

File With

SECTION 131 FORM

Appeal No

ABP— 319719.

Defer Re O/H

☒

Having considered the contents of the submission dated/received 10-06-24 from Ian Keogh ^{obs.}

I recommend that section 131 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 be/not be invoked at this stage for the following reason(s):

no new material planning issues

Section 131 not to be invoked at this stage.

Section 131 to be invoked — allow 2/4 weeks for reply.

☒
☐

Signed

EO

Date

Signed

SEO/SAO

Date

Please prepare BP — Section 131 notice enclosing a copy of the attached submission.

To

Task No

Allow 2/3/4 weeks

Signed

EO

Date

Signed

AA

Date



Planning Appeal Online Observation

Online Reference
NPA-OBS-003544

LD obs = 10-06-24 ✓

Online Observation Details

Contact Name
Ian Keogh

Lodgement Date
10/06/2024 14:57:58

Case Number / Description
319719

N/A ✓
SO ✓
Valid.

Payment Details

Payment Method
Online Payment

Cardholder Name
Ian Keogh

Payment Amount
€50.00

LDG-072729-24

Processing Section

S.131 Consideration Required

☒ Yes — See attached 131 Form

☐ N/A — Invalid

Signed

EO

Date

18-06-24.

Fee Refund Requisition

Please Arrange a Refund of Fee of

€

Lodgement No

LDG—

Reason for Refund

Documents Returned to Observer

☐ Yes ☐ No

Request Emailed to Senior Executive Officer for Approval

☐ Yes ☐ No

Signed

EO

Date

Finance Section

Payment Reference

ch_3PQ8jSB1CW0EN5FC0mSHCLyA

Checked Against Fee Income Online

EO/AA (Accounts Section)

Amount

€

Refund Date

Authorised By (1)

SEO (Finance)

Authorised By (2)

Chief Officer/Director of Corporate Affairs/SAO/Board Member

Date

Date

10th June 2024

TO: AN BORD PLANEALA, MALBOROUGH ST.
DUBLIN 1

RE: OBSERVATION 1ST PARTY APPEAL
DCC REF: 3274/24 AT CITIGROUP BUILDING, 1
NORTH WALL QUAY, DUBLIN 1, D01T8Y1 BY
NWQ DEVCO LIMITED
ABP REF: PL29N.319719
FEE: €50 PAID ONLINE

I the undersigned have previously submitted an observation on the DCC application and support the planner's reasons and decision to refuse permission.

I am the joint apartment owner and resident of Clarion Quay for over 22 years and live about 15-20m from the existing Citibank building and wish to make the following observations on the 1st party appeal to add to my observations previously made, which remain unaddressed in the submitted appeal. I am assuming there will not be an oral hearing as this scheme 1st or 2nd is to my mind anything but an exceptional or landmark development proposal.

1. The revised scheme included with the appeal should be a new application for such a large development that has been refused. To do otherwise would in my view be an abuse of the planning process, particularly for such a large scheme.
2. The submission in any case does not address the major errors and significant omissions of information and analysis in the first proposal / application with the 2nd proposal. This is now the 2nd attempt and there is no improvement in the accuracy or completeness of key reports like daylight/sunlight or basement to pick a few. This has the effect of omitting critical analysis of the proposal on a wide range of physical and environmental impacts that will for us injure the use and value of our home to us and to anyone we might try to sell it to in future. I expect that a proper analysis would show that if the proposed development

already existed you wouldn't for compliance reasons be permitted to build Clarion Quay afterwards.

3. The new building line is still proposed closer to our apartment than the current building line and in doing would eliminate even more sun and daylight than the wider proposal, but this is impossible to clearly evaluate or determine from the documents provided. This local measure along Alderman Way compounds the overall developments impact on our common areas and local public spaces. It also eliminates a scarce and valuable nature strip of trees and bushes in what is an otherwise neglected corridor that amplifies noise from buildings and delivery operations most of which are out of normal working hours.
4. The sustainability analysis provided even with this 2nd scheme has not taken a retrofit option seriously as called for by the planners. There will be an enormous amount of wasted and new embodied carbon arising from a demolition approach, yet demolition is only a "negligible difference". I would ask the Bord to seriously question whether the "Green" awards and strategy and the analysis provided by the applicant, truly reflects what would actually occur and whether it achieves what is required to meet the EU EPBD Directive and Irish Climate Act requirements, now or in the years ahead when these measures will become more restrictive.

SINCERELY,

IAN KEOGH
A14 B12, CLARION QUAY, IFSC, DUBLIN 1