection and maintenance of the SUDS infrastructure and the petrol/oil interceptors throughout the operational stage should be a condition of any permission.
- 12.7.10 Having regard to the highly urbanised location of the site and the surveys undertaken which indicate that the site is of low ecological value, I am satisfied that any significant adverse impacts to biodiversity are unlikely to arise. I am satisfied that any potential impacts to the River Camac will be appropriately managed through the implementation of good construction practice. A Preliminary Construction Management Plan has been submitted setting out measures to manage risks to the water and hydrogeological environment.

12.7.11 The development will also result in the loss of 12 existing trees. The majority of these are considered to be of moderate quality – category B and 2 are of low quality. Their loss is not considered significant. An Arboricultural Assessment is submitted with the application which sets out measures to ensure the protection of trees to be retained.

Archaeological Assessment

12.7.12 An Archaeological Assessment is submitted with the application. This notes that the closest recorded monument to the site - a holy well (DU021-045) is situated c. 990 m to the southwest. There is a habitation site c. 485m to the north. No archaeological remains were encountered during the field inspection or during two archaeological investigations previously carried out within a 500m radius of the site. The construction of the shopping centre has caused disturbance to the southern part of the site and the Mc Donalds to the north caused disturbance to that part of the site. Having regard to this previous disturbance, it is likely that any previously unrecorded archaeological remains would have been disturbed. No further archaeological works are recommended. Having regard to the low archaeological potential of the site, I do not consider that a condition requiring archaeological monitoring during the construction phase is warranted.

Aeronautical Impacts

12.7.13 The subject site lies within the area of the Inner Horizontal Surface at Casement Aerodrome designated by the Department of Defence. It also lies under a new Outer Horizontal Surface designated by the I.A.A around Weston Airport. Policies and objectives are set out in the current South Dublin County Development Plan regarding aerodromes and airports. Under section 7.8.14 of the plan, it is stated that it is the policy of the Council to safeguard the current and future operational, safety and technical requirements of the Casement Aerodrome and to facilitate its ongoing development for military and ancillary uses. A number of specific objectives are set out. Section 11.6.6 of the plan sets out further guidance regarding Inner Horizontal and Outer Horizontal surfaces.

12.7.14 An Aeronautical Assessment Report is submitted with the application. This details that the highest points of the development at 138.7m OD are a liftshaft and a façade element on Block C. The Outer Horizontal Surface for Weston Airport is 196.3mOD. Therefore, the proposed development will have no effect for Weston Airport which

lies more than 57 metres above the highest point of the development. In terms of Casement, it is noted that site is within the aerodromes Inner Horizontal Surface, but is well clear of all approach and take off climb surfaces. The site is however, 3.3 to 7.1m above the Inner Horizontal Surface. A full assessment of the site in relation to Casements Inner Horizontal Surface is carried out considering a number of criteria. This in particular notes that the existing and upcoming buildings in the vicinity of the proposed Citywest development provide sufficient shielding for all of the Citywest development. The report concludes that development would not adversely affect the safety or affect the regularity of operations of aeroplanes.

12.7.15 The report also notes that the site is not in a location where Aviation Obstruction Lighting is essential. However, if required by the IAA or Air Corps, such lighting could be facilitated on the northwest façade of Block C and to the northwest side of the liftshaft of Block F.

12.7.16 I note that the IAA have been consulted in respect of the development. Their submission raises no objection to the principle of the development. It is recommended that there is further engagement with the Department of Defence in relation to the impact on the obstacle limitation surface and flight procedures for Casement Aerodrome. It is also recommended that the IAA are contacted a minimum of 30 days prior to the erection of any cranes on the site.

12.7.17 I am satisfied on the basis of the information submitted by the applicant, which I consider to be robust, that the development is unlikely to give rise to any adverse aeronautical impacts. I recommend that a condition be attached to address the issues raised by the IAA.

Bin Storage

12.7.18 The proposed development provides for the removal of 2 no. existing bin storage areas (c. 24 sq. m.) to the west of the shopping centre and replacement with 1 no. bin storage area (c. 15 sq. m.) to the north east of Block D. Concerns have been raised by some residents that there will be insufficient facilities to cater for the development in conjunction with existing development on the site. An Operational Waste Management Plan has been submitted. Whilst this sets out the recommended bin requirements for each block, it does not provide an assessment regarding the loss of 1 of the existing bin storage areas and whether the reduced area will be

sufficient. In the absence of same, I recommend that a second bin storage area is provided for within the development. This can be addressed by condition.

