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| COMHAIRLE CONTAE ÁTHA CLIATH THEASSOUTH DUBLIN COUNTY COUNCILMinutes of South Dublin County Council Draft Development Plan Meeting held on 16th May, 2016PRESENT

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Councillors** |  | **Councillors** |
| Bonner, B. |  | Lavelle, W. |
| Casserly, V. |  | Lawlor, B. |
| Dermody, A-M. |  | Leech, B. |
| Donovan P.Duff, M. |  | Looney, D.McCann, C. |
| Duffy, F.  |  | McMahon, R. |
| Dunne, L.Egan, K.Fanning, E. |  | Mahon, K.Murphy, E.Murphy, M. |
| Ferron, B. Foley, P. |  | Nolan, R.O’Brien, D. |
|  Gilligan, T. Gogarty, P.  |  | O’Brien, E.O’Connell, G. |
|  Graham, J. |  | O’Connor, C. |
| Higgins, E. |  | O’Donovan, D. |
| Holland, S.Johansson, M. |  | O’Toole, L.Richardson, D. |
| Kearns, P. |  | Timmons, F. |
| King, C. |  | Ward, M. |
|  |  |  |

 **OFFICIALS PRESENT**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Chief Executive | D. McLoughlin |
| Directors / Heads of Function | E. Taaffe  |
| Senior Planners | B. Keaney |
| Heritage Officer | R. Dwyer |
| Senior Executive Officer | L. Leonard |
| Senior Executive Planner | A. Hyland, F. Redmond, J. Frehill |
| Executive Planners | J. Phelan, N. Conlon, J. Taylor, E. Burke, |
| Assistant Planners | A. Fahey |
| Chief Technician | L. McEvoy |
| Senior Executive Technician | P. Larkin |
| Senior Staff Officer | E. Colgan |
| Assistant Staff Officer | S. Beatty |
| Clerical OfficerIT | E. De CourcyR. Heron |

The Mayor, Councillor S. Holland , presided.An apology was received from Councillor N. Coules for inability to attend.DPM1/0516 Item ID:49541Proposed by Land use Planning & Transportation **Chief Executive’s Report and Presentation**[HI1 - CE Report](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52063) Headed Item 1 was NOTED.DPM2/0516 Item ID:49542Proposed by Land use Planning & Transportation **Environmental Assessment of the Proposed Motions**[HI 2 Environmental Assessment of Submissions](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52149)[HI 2 Environmental Assessment of Elected Members Motions](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52148)Headed Item 2 was NOTED. HousingDPM1/0516 Item ID:49324Proposed by Councillor S. Holland and seconded by Councillor A.M DermodySLO H3 SL01 to have the following text reinstated:"Any future development should have regard to the boundaries with and the protection of the existing amenity and function of Edmondstown golf course"Co-sponsored by Cllr Paula Donovan and Cllr Deirdre O'Donovan[M1](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52071)[Map - General Location](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52070)**Report**The relevant section of Material Alteration Ref. Chapter 2 – No.3 relates to the provision of H3 SLO 1 on the Residential (RES) zoned lands at Edmondstown. The H3 SLO 1 proposed Material Alteration text states: H3 SLO 1:To facilitate the development of lands at Edmondstown (former Kilmashogue House) for the purpose of a retirement village (independent, semi-independent and nursing home accommodation) at a density of not more than 20 units per hectare (not more than 8 units per acre). low density residential development at a net density of not more than 12 dwellings per hectare and to promote housing for older people (nursing home, independent and semi-independent) as a fully integrated part of such development with an increased density of not more than 20 dwellings per hectare to apply to independent and semi-independent housing for older people. All residential development, including housing for older people, shall be integrated within a sustainable residential neighbourhood that is served by shared public open space, community and local facilities. Permissible densities may be increased in accordance with the relevant ministerial guidelines where issues of accessibility have been fully resolved in an appropriate manner.The subject motion relates to the protection of the existing golf club (Edmondstown) which adjoins the residential site subject to the SLO above. It is noted that the wording of the motion requests the addition of "Any future development should have regard to the boundaries with and the protection of the existing amenity and function of Edmondstown golf course" to the SLO above. It is noted that the proposed SLO amendment wording in relation to the Edmondstown Golf Club replicates the 2010 – 2016 County Development Plan wording which included the following SLO: *91. Edmondstown – Residential Development* *Facilitate the development of the lands at Edmondstown, north of the M50 boundary, for high quality (not more than 4 houses per acre) low density residential development having regard to access and location and to the boundaries with, and the protection of the existing amenity and function of, Edmondstown Golf Course.*The Chief Executive considers that the characteristics of the subject issue are replicated across the County in terms of adjoining land use zonings, including other golf courses adjoining other zoning objectives. The area where two zones adjoin is known as a transitional area. In this regard, it is noted that the County Development Plan provides for safeguards in relation to the development of these ‘transitional areas’, with Section 11.1.1 of the Draft Plan stating that development proposals in transitional areas should seek to avoid development that would be detrimental to the amenities of contiguous zones. The Chief Executive considers that the protection of the future operations of an individual Golf Club can be assessed at Development Management stage and it is considered unnecessary and beyond the strategic scope of the County Development Plan to prescribe and pre-empt the assessment of this individual transitional area through reference in a SLO. **Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.A show of hands vote on the Motion followed:**FOR 25 (TWENTY FIVE)****AGAINST 0 (ZERO)****ABSTAIN 3(THREE)**The Motion was **CARRIED.**DPM2/0516 Item ID:49406Proposed by Councillor A-M. Dermody and seconded by Councillor D. O’Donovan**Material Alteration Ref. Chapter 2 - No.3** That provision of a strip of land 30 metres in width be included in this Development Plan, along the boundary of Edmundstown Golf Club.  In so allowing this would be in keeping with SLO 91 and SLO 113 of last two Development Plans of 2004 & 2010. By being specific as to the size of the area ensures that the objective as affirmed in both of the previous Development Plans 2004 & 2010  is protected and also that the use of this 30 metre strip be restricted to communal open space.[M2](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52072)[Map - General Location](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52078)**REPORT:**The relevant section of Material Alteration Ref. Chapter 2 – No.3 relates to the provision of H3 SLO 1 on the Residential (RES) zoned lands at Edmondstown. The H3 SLO 1 proposed Material Alteration text states: H3 SLO 1:To facilitate the development of lands at Edmondstown (former Kilmashogue House) for the purpose of a retirement village (independent, semi-independent and nursing home accommodation) at a density of not more than 20 units per hectare (not more than 8 units per acre). low density residential development at a net density of not more than 12 dwellings per hectare and to promote housing for older people (nursing home, independent and semi-independent) as a fully integrated part of such development with an increased density of not more than 20 dwellings per hectare to apply to independent and semi-independent housing for older people. All residential development, including housing for older people, shall be integrated within a sustainable residential neighbourhood that is served by shared public open space, community and local facilities. Permissible densities may be increased in accordance with the relevant ministerial guidelines where issues of accessibility have been fully resolved in an appropriate manner.The subject motion relates to the protection of the existing golf club (Edmondstown) which adjoins the residential site subject to the SLO above. The proposed motion outlines that the provision of a 30m strip on the Edmondstown site be restricted to communal open space in accordance with the 2010 – 2016 County Development Plan wording. The Chief Executive notes that a reference to a 30m strip is not included in the 2010 – 2016 County Development Plan. The following SLO text is included in the 2010 – 2016 County Development Plan:*91. Edmondstown – Residential Development* *Facilitate the development of the lands at Edmondstown, north of the M50 boundary, for high quality (not more than 4 houses per acre) low density residential development having regard to access and location and to the boundaries with, and the protection of the existing amenity and function of, Edmondstown Golf Course.*The Chief Executive considers that the characteristics of the subject issue are replicated across the County in terms of adjoining land use zonings, including other golf courses adjoining other zoning objectives. The area where two zones adjoin is known as a transitional area. In this regard, it is noted that the County Development Plan provides for safeguards in relation to the development of these ‘transitional areas’, with Section 11.1.1 of the Draft Plan stating that development proposals in transitional areas should seek to avoid development that would be detrimental to the amenities of contiguous zones. The Chief Executive considers that the protection of the future operations of an individual Golf Club can be assessed at Development Management stage and it is considered unnecessary and beyond the strategic scope of the County Development Plan to prescribe and pre-empt the assessment of this individual transitional area through reference in a SLO.It is therefore recommended that the motion not be adopted.In particular, it is considered that the provision of a blanket 30m strip on the Edmondstown site be restricted to communal open space is inappropriate and may adversely impact on residential amenity. **Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.Following contribution from Councillors A.M Dermody, D Looney and S. Holland, Mr E. Taaffe, Director of Land Use, Planning and Transportation responded to queries raised.A show of hands vote on the Motion followed:**FOR 11 (ELEVEN)****AGAINST 18 (EIGHTEEN)****ABSTAIN 4(FOUR)**The Motion **FELL.**DPM3/0516 Item ID:49393Proposed by Councillor W. Lavelle and seconded by Councillor A. M. DermodyThat this Council declines to accept the first part of the Chief Executive's recommendation in relation to Material Alteration Ref. Chapter 2 - No. 4 and agrees to retain H8 Objective 6 as displayed.**REPORT:**The relevant section of Material Alteration Ref. Chapter 2 - No. 4 states:H8 Objective 6:To require that the provisions contained in the Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas (DECLG 2009) relating to Outer Suburban locations should apply to green field sites outside the M50 which are not subject to an LAP or SDZ, therefore requiring residential densities of 35-50 units per hectare.The Chief Executive recommends that this motion is not adopted in its current format and outlines the response under the following headings:* Scope of the Objective
* Density – Site by Site assessments required
* Objective contradicting Land Use Zoning Objectives

