**COMHAIRLE CONTAE ÁTHA CLIATH THEAS**  
**SOUTH DUBLIN COUNTY COUNCIL**

Minutes of South Dublin County Council Development Plan Adjourned Meeting held on Friday 18th June 2021 remotely via Microsoft Teams.

**PRESENT**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Councillors** |  | **Councillors** |
| Bailey, C. |  | McCrave, L. |
| Carey, W.  Casserly, V. |  | McEneaney, S.  McMahon R. |
| Collins, Y. |  | Moynihan, S. |
| Costello, T.  Donaghy, L.  Duff, M.  Dunne, L.  Edge, A.  Egan, K.  Gogarty, P  Hayes, A.  Holohan, P.  Johansson, M.  Kavanagh, P.  Kearns, P.  King, C.  Lawlor, B. |  | Murphy, E.  O Brádaigh, D.  O’Brien, E.  Ó’ Broin, E.  O’Connell, G.  O’Connor, C.  O’Donovan, D.  O’Hara, S.  O’Toole, L  Pereppadan, B.  Richardson, D,  Sinclair, L.  Timmons, F  Tuffy, J.  Whelan, L. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**OFFICIALS PRESENT**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Chief Executive | D. McLoughlin | |
| Directors / Heads of Function | M. Mulhern |
| Senior Executive Officer  Senior Parks Superintendent | M. Maguire  S. Furlong | |
| Senior Planner | H. Craigie | |
| Senior Executive Planners | S. Willoughby, S, Duff, A. Hyland | |
| Executive Planners  Assistant Planners | S. O’Toole, L. Clarke  J. Carty, C. Bleytou | |
| Administrative Officer  Senior Staff Officer | C. Shanahan  E. Colgan | |
| Staff Officer | A. McGee | |
| Assistant Staff Officer | M. Dunne | |
| Clerical Officer | G. Mc Donnell | |

The Mayor E. O’Brien presided and outlined the proceedings for the Meeting.

Apologies were received from Councillor K. Mahon

**DPM45/0621 Item ID:71057**

Submitted by Councillor Alan Hayes, Councillor V. Casserly

Proposed by Councillor V. Casserly and Seconded by Councillor K. Egan

'That South Dublin County Council consider making amendments to the Draft Development Plan 2022-2028 to change the 'Rural and Agriculture' (RU) zoning of land located at Cooldrinagh Lane (See Figure 1 below) to 'Existing Residential' (RES), to facilitate land use which is consistent with the existing and established settlement pattern in this particular area. Figure 1: Current RU zoned land to be rezoned RES (boundary highlighted in red

[Cooldrinagh Motion and Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=70617)

**REPORT:**

The Core Strategy and Settlement Strategy in Chapter 2 sets out population and housing figures which must be consistent with National and Regional Planning policy as required under the Planning and Development Act. South Dublin County is anticipated to grow by 46,518 persons providing a need for over 17,817 households has been identified. Chapter 2 also confirms that the County has enough land for a further 10,470 units (79%) above the net household need and therefore there is no need to re-zone additional lands.

The lands identified for rezoning to RES (existing residential) lie to the east and west of Cooldrinagh Lane which is zoned RU (rural).

The proposed lands to the west of the lane seeking rezoning contain a single ‘one-off’ house adjacent to the boundary of Weston Aerodrome. Lands to the east of the lane at this location contain a cluster of established one and two storey detached and semi-detached houses with long back gardens bounding agricultural fields to the east. The housing units identified are not within a defined CSO settlement boundary and are rural in classification.

To re-zone such land for Existing Residential (RES) would give rise to an inappropriate densification of urban type development in this remaining rural area which acts as a green space separating Leixlip and Lucan, accessed from the Lucan-Celbridge Road.

Furthermore, urban generated housing development within the rural area which would be facilitated through the adoption of this motion, would result in and promote urban sprawl of the Dublin City and Suburbs boundary and be contrary to the rural housing guidelines which seek to prevent urban generated housing in rural areas.

The proximity to Weston Airport and the potential for the intensification of housing units in close proximity to the airport raises concerns of safety and it is noted that part of the site is within the outer public safety zone. Areas of the proposed lands are also within the current noise zones for the airport. It is known that there are already complaints of noise from aircraft flying from Weston – to facilitate increased housing in this area is not recommended from a health perspective of new residents or for the operation of the airport.

It is considered that his motion is contrary to CS6 Objective 2, CS6 Objective 3, NSO 1, RSO 2, NPO 3b, RPO 3.1, RPO 3.2 and should therefore not be adopted.

**CE Recommendation**

It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.

Link to Map

It was **AGREED** to take Motion 47 (Item ID 71224) in conjunction with Motion 45 (Item ID 71057)

[**Updated Map received from Councillor Casserly**](file:///F:\DEV%20PLAN%202022-2028\DRAFT%20PLAN\AMENDMENTS%2017%2006%2021,%2018%2006%2021%2023%2006%2021\Mot%2045%20Cllr%20Casserly%20Cooldrinagh%20Motion%20and%20Map(2)_210623%20(002).pdf)

Link for Map above will not open??

**DPM47/0621 Item ID:71224**

Submitted by Councillor G. O'Connell, Councillor L. O'Toole, Councillor P. Gogarty

Proposed by Councillor L. O’Toole, Seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell

'That South Dublin County Council consider making amendments to the Draft Development Plan 2022-2028 to change the 'Rural and Agriculture' (RU) zoning of land located at Cooldrinagh Lane (See Figure 1 below) to 'Existing Residential' (RES), to facilitate land use which is consistent with the existing and established settlement pattern in this particular area. (map to be included)

**REPORT:**

The Core Strategy and Settlement Strategy in Chapter 2 sets out population and housing figures which must be consistent with National and Regional Planning policy as required under the Planning and Development Act. South Dublin County is anticipated to grow by 46,518 persons providing a need for over 17,817 households has been identified. Chapter 2 also confirms that the County has enough land for a further 10,470 units (79%) above the net household need and therefore there is no need to re-zone additional lands.

The lands identified for rezoning to RES (existing residential) lie to the east and west of Cooldrinagh Lane which is zoned RU (rural).

The proposed lands to the west of the lane seeking rezoning contain a single ‘one-off’ house adjacent to the boundary of Weston Aerodrome. Lands to the east of the lane at this location contain a cluster of established one and two storey detached and semi-detached houses with long back gardens bounding agricultural fields to the east. The housing units identified are not within a defined CSO settlement boundary and are rural in classification.

To re-zone such land for Existing Residential (RES) would give rise to an inappropriate densification of urban type development in this remaining rural area which acts as a green space separating Leixlip and Lucan, accessed from the Lucan-Celbridge Road.

Furthermore, urban generated housing development within the rural area which would be facilitated through the adoption of this motion, would result in and promote urban sprawl of the Dublin City and Suburbs boundary and be contrary to the rural housing guidelines which seek to prevent urban generated housing in rural areas.

