



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP 309474-21.

Development	Permission for subdividing of lands, to provide for retention of existing house with associated site, development of rear and side of existing remaining site to construct 3 no. single storey detached dwellings, with all associated site works.
Location	10 Glenamuck Cottages, Rockville Drive, Carrickmines, Dublin 18.
Planning Authority	Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown Co. Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D20A/0176
Applicants	Arnage Carrickmines Limited.
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellants	(1) Paul Kane (2) Rahim Traynor
Observers	None

Date of Site Inspection

18/8/2021

Inspector

Siobhan Carroll

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	5
2.0 Proposed Development	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	6
3.1. Decision	6
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	6
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	7
3.4. Third Party Observations	7
4.0 Planning History.....	7
5.0 Policy Context.....	7
5.1. Project Ireland 2040 - National Planning Framework.....	7
5.2. Dún Laoghaire – Rathdown County Development Plan 2016-2022.....	8
5.3. Kiltiernan/Glenamuck Local Area Plan 2013 (as extended until 2023).....	8
5.4. Natural Heritage Designations	8
5.5. EIA Screening	9
6.0 The Appeal	9
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	9
6.2. Applicant Response	11
6.3. Planning Authority Response	13
7.0 Assessment.....	13
7.1. Design and impact upon residential amenity.....	13
7.2. Surface water drainage	16
7.3. Appropriate Assessment	18
8.0 Recommendation.....	19
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	19

10.0 Conditions 20

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located at no. 10 Glenamuck Cottages, Rockville Drive, Carrickmines, Dublin 18. Glenamuck Cottages were constructed circa 1910 and the dwellings are served by large rear gardens. The subject site lies to the southern side of Rockville Drive which is a narrow cul-de-sac. Rockville Drive is situated on the southern side of Glenamuck Road. It lies circa 1.1km from the junction of Enniskerry Road and Glenamuck Road. Junction 15 of the M50 is located circa 1.3km to the north-east.
- 1.2. Rockville Drive is characterised by a variety of detached & semi-detached single storey dwellings although there are two terraces of conventionally designed two-storey housing at the end of the cul-de-sac. It is noted that there are several examples of housing which has been recently developed on backland sites along the southern side of the road. This development has taken place on sites which have been formed from the subdivision of the large original plots associated with the cottages.
- 1.3. The site itself has a stated site area of 0.23 hectares and comprises an area of the original plot of No. 10 Glenamuck Cottages to the side and rear of the property. No. 10 Glenamuck Cottages is a single-storey, semi-detached dwelling, it is presently vacant. The site has frontage of circa 7m onto Rockville Drive. It extends back for circa 85m. The site level rises to the south. It contains a number of large mature coniferous trees, shrubs and planting. The site boundaries are formed by mature trees and hedgerow. The uppermost section of site is separated by a wire fence.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission for development consisting of:
- 2.2. The subdividing of lands, to provide for:
 - a) The retention of the existing single storey house with associated site.
 - b) The development of the rear and side of the existing remaining site to construct 3 no. single storey detached dwellings, 10A and 10B being 168 sq m each and 10C being 165 sq m, with associated site works including gardens, off street car parking.

- c) Forming a new access road and footpath off Glenamuck Cottages, Rockville Drive to serve the proposed development.
- d) New boundaries to define dwelling sites from each other and adjoining not owned by applicants.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission was granted subject to 14 no. conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

Further Information was requested regarding the following;

- (1) Planning Matters – (a) concerning the overall depth of properties 10A and 10B and requested that the properties be reduced to improved spacing on site. (b) concerning the rise in levels on site provide computer generated imagery showing the proposed dwellings in the wider street context.
- (2) Surface Water Drainage – (a) submit design with each residential unit infiltrating all surface water within the curtilage of that property & not into a shared system. (b) submit details to confirm that all hardstanding areas shall not be discharged to the sewer but infiltrated locally via a specifically designed permeable system.
- (3) Transportation matters – (i) Vehicular entrance to be a width of 4m. Access road to be a maximum of 5.5m. Footpath to proposed dwelling to be a minimum width of 1.8m. (ii) provide a letter of agreement from the ESB that the requirement to relocate the existing ESB pole is deemed acceptable. (iii) footpath to the front of the vehicular entrance to be continuous and be dished and strengthened at the Applicant's own expense. (iv) Front boundary treatment on Glenamuck Cottages to be a maximum of 1.1m in height to allow adequate visibility onto Glenamuck Cottages.