Scope of the Objective The wording of the proposed objective provides a geographical reference to “… green field sites outside the M50”. As such, the proposed objective imposes a blanket application of a density range of 35 – 50 dwellings per hectare to all greenfield sites to the west of the M50 that are not subject to an SDZ or LAP and does not link same to the land use zoning objectives of the sites. As detailed below, it is considered that the appropriate density for a site requires individual assessment based on the characteristics of the site/ area.Density – Site by Site assessments required The ‘Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas’ (2009) sets out a range of appropriate residential densities for different contexts based on site factors and the level of access to existing and planned infrastructure and services, including public transport, physical and social infrastructure. Town Centre and Public Transport SitesA residential density standard of 35 – 50 dwellings per hectare is not always appropriate to Town Centre locations and public transport corridors (rail and Luas) in the County, where densities above 50 dwellings per hectare are recommended, subject to site context.Edge of Urban Area Sites Conversely, the proposed objective applies a density range that exceeds that generally appropriate for edge of centre sites in Small Towns/ Villages within the County as prescribed under the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas Guidelines. A residential density standard of 35 – 50 dwellings per hectare at an edge location may result in the overdevelopment of sites in locations not subject to an existing Local Area Plan. The appropriate density for such sites require individual assessment outside the provisions of the ‘Outer Suburban’ location section of the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas Guidelines to consider site factors and the level of access to existing and planned infrastructure and services, including public transport, physical and social infrastructure. A density below 35 units per hectare may be considered appropriate. Objective contradicts the Land Use Zoning Objectives Further to the above, the text of the objective refers to greenfield sites and does not differentiate between land use zoning objectives. The provision of a density range per hectare on lands zoned Objective HA (High Amenity - Dublin Mountains, Dodder Valley and Liffey Valley), RU (rural) and OS (Open Space) creates ambiguity and may be conflict with various policies and objectives contained in the Draft County Development Plan, including the Land Use Zoning Objectives.The inclusion of conflicting objectives in the Development Plan provides uncertainty in the interpretation of the Plan by An Bord Pleanala (see Section 37(2) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended)).ConclusionThe Chief Executive’s Report recommends that the County Development Plan be made with the proposed Material Alteration subject to a modification that amends the wording of H8 Objective 6 to address the scope and inflexible nature of the proposed Material Alteration.The CE Report recommended text for inclusion in the Plan:H8 Objective 6:To require that the provisions contained in the Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas (DECLG 2009) relating to Outer Suburban locations (35-50 units per hectare) should apply to open lands that are zoned for residential development or a mix of uses that includes residential development, which are not subject to an LAP or SDZ, and are located on the periphery of the Metropolitan Consolidation Area or designated Towns within the County whose development will require the provision of new infrastructure, roads, sewers, schools, shops, employment and community facilities.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:H8 Objective 6 to read as follows:To apply the provisions contained in the Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas (DECLG 2009) relating to Outer Suburban locations, including a density range of 35-50 units per hectare, to greenfield sites that are zoned residential (RES or RES-N) and are not subject to a SDZ designation, a Local Area Plan and/or an approved plan, excluding lands within the M50 and lands on the edge or within the Small Towns/ Villages in the County.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED**Community InfrastructureDPM4/0516 Item ID:49409Proposed by Councillor L. O'Toole and seconded by Councillor P. Gogarty Cllr. Liona O'Toole , Cllr Paul Gogarty, Cllr. Guss O'Connell(replaces motion 49407)To add the following line at the end of C7 SLO 1:The new sports facility will ensure that sufficient capacity is built in to provide space for sports equipment from local clubs **including equipment required for users with special needs.****REPORT:**The intention of the motion with regard to the wording of C7 SLO1 (subject to Material Alteration Ref. Chapter 3 – No.3) is noted, and it is recommended that the additional text be included accordingly:‘To provide a swimming pool for Lucan on a new sports and leisure centre campus at Griffeen; alternative locations to be sought as part of an extensive public consultation process but with Griffeen identified as the default site. The new sports facility will ensure that sufficient capacity is built in to provide storage space for sports equipment from local clubs including equipment required for users with special needs’.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED**DPM5/0516 Item ID:49392Proposed by Councillor R. McMahon and seconded by Councillor P. Foley With Reference 3.11.0 - With regard to the reference to change in text to what the Minister announced pre-election to refer to proposed Post Primary School in Firhouse, I propose that the original text stands and to leave the reference to Knocklyon/Ballycullen/Firhouse area. [M5](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52075) **REPORT:**This motion refers to a section of text under Section 3.11.0 of the Draft Plan subject to Material Alteration Ref. Chapter 3 – No.4, specifically the third paragraph of same which, as displayed, stated:‘The Department of Education and Skills will commence a new phase of school building during the period 2016‐2022. The Department has identified a need for additional post primary schools in South Dublin County up to 2026. Schools in Lucan (Kishoge Community College), Tallaght (Kingswood) and Rathcoole (Holy Family Community School) are under construction or at design stage. Demand for further provision is also identified in the Lucan; Saggart/Citywest;Newcastle/Rathcoole; Knocklyon/Firhouse/Ballycullen areas. The Department identifies a possible requirement for further provision in the Lucan and Dublin 24 areas particularly, although other areas may also require some level of additional provision’.Following submissions on the proposed Material Alterations, including one from the Department of Education and Skills regarding Material Alteration Ref. Chapter 3 – No.4, the Chief Executive report on the Material Alterations (April 2016) recommended that the County Development Plan be made with this proposed Material Alteration subject to modification as follows:‘The Department of Education and Skills will commence a new phase of school building during the period 2016‐2022. The Department has identified a need for additional post primary schools in South Dublin County up to 2026. Schools in Lucan (Kishoge Community College), Tallaght (Kingswood) and Rathcoole (Holy Family Community School) are under construction or at design stage. Demand for further provision is also identified in the Lucan; Saggart/Citywest; Newcastle/Rathcoole; Knocklyon/Firhouse/Ballycullen areas. The Department identifies a possible requirement for further provision in the Lucan and Dublin 24 areas particularly, although other areas may also require some level of additional provision. **Two new post primary schools, one in Lucan to open in 2017 and one in Firhouse to open in 2018 (in addition to 11 other schools due to open nationwide in 2017/2018), were announced by the Minister for Education and Skills in November 2015 following completion of the latest nationwide demographic exercises by the Department regarding additional school accommodation requirements’.** [paragraph 3 extracted for clarity]The submission from the Department of Education and Skills regarding Material Alteration Ref. Chapter 3 – No.4 related to amendments to the narrative text of Section 3.11.0, predominantly comprising newly available details on school provision and identification of school needs. In this regard while it is noted that specific reference was made to new post primary schools, one in Lucan to open in 2017 and one in Firhouse to open in 2018 (in addition to 11 other schools due to open nationwide in 2017/2018), the text of Section 3.11.0, as amended and recommended in the Chief Executive’s report (April 2016), also details the process by which school requirements are identified by the Department and that demographic changes in South Dublin will continue to be monitored by the Department of Education and Skills on an ongoing basis. The amended text also notes that it possible that further educational requirements may arise over the lifetime of the Plan. Having regard to the details available to date from the Department of Education and Skills, it is considered that the response of the Chief Executive with regard to Material Alteration Ref. Chapter 3 – No.4 is adequate and appropriate.**Recommendation** It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.**Following a contribution from Councillor R. McMahon, Mr E.Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning and Transportation responded to queries raised.**A show of hands vote on the Motion followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR 15 (FIFTEEN)****AGAINST 15 (FIFTEEN)****ABSTAIN 1 (ONE)****The Mayor used her casting vote, and voted in favour of the Motion.** The Motion was **CARRIED.**Urban Centres & RetailingDPM6/0516 Item ID:49387Proposed by Councillor P. Gogarty and seconded by Councillor L. O’TooleMotion in the name of Cllrs Paul Gogarty Liona O'Toole and Guss O'Connell:Amend R6 Objective 3 to read: "To support and facilitate the development of new District Centres of an appropriate urban scale at Adamstown and Clonburris in accordance with approved Planning Schemes which should provide a sustainable retail mix including department stores and shopping centres that facilitates walking, cycling and use of public transport and reduces car journeys outside the SDZ for many retail needs.**REPORT:**The motion relates to proposed Material Alteration Ref. Chapter 5 – No.8 which displayed the following on public consultation:**‘**R6 Objective 3:To support and facilitate the development of new District Centres of an appropriate high density urban scale at Adamstown and Clonburris in accordance with approved Planning Schemes which should provide a sustainable retail mix including department stores and shopping centres that facilitates walking and use of public transport and reduces car journeys outside the SDZ for many retail needs.’**Overall, the development of Adamstown and Clonburris District Centres will be guided by detailed SDZ Planning Schemes approved by An Bord Pleanala. The SDZ process and Planning Scheme stand-alone from the County Development Plan process. As such, it is considered that being prescriptive in terms of the nature of the retail design and mix is not required in the County Development Plan.**It is considered that the inclusion of the term ‘shopping centre’ implies a particular type of design of retail development and following the completion of the Planning Scheme for Clonburris, this term may contradict the Planning Scheme for the SDZ e.g. the provision of retail in a street format.It is the recommendation of the Chief Executive that references to high density and the term ‘including department stores and shopping centres’ be omitted and the objective be included as displayed.**Recommendation**It is recommended that the motion is adopted with amendment:Amend R6 Objective 3 to read as follows:To support and facilitate the development of new District Centres of an appropriate urban scale at Adamstown and Clonburris in accordance with approved Planning Schemes which should provide a sustainable retail mix that facilitates walking, cycling and use of public transport and reduces car journeys outside the SDZ for many retail needs.**Following a contribution from Councillor P.Gogarty, Mr E.Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning and Transportation responded to queries raised.**A show of hands vote on the Motion followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 29 (TWENTYNINE)****AGAINST: 0 (ZERO)****ABSTAIN: 2 (TWO)**The Motion was CARRIED.Transport & MobilityDPM7/0516 Item ID:49384Proposed by Councillor R. McMahon and seconded by Councillor D. LooneyTo remove the objective from the plan under Table 6.6 Medium to Long term Objectives the reference to a new bridge from Firhouse to N81 due to its' unsuitability for many reasons at this location**REPORT:**The position of the Executive in relation to the proposed Firhouse - N81 and Oldcourt - Oldbawn bridges has been outlined in previous reports to Council.In summary these bridges are recommended to:* relieve local traffic congestion in order to enhance public transport services throughout areas to the south of Tallaght;

and* relieve the additional pressures that will be placed on the local road network through the development of lands within the Ballycullen-Oldcourt Local Area Plan.