The proximity to Weston Airport and the potential for the intensification of housing units in close proximity to the airport raises concerns of safety and it is noted that part of the site is within the outer public safety zone. Areas of the proposed lands are also within the current noise zones for the airport. It is known that there are already complaints of noise from aircraft flying from Weston – to facilitate increased housing in this area is not recommended from a health perspective of new residents or for the operation of the airport.

It is considered that his motion is contrary to CS6 Objective 2, CS6 Objective 3, NSO 1, RSO 2, NPO 3b, RPO 3.1, RPO 3.2 and should therefore not be adopted.

**Recommendation**

**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.**

[Link to Map](https://sdublincoco.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=71aa0778ae8f4fffba16debb2eb0132d&amp;HideLayers=Motionsjuly22&amp;query=Motionsjuly22_4365%2Cid%2C71224)

[SLO CDP Motion Ref 71224](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=70624)

A discussion ensued with contributions from Councillors V. Casserly, D. Ó Brádaigh, A. Hayes, S. Moynihan, L. O’Toole, C. King, P. Kavanagh, P. Gogarty, P. Kearns, J. Tuffy, A. Edge, L. Donaghy, Mr M. Mulhern, Director and Ms H. Craigie, Senior Planner responded to queries raised.

Councillor C. O’Connor proposed an Amended wording to the Motion which was seconded by Councillor C. King as follows:

*That South Dublin County Council consider making amendments to the Draft Development Plan 2022-2028 to change the 'Rural and Agriculture' (RU) zoning of land located at Cooldrinagh Lane (See Figure 1 below) to 'Existing Residential' (RES) that will facilitate low rise houses for the existing residents/families, to facilitate land use which is consistent with the existing and established settlement pattern in this particular area. Figure 1: Current RU zoned land to be rezoned RES (boundary highlighted in red.*

The Motion **AS AMENDED** was **AGREED**

**DPM46/0621 Item ID:71223**

Submitted by Councillor G. O'Connell, Councillor L. O'Toole, Councillor P. Gogarty

Proposed

Insert an SLO to following section of land (map attached) Given the established residential settlement located in the northern portion of Cooldrinagh Lane, it is considered that the existing 'RU' zoning is not reflective of the existing settlement pattern and should be amended to replicate this. We recognise the zoning objective of the RU zone is 'To protect and improve rural amenity and to provide for the development of agriculture', however, it is considered that the 'Existing Residential' (RES) zone which provides zoning objective 'To protect and/or improve residential amenity' is more appropriate in terms of considering the existing development pattern.

**REPORT:**

The Core Strategy and Settlement Strategy in Chapter 2 sets out population and housing figures which must be consistent with National and Regional Planning policy as required under the Planning and Development Act. South Dublin County is anticipated to grow by 46,518 persons providing a need for over 17,817 households has been identified. Chapter 2 also confirms that the County has enough land for a further 10,470 units (79%) above the net household need and therefore there is no need to re-zone additional lands.

The lands identified for the SLO lie to the east and west of Cooldrinagh Lane which is zoned RU (rural).

The wording of the SLO is not appropriate as it is, in effect, a statement setting out a rationale to rezone the lands. An SLO by definition is a specific local objective and cannot by its existence rezone lands. Therefore, should this motion pass it would have no effect as the underlying zoning objective is RU – Rural.  Where zoning objectives and SLOs are in conflict, the zoning objective will apply.

**Recommendation:**

**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.**

[Link to Map](https://sdublincoco.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=71aa0778ae8f4fffba16debb2eb0132d&amp;HideLayers=Motionsjuly22&amp;query=Motionsjuly22_4365%2Cid%2C71223)

SLO CDP Motion Ref 71223

**The Motion FELL as a result of the outcome of Motions 45 & 47 above**

**DPM48/0621 Item ID:70876**

Submitted by Councillor L. Donaghy, Councillor Liam Sinclair, Councillor Peter Kavanagh, Councillor S. McEneaney

Proposed by Councillor P. Kavanagh, Seconded by Councillor L. Donaghy

Core Strategy and Settlement Strategy Motion: That this Development Plan will provide for the rezoning of the lands at Rathcreedan, Rathcoole, Co. Dublin outlined in red on the attached map from their current Objective 'RU' use to Objective 'RES-N' and will extend the boundary of the Newcastle Local Area Plan to the east to encompass this 10.5 Ha site and the Newcastle cemetery. In addition, the lands shall be subject to a Site Specific Local Objective to provide a minimum of 3.2 Ha of the site for the development of recreational and leisure facilities. The land and the facilities must be provided before any development can take place on the remainder of the site.

**REPORT:**

The Core Strategy and Settlement Strategy in Chapter 2 sets out population and housing figures which must be consistent with National and Regional Planning policy as required under the Planning and Development Act. South Dublin County is anticipated to grow by 46,518 persons and a need for over 17,817 households has been identified up to 2028. Chapter 2 also confirms that the County has enough land for a further 10,470 units (79%) above the net household need and therefore there is no need to re-zone additional lands.

The subject lands are currently zoned rural, located at the eastern edge of the Newcastle settlement boundary. The core principle of the NPF is provide for compact urban growth in order to utilise the existing public transport and maximise social infrastructure, through consolidation within the exiting-built footprint settlements. The current Newcastle Local Area Plan is a carefully planned strategic document. Significant lands within the LAP remain undeveloped, land which is sequentially preferred for the compact development of Newcastle when compared with the identified lands.

A recent SHD application (SHD3ABP-305343-19), currently under construction, includes a range of amenities in close proximity to the Main Street which included a new public park measuring 2 hectares with the following amenities: Mixed-Use Games Area, picnic area, natural play area, kickabout area, teen play zone with shelter and play area and 1no. playing pitch.

While the further provision of community services is welcomed, linking it to further residential development which further sprawls the settlement boundary of Newcastle is contrary to the analysis carried out in Chapter 2 having regard to the projected population growth for the Newcastle and parameters under of NSO 1, NPO 7 and 9. There is no requirement to re-zone additional land for residential purposes to meet the needs of the population increase and thus household need up to 2028 and the proposed motion should not be adopted.

SEA Comments: The lands of the proposed amendment are zoned ‘*Objective RU To protect and improve rural amenity and to provide for the development of agriculture*’. The amendment would not constitute proper and sustainable planning or development and lead to potential negative environmental impacts through:

* potential erosion of rural amenity and landscape character; and
* loss of agricultural land.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.