Fire Safety

12.7.19 I note concerns raised by some parties regarding fire safety, particularly in light of the Grenfell disaster. I consider this to be a matter outside the scope of this planning assessment, as fire safety and compliance is addressed under the Building Regulations. The applicants have submitted a Fire Safety Strategy with the application. This states that the principles of Fire Safety Engineering will be employed to ensure the design concept is adhered with whilst meeting the statutory requirements to comply with Building Regulations.

13.0 Recommendation

13.1 Having regard to the above assessment, I recommend that section 9(4)(a) of the Act of 2016 be applied and that permission is **GRANTED** for the development, for the reasons and considerations and subject to the conditions set out below.

14.0 Draft Order

Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the:

- a) the policies and objectives in the South Dublin County Council Development Plan 2016-2022;
- b) the policies and objectives in the Fortunestown Local Area Plan 2012;
- c) nature, scale and design of the proposed development and the availability in the area of a wide range of social and transport infrastructure including the Luas Red Line;
- d) pattern of existing and permitted development on the site and in the area;
- e) the Rebuilding Ireland Action Plan for Housing and Homelessness 2016;
- f) the National Planning Framework issued by the Department of Housing, Planning and Local Government in February 2018;

- g) the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS) issued by the Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport and the Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government in March 2013;
- h) the Guidelines for Sustainable Residential Developments in Urban Areas and the accompanying Urban Design Manual – a Best Practice Guide, issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government in May 2009;
- i) the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments issued by the Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government in March 2018;
- j) the Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2019;
- k) submissions and observations received.
- l) the report of the Inspector.

It is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would provide residential accommodation at a location that would promote sustainable travel patterns, would be acceptable in terms of pedestrian and traffic safety, would achieve an acceptable standard of urban design and would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

The Board noted that the Planning Authority had recommended that the development should be refused, on the basis that it represented a material contravention of certain provisions of the Fortunestown Local Area Plan. However, the Board decided that, pursuant to Section 9(6) of the Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 2016 and to Section 37(2)(b) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, it was appropriate to grant permission in this case, notwithstanding this recommendation, as the Board considered that permission for the development should be granted, in accordance with Section 37(2)(b)(iii) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, having regard to Guidelines issued under Section 28, and relevant policies of the Minister and of the Government, and in particular objectives 11, 13, 27 and 35 of the National Planning Framework, section 5.8 of the Guidelines for Planning Authorities

on Sustainable Urban Residential Development and section 2.4 of the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments.

Appropriate Assessment Screening

The Board completed an Appropriate Assessment Screening exercise in relation to the potential effects of the proposed development on designated European sites, taking into account the nature, scale and location of the proposed development within a zoned and services urban area, the Screening Report for Appropriate Assessment submitted with the application and the Inspector's report and submissions on file. In completing the screening exercise, the Board adopted the report of the Inspector and concluded that, by itself or in combination with other development in the vicinity, the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect on any European site in view of the conservation objectives of such sites, and that a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment is not, therefore, required.

Environmental Impact Assessment

The Board completed an Environmental Impact Assessment screening of the proposed development and considered that the Environmental Impact Screening Report submitted by the applicant, identifies and describes adequately the direct, indirect, secondary, and cumulative effects of the proposed development on the environment.

Having regard to:

(a) the nature and scale of the proposed development on an urban site served by public infrastructure,

(b) the absence of any significant environmental sensitivities in the area,

(c) the location of the development outside of any sensitive location specified in article 109(3) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended),

the Board concluded that, by reason of the nature, scale and location of the subject site, the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment. The Board decided, therefore, that an Environmental Impact Assessment Report for the proposed development was not necessary in this case.

Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the Planning Authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars. In default of agreement, the matter(s) in dispute shall be referred to An Board Pleanála for determination.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit for the written agreement of the Planning Authority a revised plans and details to include:

The omission of the 29 no. car parking spaces proposed to the east and south east of Block E and their replacement with appropriate landscaping to provide a buffer between the apartment block and service/access road.

The omission of the 12 perpendicular spaces located to the west of Block A and C and for this area to be incorporated with the proposed outdoor gym with revised hard and soft landscaping detail.