The removal of these bridges from the Plan will inhibit the ability of Council and other service providers (such as the National Transport Authority, whom have included both bridges within the Greater Dublin Area Transport Strategy 2016-2035) to manage traffic congestion in the area and provide viable alternatives to private vehicle usage.The Chief Executive’s Report recommends that the County Development Plan be made with the proposed Material Alteration as displayed subject to modification to reinsert details of the Firhouse-N81 Bridge and the Oldcourt-Oldbawn Bridge (including proposal, description and route) into Table 6.6 Medium to Long Term Road Objectives.**Recommendation** It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[Map - General Location](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52079)It was **AGREED** to take Motion 7 in conjunction with Motion 8.DPM8/0516 Item ID:49411Proposed by Councillor K. Mahon and seconded by Councillor A. M DermodyThat CEO's Material Alteration Chapter 6 No. 7 (to re-instate the Proposed Road cutting Dodder Valley from Firhouse to the N81) be removed from the Development Plan.**REPORT:**The position of the Executive in relation to the proposed Firhouse - N81 and Oldcourt - Oldbawn bridges has been outlined in previous reports to Council.In summary these bridges are recommended to:* relieve local traffic congestion in order to enhance public transport services throughout areas to the south of Tallaght;

and* relieve the additional pressures that will be placed on the local road network through the development of lands within the Ballycullen-Oldcourt Local Area Plan.

The removal of these bridges from the Plan will inhibit the ability of Council and other service providers (such as the National Transport Authority, whom have included both bridges within the Greater Dublin Area Transport Strategy 2016-2035) to manage traffic congestion in the area and provide viable alternatives to private vehicle usage.The Chief Executive’s Report recommends that the County Development Plan be made with the proposed Material Alteration as displayed subject to modification to reinsert details of the Firhouse-N81 Bridge and the Oldcourt-Oldbawn Bridge (including proposal, description and route) into Table 6.6 Medium to Long Term Road Objectives.**Recommendation** It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[Map - General Location](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52080)**Following contributions from Councillors K. McMahon and D. Looney, Mr E.Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning and Transportation responded to queries raised.**A show of hands vote on Motion 7 followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 34 (THIRTYFOUR)****AGAINST: 0 (ZERO)****ABSTAIN: 0 (ZERO)**A show of hands vote on Motion 8 followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 34 (THIRTYFOUR)****AGAINST: 0 (ZERO)****ABSTAIN: 0 (ZERO)**The Motions were CARRIED.DPM9/0516 Item ID:49385Proposed by Councillor R. McMahon and seconded by Councillor To remove the objective from the plan under Table 6.6 Medium to Long term Objectives the reference to a new bridge from Bohernabreena Road to Kiltipper Road due to its' unsuitability for many reasons at this location**REPORT:**The position of the Executive in relation to the proposed Firhouse - N81 and Oldcourt - Oldbawn bridges has been outlined in previous reports to Council.In summary these bridges are recommended to:* relieve local traffic congestion in order to enhance public transport services throughout areas to the south of Tallaght;

and* relieve the additional pressures that will be placed on the local road network through the development of lands within the Ballycullen-Oldcourt Local Area Plan.