[Link to Map](https://sdublincoco.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=71aa0778ae8f4fffba16debb2eb0132d&amp;HideLayers=Motionsjuly22&amp;query=Motionsjuly22_4365%2Cid%2C70876)

[Schematic + Proposal (Rathcoole)](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=70681)

It was **AGREED** to take Motion 49 (ID 70582) and Motion 50 (ID 71055) in conjunction with Motion 48 (70876)

**DPM49/0621 Item ID:70582**

Proposed by Councillor F. Timmons, Seconded by Councillor P. Kavanagh

That the Draft South Dublin County Development Plan 2023 -2029 will provide for the rezoning of the lands at Rathcreeden, Rathcoole, Co. Dublin outlined in red on the attached map from their current Objective 'RU' use (to protect and improve rural amenity and to provide for the development of agriculture) to Objective 'RES-N' (to provide for new residential communities in accordance with approved area plans) and will extend the boundary of the Newcastle Local Area Plan to the east to encompass this 10.5 Ha site and the Newcastle cemetery. In addition, the lands shall be subject to a Site Specific Local Objective to provide a minimum of 3.2 Ha of the site for the development of recreational and leisure facilities. The land and the facilities must be provided before any development can take place on the remainder of the site.

**REPORT:**

The Core Strategy and Settlement Strategy in Chapter 2 sets out population and housing figures which must be consistent with National and Regional Planning policy as required under the Planning and Development Act. South Dublin County is anticipated to grow by 46,518 persons and a need for over 17,817 households has been identified up to 2028. Chapter 2 also confirms that the County has enough land for a further 10,470 units (79%) above the net household need and therefore there is no need to re-zone additional lands.

The subject lands are currently zoned rural, located at the eastern edge of the Newcastle settlement boundary. The core principle of the NPF is provide for compact urban growth in order to utilise the existing public transport and maximise social infrastructure, through consolidation within the exiting-built footprint settlements. The current Newcastle Local Area Plan is a carefully planned strategic document. Significant lands within the LAP remain undeveloped, land which is sequentially preferred for the compact development of Newcastle when compared with the identified lands.

A recent SHD application (SHD3ABP-305343-19), currently under construction, included a range of amenities in close proximity to the main street which included a new public park measuring 2 hectares with the following amenities: Mixed-Use Games Area, picnic area, natural play area, kickabout area, teen play zone with shelter and play area and 1no. playing pitch.

While the further provision of community services is welcomed, linking it to further residential development which further sprawls the settlement boundary of Newcastle is contrary to the analysis carried out in Chapter 2 having regard to the projected population growth for the Newcastle and parameters under of NSO 1, NPO 7 and 9. There is

no requirement to re-zone additional land for residential purposes to meet the needs of the population increase and thus household need up to 2028 and the proposed motion should not be adopted.

SEA Comments: The lands of the proposed amendment are zoned ‘*Objective RU To protect and improve rural amenity and to provide for the development of agriculture*’. The amendment would not constitute proper and sustainable planning or development and lead to potential negative environmental impacts through:

* potential erosion of rural amenity and landscape character; and
* loss of agricultural land.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.

[Link to Map](https://sdublincoco.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=71aa0778ae8f4fffba16debb2eb0132d&amp;HideLayers=Motionsjuly22&amp;query=Motionsjuly22_4365%2Cid%2C70582)

[schematic (2) (1)](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=70568)  
[Schematic + Proposal](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=70569)

**DPM50/0621 Item ID:71055**

Proposed by Councillor V. Casserly, Seconded by Councillor P. Kavanagh

That the Draft South Dublin County Development Plan 2023 -2029 will provide for the rezoning of the lands at Rathcreedan, Rathcoole, Co. Dublin outlined in red on the attached map from their current Objective 'RU' use (to protect and improve rural amenity and to provide for the development of agriculture) to Objective 'RES-N' (to provide for new residential communities in accordance with approved area plans) and will extend the boundary of the Newcastle Local Area Plan to the east to encompass this 10.5 Ha site and the Newcastle cemetery. In addition, the lands shall be subject to a Site Specific Local Objective to provide a minimum of 3.2 Ha of the site for the development of recreational and leisure facilities. The land and the facilities must be provided before any development can take place on the remainder of the site.

[Dev Plan Newcastle](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=70616)

**REPORT:**

The Core Strategy and Settlement Strategy in Chapter 2 sets out population and housing figures which must be consistent with National and Regional Planning policy as required under the Planning and Development Act. South Dublin County is anticipated to grow by 46,518 persons and a need for over 17,817 households has been identified up to 2028. Chapter 2 also confirms that the County has enough land for a further 10,470 units (79%) above the net household need and therefore there is no need to re-zone additional lands.

The subject lands are currently zoned rural, located at the eastern edge of the Newcastle settlement boundary. The core principle of the NPF is provide for compact urban growth in order to utilise the existing public transport and maximise social infrastructure, through consolidation within the exiting-built footprint settlements. The current Newcastle Local Area Plan is a carefully planned strategic document. Significant lands within the LAP remain undeveloped, land which is sequentially preferred for the compact development of Newcastle when compared with the identified lands.

A recent SHD application (SHD3ABP-305343-19), currently under construction, included a range of amenities in close proximity to the main street which included a new public park measuring 2 hectares with the following amenities: Mixed-Use Games Area, picnic area, natural play area, kickabout area, teen play zone with shelter and play area and 1no. playing pitch.

Providing community services on the basis only of zoning for new residential development further sprawls the settlement boundary of Newcastle without justification and is contrary to the analysis carried out in Chapter 2 setting out the projected population growth for Newcastle and the parameters under NSO 1, NPO 7 and 9. There is no requirement to re-zone additional land for residential purposes to meet the needs of the population increase and thus household need up to 2028.

SEA Comments: The lands of the proposed amendment are zoned ‘*Objective RU To protect and improve rural amenity and to provide for the development of agriculture*’. The amendment would not constitute proper and sustainable planning or development and lead to potential negative environmental impacts through:

* potential erosion of rural amenity and landscape character; and
* loss of agricultural land.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.

[Link to Map](https://sdublincoco.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=71aa0778ae8f4fffba16debb2eb0132d&amp;HideLayers=Motionsjuly22&amp;query=Motionsjuly22_4365%2Cid%2C71055)

A discussion ensued with contributions from Councillors P. Kavanagh, F. Timmons, V. Casserly, M. Johansson, P. Gogarty, J. Tuffy, L. Dunne, W. Carey, C. King, L. O’Toole, A. Hayes, G. O’Connell, P. Kearns, Mr M. Mulhern, Director responded to queries raised.

A Roll Call vote on the combined Motions followed, the result of which was as follows:

**FOR: 9 (NINE)**

**AGAINST: 24 (TWENTY-FOUR)**

**ABSTAIN: 4 (FOUR)**

[Motion 48,49, 50 Roll Call Vote.pdf](file:///C:\Users\mdunne\Downloads\Motion%2048,49,%2050%20Roll%20Call%20Vote.pdf)

The Motions **FELL**

**DPM51/0621 Item ID:71181**

Submitted by Councillor Alan Hayes, Councillor R. McMahon

To rezone lands at Newlands Farm, Red Cow comprising: 53 Ha from Objective 'RU' (Rural Amenity) to Objective 'RES-N' (New Residential Communities in Accordance with Approved Area Plans); and 5.7 Ha from Objective 'EE' (Enterprise and Employment) to Objective 'REGEN' (Enterprise and/or Residential-led Regeneration), to allow for the delivery of an area plan-led mixed-use sustainable development quarter that incorporates housing, offices, community and recreational uses on lands that are located adjacent to infrastructure and services and easily accessible to major public transport nodes.