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

3. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit for the written agreement of the Planning Authority a revised layout for the existing road and car parking arrangement located to the south of Block D to include provision for the Citywest Drive Access Road to connect up to the boundary with Carrigmore Green to facilitate the potential for future vehicular access. Revised layout also to facilitate potential for revisions to existing vehicular access to car parking area within the District Park and for appropriate pedestrian and cyclist connectivity to Carrigmore Green and the park.

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

4. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit for the written agreement of the Planning Authority revised landscape plans to include details of hard and soft landscaping, including levels, sections and elevations; detailed design of SUDS features including swales and tree pits, revised tree planting schedule and measures to protect trees and hedgerows and details regarding the maintenance and management of the green wall. The landscaping scheme shall be carried out within the first planting season following substantial completion of external construction works.

All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of five years from the completion of the development, shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity.

5. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall retain the professional services of a qualified Landscape Architect as Landscape Consultant throughout the life of the site development works and shall notify the Planning Authority of that appointment in writing. The developer shall engage the Landscape Consultant to procure, oversee and supervise the landscape contract for the implementation of the permitted landscape proposals. When all landscape works are inspected and completed to the satisfaction of the Landscape Consultant, he/she shall submit a Practical Completion Certificate (PCC) to the Planning Authority for written agreement, as verification that the approved landscape plans and specification have been fully implemented.

Reason: To ensure full and verifiable implementation of the approved landscape design proposals for the permitted development, to the approved standards and specification.

6. The following requirements in terms of traffic, transportation and mobility shall be incorporated and where required, revised drawings / reports showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development:

(a) The roads and traffic arrangements serving the site (including footpath connections and signage) shall be in accordance with the detailed requirements of the Planning Authority for such works and shall be carried out at the developer's expense.

(b) The roads layout including junctions, parking areas, footpaths, cycle paths and kerbs, pedestrian crossings, car parking bay sizes and road access to the development shall comply with the requirements of the Design Manual for Roads and Streets and with any requirements of the Planning Authority for such road works.

(c) Cycle tracks within the development shall be in accordance with the guidance provided in the National Cycle Manual.

(d) The materials used in any roads/footpaths/set down areas provided by the developer shall comply with the detailed standards of the Planning Authority for such road works.

(e) A Mobility Management Plan shall be prepared and submitted to the Planning Authority for approval prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In the interests of traffic, cyclist and pedestrian safety.

7. All of the communal parking areas serving the apartments shall be provided with electric vehicle charging points, to allow for the provision of future electric vehicle charging points. Details of how it is proposed to comply with these requirements, including details of design of, and signage for, the electrical charging points shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of sustainable transportation.

8. The developer shall consult with Transport Infrastructure Ireland prior to the commencement of development and shall comply with its requirements to safeguard the physical integrity and the operation of the adjacent light railway during the carrying out of the development in accordance with the Guideline RSC – G- 010A issued by the Railway Safety Commission.

Reason: In the interests of public safety.

9. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall consult with Transport Infrastructure Ireland and shall comply with its requirement and specifications regarding the provision of access to the Luas stop at Fortunestown.

Reason: To protect the operation of the tramway and to ensure a consistent standard of works along it.

10. No dwelling units within the proposed development shall be sold separately, independent from the associated car parking provision. All the proposed car parking spaces shall be for occupants of the residential units and shall be sold off/let with the units and not sold separately or let independently from the residential development.

Reason: In the interest of orderly development.

11. Public lighting shall be provided in accordance with a scheme, details of which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development. Such lighting shall be provided prior to the making available for occupation of any unit.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and public safety.

12. Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the Planning Authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit for the written agreement of the Planning Authority a revised detailed foul and surface water drainage plan for the proposed development, to include enlargement of the attenuation for Catchment Area C.

Reason: In the interest of public health and in order to ensure adequate and appropriate surface water drainage provision.

13. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall undertake a survey to verify the precise location of the culverted stream at the north east corner of the site and submit a drawing indicating that the proposed development including the footprint of Block F retains a minimum clear distance of 3 metres between the external wall of the culverted stream and all structures

on the site, including overhanging structures. Where the depth to invert of the culverted stream exceeds 3m, the boundary of the clear distance shall not be within the 45 degree line of influence from the base of the culvert trench as per GDSDS requirements.

Reason: In the interest of public health, safety and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

14. The applicant or developer shall enter into water and/or wastewater connection agreement(s) with Irish Water prior to the commencement of this development.