The removal of these bridges from the Plan will inhibit the ability of Council and other service providers (such as the National Transport Authority, whom have included both bridges within the Greater Dublin Area Transport Strategy 2016-2035) to manage traffic congestion in the area and provide viable alternatives to private vehicle usage.The Chief Executive’s Report recommends that the County Development Plan be made with the proposed Material Alteration as displayed subject to modification to reinsert details of the Firhouse-N81 Bridge and the Oldcourt-Oldbawn Bridge (including proposal, description and route) into Table 6.6 Medium to Long Term Road Objectives.**Recommendation** It is recommended that this motion is not adopted[Map - General Location](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52081)A show of hands vote on the Motion followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 34 (THIRTYFOUR)****AGAINST: 0 (ZERO)****ABSTAIN: 0 (ZERO)**The Motion was CARRIED.Infrastructure & Environmental QualityDPM10/0516 Item ID:49394Proposed by Councillor W. LavelleCo-sponsored by Cllr V. CasserlyThat this Council declines to accept the Chief Executive's recommendation in relation to Material Alteration Ref. Chapter 7 - No.12 and agrees to retain IE9 Objective 6 as displayed.[M10](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52073)[Map - General Location](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52082)**REPORT:**The subject proposed Material Alteration Ref Chapter 7 – No.12 displays IE9 Objective 6 as Section 7.8.0 Aerodromes & AirportsINFRASTRUCTURE & ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (IE) Policy 9 Weston Aerodrome IE9 Objective 6: To consolidate the development of the aerodrome within its existing setting, but to restrict further growth given its proximity to Casement Aerodrome, Dublin Airport and neighbouring suburban residential areas.IE9 Objective 6: To consolidate the development of the aerodrome within its existing setting, while facilitating small-scale ancillary uses, but to restrict further growth given its proximity to Casement Aerodrome, Dublin Airport and neighbouring suburban residential areasThe Chief Executive considers that the proposed wording (in green above) is ambiguous and the use of the term 'restrict further growth’ does not provide sufficient clarity in terms of what is intended to be restricted i.e. the physical boundary of the airport, number of the annual aircraft movements, range of aviation uses etc. The Chief Executive considers that ancillary on the ground uses are acceptable and the extent of aviation operations should be consolidated. Additionally, it is considered that the provision of restrictions on the Aerodrome may have unintended consequences including limiting the implementation of future aviation improvements in terms of aircraft noise and protection of residential amenity. In this context, the following modification to the objective wording is recommended in the Chief Executive’s Report: IE9 Objective 6To facilitate the development of ancillary uses at the aerodrome within its existing setting and consolidate aviation operations.It is recommended that this motion is not adopted and the recommendation in the CE Report for IE9 Objective 6 is included in the County Development Plan. **Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.Councillor W. Lavelle **AGREED** to **WITHDRAW** the Motion.DPM11/0516 Item ID:49405Proposed by Councillor W. Lavelle and seconded by Councillor P. DonovanCo-sponsored by Cllr V. CasserlyThat this Council declines to accept the Chief Executive's recommendation in relation to Material Alteration Ref. Chapter 7 - No.12 and agrees to retain IE9 Objective 6 as displayed, subject to the following modification:That the following wording be added to the end of IE9 Objective 6: “South Dublin County Council shall, during the lifetime of this plan, facilitate a public consultation and comprehensive review of the land-use planning framework governing the future operation of Weston Aerodrome; and arising from this consultation and review shall recommend any variations to the plan as may be considered appropriate for consideration by the elected members.” **REPORT:**The Chief Executive notes the content of the motion to include a review of the land use planning framework governing the future operation of Weston Aerodrome.**The Chief Executive considers that the ongoing statutory County Development Plan process has provided a comprehensive review of the land- use planning framework for the County, including Weston Aerodrome.** The Draft Plan provides for the zoning of lands, Section 7.8.2 Weston Aerodrome including specific policies and objectives and Section 11.6.6 Aerodromes.The ongoing Plan making process has included 3 stages of public consultation (Pre-Draft, Draft & Material Alterations) since September 2014 and subsequent consideration of public submissions and the Chief Executive’s Report by the Elected Members for each stage. This consultation and plan making process has included numerous submissions and motions in relation to Weston Aerodrome. **Furthermore, there is no evidence or indications that new strategic planning considerations for the established aviation use at Weston Aerodrome will emerge during the lifetime of the Development Plan to warrant a review of the planning framework established by the ongoing Development Plan process.**It is considered that the proposed motion would result in a repetition of the work carried out by the Executive and the Members to establish a planning framework through the County Development Plan process and would represent a poor allocation of resources.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[Map - General Location](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52083)An amended wording of the Motion was proposed by Councillor W. Lavelle and seconded by Councillor E. O’Brien as follows:To amend Motion 11, to accept the Chief Executive’s recommend amendment:***“To facilitate the development of ancillary uses at the aerodrome within its existing setting and consolidate aviation operations.”***But with the following wording to be added to the end of IE9 Objective 6:***“Furthermore South Dublin County Council shall, with six months of adoption of this plan, facilitate a further public consultation and review of the land-use planning framework governing the future development and operation of Weston Aerodrome with reference to changing European safety requirements, economic development opportunities for our county and the impact on neighbouring residential communities.”*****Following contributions from Councillors W. Lavelle, P. Gogarty, G. O’Connell, E. O’Brien, D. O’Brien and R. Nolan, Mr. D. McLoughlin, Chief Executive and Mr E.Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning and Transportation responded to queries raised.**A show of hands vote on the Amended Wording of the Motion followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 26 (TWENTYSIX)****AGAINST: 1 (ONE)****ABSTAIN: 1 (ONE)**The AMENDED Motion was CARRIED.DPM12/0516 Item ID:49395Proposed by Councillor W. Lavelle and seconded by Councillor A. M. DermodyCo-sponsored by Cllr V. CasserlyThat this Council declines to accept the Chief Executive's recommendation in relation to Material Alteration Ref. Chapter 7 - No.13 and agrees to retain IE9 Objective 7 as displayed.**REPORT:**The subject proposed Material Alteration inserts the following objective into the County Development Plan:IE9 Objective 7:  To seek to revert the runway classification from Code 2B to Code 1A.  The coding of the runway at Weston Aerodrome is a matter for the Irish Aviation Authority. The aerodrome as a whole is currently licensed by the IAA as Code 2B and it is not within the remit of the Council to change the code of the runway. The coding of the runway is linked to the length and width of the runway.In this context, it is considered that the content of IE9 Objective 5 of the Draft Plan 2016-2022 is relevant and adequate.  IE9 Objective 5 - ‘To restrict any further effective lengthening of the operational runway or over-run areas’ **Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[Map - General Location](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52084)**Following contributions from Councillors W. Lavelle, G. O’Connell and D. O’Brien, Mr E.Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning and Transportation responded to queries raised.** Following a [Roll Call Vote](http://membersnet.sdublincoco.ie/viewdocument.aspx?id=9881af81-aae5-4710-96a3-a620010e4894) , the result of which was as follows:**FOR 9 (NINE)****AGAINST 18 (EIGHTTEEN)****ABSTAIN 4 (FOUR)**The Motion **FELL.** Heritage, Architectural Conservation & LandscapesDPM13/0516 Item ID:49386Proposed by Councillor R. McMahon and seconded by Councillor HollandTo remove the words "for use by local farmers" and to include the wording under HCL 9 Objective 7 "....and to encourage the grazing of such areas by local farmers, which would include the provision of cattle grids on the roads leading down from the commonage"**REPORT:**The subject motion relates to the proposed Material Alteration Ref Chapter 9 – No.7 which states:HCL9 Objective 7: To enhance and protect our rural traditions by preserving traditional common grazing grounds in Bohernabreena for use by local farmers.It should also be noted that the issue of implementing cattle grids has also been raised at the Council Meeting on 8 February 2016. It was noted that:'the installation of cattle grids is not considered safe for cycling on hilly areas where the cyclists are travelling downhill at speed’. Following discussion, it was agreed to procure an Independent Road Safety Audit undertaken by an expert panel of independent Road Safety Engineers and report back to the Members with their findings. Independent consultants have been appointed to review this matter.  The consultant’s report has yet to be finalised and the adoption of the proposed amendment would circumvent this process.The views of cycling groups have also been sought in regard to this matter.  A response has been received from Cycling Ireland (the national governing body for the sport of cycling on the island Ireland).  Cycling Ireland have raised several concerns noting that the roads in the Dublin Mountains area are well used by cyclists (especially the Old Military Road) and that the installation of cattle grids present a hazard to cyclists in all locations, and in particular in hilly areas. It is considered that the provision of cattle grids is beyond the strategic land use scope of the County Development Plan and cannot be actioned or achieved through the Plan.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.**Following contributions from Councillors R. McMahon, D. O’Donovan & D. Richardson,** A show of hands vote on the Motion followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 30 (THIRTY)****AGAINST: 0 (ZERO)****ABSTAIN: 1 (ONE)**The Motion was CARRIED.EnergyDPM14/0516 Item ID:49388Proposed by Councillor P. GogartyMotion Cllrs Paul Gogarty, Liona O'Toole, Guss O'ConnellAmend E2 Objective 6 to read: To ensure all new public buildings (eg Council buildings, school buildings, hospitals, health centres, community centres, sports facilities, libraries, Garda stations etc) are designed to include PV solar panels for electricity generation/storage and/or water heating so as to reduce energy costs, minimise carbon emissions and reduce our dependence on imported fossil fuels.**REPORT:**It is noted that the energy efficiency and renewable energy requirements for the construction of new non-residential buildings are currently addressed in the Building Regulations Part L (2008) and relevant national policy and guidelines. In consideration of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and the Planning and Development Amendment Act 2010, it is considered that the function of County Development Plan policies and objectives in this regard, is to support incremental changes to the Building Regulations Part L, national guidelines and other guidance, that may occur over the lifetime of the Development Plan, without duplicating or introducing specific requirements on energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies that may conflict with or impede the implementation of the Building Regulations on any specific site for development. It is recommended that the Draft Plan policies and objectives continue to support any future changes to the Building Regulations and national guidance, such as for example, Towards Nearly Zero Energy Buildings in Ireland: Planning for 2020 and Beyond, Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, (2012).Solar Energy is also specifically addressed in Energy (E) Policy 7 of the Draft Development Plan, which states,‘It is the policy of the Council to promote the development of solar energy infrastructure in the County, in particular for on-site energy use, including solar PV, solar thermal and seasonal storage technologies. Such projects will be considered subject to environmental safeguards and the protection of natural or built heritage features, biodiversity and views and prospects’.Development Management standards for solar energy proposals are also contained in Section 11.7.5 of Chapter 11 – Implementation.In consideration of the motion to ensure that all new public buildings are designed to include PV solar panels, such a mandatory requirement could increase the cost of constructing public buildings in South Dublin County, whereby energy requirements on site are unique to each public building and are addressed on a case by case basis. For example, the low hot water needs or absence of high energy demand loads etc across the range of public buildings, would negate the specific necessity for solar panels on each new public building to be constructed in South Dublin County.As such, it is considered that the energy performance of new buildings, which includes public buildings, is sufficiently addressed in Energy (E) Policy 4 and Chapter 11 Implementation, of the Draft Plan. Under Energy (E) Policy 4, the Council aims to ensure that all new development is designed to take account of the impacts of climate change, and that energy efficiency and renewable energy measures are considered in accordance with national building regulations, policy and guidelines.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:E2 Objective 6 to read as follows:‘To support, where feasibly practical and viable, the provision of PV solar panels in new public buildings (eg Council buildings, school buildings, hospitals, health centres, community centres, sports facilities, libraries, Garda stations etc), for electricity generation/storage and/or water heating so as to reduce energy costs, minimise carbon emissions and reduce our dependence on imported fossil fuels’.Motion 14 was taken in conjunction with Motions 15 and 16.DPM15/0516 Item ID:49389Proposed by Councillor P. GogartyMotion Cllrs P Gogarty, L O'Toole, G O'ConnellInsert E2 Objective 7 to read:To actively promote, where feasibly practical and viable, the provision of PV solar panels in new housing and apartment builds, for electricity generation/storage and/or water heating, so as to reduce the long term energy/heating costs of residents living in such dwellings, to minimise carbon emissions and to reduce Ireland's dependency on imported energy derived from fossil fuels.**REPORT:**The energy efficiency and renewable energy requirements for the construction of new residential buildings are currently addressed in the Building Regulations Part L (2011) and relevant national policy and guidelines. In consideration of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and the Planning and Development Amendment Act 2010, it is considered that the function of County Development Plan policies and objectives in this regard, is to support incremental changes to the Building Regulations Part L, national guidelines and other guidance, that may occur over the lifetime of the Development Plan, without duplicating or introducing specific requirements on energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies that may conflict with or impede the implementation of the Building Regulations on any specific site for development. It is recommended that the Draft Plan 2016-2022 policies and objectives continue to support any future changes to the Building Regulations and national guidance, such as for example, Towards Nearly Zero Energy Buildings in Ireland: Planning for 2020 and Beyond, Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, (2012).Solar Energy is also specifically addressed in Energy (E) Policy 7 of the Draft Development Plan, which states,‘It is the policy of the Council to promote the development of solar energy infrastructure in the County, in particular for on-site energy use, including solar PV, solar thermal and seasonal storage technologies. Such projects will be considered subject to environmental safeguards and the protection of natural or built heritage features, biodiversity and views and prospects’.Development Management standards for solar energy proposals are also contained in Section 11.7.5 of Chapter 11 – Implementation.In consideration of the motion to actively promote the provision of PV solar panels in new housing and apartment builds, this could lead to potential conflict with the implementation of the Building Regulations on any individual site for residential development, where the energy requirements will be specific to each site and closely related to the location, layout, design and orientation of each residential dwelling. As such the variety of energy needs for the broad range of residential developments proposed in South Dublin County and other site specific proposals on site, would negate the specific necessity for solar panels on each new housing and apartment builds to be constructed in the County.As such, it is considered that the energy performance of new buildings, which includes residential dwellings, is sufficiently addressed in Energy (E) Policy 4 and Chapter 11 Implementation, of the Draft Plan. Under Energy (E) Policy 4, the Council aims to ensure that all new development is designed to take account of the impacts of climate change, and that energy efficiency and renewable energy measures are considered in accordance with national building regulations, policy and guidelines.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:Additional Objective, E2 Objective 7, to be inserted and to read as follows:‘To support, where feasibly practical and viable, the provision of PV solar panels in new housing and apartment builds, for electricity generation/storage and/or water heating, so as to reduce the long term energy/heating costs of residents living in such dwellings, to minimise carbon emissions and to reduce Ireland's dependency on imported energy derived from fossil fuels’.Motion 15 was taken in conjunction with Motions 14 and 16.DPM16/0516 Item ID:49390Proposed by Councillor P. GogartyMotion Cllr P Gogarty, Cllr L O'Toole, Cllr G O'ConnellInsert E2 Objective 8 to read: To ensure, where feasibly practical and viable, the provision of green roofs for all new public buildings (Council buildings, school buildings, hospitals, community centres, sports facilities, libraries, Garda stations etc), to assist in flood alleviation, insulation and improved biodiversity, and to actively promote these measures where appropriate in new commercial and industrial buildings.**REPORT:**The inclusion of green roofs in new developments can make significant contributions to managing and draining surface water in an environmentally friendly way, and as part of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS).In this regard Green Infrastructure (G) Policy 5 – Objective 2 of the Draft Plan, states:‘to promote the provision of Green Roofs and/or Living Walls in developments where expansive roofs are proposed such as industrial, retail and civic developments.  Furthermore, having regard to Development Management implementation standards, Section 11.6.1 (iii) states that: ‘in general all new developments will be required to incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS)’. Green roofs are listed in this section as devices that can be included in a Sustainable Urban Drainage System.  As such, it is considered that the Draft Plan adequately addresses the opportunities for the inclusion of green roofs in new buildings in South Dublin County.It is noted that ensuring the provision for green roofs for all new public buildings will impact on the viability and effectiveness of rainwater harvesting systems particularly for public buildings that will have a high water demand such as schools, hospitals and sports facilities. The use of green roof measures may, therefore, not be appropriate or viable for all public building developments in the County.Furthermore, it is considered that there are a range of options for flood alleviation for each development proposal and on a case by case basis. It is considered that to ensure the provision of green roof technologies on all public buildings is overly prescriptive and may limit the range of flood alleviation and climate change mitigation measures that are both viable and practical on each site.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:Additional Objective, E2 Objective 8, to be inserted and to read as follows:‘To support, where feasibly practical and viable, the provision of green roofs for all new public buildings (Council buildings, school buildings, hospitals, community centres, sports facilities, libraries, Garda stations etc), to assist in flood alleviation, insulation and improved biodiversity, and to actively promote these measures where appropriate in new commercial and industrial buildings’.Motion 16 was taken in conjunction with Motions 14 and 15.Following contributions from Councillors P. Gogarty, L. O’Toole, P. Kearns, C. King Councillor W. Lavelle proposed an amendment to the Chief Executive’s recommended amendment wording, and seconded by Councillor C. King, to replace the word “support” with “require” in the Chief Executive’s recommended amendment wordings for Motion 14, 15 & 16.A show of hands vote on the Amended Wordings followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 22 (TWENTYTWO)****AGAINST: 12 (TWELVE)****ABSTAIN: 0 (ZERO)******The AMENDED wordings were AGREED****.A further show of hands vote on Motions 14, 15 & 16 followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 32 (THIRTYTWO)****AGAINST: 0 (ZERO)****ABSTAIN: 0 (ZERO)**The Motions were CARRIED.DPM17/0516 Item ID:49391Proposed by Councillor P. Gogarty and seconded by Councillor G. O’ConnellMotion Cllrs P Gogarty, G O'Connell, L O'TooleTo amend E11 Objective 1 to read: To work in conjunction with EirGrid to prioritise the undergrounding of the 220kv power line between Foxborough and the County boundary, including in the Balgaddy and Ronanstown areas.**REPORT:**The West Dublin project is being carried out under Eirgrid’s Project Development Roadmap and is based around the delivery of a new 220/110 kV substation and associated works. The project is being developed by Eirgrid to meet the needs of lands in west Dublin, including Grange Castle Business Park.It is recognised that the undergrounding of the 220Kv power lines at this location could benefit the future development of lands zoned for development in the surrounding area, including lands that form part of the Clonburris Strategic Development Zone (SDZ). The Council shall continue to work in partnership with EirGrid and all relevant stakeholders to explore the undergrounding of power lines and other related opportunities at these locations.It is noted that An Bord Pleanala is currently considering a Strategic Infrastructure planning application for the development of the West Dublin 220/100 kV substation and associated works project, which includes for the removal of approximately 3 kilometres of the existing Inchicore-Maynooth 220 kV double circuit overhead line and the undergrounding of electricity cables along regional roads, local roads and adjoining lands in the vicinity. The project is located in South Dublin County and extends across the following townlands: Gollierstown, Finnstown, Adamstown, Ballymakaily, Grange, Clutterland, Kilmactalway, Milltown, Ballybane, Kilbride, Kilcarbery, Nangor, Kilmahuddrick, Esker South and Kishoge. The development includes works to be carried out within the Clonburris SDZ, Adamstown SDZ and Grange Castle Business Park.It is noted that planning permission for the undergrounding of powerlines at this location has yet to be determined by An Bord Pleanala. With regard to any future extensions to the undergrounding of power lines at this location, it is the role of South Dublin County Council to engage with such Strategic Infrastructure applications, if and when referred to, by An Bord Pleanala, as they arise. Accordingly, to prioritise the undergrounding of the 220kv power line between Foxborough and the County boundary, would be pre-emptive of any future projects under Eirgrid’s Project Development Roadmap and any subsequent Strategic Infrastructure applications to An Bord Pleanala.It is recommended the County Development Plan be made with the proposed Material Alteration as displayed, to reflect the Council’s position to support and explore the undergrounding of powerlines at this location.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:E11 Objective 1 to read as follows:‘To work in conjunction with EirGrid to explore and support the undergrounding of the 220kv power line between Foxborough and the County boundary, including in the Balgaddy and Ronanstown areas’.[Map - General Location](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52076)A show of hands vote on the Motion followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 35 (THIRTYFIVE)****AGAINST: 0 (ZERO)****ABSTAIN: 0 (ZERO)**The Motion was CARRIED.MappingDPM18/0516 Item ID:49350Proposed by Councillor E. Higgins and seconded by Councillor P. DonovanThat the Council retain the EE zoning at Moneenalion Commons Upper and Collegelands as per the zoning in the Draft Development Plan and; that the Specific Local Objective IE3SL0:1 be retained for the subject lands (i.e. to require the preparation of a site and catchment specific Flood Risk Assessment and Mitigation Strategy, prepared by a qualified person(s), to be submitted with any proposal for development on these ‘EE’ zoned lands”).The rationale for the subject EE zoning on the subject lands was provided during the preparation of the Draft Development Plan and that rationale still stands.  A detailed submission on the proposed material amendments has been made by John Spain Associates on behalf of MLEU Dublin Ltd.  This submission sets out a detailed rationale including a full Justification Test for Development Plans for the retention of the EE zoning and SLO IE3SLO:1 on the subject lands.  I refer specifically to the conclusions of this submission set out in Section 4 of the submission which I believe sets out clearly the rationale for the EE zoning and provides a reasonable justification for the retention of the EE zoning and the specific local objective IE3SLO:1.Map: <https://picasaweb.google.com/112464768887449628770/6278336393648838433?authuser=0&feat=directlink>**REPORT:**The subject motion relates to Material Alteration Refs:* MA.C7-08 (zoning of land),
* MA.C7-08 (SLO Mapping icon) and
* C7-08 (SLO in written text).