***REPORT:***

*The Core Strategy and Settlement Strategy in Chapter 2 sets out population and housing figures which must be consistent with National and Regional Planning policy as required under the Planning and Development Act. South Dublin County is anticipated to grow by 46,518 persons with an identified need for over 17,817 households. Chapter 2 also confirms that the County has enough land to accommodate this need and additional for a further 10,470 units (79%) above the net household need. Therefore, to re-zone or zone new additional lands over and above those currently set out in the Draft Plan would be contrary to National and Regional planning policy set out in the NPF and RSES.*

*The proposed lands are greenfield zoned RU - Rural Amenity and currently form a part of the wider green buffer between Tallaght and Clondalkin. Based on general assumptions using the prevailing Ministerial Guidelines, the re-zoning of the subject lands has a conservative potential for 3,000 household units (applying an average density of 50uph x 58.7Ha). This has the potential to increase the excess of zoned lands within the County to 13,470 units or 102% above the net household need set at a National and Regional plan level. The current excess of zoned land, without the need for further zoning, is considered to provide sufficient flexibility to meet the household requirements for 2031 and potentially up to 2040.*

*In this context, the motion could undermine the delivery of households within strategic residential growth sites identified within the Regional Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan at: Adamstown, Clonburris, Tallaght, Naas Road and Fortunestown which would be contrary to National and Regional Planning Policy.*

***Recommendation***

*It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.*

[*Link to Map*](https://sdublincoco.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=71aa0778ae8f4fffba16debb2eb0132d&amp;HideLayers=Motionsjuly22&amp;query=Motionsjuly22_4365%2Cid%2C71181)

[*Newlands map*](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=70620)

The Motion **FELL** as a result of the outcome of Motions14 and 15.

**DPM52/0621 Item ID:71300**

Proposed by Councillor R. McMahon

That lands at Cheeverstown House, Kilvare, Templeogue Road, Dublin 6W owned by the Cheeverstown charity outlined in red on Map attached of approximately 3.2 hectares in area be rezoned from 'HA' (High Amenity) to RES (Residential) 'to protect and/or improve residential amenity'

Councillor R. McMahon **AGREED** to **WITHDRAW** the Motion.

**DPM53/0621 Item ID:71583**

Submitted by Councillor B. Lawlor, Councillor Baby Pereppadan, Councillor David McManus

Proposed by Councillor B. Lawlor, Seconded by Councillor A. Egan

That the 'Proposed Primary School' Specific Objective be removed from the 1.9 hectares of lands at Stocking Avenue [Site A],

**REPORT:**

This motion seeks to remove the School Symbol Objective from the 1.9 hectares of land at Stocking Avenue. It is noted that there is no proposed justification supporting this motion or alternative for the schooling need in the Templeogue area.

The Planning Department liaised with the Department of Education and Skills (DES) in preparation of the draft Plan. Based on the information in the Core Strategy and the DES’s own internal analysis of schooling requirements it was determined that there was a need for an additional school on this site. This requirement is above any schools which have been granted permission and awaiting funding or in the process of seeking planning permission. On this basis, the proposed motion should not be adopted.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.

[Link to Map](https://sdublincoco.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=71aa0778ae8f4fffba16debb2eb0132d&amp;HideLayers=Motionsjuly22&amp;query=Motionsjuly22_4365%2Cid%2C71583)

[Map 1](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=70980)

A discussion ensued with contributions from Councillors B. Lawlor, P. Gogarty, C. Bailey, A. Edge, L. Donaghy, E. Murphy, C. King, L. Dunne, L. O’Toole, D. O’Donovan, P. Kearns, S. Sinclair, R. McMahon, Ms H. Craigie, Senior Planner responded to queries raised.

A Roll Call vote on the Motion followed, the result of which was as follows:

**FOR 13 (THIRTEEN)**

**AGAINST 24 (TWENTY-FOUR)**

**ABSTAIN Nil**

[Motion 53 Roll Call Vote.pdf](file:///C:\Users\mdunne\Downloads\Motion%2053%20Roll%20Call%20Vote.pdf)

The Motion **FELL**

**DPM54/0621 Item ID:71584**

Submitted by Councillor B. Lawlor, Councillor Baby Pereppadan, Councillor David McManus

That 8.09 hectares lands off Ballycullen Road / Gunny Hill (R113) [Site B] be rezoned from 'Objective RU' to the following zonings and with the following Specific Local Objectives applied: ? Parcel A: from Objective RU to Objective OS ('to preserve and provide for open space and recreational amenities'). That a Specific Local Objective be applied that requires the rezoned open space to be provided as a playground for Abbot's Grove. ? Parcel B: from Objective RU to Objective RES-N ('to provide for new residential communities in accordance with approved area plans'). That a Specific Local Objective be applied that requires the rezoned new residential land to be provided as step down housing. ? Parcel C: from Objective RU to Objective OS ('to preserve and provide for open space and recreational amenities'). That a Specific Local Objective be applied that requires the rezoned open space to be provided as playing pitches.' map 10

Councillor B. Lawlor **AGREED** to **WITHDRAW** the Motion

**DPM55/0621 Item ID:70991**

Submitted by Councillor B. Lawlor, Councillor R. McMahon

Proposed by Councillor R. McMahon, Seconded by Councillor K. Egan

I propose that South Dublin County Council amend Chapter 9 of the Chief Executive's Draft South Dublin County Development Plan 2022 - 2028 as set out below. Chapter 9 Economic Development and Employment (EDE) Policy 10 Liffey Valley Major Retail Centre Support the Level 2 Major Town Centre retail function of Liffey Valley Shopping Centre EDE10 Objective 1: To support Liffey Valley as a Major Retail Centre (MRC) and allow for the growth of the existing shopping centre and complementary leisure/entertainment, retail warehouse, residential and commercial land uses.

**REPORT:**

The proposed Motion seeks to amend Chapter 9 Policy EDE 10 Objective 1 Liffey Valley Major Retail Centre as follows:

From:

**EDE10 Objective 1:** *To support Liffey Valley as a Major Retail Centre (MRC) and allow for the growth of the existing shopping centre and complementary leisure/entertainment, retail warehouse and commercial land uses.*

To:

**EDE10 Objective 1:** *To support Liffey Valley as a Major Retail Centre (MRC) and allow for the growth of the existing shopping centre and complementary leisure/entertainment, retail warehouse,* ***residential*** *and commercial land uses.*

In addition, it should be noted that this motion is intrinsically linked to Motion Item IDs 70992 and 70993 which when combined with this current Motion ID 70991 would result in the Section 9.5.2, EDE10 Objective 1 and Chapter 13 Implementation and Monitoring Table 13.8: reading in their entirety (Bold text identifies new additional text and strikethrough identifies text to be removed) as follows:

**9*.5.2 Liffey Valley Shopping Centre***

*Liffey Valley Shopping Centre is designated as a Major Retail Centre (MRC). This reflects the Level 2 Retail designation under the regional retail hierarchy set out in the RSES. The established shopping centre use allows for complementary leisure, retail warehouse and commercial land uses. A Major Retail Centre zoning objective applies to this area (see also Chapter 13 Implementation. On-going redevelopment of the shopping centre is taking place with new and expanded retail offer and improved transport mobility measures. The centre will develop as a key public transport hub, works for which should be completed by the time of adoption of this County Development Plan in 2022. This will provide opportunity for the centre to further expand its offering and to take advantage of the opportunities provided by the vacant sites within the area.*

And to add through motion 70992:

**Building on its existing context and existing and proposed utilities and transport infrastructure, it is considered that Liffey Valley has the potential to act as an urban centre for the north of the County, reinforcing the existing network of urban centres, and be an appropriate location for additional mixed-use development, ensuring that the existing context including identified built and natural assets, urban design, integration and potential for connectivity fully inform development.**

**E**CONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND EMPLOYMENT (EDE) Policy 10 Liffey Valley Major Retail Centre

Support the Level 2 Major Town Centre retail function of Liffey Valley Shopping Centre

EDE10 Objective 1: *To support Liffey Valley as a Major Retail Centre (MRC) and allow for the growth of the existing shopping centre and complementary leisure/entertainment, retail warehouse,* ***residential*** *and commercial land uses.* (proposed addition through this motion 70991)

EDE10 Objective 2: *To support and facilitate consolidation of the quantum and quality of the retail offering at the Liffey Valley Major Retail Centre.*

EDE10 Objective 3: *To support the development of retail warehousing within the Liffey Valley Major Retail Centre.*

EDE10 Objective 4: *To promote a high standard of urban design in the Major Retail Centre that contributes to the creation of safe and attractive spaces and creates desirable places within which to work and visit.*

And through motion 70993:

To amend the use classes in **Table 13.8: Zoning Objective ‘MRC’: ‘To protect, improve and provide for the future development of a Major Retail Centre’**

Permitted in Principle:

Advertisements and Advertising Structures, Betting Office, Car Park, Childcare Facilities, Enterprise Centre, Funeral Home, Garden Centre, Hotel/Hostel, Motor Sales Outlet, **Offices less than 100 sq.m,** Off-Licence, Open Space, Petrol Station, Public House, Public Services, Recreational Facility, Recycling Facility, Restaurant/Café, Retail Warehouse, Service Garage, Shop-Local, Shop-Major Sales Outlet, Shop-Neighbourhood, Veterinary Surgery, Wholesale Outlet, **Community Centre, Housing for Older People, Residential, Residential Institution.**

Open for Consideration:

Allotments, Crematorium, Cultural Use, Data Centre, Doctor/Dentist, Education, Health Centre, Hospital, Industry-Light, Nightclub, **Offices 100 sq.m - 1,000 sq.m**, Outdoor Entertainment Park, Place of Worship, Primary Health Care Centre, Social Club, Sports Club/Facility, Stadium, Transport Depot, Warehousing.

Not Permitted:

Abattoir, Aerodrome/Airfield, Agriculture, Bed & Breakfast, Boarding Kennels, Camp Site, Caravan Park-Residential, Cemetery, **Community Centre**, Concrete/Asphalt Plant in or adjacent to a Quarry, Conference Centre, Embassy, Fuel Depot, Guest House, Heavy Vehicle Park, Home Based Economic Activities, **Housing for Older People**, Industry-Extractive, Industry-General, Industry-Special, Live-Work Units, **Nursing Home**, Office-Based Industry, **Offices over 1,000 sq.m,** Refuse Landfill/Tip, Refuse Transfer Station, Residential, Residential Institution, **Retirement Home**, Rural Industry-Food, Science and Technology Based Enterprise, Scrap Yard, Traveller Accommodation, Wind Farm, Work-Live Units.

The combined effect of the above changes effectively changes the purpose and function of the Major Retail Centre Zoning to an Urban Town Centre type zoning where a mix of uses would be permitted in addition to those already permitted in principle or open for consideration specifically residential development. The proposed alterations to the commercial office development, while deleting office over 1000sq m from the ‘not permitted’ category have effectively omitted all types of office development from the matrix. Given that small, medium and large type office developments are each defined in the County’s land use types, this would make their status for assessment unclear should a planning application be received.

The core principle of the National Planning Framework is compact urban growth which will be delivered through the consolidation of the exiting-built footprint of settlements. The Draft Plan prioritises the development of existing zoned lands particularly within MASP Strategic Development Areas namely Adamstown, Clonburris, Tallaght, Naas Road and Fortunestown. Liffey Valley has not been identified as a Strategic Development Area within the Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan.

In regard to residential development the Core Strategy and Settlement Strategy in Chapter 2 sets out population and housing figures which must be consistent with National and Regional Planning policy as required under the Planning and Development Act. South Dublin County is anticipated to grow by 46,518 persons and a need for over 17,817 households has been identified up to 2028. Chapter 2 also confirms that the County has enough land for a further 10,470 units (79%) above the net household need and therefore there is no need to re-zone additional lands for residential purposes.

In regard to Employment zoning the Draft Plan includes a land capacity analysis under Section 2.6.8 of Chapter 2 setting out the availability of zoned land for employment purposes. Based on the assessment carried out there is potential for 31,824 jobs on existing zoned undeveloped land. The need during the lifetime of the Plan amounts to 18,336 jobs and thus there is sufficient zoned land to meet the projected need without considering further land.

The Retail Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2008 was prepared by the Dublin and the Mid-East Regional Authorities and carried over into the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy until such time as it may be reviewed. The retail hierarchy as expressed in the GDA strategy identifies Liffey Valley as a Level 2 Retail Centre with the following description - Full range of all types of retail services from newsagents to specialist shops and boutiques, department stores, food stores of all types and a high level of mixed uses including the arts and culture to create a vibrant living place. Centres should be well connected and served by high quality public transport and should be serving population catchments in excess of 60,000 people.

Liffey Valley alongside the Square in Tallaght form the only Level 2 retail centres within the County serving a significant catchment and providing significant employment opportunities. Policy 8 Retail of the Plan seeks to *“protect the vitality and viability of existing centres in accordance with the retail framework provided by the Retail Planning Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2012, or any superseding guidelines) and EMRA RSES Retail Hierarchy* while EDE8 Objective 8 seeks “*To direct new major retail floorspace in the County to designated centres at the appropriate level within the retail hierarchy, and to further direct major retail development in designated centres into the Core Retail Areas”*. This objective is further supported specifically through EDE10 Objective 2: *To support and facilitate consolidation of the quantum and quality of the retail offering at the Liffey Valley Major Retail Centre.*

Having regard to the above it is not considered that the proposed motion either individually or in combination with Motion Item IDs 70992 and 70993 are acceptable as;

* It would conflict and undermine the provisions of the Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan which identifies Strategic Growth Areas which Liffey Valley has not been identified within,
* Chapter 2 confirms that the County has enough land for a further 10,470 units (79%) above the net household need and therefore there is no need to re-zone additional lands for residential purposes
* The Draft Plan includes a land capacity analysis under Section 2.6.8 of Chapter 2 which identifies that there is potential for 31,824 jobs on existing zoned undeveloped land with a need during the lifetime of the Plan amounting to 18,336 jobs and thus there is sufficient zoned land to meet the projected need without considering further land or amendments to existing provisions and
* The proposed amendments to the Draft Plan have the potential to undermine the designation of this area as one of only two Major Retail Centres within the County where the focus of the plan is to support and facilitate the consolidation of the quantum and quality of the retail offering in this area.
* Major Retail Centre zoning is specifically in place to differentiate from the uses in other mixed use zoning areas such at Town Centre zoning – to add in residential and to revise the zoning matrix as proposed in related motions would make it a town centre zoning and as such would make the current zoning defunct.