- Following the submission of further information the Planning Authority were satisfied with the information provided and recommended a grant of permission.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Transportation Planning: No objections.

Drainage Planning: Report dated 1/4/2020: Further information requested.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Irish Water: No objection, subject to conditions.

3.4. Third Party Observations

- 3.4.1. The Planning Authority received five submissions/observations in relation to the application. The main issues raised are similar to those set out in the appeals.

4.0 Planning History

- None on site
- There are a number of previous applications pertaining to the adjacent sites on Rockville Drive which are detailed in the report of the Planning Authority.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Project Ireland 2040 - National Planning Framework

- 5.1.1. The NPF includes a Chapter, No. 6 entitled 'People, Homes and Communities'. It sets out that place is intrinsic to achieving good quality of life. National Policy 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".
- 5.1.2. National Policy Objective 35 seeks "to increase residential density in settlements, through a range of measures including restrictions in vacancy, re-use of existing

buildings, infill development schemes, area or site-based regeneration and increased building heights”.

5.2. Dún Laoghaire – Rathdown County Development Plan 2016-2022.

- 5.2.1. The subject site is zoned Objective A: ‘To protect and/or improve residential amenity’.
- 5.2.2. Section 8.2.3.4 refers to Additional Accommodation in Existing Built-up Areas
- 5.2.3. Section 8.2.3.4(vi) refers to Backland Development.

5.3. Kiltiernan/Glenamuck Local Area Plan 2013 (as extended until 2023)

- 5.3.1. Chapter 4.0: Residential Development
- 5.3.2. Section 4.2: Residential Density
- 5.3.3. Section 4.8: Housing Design Issues
- 5.3.4. The proposed development site is located on lands identified for ‘1-2 storey’ development on Drg. No. PI-13-417: ‘Building Heights Map’.
- 5.3.5. Chapter 11: Planning Guidelines for the Development Land Parcels:
- 5.3.6. Requirements for Development Parcel 29a (incl):
- 5.3.7. Type of Development: Residential infill only.
- 5.3.8. Height: One storey on sites on the southern side of roadway.
- 5.3.9. Building Materials: Black slate tiles (or the like) for roofing material
- 5.3.10. Architectural Style Spec.: To acknowledge the vernacular style of the current mostly single storey cottages in the enclave. Contemporary designs are welcomed, however these to complement in-situ building fabric and streetscape.
- 5.3.11. Paint colours to be pale in colour (preferably white, pale cream or yellow).

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.4.1. The nearest Natura 2000 sites are;
 - Knocksink Wood SAC is 3.7km to the south of the appeal site.

- Ballyglen SAC is 4.1km to the south of the appeal site.
- Wicklow Mountains SAC and Wicklow Mountains SPA are 5.3km to the south-west of the appeal site.
- South Dublin Bay SAC is 6.4km to the north-east of the site.
- South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA is 6.4km to the north-east of the site.
- Dalkey Island SPA is 7km to the east of the site.
- Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC is 6.2km to the east of the site.

5.5. EIA Screening

- 5.5.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the development proposed, the site location outside of any protected site and the nature of the receiving environment, the limited ecological value of the lands in question, the availability of public services, the topography of the site and the surrounding area, and the separation distance from the nearest sensitive location, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

Third party appeals have been submitted by (1) Paul Kane (2) Rahim Traynor

(1) Paul Kane

- It is stated that the appellant Mr. Kane has no issue with the principle of the development of the lands neighbouring to his property no. 11A Glenamuck Cottages. However, he objects to the scale of the proposed development and considers that it would represent overdevelopment of the site and would set an undesirable precedent for other similar development.