In relation to these proposed Material Alterations, the Chief Executive’s Report recommends that the lands remain zoned Rural (RU) (as displayed at public consultation) and the SLO be removed (both in written text and the mapping icon).The subject motion refers to the submission from MLEU Ltd and outlines that the submission sets out a detailed rationale including a full Justification Test for Development Plans for the retention of the EE zoning and SLO IE3SLO:1 on the subject lands.Summary of the Chief Executive’s decision making on the recommendation for Rural (RU) zoning of the lands:* **The Chief Executive specifically commissioned a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) prepared by independent consultants for the County Development Plan**
* **The SFRA identified a Flood Zone A sporadically dispersed on the subject lands**
* **Flood Zone A has a ‘High Probability of Flooding’ and most types of development should be avoided.**
* **The Flood Risk Guidelines outline that the zoning of lands for less vulnerable uses (such as ‘EE’ uses) in Flood Zone A are required to meet the criteria of the Development Plan Justification Test.**
* **The Chief Executive considers that the subject lands does not satisfy the 3 criteria of the Justification Test as:**
	+ **The lands are isolated from the identified urban settlements for growth in the County under the RPGs,**
	+ **The lands are not essential to facilitate regeneration and/or expansion of the centre of an identified urban settlement,**
	+ **The lands are not within or adjoining the core of an established and designated urban settlement,**
	+ **The lands are not essential in achieving compact and sustainable urban growth of an urban settlement**
	+ **There are suitable alternative lands in areas at lower risk of flooding**
* **In accordance with the Flood Risk Guidelines, the Chief Executive recommends that the zoning of the site be retained as Rural (RU).**

Flood RiskAs part of the County Development Plan and SEA process 2016-2022, a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to inform the Draft Plan was carried out for the County, with a further specific report on flood risk also carried out subsequently due to the lands located at Moneenalion Commons being identified in the County study as having a potential risk. Additionally, the Eastern CFRAM study mapping identifies the area as having a potential risk. The foregoing studies incorporate the best available data and provide an evidence base on flood risk in the County. The studies identify a significant portion of the lands in question as being in Flood Zone A, with ‘a high probability of flooding’.The Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Flood Risk Management (2009) advises in relation to Flood Zone A that ‘most types of development would be considered inappropriate in this zone’ and that ‘development in this zone should be avoided and/or only considered in exceptional circumstances, such as in city and town centres, or in the case of essential infrastructure that cannot be located elsewhere’. These 'exceptional circumstances' require all parts of a Development Plan Justification Test in the Guidelines to be met.Section 4 of the Flood Risk Guidelines relates specifically to "existing, undeveloped, zoned areas at risk of flooding" and Sections 4.26 & 4.27 state that “future flood risk assessments required to support the development plan process may highlight existing, undeveloped areas which, on their own merits, were zoned for development in previous development plans but which new information indicates may now, or in the future, be at risk of flooding”. The Flood Risk Guidelines advise that in the these cases “planning authorities should reconsider the zoning objective” and following this reconsideration, “may decide to:* Remove the existing zoning for all types of development;
* Reduce the zoned area and change or add zoning categories to reflect flood risk;
* Replace the existing zoning with a zoning or specific objective for less vulnerable uses;
* Prepare a local area plan informed by a detailed flood risk assessment to address zoning and development issues in more detail; and/or
* Specify, in exceptional circumstances and where the criteria of the Justification Test have been met, design of structural or non-structural flood risk management measures as prerequisites to development in specific areas, ensuring that flood hazard and risk to other locations will not be increased or, if practicable, will be reduced.

Given the extent and sporadically dispersed nature of the flood risk zone A on the lands in question, it is considered that the retention of a Rural (RU) zoning, as the lands are undeveloped, is the most appropriate course of action. This is in line with the 'precautionary approach', which requires planning authorities to consider possible future changes in flood risk including the effects of climate change. The intensive development of this area will displace the flood zone and may impact on the residents of existing dwellings downstream.Development Plan Justification TestThe Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Flood Risk Management (2009) advises in relation to Flood Zone A that ‘most types of development would be considered inappropriate in this zone’ and that ‘development in this zone should be avoided and/or only considered in exceptional circumstances, such as in city and town centres, or in the case of essential infrastructure that cannot be located elsewhere’.These 'exceptional circumstances' require all parts of a Development Plan Justification Test to be met. The Flood Risk Guidelines provide a set of criteria under Box 4.1 for the assessment of the Justification Test and outlines that where, as part of the preparation and adoption of a development plan, a planning authority is considering the future development of areas in an urban settlement that are at moderate or high risk of flooding, all of the following criteria must be satisfied:Criteria 1.1. The urban settlement is targeted for growth under the National Spatial Strategy, Regional Planning Guidelines, statutory plans as defined above or under the Planning Guidelines or Planning Directives provisions of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended.

Criteria 2.1. The zoning or designation of the lands for the particular use or development type is required to achieve the proper planning and sustainable development of the urban settlement and, in particular:
* iv) Will be essential in achieving compact and sustainable urban growth; and
* iii) Is essential to facilitate regeneration and/or expansion of the centre of the urban settlement (note 2 applies);
* ii) Comprises significant previously developed and/or under-utilised lands;
* iii) Is within or adjoining the core (note 3 applies) of an established or designated urban settlement;
* v) There are no suitable alternative lands for the particular use or development type, in areas at lower risk of flooding within or adjoining the core of the urban settlement. (Note 4 applies)

Criteria 3.1. A flood risk assessment to an appropriate level of detail has been carried out as part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment as part of the development plan preparation process, which demonstrates that flood risk to the development can be adequately managed and the use or development of the lands will not cause unacceptable adverse impacts elsewhere.