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

15. Proposals for an estate/development name, apartment 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/development signs, and apartment numbers, shall be provided in accordance with the agreed scheme. The proposed name shall be based on local historical or topographical features, or other alternatives acceptable to the Planning Authority. No advertisements/marketing signage relating to the name of the development shall be erected until the developer has obtained the Planning Authority's written agreement to the proposed name.

Reason: In the interests of urban legibility, and to ensure the use of locally appropriate place names for new residential developments.

16. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed buildings shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area.

17. Details of proposed signage to the commercial/retail units to be submitted prior to occupation for the written agreement of the Planning Authority.

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

18. 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.

Reason: To protect the residential amenities of property in the vicinity and the visual amenities of the area.

19. The glazing system of the building shall have suitable sound insulation performance values. Prior to any development taking place on the site, the developer shall submit to and agree in writing with the Planning Authority details of the glazing system to be installed supported by laboratory tests confirming the sound insulation performance of the glazing system to currently recognised EU standards.

Reason: To protect the residential amenity of future occupants of the apartments.

20. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1800 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities of property in the vicinity.

21. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit a construction and demolition waste management plan to the Planning Authority for agreement prepared in accordance with the Best Practice Guidelines on the Preparation of Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects published by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government in July, 2006. This shall include details of waste to be generated during site clearance and construction phases and details of the methods and locations to be employed for the prevention, minimisation, recovery and disposal of this material.

Reason: In the interest of orderly development and sustainable waste management.

22. Prior to commencement of development the developer shall submit and obtain the written agreement of the Planning Authority, a plan containing details for the

management of waste within the development, including the provision of facilities for the storage, separation and collection of the waste and for the ongoing operation of these facilities. Additional bin storage facilities to be provided in lieu of the removal of the 2 no. existing bin storage areas (c. 24 sq. m.) to the west of the shopping centre.

Reason: To provide for the appropriate management of waste and, in particular recyclable materials, in the interest of protecting the environment.

23. All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, communal television, telephone and public lighting cables) shall be run underground within the site. In this regard, ducting shall be provided to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development.

Reason: In the interest of orderly development and the visual amenities of the area.

24. The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including:

(a) Location of the site and materials compounds including areas identified for the storage of construction refuse; areas for construction site offices and staff facilities; site security fencing and hoardings; and on-site car parking facilities for site workers during the course of construction and the prohibition of parking on neighbouring residential streets;

(b) 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; measures to obviate queuing of construction traffic on the adjoining road network; and measures to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble or other debris on the public road network;

(c) Details of the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures for noise, dust and vibration, and monitoring of such levels;

(d) Containment of all construction-related fuel and oil within specially constructed bunds to ensure that fuel spillages are fully contained. Such bunds shall be roofed to exclude rainwater;

(e) Means to ensure that surface water run-off is controlled such that no silt or other pollutants enter local surface water sewers or drains.

(f) Provision shall be made in this Construction Management Plan to comply with the requirements of the Irish Aviation Authority, including the potential impact of the development on the obstacle limitation surface and flight procedures for Casement Aerodrome and the positioning and heights of any construction cranes, and for co-ordination in the operation of the cranes with the Air Corps Air Traffic Services.

(g) A record of daily checks that the works are being undertaken in accordance with the Construction Management Plan shall be kept for inspection by the Planning Authority. The developer shall provide contact details for the public to make complaints during construction and provide a record of any such complaints and its response to them, which may also be inspected by the Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of amenities, public health and safety and to ensure that construction works do not affect the safety, efficiency and regularity of Air Corps operations.

25. 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.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory completion and maintenance of this development.

26. The mitigation measures contained in Ecological Impact Assessment shall be implemented in full.

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

27. Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the Planning Authority a cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company, or such other security as may be acceptable to the Planning Authority, to secure the reinstatement of public roads which may be damaged by the transport of materials to the site, coupled with an agreement empowering the Planning Authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory reinstatement of the public road. 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.

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

28. 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 97(7) applies) may be referred by the Planning Authority or any other prospective party to the agreement to the Board for determination.

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

29. The developer shall pay a financial contribution to the Planning Authority as a contribution in lieu of public open space provision within the development and towards the cost of amenity works in the area of the proposed development in accordance with the requirements of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2016-2022. This contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the Planning Authority may facilitate.