*It is therefore recommended that this motion is not adopted.*

**RECOMMENDATION:**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.

It was **AGREED** to take Motion 56 (ID 70992) and Motion 57 (ID 70993) in conjunction with Motion 55 (ID 70991)

**DPM56/0621 Item ID:70992**

Submitted by Councillor B. Lawlor, Councillor R. McMahon

Proposed by Councillor R. McMahon, Seconded by Councillor K. Egan

I propose that South Dublin County Council amend Chapter 9 of the Chief Executive's Draft South Dublin County Development Plan 2022 - 2028 as set out below. Chapter 9 Economic Development and Employment (EDE) 9.5.2 Liffey Valley Shopping Centre, remove Shopping and Insert Major Retail to read "Liffey Valley Major Retail Centre" And to add in the following text at the end of the 1st paragraph under section 9.5.2 Building on its existing context and existing and proposed utilities and transport infrastructure, it is considered that Liffey Valley has the potential to act as an urban centre for the north of the County, reinforcing the existing network of urban centres, and be an appropriate location for additional mixed-use development, ensuring that the existing context including identified built and natural assets, urban design, integration and potential for connectivity fully inform development.

**REPORT:**

The proposed motion seeks to add additional wording to the end of section 9.5.2 Liffey Valley Shopping Centre as follows:

From:

**9.5.2 Liffey Valley Shopping Centre**

Liffey Valley Shopping Centre is designated as a Major Retail Centre (MRC). This reflects the Level 2 Retail designation under the regional retail hierarchy set out in the RSES. The established shopping centre use allows for complementary leisure, retail warehouse and commercial land uses. A Major Retail Centre zoning objective applies to this area (see also Chapter 13 Implementation. On-going redevelopment of the shopping centre is taking place with new and expanded retail offer and improved transport mobility measures. The centre will develop as a key public transport hub, works for which should be completed by the time of adoption of this County Development Plan in 2022. This will provide opportunity for the centre to further expand its offering and to take advantage of the opportunities provided by the vacant sites within the area.

To:

**9.5.2 Liffey Valley Shopping Centre**

Liffey Valley Shopping Centre is designated as a Major Retail Centre (MRC). This reflects the Level 2 Retail designation under the regional retail hierarchy set out in the RSES. The established shopping centre use allows for complementary leisure, retail warehouse and commercial land uses. A Major Retail Centre zoning objective applies to this area (see also Chapter 13 Implementation. On-going redevelopment of the shopping centre is taking place with new and expanded retail offer and improved transport mobility measures. The centre will develop as a key public transport hub, works for which should be completed by the time of adoption of this County Development Plan in 2022. This will provide opportunity for the centre to further expand its offering and to take advantage of the opportunities provided by the vacant sites within the area.

**Building on its existing context and existing and proposed utilities and transport infrastructure, it is considered that Liffey Valley has the potential to act as an urban centre for the north of the County, reinforcing the existing network of urban centres, and be an appropriate location for additional mixed-use development, ensuring that the existing context including identified built and natural assets, urban design, integration and potential for connectivity fully inform development.**

In addition, it should be noted that this motion is intrinsically linked to Motion Item IDs 70991 and 70993 which when combined with this current Motion ID 70992 would result in the Section 9.5.2, EDE10 Objective 1 and Chapter 13 Implementation and Monitoring Table 13.8: reading in their entirety (Bold text identifies new additional text and strikethrough identifies text to be removed) as follows:

**9*.5.2 Liffey Valley Shopping Centre***

***Liffey Valley Shopping Centre is designated as a Major Retail Centre (MRC). This reflects the Level 2 Retail designation under the regional retail hierarchy set out in the RSES. The***

*established shopping centre use allows for complementary leisure, retail warehouse and commercial land uses. A Major Retail Centre zoning objective applies to this area (see also Chapter 13 Implementation. On-going redevelopment of the shopping centre is taking place with new and expanded retail offer and improved transport mobility measures. The centre will develop as a key public transport hub, works for which should be completed by the time of adoption of this County Development Plan in 2022. This will provide opportunity for the centre to further expand its offering and to take advantage of the opportunities provided by the vacant sites within the area.*

And to add through this current motion 70992:

**Building on its existing context and existing and proposed utilities and transport infrastructure, it is considered that Liffey Valley has the potential to act as an urban centre for the north of the County, reinforcing the existing network of urban centres, and be an appropriate location for additional mixed-use development, ensuring that the existing context including identified built and natural assets, urban design, integration and potential for connectivity fully inform development.**

**E**CONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND EMPLOYMENT (EDE) Policy 10 Liffey Valley Major Retail Centre

Support the Level 2 Major Town Centre retail function of Liffey Valley Shopping Centre

EDE10 Objective 1: *To support Liffey Valley as a Major Retail Centre (MRC) and allow for the growth of the existing shopping centre and complementary leisure/entertainment, retail warehouse,* ***residential*** *and commercial land uses.* (proposed addition through motion 70991)

EDE10 Objective 2: *To support and facilitate consolidation of the quantum and quality of the retail offering at the Liffey Valley Major Retail Centre.*

EDE10 Objective 3: *To support the development of retail warehousing within the Liffey Valley Major Retail Centre.*

EDE10 Objective 4: *To promote a high standard of urban design in the Major Retail Centre that contributes to the creation of safe and attractive spaces and creates desirable places within which to work and visit.*

And through motion 70993:

To amend the use classes in **Table 13.8: Zoning Objective ‘MRC’: ‘To protect, improve and provide for the future development of a Major Retail Centre’**

Permitted in Principle:

Advertisements and Advertising Structures, Betting Office, Car Park, Childcare Facilities, Enterprise Centre, Funeral Home, Garden Centre, Hotel/Hostel, Motor Sales Outlet, **Offices less than 100 sq.m**, Off-Licence, Open Space, Petrol Station, Public House, Public Services, Recreational Facility, Recycling Facility, Restaurant/Café, Retail Warehouse, Service Garage, Shop-Local, Shop-Major Sales Outlet, Shop-Neighbourhood, Veterinary Surgery, Wholesale Outlet, **Community Centre, Housing for Older People, Residential, Residential Institution.**

Open for Consideration:

Allotments, Crematorium, Cultural Use, Data Centre, Doctor/Dentist, Education, Health Centre, Hospital, Industry-Light, Nightclub, **Offices 100 sq.m - 1,000 sq.m**, Outdoor Entertainment Park, Place of Worship, Primary Health  Care Centre, Social Club, Sports Club/Facility, Stadium, Transport Depot, Warehousing.