N.B. The acceptability or otherwise of levels of any residual risk should be made with consideration for the proposed development and the local context and should be described in the relevant flood risk assessment.As part of the submission, MLEU Ltd outline that the zoning of the subject lands complies with the Development Plan Justification Test by way of strategic location within the Dublin Metropolitan Area, proximity to the N7 and Dublin City Centre. The submission identifies the whole of South Dublin County as a key urban settlement in the Dublin Metropolitan Area and proposes that this satisfies Criteria 1 of the Justification Test. The submission extrapolates this assumption to provide a context for the proposed rationale to satisfy Criteria 2 & 3 above. The Chief Executive considers that the subject lands do not comply with the Justification Test for Development Plans of the Flood Risk Management Guidelines (2009). The Justification Test requires that the lands are within an urban settlement targeted for growth under the Regional Planning Guidelines. The Settlement Hierarchy as defined within ‘Table 8 – Settlement Typology and Hierarchy’ of the Regional Planning Guidelines for the Greater Dublin Area (RPGGDA) indicates that Dublin City Centre and immediate suburbs are the ‘Gateway Core’, while Tallaght, Clondalkin and Lucan are the defined ‘Metropolitan Consolidation Towns’.  No ‘Large Growth Towns’ 1 or 2, or ‘Moderate Sustainable Growth Towns’ are defined in South Dublin.  Tallaght, Clondalkin and Lucan are therefore the ‘urban settlements’ targeted for growth within the effective Regional Planning Guidelines for the County.Section 4.6 of the RPGGDA defines the ‘Metropolitan Area’ as:Dublin City Centre, its immediate suburbs and the built up areas outside of Dublin City Centre, including a number of proximate major existing towns which are strongly integrated and connected with the built up area of Dublin. Furthermore, the policy emphasis for the Metropolitan Area is:-To gain maximum benefit from existing assets – public transport, social, infrastructural – through the continuation of consolidation and increasing densities within the existing built footprint of the City, suburbs and Consolidation and Large Growth towns. In assessing the suitability of these lands on an identified floodplain for zoning, it is noted that the lands are located in the Baldonnell area of the County which is unconnected either physically or in terms of intensive development zoning to any of the identified RPGGDA urban settlements of Tallaght, Clondalkin or Lucan.  The lands do not form part of land required for the consolidation or strengthening of these South Dublin ‘urban settlements’ as defined in Table 8 of the RPGGDA.  The submission has incorrectly identified the whole of South Dublin County as a key urban settlement and attempts to justify the development of the lands as part of the overall development of South Dublin, however the Regional Planning Guidelines has identified three distinct Consolidation Towns as being the ‘urban settlements’ designated for growth within South Dublin. It is therefore considered that the identified lands are not part of an urban settlement targeted for growth under the NSS or the Regional Planning Guidelines and do not fall within Criteria 1 & 2 of the Justification Test as defined within Box 4.1 of the Guidelines. It is considered that on the basis of the information currently available to the Planning Authority, **the Development Plan Justification Test cannot be met in respect of the subject lands.****The subject lands are:-****(a) Not located within Lucan, Clondalkin or Tallaght, which are identified urban settlements targeted for growth under the Regional Planning Guidelines.****(b) Not essential to facilitate regeneration and/or expansion of the centre of an identified urban settlement,****(c) Is not significant previously developed or underutilised lands within the urban settlement,****(d) Is not within or adjoining the core of an established and designated urban settlement,****(e) Will not be essential in achieving compact and sustainable urban growth of the urban settlement' and****(f) There are suitable alternative lands for the particular use or development type, in areas at lower risk of flooding.**Therefore the zoning of the identified floodplain, which is not proximate to any identified urban centres designated for growth under the Regional Planning Guidelines, for non-essential uses, would not be in accordance with the Flood Risk Guidelines or the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[Map - General Location](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52077)[Map Showing Flood Zones](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52067) It was **AGREED** to take Motion 18 in conjunction with Motion 19.DPM19/0516 Item ID:49399Proposed by Councillor K. Egan and seconded by Councillor W. LavelleThat the Council retain the EE zoning at Moneenalion Commons Upper and Collegelands as per the zoning in the Draft Development Plan and; that the Specific Local Objective IE3SL0:1 be retained for the subject lands (i.e. to require the preparation of a site and catchment specific Flood Risk Assessment and Mitigation Strategy, prepared by a qualified person(s), to be submitted with any proposal for development on these ‘EE’ zoned lands”).The rationale for the subject EE zoning on the subject lands was provided during the preparation of the Draft Development Plan and that rationale still stands.  A detailed submission on the proposed material amendments has been made by John Spain Associates on behalf of MLEU Dublin Ltd.  This submission sets out a detailed rationale including a full Justification Test for Development Plans for the retention of the EE zoning and SLO IE3SLO:1 on the subject lands.  I refer specifically to the conclusions of this submission set out in Section 4 of the submission which I believe sets out clearly the rationale for the EE zoning and provides a reasonable justification for the retention of the EE zoning and the specific local objective IE3SLO:1.**REPORT:**The subject motion relates to Material Alteration Refs:* MA.C7-08 (zoning of land),
* MA.C7-08 (SLO Mapping icon) and
* C7-08 (SLO in written text).

In relation to these proposed Material Alterations, the Chief Executive’s Report recommends that the lands remain zoned Rural (RU) (as displayed at public consultation) and the SLO be removed (both in written text and the mapping icon).The subject motion refers to the submission from MLEU Ltd and outlines that the submission sets out a detailed rationale including a full Justification Test for Development Plans for the retention of the EE zoning and SLO IE3SLO:1 on the subject lands.Summary of the Chief Executive’s decision making on the recommendation for Rural (RU) zoning of the lands:* **The Chief Executive specifically commissioned a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) prepared by independent consultants for the County Development Plan**
* **The SFRA identified a Flood Zone A sporadically dispersed on the subject lands**
* **Flood Zone A has a ‘High Probability of Flooding’ and most types of development should be avoided.**
* **The Flood Risk Guidelines outline that the zoning of lands for less vulnerable uses (such as ‘EE’ uses) in Flood Zone A are required to meet the criteria of the Development Plan Justification Test.**
* **The Chief Executive considers that the subject lands does not satisfy the 3 criteria of the Justification Test as:**
	+ **The lands are isolated from the identified urban settlements for growth in the County under the RPGs,**
	+ **The lands are not essential to facilitate regeneration and/or expansion of the centre of an identified urban settlement,**
	+ **The lands are not within or adjoining the core of an established and designated urban settlement,**
	+ **The lands are not essential in achieving compact and sustainable urban growth of an urban settlement**
	+ **There are suitable alternative lands in areas at lower risk of flooding**
* **In accordance with the Flood Risk Guidelines, the Chief Executive recommends that the zoning of the site be retained as Rural (RU).**

Flood Risk As part of the County Development Plan and SEA process 2016-2022, a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to inform the Draft Plan was carried out for the County, with a further specific report on flood risk also carried out subsequently due to the lands located at Moneenalion Commons being identified in the County study as having a potential risk. Additionally, the Eastern CFRAM study mapping identifies the area as having a potential risk. The foregoing studies incorporate the best available data and provide an evidence base on flood risk in the County. The studies identify a significant portion of the lands in question as being in Flood Zone A, with ‘a high probability of flooding’.The Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Flood Risk Management (2009) advises in relation to Flood Zone A that ‘most types of development would be considered inappropriate in this zone’ and that ‘development in this zone should be avoided and/or only considered in exceptional circumstances, such as in city and town centres, or in the case of essential infrastructure that cannot be located elsewhere’. These 'exceptional circumstances' require all parts of a Development Plan Justification Test in the Guidelines to be met.Section 4 of the Flood Risk Guidelines relates specifically to "existing, undeveloped, zoned areas at risk of flooding" and Sections 4.26 & 4.27 state that “future flood risk assessments required to support the development plan process may highlight existing, undeveloped areas which, on their own merits, were zoned for development in previous development plans but which new information indicates may now, or in the future, be at risk of flooding”. The Flood Risk Guidelines advise that in the these cases “planning authorities should reconsider the zoning objective” and following this reconsideration, “may decide to:* Remove the existing zoning for all types of development;
* Reduce the zoned area and change or add zoning categories to reflect flood risk;
* Replace the existing zoning with a zoning or specific objective for less vulnerable uses;
* Prepare a local area plan informed by a detailed flood risk assessment to address zoning and development issues in more detail; and/or
* Specify, in exceptional circumstances and where the criteria of the Justification Test have been met, design of structural or non-structural flood risk management measures as prerequisites to development in specific areas, ensuring that flood hazard and risk to other locations will not be increased or, if practicable, will be reduced.

Given the extent and sporadically dispersed nature of the flood risk zone A on the lands in question, it is considered that the retention of a Rural (RU) zoning, as the lands are undeveloped, is the most appropriate course of action. This is in line with the 'precautionary approach', which requires planning authorities to consider possible future changes in flood risk including the effects of climate change. The intensive development of this area will displace the flood zone and may impact on the residents of existing dwellings downstream.Development Plan Justification Test The Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Flood Risk Management (2009) advises in relation to Flood Zone A that ‘most types of development would be considered inappropriate in this zone’ and that ‘development in this zone should be avoided and/or only considered in exceptional circumstances, such as in city and town centres, or in the case of essential infrastructure that cannot be located elsewhere’.These 'exceptional circumstances' require all parts of a Development Plan Justification Test to be met. The Flood Risk Guidelines provide a set of criteria under Box 4.1 for the assessment of the Justification Test and outlines that where, as part of the preparation and adoption of a development plan, a planning authority is considering the future development of areas in an urban settlement that are at moderate or high risk of flooding, all of the following criteria must be satisfied:Criteria 1. 1. The urban settlement is targeted for growth under the National Spatial Strategy, Regional Planning Guidelines, statutory plans as defined above or under the Planning Guidelines or Planning Directives provisions of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended.