- The appellant cites the development to the rear of no. 13 Glenamuck Cottages of two dwellings as a good example of backland development at this location. They contend that an appropriate scale of development would be one additional dwelling per original site.
- It is contended that the proposed development would appear overbearing and that it would cause overlooking due to the increase in site level from the front of the site. The appellant considers that inadequate separation distances have been provided between the dwellings and the boundaries. The separation distance between House no. 10B and the boundary is noted.
- The matter of the visual impact of the proposed development upon the streetscape is raised due to the increase in site level from the front of the site.
- Concern is expressed in relation to surface water proposals in particular the suitability of the three individual house sites to accommodate soakaways. It is considered that the site is steep and that there are small underground springs. Concern is raised that neighbouring lands would become saturated from lands to the south. The location of the proposed soakaways to the rear of the houses abuts the western boundary with no. 9 Glenamuck Cottages. The BRE Digest recommends that there shall be a minimum of 5m between soakpits and the house and 3m between a soakpit and a boundary. There is no requirement for the applicant to submit revised proposals for the approval of the Council in advance of commencement of development on site.

(2) Rahim Traynor

- The issues raised in the appeal are the same as those raised in the appeal lodged by Mr. Kane in terms of the matters of overdevelopment, overbearing, overlooking, visual impact and concerns in relation to surface water proposals.

- The further matter of boundary treatment is raised in the appeal. The appellant considers that the proposals for the existing site boundaries where the site abuts neighbouring properties is not sufficiently detailed. There is a note on Drawing No: 101D which states, “carefully manage and agree with adjoining property owner, treatment and retention of hedges/boundaries”. It is considered this wording is vague. It is noted that there was no consultation between the applicant and the appellant prior to the submission of the application. Condition no. 7 as attached by the Planning Authority refers to the front boundary, however the other boundaries are not referred to in the conditions.
- The proposed development due to the proposed tiered approach on site would result in the requirement to remove existing boundary hedgerow during ground shaping works. It is considered that it would be appropriate to replace the existing boundary with a 2m high blockwork boundary wall, capped and rendered on both sides to properly define the boundary. The development of a solid boundary between the existing rear garden and the new rear gardens will ensure the protection of the privacy which the appellant currently enjoys.
- It is considered that the harsh appearance of a boundary wall can be addressed with planting along both sides.

6.2. Applicant Response

A response to the third party appeals was submitted by Hamilton Young Architects on behalf of the applicant Arnage Carrickmines Limited. The main issues raised are as follows;

- Regarding separation distances, the appellants have correctly highlighted an error in Drawing no: PA101D which showed the outline of Proposed House 10B on the Existing Site Plan. Drawing No: PA101E submitted with the appeal response shows the correct outline of Proposed House 10B.
- It is submitted that the proposed development is in accordance with Development Plan standards. The proposed scheme includes the provision of abundant private garden spaces to the rear and side of each property. The orientation of the proposed single storey houses is such that it will not

adversely affect the future potential development in no's 9 and 11A Glenamuck Cottages, the appellants properties.

- The appellants have cited the development to the rear of 13 Glenamuck Cottages as a good example. The site at no. 13 has an area of approximately 495sq m with a house with a floor area of 130sq m. The proposed houses to the rear of no. 10 have a minimum site area of 550sq m and floor areas are, no. 10A & 10B – 140sq m and no. 10C – 168sq m.
- It is contended that the proposed development would not result in a negative visual impact. The site slopes to the south away from the road. Having regard to the depth of the site, it is considered that flat elevations distort the actual impact and that CGI's provide a true representation of how the development will integrate into the site.
- Regarding the matter of overlooking, there will be no overlooking of no. 11 Glenamuck Cottages from the proposed new houses. The site sections clearly show that there is a gentle rise of the site level and that the proposed single storey house would sit into the natural lay of the land.
- Regarding the issue of overdevelopment, it is contended that the application site is one of the largest within Glenamuck Cottages and that is sufficient to comply with development plan standards. Site 10A has an area of 550sq m, 10B has an area of 565sq m and site 10C has an area of 710sq m. The private open space for 10A is 166sq m, for 10B is 155sq m and for 10C is 294sq m. House 10A and House 10B were reduced as requested by the Planning Authority in size from 168sq m to 140sq m to provide greater external space and separation.
- In relation to the issue of surface water the design team Engineers Doherty Finnegan Kelly have carried out an assessment of the issues raised by the appellants and have provided a detailed response.
- Regarding the matter of boundary treatment, it is stated that the issue of engaging with neighbours on boundary treatment is important. The applicants Arnage Carrickmines Ltd. have confirmed that they are anxious to agree boundary treatments with all adjoining neighbours.