Reason: It is considered reasonable that the developer should contribute towards the provision of open space and amenity facilities in the area of the development.

30. 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.

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.

Erika Casey

Senior Planning Inspector

13th December 2019

Appendix 1

1. Aidan Downey, 19 Carrigmore Grove, Citywest, Dublin 24
2. Alan and Michelle Buckley, 48 Verschoyle Drive, Saggart Abbey, Dublin 24
3. Alison Sheppard, 50 Corbally Heath, Westbrook, Saggart, Co. Dublin
4. Barbara O' Brien and Ian Roberts, 46 Verschoyle Drive, Saggart Abbey, Citywest, Dublin 24.
5. Bianca Fatu, Belfry Hall, Citywest, Dublin 24
6. Caroline Quigley, 37 Belfry Lodge, The Belfry, Citywest, Dublin 24
7. Cathy Moore, 4 Carrigmore Dale, Saggart, Co. Dublin
8. David Geary, 8 Carrigmore Green, Fortunestown Lane, Saggart, Co. Dublin.
9. Deirdre Kearns, 6 Verschoyle Drive, Saggart Abbey, Co. Dublin
10. Eleanor Geary, 52 Verschoyle park, Lakelands, Saggart, Co. Dublin
11. Emmet Holland, 21 Fortunes Lawn, Citypark, Citywest, Dublin 24
12. Gabrielle O' Sullivan, 114 Citywest Drive, Citywest, Dublin 24
13. Georgina Graham, 44 Carrigmore Ave., Citywest, Saggart, Dublin 24
14. Jennifer Byrne, 39 Verschoyle Glen, Saggart Abbey, Citywest, Dublin
15. John Lahart TD, 5A Village Square, Tallaght Village, Tallaght, Dublin 24
16. Katarzyna Junyent Arnau, Apt. 138, Fortunes Lawn, Citywest, Dublin 24
17. Keith Darcy, 35 Fortunes Lawn, Citypark, Citywest, Dublin 24
18. Keith Gavaghan, 52 Fortunes Lawn, Citypark, Citywest, Co. Dublin
19. Liam Byrne, Carrigmore Gardens, Citywest, Saggart, Co. Dublin
20. Lorraine and John Honan, 9 Verschoyle Close, Saggart Abbey, Dublin 24
21. Lorraine Smith and Paraic Kenny, 24, Verschoyle Close, Saggart Abbey, Citywest, Dublin 24
22. Lynda and Eoin Prendergast, 1 Corbally Square, Westbrook Glen, Citywest, Dublin 24
23. Lynsey Dunne, 4 Verschoyle Drive, Saggart Abbey, Co. Dublin
24. Maeve Wright, 136 Belfry Hall, Citywest, Saggart, Co. Dublin
25. Mary Devine, 13 Belfry Meadows, Citywest, Dublin 24
26. Nichola and Brian Priestly, 4 Verschoyle Close, Saggart Abbey, Co. Dublin
27. Nicki Dezeeuw, 165 Belfry Hall, Citywest Road, Citywest, Dublin 24
28. Nicola and David Fitzpatrick, 30 Carrigmore Downs, Saggart, Co. Dublin
29. Saggart East Residents Association, 4 Verschoyle Glen, Citywest Road, Dublin 24
30. Ronan Lynskey, 3 Carrigmore Glen, Saggart. Co. Dublin
31. Sarah and Brian Kavanagh, 2 Carrigmore Dale, Saggart. Co. Dublin
32. Sharon and Mark Cummins, 13 Verschoyle Close, Saggart Abbey, Saggart, Co. Dublin
33. Sharon Mordaunt, 6 Corbally Green, Westbrook Lawns, Citywest Road, Dublin 24
34. Sharon Thompson and Neal Murphy, 2 Vershoyle Close, Saggart Abbey, Saggart, Co. Dublin
35. Tallaght Community Council C/O 52 Bancroft Park, Tallaght, Dublin 24

36. Tracy and Stephen Walsh, 6, Carrigmore Close, Citywest, Dublin 24.
37. Ciara Spillane, 120 Carrig Court, Citywest, Co. Dublin
38. Citywest Plaza Management Company CLG, Office 3 Eden Business Centre, Grange Road, Rathfarnham, Dublin 16
39. Dunnes Stores, 46-50 South Great Georges Street, Dublin 2