Criteria 2. 1. The zoning or designation of the lands for the particular use or development type is required to achieve the proper planning and sustainable development of the urban settlement and, in particular:
* iv) Will be essential in achieving compact and sustainable urban growth; and
* iii) Is essential to facilitate regeneration and/or expansion of the centre of the urban settlement (note 2 applies);
* ii) Comprises significant previously developed and/or under-utilised lands;
* iii) Is within or adjoining the core (note 3 applies) of an established or designated urban settlement;
* v) There are no suitable alternative lands for the particular use or development type, in areas at lower risk of flooding within or adjoining the core of the urban settlement. (Note 4 applies)

Criteria 3. 1. A flood risk assessment to an appropriate level of detail has been carried out as part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment as part of the development plan preparation process, which demonstrates that flood risk to the development can be adequately managed and the use or development of the lands will not cause unacceptable adverse impacts elsewhere.

N.B. The acceptability or otherwise of levels of any residual risk should be made with consideration for the proposed development and the local context and should be described in the relevant flood risk assessment.As part of the submission, MLEU Ltd outline that the zoning of the subject lands complies with the Development Plan Justification Test by way of strategic location within the Dublin Metropolitan Area, proximity to the N7 and Dublin City Centre. The submission identifies the whole of South Dublin County as a key urban settlement in the Dublin Metropolitan Area and proposes that this satisfies Criteria 1 of the Justification Test. The submission extrapolates this assumption to provide a context for the proposed rationale to satisfy Criteria 2 & 3 above. The Chief Executive considers that the subject lands do not comply with the Justification Test for Development Plans of the Flood Risk Management Guidelines (2009). The Justification Test requires that the lands are within an urban settlement targeted for growth under the Regional Planning Guidelines. The Settlement Hierarchy as defined within ‘Table 8 – Settlement Typology and Hierarchy’ of the Regional Planning Guidelines for the Greater Dublin Area (RPGGDA) indicates that Dublin City Centre and immediate suburbs are the ‘Gateway Core’, while Tallaght, Clondalkin and Lucan are the defined ‘Metropolitan Consolidation Towns’.  No ‘Large Growth Towns’ 1 or 2, or ‘Moderate Sustainable Growth Towns’ are defined in South Dublin.  Tallaght, Clondalkin and Lucan are therefore the ‘urban settlements’ targeted for growth within the effective Regional Planning Guidelines for the County.Section 4.6 of the RPGGDA defines the ‘Metropolitan Area’ as:Dublin City Centre, its immediate suburbs and the built up areas outside of Dublin City Centre, including a number of proximate major existing towns which are strongly integrated and connected with the built up area of Dublin.  Furthermore, the policy emphasis for the Metropolitan Area is:-To gain maximum benefit from existing assets – public transport, social, infrastructural – through the continuation of consolidation and increasing densities within the existing built footprint of the City, suburbs and Consolidation and Large Growth towns.  In assessing the suitability of these lands on an identified floodplain for zoning, it is noted that the lands are located in the Baldonnell area of the County which is unconnected either physically or in terms of intensive development zoning to any of the identified RPGGDA urban settlements of Tallaght, Clondalkin or Lucan.  The lands do not form part of land required for the consolidation or strengthening of these South Dublin ‘urban settlements’ as defined in Table 8 of the RPGGDA.  The submission has incorrectly identified the whole of South Dublin County as a key urban settlement and attempts to justify the development of the lands as part of the overall development of South Dublin, however the Regional Planning Guidelines has identified three distinct Consolidation Towns as being the ‘urban settlements’ designated for growth within South Dublin. It is therefore considered that the identified lands are not part of an urban settlement targeted for growth under the NSS or the Regional Planning Guidelines and do not fall within Criteria 1 & 2 of the Justification Test as defined within Box 4.1 of the Guidelines. It is considered that on the basis of the information currently available to the Planning Authority, **the Development Plan Justification Test cannot be met in respect of the subject lands.****The subject lands are:-****(a) Not located within Lucan, Clondalkin or Tallaght, which are identified urban settlements targeted for growth under the Regional Planning Guidelines.** **(b) Not essential to facilitate regeneration and/or expansion of the centre of an identified urban settlement,** **(c) Is not significant previously developed or underutilised lands within the urban settlement,****(d) Is not within or adjoining the core of an established and designated urban settlement,****(e) Will not be essential in achieving compact and sustainable urban growth of the urban settlement, and****(f) There are suitable alternative lands for the particular use or development type, in areas at lower risk of flooding.**Therefore the zoning of the identified floodplain, which is not proximate to any identified urban centres designated for growth under the Regional Planning Guidelines, for non-essential uses, would not be in accordance with the Flood Risk Guidelines or the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[Map - General Location](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52086)[Map Showing Flood Zones](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52068)Following contributions from Councillors E. Higgins and M. Murphy, Councillor W. Lavelle proposed and seconded by Councillor P. Donovan, an amendment to the wording as follows:ADD the following wording to the end of the first paragraph “***and would satisfy all the criteria of the Development Management Justification Test as set out in table 2.3 of the document titled ‘Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for SDCC Development Plan - Detailed Report on Flood Risk in the Baldonnell Area’.”***A show of hands vote on the amended wording to the Motion followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 21 (TWENTYONE)****AGAINST: 10 (TEN)****ABSTAIN: 3 (THREE)**The Motion AS AMENDED was AGREED.**Following contributions from Councillors P. Foley, P. Gogarty, D. Richardson, B. Bonner, M. Johansson, B. Leech, R. McMahon, K. Mahon, L. Dunne, D. Looney, P. Kearns, L. O’Toole, M. Duff, C. King, G. O’Connell, E. Fanning, E. Higgins and S. Holland, Mr D. McLoughlin, Chief Executive and Mr E.Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning and Transportation responded to queries raised.**A [Roll Call Vote](http://membersnet.sdublincoco.ie/viewdocument.aspx?id=ab3c7a47-770a-402e-83c4-a6200112943f) on the AMENDED wording to the Motions followed, the result of which was as follows:FOR 24 (TWENTYFOUR)AGAINST 12 (TWELVE)ABSTAIN 1 (ONE)The Motions **AS AMENDED** were **CARRIED.**DPM20/0516 Item ID:49410Proposed by Councillor M. Murphy Co-sponsored by Cllr B. Leech & Cllr K. MahonMaterial alteration 07-08 relating to zoning lands at Baldonnell which are identified as being at risk of flooding and also identified as not being a strategic site in terms of its location be maintained as displayed.**REPORT:**The Chief Executive notes the content of the motion and recommends that the motion be adopted as it is in accordance with the recommendation of the CE Report.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted[Map - General Location](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52085)[Map Showing Flood Zones](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52069)The Motion **FELL**.DPM21/0516 Item ID:49408Proposed by Councillor L. O'Toole and seconded by Councillor D. O’DonavanCllr. Liona O'Toole , Cllr Guss O'Connell, Cllr. Paul GogartyTo add the following line to Ref: MA M07 (page 141 material alterations)Land use Zoning Alteration at Mount Bellew, Lucan – Residential (RES) zoning to Open Space (OS) zoning with an objective ‘To preserve and provide for open space and recreational amenities’ **including a safe drop-off / turning facility / parking zone for both school traffic and any future community buildings.****REPORT:**The proposed motion requests a change in the OS Zoning Objective for a site at Mount Bellew, Lucan. The proposed amendment cannot be directly linked to the zoning objective as this would apply to all similarly zoned lands within the County.Any such stipulation would need to be in the form of a Specific Local Objective (SLO).  It should be noted that Material Alteration Chapter 6 – No. 10 refers TM7 SLO 1 which states:Provide for visitor parking spaces, along with a turning point, on any primary access roadway off Mount Bellew Way so as to provide for the future development of these zoned lands and to facilitate the better management of drop-offs and pick-ups at the neighbouring Lucan Educate Together NS.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted[Map - General Location](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52087)The Motion was AGREED.DPM22/0516 Item ID:49357Proposed by Councillor B. Bonner and seconded by Councillor T. GilliganThat the zoning of the site next to the Green Isle Hotel at Boot Road / Old Naas Road would be reverted to (OS) Open Space, with a Specific Local Objective to facilitate and extension to the Hotel for it's existing activities.**REPORT:**Principle of proposed EE zoning With regard to the proposed EE zoning of the subject site, it is noted that the subject lands comprise a narrow strip of land sandwiched between Boot Road and the N7, and immediately adjoining the existing Green Isle Hotel premises. The site is not functional as an amenity area. It is noted that the subject site could be served by road access from Boot Road or via the adjoining Green Isle Hotel, and the adjoining Green Isle Hotel site has an EE zoning. Having regard to the context and character of the subject lands, existing adjoining zoning objectives, and the limited scale of the subject lands, it is considered that the lands are appropriate for an EE zoning to facilitate an infill style employment extension at this location and in this instance. It is considered, therefore, that the EE zoning of the site is appropriate and no change is required to the Draft Plan in this regard.Application of an SLOWith regard to the application of an SLO to the subject lands to restrict the use of the site for an extension to the hotel for its existing activities, it is noted that the characteristics of the subject site are replicated across the County in terms of adjacent residential and commercial areas.In this regard, it is noted that the County Development Plan provides for safeguards in relation to the development of such ‘transitional areas’, with Section 11.1.1 of the Draft Plan stating that development proposals in transitional areas should seek to avoid development that would be detrimental to the amenities of contiguous zones; for example, regard should be had to the use, scale and density of development proposals in zones abutting residential areas in order to protect residential amenity. It is also noted that any development proposals on the subject site would be assessed on their merits having regard to compliance with relevant policies and objectives of the Draft Plan, including impact on residential amenity and visual impact, health and safety, and parking issues and traffic implications.Having regard to the above, it is considered that the provision of a SLO for the subject lands in an attempt to restrict the development of the subject land is unwarranted and inappropriate in this instance. No change is required to the Draft Plan in this regard.It should also be noted that Hotel use is open for consideration under both zoning objective OS and EE; an SLO regarding the future development of the hotel on said lands is therefore not required in this regard.**Recommendation** It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[Map - General Location](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52088)It was AGREED to take Motion 22 in conjunction with Motions 23, 25 & 26DPM23/0516 Item ID:49376Proposed by Councillor F. Timmons and seconded by Councillor T. GilliganRe Material Alteration - .M12 - zoning of lands adjacent to Green Isle Hotel from Open Space (OS) to Enterprise and Employment (EE) - That this is not granted and that the Open Space (0S) is kept with a specific Local Objective to facilitate an extension to the Hotel for Office space and Hotel Business.  **REPORT:**Principle of proposed EE zoning With regard to the proposed EE zoning of the subject site, it is noted that the subject lands comprise a narrow strip of land sandwiched between Boot Road and the N7, and immediately adjoining the existing Green Isle Hotel premises. The site is not functional as an amenity area. It is noted that the subject site could be served by road access from Boot Road or via the adjoining Green Isle Hotel, and the adjoining Green Isle Hotel site has an EE zoning. Having regard to the context and character of the subject lands, existing adjoining zoning objectives, and the limited scale of the subject lands, it is considered that the lands are appropriate for an EE zoning to facilitate an infill style employment extension at this location and in this instance. It is considered, therefore, that the EE zoning of the site is appropriate and no change is required to the Draft Plan in this regard.Application of an SLOWith regard to the application of an SLO to the subject lands to restrict the use of the site for an extension to the Hotel for Office space and Hotel Business, it is noted that the characteristics of the subject site are replicated across the County in terms of adjacent residential and commercial areas.In this regard, it is noted that the County Development Plan provides for safeguards in relation to the development of such ‘transitional areas’, with Section 11.1.1 of the Draft Plan stating that development proposals in transitional areas should seek to avoid development that would be detrimental to the amenities of contiguous zones; for example, regard should be had to the use, scale and density of development proposals in zones abutting residential areas in order to protect residential amenity. It is also noted that any development proposals on the subject site would be assessed on their merits having regard to compliance with relevant policies and objectives of the Draft Plan, including impact on residential amenity and visual impact, health and safety, and parking issues and traffic implications.Having regard to the above, it is considered that the provision of a SLO for the subject lands in an attempt to restrict the development of the subject land is unwarranted and inappropriate in this instance. No change is required to the Draft Plan in this regard.It should also be noted that Hotel use is open for consideration under both zoning objective OS and EE; an SLO regarding the future development of the hotel on said lands is therefore not required in this regard.**Recommendation** It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[Map - General Location](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52089)It was AGREED to take Motion 23 in conjunction with Motions 22, 25 & 26DPM25/0516 Item ID:49351Proposed by Councillor E. Higgins and seconded by Councillor T. GilliganWith reference to MA.M13 that the proposed change of zoning from F to EE, at the site next to the Green Isle Hotel on Boot Road, be subject to a Specific Local Objective that limits development at this site to an infill extension of the Hotel’s existing activities**REPORT:**Principle of proposed EE zoning With regard to the proposed EE zoning of the subject site, it is noted that the subject lands comprise a narrow strip of land sandwiched between Boot Road and the N7, and immediately adjoining the existing Green Isle Hotel premises. The site is not functional as an amenity area. It is noted that the subject site could be served by road access from Boot Road or via the adjoining Green Isle Hotel, and the adjoining Green Isle Hotel site has an EE zoning. Having regard to the context and character of the subject lands, existing adjoining zoning objectives, and the limited scale of the subject lands, it is considered that the lands are appropriate for an EE zoning to facilitate an infill style employment extension at this location and in this instance. It is considered, therefore, that the EE zoning of the site is appropriate and no change is required to the Draft Plan in this regard.Application of an SLOWith regard to the application of an SLO to the subject lands to restrict the use of the site for an infill extension of the Hotel’s existing activities, it is noted that the characteristics of the subject site are replicated across the County in terms of adjacent residential and commercial areas.In this regard, it is noted that the County Development Plan provides for safeguards in relation to the development of such ‘transitional areas’, with Section 11.1.1 of the Draft Plan stating that development proposals in transitional areas should seek to avoid development that would be detrimental to the amenities of contiguous zones; for example, regard should be had to the use, scale and density of development proposals in zones abutting residential areas in order to protect residential amenity. It is also noted that any development proposals on the subject site would be assessed on their merits having regard to compliance with relevant policies and objectives of the Draft Plan, including impact on residential amenity and visual impact, health and safety, and parking issues and traffic implications.Having regard to the above, it is considered that the provision of a SLO for the subject lands in an attempt to restrict the development of the subject land is unwarranted and inappropriate in this instance. No change is required to the Draft Plan in this regard.It should also be noted that Hotel use is open for consideration under both zoning objective OS and EE; an SLO regarding the future development of the hotel on said lands is therefore not required in this regard.**Recommendation** It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[Map - General Location](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52091)It was AGREED to take Motion 25 in conjunction with Motions 22, 23 & 26DPM26/0516 Item ID:49400Proposed by Councillor K. Egan and seconded by Councillor T. GilliganWith reference to MA.M13 that the proposed change of zoning from F to EE, at the site next to the Green Isle Hotel on Boot Road, be subject to a Specific Local Objective that limits development at this site to an infill extension of the Hotel’s existing activities**REPORT:**Principle of proposed EE zoning With regard to the proposed EE zoning of the subject site, it is noted that the subject lands comprise a narrow strip of land sandwiched between Boot Road and the N7, and immediately adjoining the existing Green Isle Hotel premises. The site is not functional as an amenity area. It is noted that the subject site could be served by road access from Boot Road or via the adjoining Green Isle Hotel, and the adjoining Green Isle Hotel site has an EE zoning. Having regard to the context and character of the subject lands, existing adjoining zoning objectives, and the limited scale of the subject lands, it is considered that the lands are appropriate for an EE zoning to facilitate an infill style employment extension at this location and in this instance. It is considered, therefore, that the EE zoning of the site is appropriate and no change is required to the Draft Plan in this regard.Application of an SLOWith regard to the application of an SLO to the subject lands to restrict the use of the site for an infill extension of the Hotel’s existing activities, it is noted that the characteristics of the subject site are replicated across the County in terms of adjacent residential and commercial areas.In this regard, it is noted that the County Development Plan provides for safeguards in relation to the development of such ‘transitional areas’, with Section 11.1.1 of the Draft Plan stating that development proposals in transitional areas should seek to avoid development that would be detrimental to the amenities of contiguous zones; for example, regard should be had to the use, scale and density of development proposals in zones abutting residential areas in order to protect residential amenity. It is also noted that any development proposals on the subject site would be assessed on their merits having regard to compliance with relevant policies and objectives of the Draft Plan, including impact on residential amenity and visual impact, health and safety, and parking issues and traffic implications.Having regard to the above, it is considered that the provision of a SLO for the subject lands in an attempt to restrict the development of the subject land is unwarranted and inappropriate in this instance. No change is required to the Draft Plan in this regard.It should also be noted that Hotel use is open for consideration under both zoning objective OS and EE; an SLO regarding the future development of the hotel on said lands is therefore not required in this regard.**Recommendation** It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[Map - General Location](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52093) **Following contributions from Councillors B. Bonner, K. Egan, F. Timmons, T. Gilligan, M. Ward, Mr E.Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning and Transportation responded to queries raised.****The Motions were AGREED with an SLO to be applied to the site to facilitate an extension of the existing hotel and its existing activities.** |
|  |