- It is considered that fencing and soft planting will provide a much greater and appropriate environment rather than 2m high boundary walls. The applicant would be amenable to the attachment of a condition requiring a maximum height for both hedges and fencing.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- It is considered that the grounds of appeal do not raise any new matter which, in the opinion of the Planning Authority, would justify a change of attitude to the proposed development.

7.0 Assessment

The main issues in this appeal are those raised in the grounds of appeal and it is considered that no other substantive issues arise. The issue of appropriate assessment screening also needs to be addressed. The issues can be dealt with under the following headings:

- Design and impact upon residential amenity
- Surface water drainage
- Appropriate Assessment

7.1. Design and impact upon residential amenity

- 7.1.1. The proposed development comprises a small backland scheme within a site zoned residential. The site is located within an area covered by the provisions of the Kiltiernan/Glenamuck Local Area Plan 2013 (as extended until 2023). As detailed in the LAP the site is located within an area which forms part of a larger landbank identified as 'Development Parcel 29a' in Chapter 11 of the LAP. Under these provisions of the LAP the location is considered suitable for 'residential infill' development (with specific reference being made to the construction of single-storey units on those lands to the south of the roadway). I note that the prevailing pattern of development in the immediate vicinity of the application site is characterised by a mix of detached & semi-detached single storey dwellings sited on large plots. Furthermore, I note that a number of these plots on the southern side of Rockville

Drive have been subdivided in similar way to that proposed under this application which facilitate the development of dwellings in a backland location. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the proposed scheme is in accordance with the provisions of the LAP and that it is also in accordance with the prevailing pattern of the development in the area.

- 7.1.2. The appellants state that they consider that the development would represent overdevelopment of the site. In response to this matter, I note the details provided in the first party response to the appeals which states that the subject site represents one of the largest backland sites within Rockville Drive. The appellants have cited the development to the rear of 13 Glenamuck Cottages as a good example. The first party in their response noted that the site at no. 13 Glenamuck Cottages has an area of circa 495sq m and the dwelling developed has a floor area of 130sq m. Under the current applicant, site no. 10A has an area of 550sq m and the proposed dwelling has a floor area of 140sq m, site no. 10B has an area of 565sq m and the proposed dwelling has a floor area of 140sq m and site no. 10C has an area of 710sq m and the proposed dwelling has a floor area of 168sq m. I note that as part of the further information issued by the Planning Authority that they sought that the depth of the dwellings on sites no. 10A and no. 10B be reduced in order to create more space within the individual plots and improve space within the scheme. The revised siting and design of the dwellings is illustrated on Drg. No. 101-Rev D, 'Existing and Proposed Site Plan'. I note that the appeals referred to concerns regarding separation distances and in particular, the highlighted an error in Drg. No. 101-Rev D in relation to house no. 10B. In response to the matter the first party have submitted a revised drawing, Drg. No. 101-Rev E which shows the correct outline of house no. 10B.
- 7.1.3. In relation to private open space house no. 10A has an area of 166sq m, house no. 10B has an area of 155sq m and house no. 10C has an area of 294sq m. Accordingly, I note that each dwelling is served by a private open space area in excess of the standards set out in Section 8.2.3.4(vi) of the development plan which refers to backland development.
- 7.1.4. The appeals refer to concerns in relation to the overlooking, overbearing and visual impact. Firstly, in relation to the issue of overlooking and overbearing, I note that the proposed dwellings are all single-storey. The level of the site rises in a north to

south direction. As detailed on Drg. No. 102 which illustrates the proposed site section the dwellings will be built into the site with floor level of house no. 10A being circa 2.1m above that of the original cottage. The floor level of house no. 10B would be circa 1.5m above that of house no. 10A and the floor level of house no. 10C would be circa 0.75m above the floor level of house no. 10B. The separation distance between the dwellings is circa 10m with 13m separation provided between house no. 10A and the original cottage. In relation to the appellant's properties, I note that the closest proposed dwellings would be located 20m from no. 9A Glenamuck Cottages to the west and 16m from no. 11A Glenamuck Cottages to the east. Furthermore, having regard to the site configuration and proposed layout there would be not directly opposing windows proposed between the dwellings within the scheme and any neighbouring properties to the east and west. Having regard to the separation distances provided and the single storey nature of the proposed dwellings, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not unduly impact the amenities of the neighbouring residential properties in terms of overlooking or overbearing.