Not Permitted:

Abattoir, Aerodrome/Airfield, Agriculture, Bed & Breakfast, Boarding Kennels, Camp Site, Caravan Park-Residential, Cemetery, **Community Centre**, Concrete/Asphalt Plant in or adjacent to a Quarry, Conference Centre, Embassy, Fuel Depot, Guest House, Heavy Vehicle Park, Home Based Economic Activities, **Housing for Older People**, Industry-Extractive, Industry-General, Industry-Special, Live-Work Units, **Nursing Home**, Office-Based Industry, **Offices over 1,000 sq.m,** Refuse Landfill/Tip, Refuse Transfer Station, Residential, Residential Institution, **Retirement Home**, Rural Industry-Food, Science and Technology Based Enterprise, Scrap Yard, Traveller Accommodation, Wind Farm, Work-Live Units.

The combined effect of the above changes effectively changes the purpose and function of the Major Retail Centre Zoning to an Urban Town Centre type zoning where a mix of uses would be permitted in addition to those already permitted in principle or open for consideration specifically residential development. The proposed alterations to the commercial office development, while deleting office over 1000sq m from the ‘not permitted’ category have effectively omitted all types of office development from the matrix. Given that small, medium and large type office developments are each defined in the County’s land use types, this would make their status for assessment unclear should a planning application be received.

The core principle of the National Planning Framework is compact urban growth which will be delivered through the consolidation of the exiting-built footprint of settlements. The Draft Plan prioritises the development of existing zoned lands particularly within MASP Strategic Development Areas namely Adamstown, Clonburris, Tallaght, Naas Road and Fortunestown. Liffey Valley has not been identified as a Strategic Development Area within the Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan.

In regard to residential development the Core Strategy and Settlement Strategy in Chapter 2 sets out population and housing figures which must be consistent with National and Regional Planning policy as required under the Planning and Development Act. South Dublin County is anticipated to grow by 46,518 persons and a need for over 17,817 households has been identified up to 2028. Chapter 2 also confirms that the County has enough land for a further 10,470 units (79%) above the net household need and therefore there is no need to re-zone additional lands for residential purposes.

In regard to Employment zoning the Draft Plan includes a land capacity analysis under Section 2.6.8 of Chapter 2 setting out the availability of zoned land for employment purposes. Based on the assessment carried out there is potential for 31,824 jobs on existing zoned undeveloped land. The need during the lifetime of the Plan amounts to 18,336 jobs and thus there is sufficient zoned land to meet the projected need without considering further land.

The Retail Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2008 was prepared by the Dublin and the Mid-East Regional Authorities and carried over into the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy until such time as it may be reviewed. The retail hierarchy as expressed in the GDA strategy identifies Liffey Valley as a Level 2 Retail Centre with the following description - Full range of all types of retail services from newsagents to specialist shops and boutiques, department stores, food stores of all types and a high level of mixed uses including the arts and culture to create a vibrant living place. Centres should be well connected and served by high quality public transport and should be serving population catchments in excess of 60,000 people.

Liffey Valley alongside the Square in Tallaght form the only Level 2 retail centres within the County serving a significant catchment and providing significant employment opportunities. Policy 8 Retail of the Plan seeks to *“protect the vitality and viability of existing centres in accordance with the retail framework provided by the Retail Planning Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2012, or any superseding guidelines) and EMRA RSES Retail Hierarchy* while EDE8 Objective 8 seeks “*To direct new major retail floorspace in the County to designated centres at the appropriate level within the retail hierarchy, and to further direct major retail development in designated centres into the Core Retail Areas”*. This objective is further supported specifically through EDE10 Objective 2: *To support and facilitate consolidation of the quantum and quality of the retail offering at the Liffey Valley Major Retail Centre.*

Having regard to the above it is not considered that the proposed motion either individually or in combination with Motion Item IDs 70992 and 70993 are acceptable as;

* It would conflict and undermine the provisions of the Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan which identifies Strategic Growth Areas which Liffey Valley has not been identified within,
* Chapter 2 confirms that the County has enough land for a further 10,470 units (79%) above the net household need and therefore there is no need to re-zone additional lands for residential purposes
* The Draft Plan includes a land capacity analysis under Section 2.6.8 of Chapter 2 which identifies that there is potential for 31,824 jobs on existing zoned undeveloped land with a need during the lifetime of the Plan amounting to 18,336 jobs and thus there is sufficient zoned land to meet the projected need without considering further land or amendments to existing provisions and
* The proposed amendments to the Draft Plan have the potential to undermine the designation of this area as one of only two Major Retail Centres within the County where the focus of the plan is to support and facilitate the consolidation of the quantum and quality of the retail offering in this area.
* Major Retail Centre zoning is specifically in place to differentiate from the uses in other mixed use zoning areas such at Town Centre zoning – to add in residential and to revise the zoning matrix as proposed in related motions would make it a town centre zoning and as such would make the current zoning defunct.

**It is therefore recommended that this motion is not adopted.**

**RECOMMENDATION:**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.

**DPM57/0621 Item ID:70993**

Submitted by Councillor B. Lawlor, Councillor R. McMahon

Proposed by Councillor R. McMahon, Seconded by Councillor K. Egan

I propose that South Dublin County Council amend Chapter 13 of the Chief Executive's Draft South Dublin County Development Plan 2022 - 2028 as set out below. Chapter 13 Implementation and Monitoring Table 13.8: Zoning Objective 'MRC': 'To protect, improve and provide for the future development of a Major Retail Centre' USE CLASSES RELATED TO ZONING OBJECTIVE To add in the following under Permitted in Principle - Community Centre, Housing for Older People, Residential, Residential Institution, and remove 'less than 100 sq.m' under Offices. And to remove under Open for Consideration 'Offices 100 sq.m - 1,000 sq.m' And to remove under Not Permitted Community Centre, Housing for Older People, Nursing Home, Offices over 1,000 sq.m, Residential, Residential Institution, Retirement Home,

**REPORT:**

The motion seeks to amend Chapter 13 Implementation and Monitoring Table 13.8: Zoning Objective 'MRC' as follows:

From:

**Table 13.8: Zoning Objective ‘MRC’: ‘To protect, improve and provide for the future development of a**

Major Retail Centre’

Permitted in Principle:

Advertisements and Advertising Structures, Betting Office, Car Park, Childcare Facilities, Enterprise Centre, Funeral Home, Garden Centre, Hotel/Hostel, Motor Sales Outlet, Offices less than 100 sq.m, Off-Licence, Open Space, Petrol Station, Public House, Public Services, Recreational Facility, Recycling Facility, Restaurant/Café, Retail Warehouse, Service Garage, Shop-Local, Shop-Major Sales Outlet, Shop-Neighbourhood, Veterinary Surgery, Wholesale Outlet.

