

Coologe,
Brennanstown Road,
Dublin
D18 E9P4

13th May 2022

The Secretary,
An Bord Pleanála,
64 Marlborough Street
Dublin 1

AN BORD PLEANÁLA	
LDG-	<u>053375-22</u>
ABP-	
16 MAY 2022	
Fee: €	<u>200</u> Type: <u>cheque</u>
Time:	<u>1005</u> By: <u>hazel</u>

Re: Cairn Planning Application – Barrington Tower at Brennanstown Road

ABF Ref: 313281

Dear Sir/Madam,

We have been living on Brennanstown Road since 1994. In this time we have seen an increasing number of dangerous incidents on the road. In this time, no significant improvements have been made to address the situation in relation to increased use of the road by cars. There has been little increase in pedestrian and cyclist traffic as the road is deemed too dangerous for this type of use. Wheeling of prams/buggies down the road is not possible due to sloped and narrow or non-existent footpaths. Pedestrians using the road currently are in danger of being hit by the wing mirrors of passing cars and also by wing mirrors and hub caps flying off vehicles colliding with walls and/or other cars. The recent introduction of a roundabout at Brennanstown Wood and the changed profile of pavements has increased the number of incidents of cars having blowouts after collision with the curb.

Against this backdrop we were saddened to see the above proposal by Cairn Homes which solely utilises Brennanstown Road for pedestrian, vehicle and cyclist access. The road infrastructure and connections required to support a development of this size are just not present in the proposed location. The scale of the development is simply dangerous in the context of access for individuals residing in the units and other road users. Emergency vehicles already have difficulty accessing properties on this road and the height of the development (above seven stories in some blocks) means that current fire services will not be able to promptly respond to fires, particularly on high level units.

The application envisages some 1200+ bicycle spaces to enable cyclists to use a road which has no provision for cycle lanes and is already a serious danger to cyclists. In this respect, the application shows a reckless disregard for safety.

The development of 500+ units on the site represents a development completely out of scale and character for the site which is located in a historic valley surrounded by low rise individual houses. Also, the proposal significantly overdevelops the site, in some instances, with distances between blocks of less than 50% of the 22 metre guidelines. The proposed density is significantly greater than that of Cherrywood, extraordinary in the context of the different character of the surrounding lands and the provision of services.

The County Development Plan provides for the possibility of a convenience shop in developments of this nature but not greater than 100 sq mtrs in size. The application is for 366 sq mtrs which is a "very" material contravention. 366 sq mtrs is a mid-sized supermarket and would undoubtedly need to be open for long hours to be viable. It would generate additional traffic from outside the development and, very likely, would become a popular venue for late night alcohol purchasing, potentially leading to anti-social behaviour.

We submit below our formal request to An Bord Pleanála to refuse permission for the proposed development based on the grounds set out, including "Material Contraventions" of the County Development Plan 2022 - 2028 and other issues.

Observation on Strategic Housing Development ABP Ref 313281 2022, also known as the Brennanstown Road SHD or the Barrington Tower SHD. We ask An Bord Pleanála to refuse permission for the proposed development based on the below grounds, including Material Contraventions of the County Development Plan 2022-2028 and other issues.

1. The Land Use Zoning is *"Objective A – to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities."*

We submit that the proposed development would materially contravene Land Use zoning Objective A, its purpose and intent – to protect and improve residential amenity. We ask An Bord to uphold the Development Plan.

2. SLO 73 states: *"It is an Objective of the Council: To limit development along the Brennanstown Road to minor domestic infills and extensions until a Traffic Management Scheme for the area has been completed and its recommendations implemented."*

We submit that the proposed development would materially contravene Objective SLO 73. We submit that if An Bord disregards Objective SLO 73 it would fail to discharge its duty of care to existing and future residents and all the foreseeable users of Brennanstown Road. This includes adult and child pedestrians; able bodied and disabled persons; cyclists, e-bikers and e-scooterists; visitors and delivery personnel; truck drivers, car drivers and construction vehicle drivers; drivers of emergency service vehicles. Safety and amenity would be diminished due to traffic hazards that will arise under several headings due to the congestion, and obstruction of traffic movements arising during the construction and operational phases of the proposed high density residential development.

3. Policy Objective PHP20: states *"Protection of Existing Residential Amenity. It is a Policy Objective to ensure the residential amenity of existing homes in the Built-Up Area is protected where they are adjacent to proposed higher density and greater height infill developments."*

We submit that the proposed development would materially contravene Objective PHP20 and accordingly would, due to their height, overlooking, loss of privacy, scale, visual obtrusion, failure to respect the existing patterns of and scale of local development, loss of sunlight to mature gardens and hedgerows, seriously injure the residential amenity of existing properties leading to a loss in house prices.