### DPM24/0516 Item ID:49377

Proposed by Councillor F. Timmons and seconded by Councillor P. Gogarty

Re Material Alteration - .M12 - zoning of lands adjacent to Green Isle Hotel from Open Space (OS) to Enterprise and Employment (EE) - That this is not granted and that the Open Space (0S) is kept with a specific Local Objective to facilitate the retention of what is
remaining of the Old Naas Road wall.

**REPORT:**

Principle of proposed EE zoning

With regard to the proposed EE zoning of the subject site, it is noted that the subject lands comprise a narrow strip of land sandwiched between Boot Road and the N7, and immediately adjoining the existing Green Isle Hotel premises. The site is not functional as an amenity area. It is noted that the subject site could be served by road access from Boot Road or via the adjoining Green Isle Hotel, and the adjoining Green Isle Hotel site has an EE zoning. Having regard to the context and character of the subject lands, existing adjoining zoning objectives, and the limited scale of the subject lands, it is considered that the lands are appropriate for an EE zoning to facilitate an infill style employment extension at this location and in this instance. It is considered, therefore, that the EE zoning of the site is appropriate and no change is required to the Draft Plan in this regard.

Application of an SLO

With regard to the application of an SLO to the subject lands to facilitate the retention of what is remaining of the Old Naas Road wall, it is noted that the any development proposals on the subject site would be assessed on their merits having regard to compliance with relevant policies and objectives of the Draft Plan, including impact on residential amenity and visual impact, health and safety, and parking issues and traffic implications.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the provision of a SLO for the subject lands referring specifically to the Old Naas Road wall would, in the absence of the appropriate survey work and study, be overly prescriptive and premature.

No change is required to the Draft Plan in this regard.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.

[Map - General Location](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=52090)

**Following contributions from Councillors F. Timmons, G. O’Connell, E. Fanning, P. Gogarty and B. Bonner, Mr E.Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning and Transportation responded to queries raised, noting that the Old Naas Road wall may be included in the SLO resulting from Motions 22, 23, 25 & 26 but that it would not afford said wall protection/preservation status.**

**In conjunction with Motions 22, 23, 25 & 26 this Motion was AGREED with an SLO to be applied to the site to facilitate an extension of the existing hotel and its existing activities, and to facilitate the retention of the remaining Old Naas Road wall.**

### The Chief Executive Mr D. McLoughlin thanked the Members and all involved in securing a very good Plan and Councillors C. King, M. Duff, L. O’Toole, W. Lavelle, L. Dunne, E. O’Brien, G. O’Connell, P. Gogarty, C. O’Connor, D. Looney on behalf of their fellow Councillors and Mayor S. Holland expressed their thanks to Management and staff for all their work during the Development Plan process.

### DPM3/0516 Item ID:49543

Proposed by Land use Planning & Transportation

**Resolution to make the South Dublin County Council Development Plan 2016 – 2022**

**REPLY:**

The Development Plan hereby made under Section 12 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) shall have effect 4 weeks from the day that it is made.

Following a [Roll Call Vote](http://membersnet.sdublincoco.ie/viewdocument.aspx?id=945db30f-c88c-4e0c-b140-a6200113b695), the result of which was as follows:

**FOR: 34 (THIRTYFOUR)**

**AGAINST: 3 (THREE)**

**ABSTAIN: 0 (ZERO)**

The Resolution was **AGREED**.

**The meeting concluded at 7.40pm**

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 **Mayor**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_