- 7.1.5. Regarding the visual impact and the appearance of the proposed development in the streetscape, the Planning Authority in their assessment of the scheme required as part of the further information that the applicant submit Computer Generated Images showing the proposed dwellings in the context of the wider street setting as well as the relationship with the original property no. 10 Glenamuck Cottages. As detailed on the photomontages and CGI's of the proposed development, prepared by G-Net 3D, I note that the proposed dwellings would integrate well into the site and surroundings subject to the retention of some existing mature trees and the provision of appropriate landscaping and boundary treatment.
- 7.1.6. The matter of boundary treatment has been specifically raised in the grounds of appeal. The site features matures trees and hedgerow planting to the eastern, western and southern site boundaries. As detailed on the 'Existing and Proposed Site Plan' – Drg No: 101-Rev D, the applicant proposed to carefully manage and agree with the adjoining property owner the treatment and retention of hedges/boundaries. The appellant, who is the owner of the neighbouring property to the west has expressed a preference that the new boundary be formed by a 2m high blockwork boundary wall which would be capped and rendered on both sides to

properly define the boundary. They consider that the provision of such a wall will ensure the protection of residential amenity. The first party in response to the matter have stated that they considered that fencing and soft planting will provide a much greater and appropriate environment rather than 2m high boundary walls.

- 7.1.7. I consider that given the existing boundaries are formed by high mature hedges it would be appropriate that where possible these would be retained. However, should the proposed development necessitate the removal of part or all of the existing hedge boundary then an appropriate boundary treatment would be a 1.8m-2m high wall with appropriate screen planting to assimilate it. Accordingly, I considered that should the Bord decide to grant permission I would recommend the attachment of a condition requiring that details of all boundary treatments to be submitted to the Planning Authority for their agreement in writing prior to commencement of development.

7.2. Surface water drainage

- 7.2.1. The third party appeals raised concern regarding surface water drainage proposals in particular the suitability of the three individual house sites to accommodate soakaways. They noted that the site is steep and that there are small underground springs in the area. The appellants have concern that the neighbouring lands would become saturated from lands to the south. Concern was also expressed at the location of the proposed soakaways to the rear of the houses which abuts the western boundary with no. 9 Glenamuck Cottages. The appellants noted the provisions of the BRE Digest which recommends that there shall be a minimum of 5m between soakpits and the house and 3m between a soakpit and a boundary. The appellants had concerns that there is no requirement for the applicant to submit revised proposals in respect of surface water drainage for the approval of the Council in advance of commencement of development on site.
- 7.2.2. Regarding the topography of the site, the applicant's Consultation Engineers noted that the site is sloping from south to north and that the level of the dwellings have been designed having regard to the existing topography. They noted this is the same for all other backland development located to the southern side of Rockville Drive. The fall in levels from south to north ensures that there would be no ground water run-off in an easterly or westerly direction where development works could impact

neighbouring properties. The Consultation Engineers considered that it would be appropriate that each proposed dwelling have a land drain along the southern boundary of each plot. They noted that no ground water was encountered in any of the soakaway tests carried out. Therefore, ground water is not an issue on site. The Consultation Engineers stated that the proposals to deal with surface water are considered fully sustainable as all surface water generated from the proposed development would be infiltrated back into the ground and this is a suitable approach based on the site specific soakaway test results.

7.2.3. The response from the Consultation Engineers noted the recommendations from BRE Digest 365, which states that soakaways should be 3m from the abutting site boundaries. The Consultation Engineers noted that these are not specific requirements. Furthermore, they noted that there would be high demand for water along the eastern boundary due to existing and proposed trees and vegetation. The Planning Authority in the further information requested that each dwelling deal with their own surface water. That approach was proposed and was accepted by the Planning Authority. It was detailed in the report of the Planning Officer that the Water Services Department had no further comments when they received the final and approved surface water solution.

7.2.4. The response from the Consultation Engineers regarding the BRE Digest states that it stipulates that the soakpit shall be designed to BRE Digest 365 and that it shall be a minimum of 5m from the houses and that it should not affect neighbouring dwellings. The Planning Authority in their further information request stated that should the applicant consider the soakaway a feasible solution that they should submit a report signed by a Chartered Engineer showing infiltration tests or provide an alternative solution. The applicant's Consultation Engineers state that they consider it is a common sense approach to allow a flexible approach given the site constraints. They recommend that in the two cases where a 4m minimum separation distance is provided instead of 5m, that the foundations within the 5m zone extend a minimum of 300mm below the invert level of the lower part of the infiltration trench/soakaway. This would eliminate the possibility of water affecting foundation forming levels. The Consultation Engineers confirm that this solution has been successfully used by them previously. They note that there are many ways to successfully attenuate surface water when good infiltration on lands is provided.