4. Paragraph 12.3.5.2 "Separation Between Blocks" states *"All proposals for residential development, particularly apartment developments and those over three storeys high, shall provide for acceptable separation distances between blocks to avoid negative effects such as excessive overlooking, overbearing and overshadowing effects and provide sustainable residential amenity conditions and open spaces."*

This is qualified by the following paragraph (our emphasis in **bold**): *"A minimum clearance distance of circa 22 metres, in general, is required, between opposing windows in the case of apartments up to three storeys in height. In taller blocks, a greater separation distance may be prescribed having regard to the layout, size, and design. In certain instances, depending on orientation and location in built-up areas, reduced separation distances may be acceptable. In all instances where the minimum separation distances are not met, the applicant shall submit a daylight availability analysis for the proposed development."*

We submit that this development exceeds the prescribed height of three stories whereby 22M separation distance is considered acceptable by two to seven stories. We submit that this low-density area of predominantly single-storey and two storey houses cannot be considered one of the "built-up areas". We therefore submit that the proposed development would materially contravene this requirement of the Development Plan, which is intended to ensure that the primary land use zoning objective is met. The daylight report shows that these blocks, due to the limited distance between them, their excessive length and height will cause overshadowing of the Communal Open Space, resulting in a poor quality external environment. We submit the COS will suffer from tunnel-effect high winds from the prevailing wind direction and significant downdrafts due to the height of the buildings.

5. Policy Objective CA6 States *"Policy Objective CA6: Retrofit and reuse of buildings - It is a Policy Objective to require the retrofitting and reuse of existing buildings rather than their demolition and reconstruction where possible recognising the embodied energy in existing buildings and thereby reducing the overall embodied energy in construction as set out in the Urban Design Manual (Department of Environment Heritage and Local Government, 2009). (Consistent with RPO 7.40 and 7.41 of the RSES)."*

We submit that the proposed development would materially contravene this requirement of the Development Plan, due to the proposed complete demolition of "Winterbrook" (which is in reasonable condition) and the dwelling attached to "Barrington Tower", which although currently derelict could be retrofitted and re-used. We submit that the retrofitting and re-use existing buildings to provide residential accommodation achieves one of the primary aims sustainable development and reduction of Ireland's carbon footprint. We submit that this is a viable alternative to carbon-intensive new build multi-storey developments like the one proposed and entirely supports the Land Use Zoning Objective of the subject site.

6. The second paragraph of Section 12.3.3 'Quantitative Standards for All Residential Development' of Chapter 12 (pg. 236) of the Written Statement, states: *"That the requirement for certain percentages of 3-bed units in apartments shall apply to Build To Rent developments to accord with mix on page 237."*

We submit that the proposed development would materially contravene this requirement of the Development Plan, which is intended to ensure that an appropriate mix of apartment types are available to the rental market, would therefore fail to support the growth of a sustainable local community and fail to improve residential amenity.

7. The preservation of the trees to the north of the subject site is an objective of the development plan as shown on Land Use Zoning Map 7. This can be downloaded as [land_use_zoning_map_7_0.pdf](#) from the Council website.



We submit that the proposed development would materially contravene this requirement of the Development Plan, as the removal of these trees is required for the development of Blocks AB and CD. The removal of these trees would seriously injure the amenity of both the neighbouring houses and the visual amenity of Brennanstown Road and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of

the area.

To protect and preserve Trees and Woodlands



8. The Site Layout as proposed does not appear to be compliant with TGD B Fire (2006) Section 5.2 Vehicle Access.

The smaller five storey front blocks' top floor is more than 10M above GL and their volume exceeds 7,000 cubic metres. These and all the bigger blocks require a 5M wide hard standing to give access to 50% of their perimeters, a 3.7M wide access road and turning facilities. Attempting to comply with these requirements significantly reduces the proposed public open space and it is not clear how 50% of perimeter access will be provided

9. Given the Material Contraventions above, any future proposed development should be significantly reduced.

The topography of the northern boundary does not allow for taller buildings without damaging the appearance or character of the area by the impact of significantly overbearing existing adjoining residential property west of the northern boundary. Blocks AB and CD, at a minimum, should be removed from any new proposal. This land should be laid out as public open space as a community gain for the Brennanstown Road Area to improve local amenity.


The clustering of the remaining six blocks should be reconsidered. Their height and close proximity lead to overlooking, loss of privacy and visual obtrusion towards the western boundary, creating a shadowed, low-amenity windswept environment between the blocks. Providing proper fire tender access will significantly reduce the depth and quality of the proposed public open space to the west of the site. This suggests that at least two more blocks should be deleted from the lower part of the site for any new proposal.

Development of this site should not be undertaken until such time as:

- a) Alternative access routes are available
- b) A fully comprehensive redesign of Brennanstown Road has been undertaken
- c) Pedestrian and Cyclist routes on adjoining roads are fully implemented
- d) The Brennanstown Luas stop and required increased rail infrastructure is in place.

The nature and scale of the density of the development is dramatically out of character with the area. It poses significant safety risks in light of the condition of Brennanstown Road and the absence of any comprehensive plan to remedy this. The application is fundamentally flawed and should be rejected in its entirety.

Your faithfully,


Bryan Evans


Jane Evans