They state that the matter of surface water attenuation can be addressed by condition.

- 7.2.5. In response to the matter the applicant's Consultation Engineers, Doherty Finegan Kelly provided a detailed appeal response. Regarding any conditions attached concern surface water, it is at the discretion of the Board should a condition be attached to deal with surface water proposals are part of a prior to commencement compliance. The Consultation Engineers have confirmed that applicant would be amenable to such a condition should it be considered appropriate.
- 7.2.6. I note the response provided from applicant's Consultation Engineers, Doherty Finegan Kelly. Furthermore, I note the revised plans submitted as detailed on Drg. No. 19281-002-Rev B, 'Proposed Drainage Layout & Details', in response to the further information request which indicate each of the dwellings served by a surface water infiltration system within the curtilage of each site. I note in their response that the applicant's Consultation Engineers state that while a separation distance of 4m is provided between two of the proposed surface water infiltration systems and the dwellings that design measures are proposed to protect foundations located within the 5m zone. The proposed soakaways would be sited to the west of the dwellings. I note that permeable paving is proposed to the parking area to serve each house.
- 7.2.7. I consider given that the revised proposals addressed the matters raised by the Planning Authority in respect of surface water in terms of the surface water generated within each individual site being accommodate within an on-site surface water infiltration systems and that the report of the Planning Officer confirms that the Drainage Department are satisfied with the proposals and recommend standard conditions. Accordingly, I would concur with the assessment of Planning Authority that the surface water proposal are acceptable. Should the Board decide to grant permission, I would recommend the attachment of a condition requiring that drainage arrangements including the attenuation and disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

7.3. **Appropriate Assessment**

- 7.3.1. The appeal site is not within or adjoining any Natura 2000 site. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development under consideration, the location of

the site within an existing built-up area, the nature of the receiving environment, the availability of public services and the separation distance to the nearest European site, no Appropriate Assessment issues arise and it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

8.0 Recommendation

8.1. I recommend a grant of permission.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

9.1.1. Having regard to the land use zoning of the site in the current Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan, 2016-2022 and the Kiltiernan / Glenamuck Local Area Plan, 2013, to the infill nature of the site, to the design and scale of the proposed development, and to the nature and pattern of development in the vicinity, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity, would represent an appropriate residential density, would comply with the provisions of the Kiltiernan / Glenamuck Local Area Plan, 2013 and the Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan, 2016-2022, and would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application as amended by the further plans and particulars submitted on the 16th day of December, 2020, and by the further plans and particulars received by An Bord Pleanála on the 19th day of March, 2021, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. 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.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

3. All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground. Ducting shall be provided by the developer to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

4. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed development shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

5. Details of the site entrance shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This shall include the vehicular entrance onto Glenamuck Cottages being a maximum of 4m in width. The adjoining footpath to the proposed dwelling shall be continuous and be dished across the entrances to house numbers 10a and 10b and be a minimum of 1.8m in width.

Reason: In the interest of traffic and pedestrian safety.

6. Prior to commencement of development, the applicant shall submit details to the Planning Authority for written agreement indicating the following:
 - (i) A letter of agreement from the ESB that the required relocation of the existing ESB pole to accommodate the proposed development is deemed acceptable.
 - (ii) The Applicant shall submit plans and details of the proposed relocation of the said existing ESB pole.

Note: The required relocation of the existing ESB pole to accommodate the proposed development shall be carried out to the satisfaction of the ESB and all at the applicant's own expense.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

7. Details of all boundary treatments shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

8. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 and 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between the hours of 0800 and 1400 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or Public Holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

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

9. 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 noise management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.

Reason: In the interests of public safety and residential amenity.

10. 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.

11. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of the Glenamuck District Distributor Road Scheme and Surface Water Attenuation Ponds Scheme in accordance with the terms of the Supplementary Development Contribution Scheme made by the planning authority under section 49 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.

Siobhan Carroll
Planning Inspector

20th of August 2021