Open for Consideration:

Allotments, Crematorium, Cultural Use, Data Centre, Doctor/Dentist, Education, Health Centre, Hospital, Industry-Light, Nightclub, Offices 100 sq.m - 1,000 sq.m, Outdoor Entertainment Park, Place of Worship, Primary Health Care Centre, Social Club, Sports Club/Facility, Stadium, Transport Depot, Warehousing.

Not Permitted:

Abattoir, Aerodrome/Airfield, Agriculture, Bed & Breakfast, Boarding Kennels, Camp Site, Caravan Park-Residential, Cemetery, Community Centre, Concrete/Asphalt Plant in or adjacent to a Quarry, Conference Centre, Embassy, Fuel Depot, Guest House, Heavy Vehicle Park, Home Based Economic Activities, Housing for Older People, Industry-Extractive, Industry-General, Industry-Special, Live-Work Units, Nursing Home, Office-Based Industry, Offices over 1,000 sq.m, Refuse Landfill/Tip, Refuse Transfer Station, Residential, Residential Institution, Retirement Home, Rural Industry-Food, Science and Technology Based Enterprise, Scrap Yard,

Traveller Accommodation, Wind Farm, Work-Live Units.

To:

**Table 13.8: Zoning Objective ‘MRC’: ‘To protect, improve and provide for the future development of a**

Major Retail Centre’

Permitted in Principle:

Advertisements and Advertising Structures, Betting Office, Car Park, Childcare Facilities, Enterprise Centre, Funeral Home, Garden Centre, Hotel/Hostel, Motor Sales Outlet, **Offices less than 100 sq.m,** Off-Licence, Open Space, Petrol Station, Public House, Public Services, Recreational Facility, Recycling Facility, Restaurant/Café, Retail Warehouse, Service Garage, Shop-Local, Shop-Major Sales Outlet, Shop-Neighbourhood, Veterinary Surgery, Wholesale Outlet, **Community Centre, Housing for Older People, Residential, Residential Institution.**

Open for Consideration:

Allotments, Crematorium, Cultural Use, Data Centre, Doctor/Dentist, Education, Health Centre, Hospital, Industry-Light, Nightclub, **Offices 100 sq.m - 1,000 sq.m**, Outdoor Entertainment Park, Place of Worship, Primary Health Care Centre, Social Club, Sports Club/Facility, Stadium, Transport Depot, Warehousing.

Not Permitted:

Abattoir, Aerodrome/Airfield, Agriculture, Bed & Breakfast, Boarding Kennels, Camp Site, Caravan Park-Residential, Cemetery, **Community Centre**, Concrete/Asphalt Plant in or adjacent to a Quarry, Conference Centre, Embassy, Fuel Depot, Guest House, Heavy Vehicle Park, Home Based Economic Activities, **Housing for Older People**, Industry-Extractive, Industry-General, Industry-Special, Live-Work Units, **Nursing Home**, Office-Based Industry, **Offices over 1,000 sq.m,** Refuse Landfill/Tip, Refuse Transfer Station, Residential, Residential Institution, **Retirement Home**, Rural Industry-Food, Science and Technology Based Enterprise, Scrap Yard, Traveller Accommodation, Wind Farm, Work-Live Units.

In addition, it should be noted that this motion is intrinsically linked to Motion Item IDs 70991 and 70992 which when combined with this current Motion ID 70993 would result in the Section 9.5.2, EDE10 Objective 1 and Chapter 13 Implementation and Monitoring Table 13.8: reading in their entirety (Bold text identifies new additional text and strikethrough identifies text to be removed) as follows:

**9*.5.2 Liffey Valley Shopping Centre***

*Liffey Valley Shopping Centre is designated as a Major Retail Centre (MRC). This reflects the Level 2 Retail designation under the regional retail hierarchy set out in the RSES. The established shopping centre use allows for complementary leisure, retail warehouse and commercial land uses. A Major Retail Centre zoning objective applies to this area (see also Chapter 13 Implementation. On-going redevelopment of the shopping centre is taking place with new and expanded retail offer and improved transport mobility measures. The centre will develop as a key public transport hub, works for which should be completed by the time of adoption of this County Development Plan in 2022. This will provide opportunity for the centre to further expand its offering and to take advantage of the opportunities provided by the vacant sites within the area.*

And to add through motion 70992:

**Building on its existing context and existing and proposed utilities and transport infrastructure, it is considered that Liffey Valley has the potential to act as an urban centre for the north of the County, reinforcing the existing network of urban centres, and be an appropriate location for additional mixed-use development, ensuring that the existing context including identified built and natural assets, urban design, integration and potential for connectivity fully inform development.**

**E**CONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND EMPLOYMENT (EDE) Policy 10 Liffey Valley Major Retail Centre

Support the Level 2 Major Town Centre retail function of Liffey Valley Shopping Centre

EDE10 Objective 1: *To support Liffey Valley as a Major Retail Centre (MRC) and allow for the growth of the existing shopping centre and complementary leisure/entertainment, retail warehouse,* ***residential*** *and commercial land uses.* (proposed addition through motion 70991)

EDE10 Objective 2: *To support and facilitate consolidation of the quantum and quality of the retail offering at the Liffey Valley Major Retail Centre.*

EDE10 Objective 3: *To support the development of retail warehousing within the Liffey Valley Major Retail Centre.*

EDE10 Objective 4: *To promote a high standard of urban design in the Major Retail Centre that contributes to the creation of safe and attractive spaces and creates desirable places within which to work and visit.*

And through this current motion 70993:

To amend the use classes in **Table 13.8: Zoning Objective ‘MRC’: ‘To protect, improve and provide for the future development of a Major Retail Centre’**

Permitted in Principle:

Advertisements and Advertising Structures, Betting Office, Car Park, Childcare Facilities, Enterprise Centre, Funeral Home, Garden Centre, Hotel/Hostel, Motor Sales Outlet, **Offices less than 100 sq.m,** Off-Licence, Open Space, Petrol Station, Public House, Public Services, Recreational Facility, Recycling Facility, Restaurant/Café, Retail Warehouse, Service Garage, Shop-Local, Shop-Major Sales Outlet, Shop-Neighbourhood, Veterinary Surgery, Wholesale Outlet, **Community Centre, Housing for Older People, Residential, Residential Institution.**

Open for Consideration:

Allotments, Crematorium, Cultural Use, Data Centre, Doctor/Dentist, Education, Health Centre, Hospital, Industry-Light, Nightclub, **Offices 100 sq.m - 1,000 sq.m**, Outdoor Entertainment Park, Place of Worship, Primary Health Care Centre, Social Club, Sports Club/Facility, Stadium, Transport Depot, Warehousing.

Not Permitted:

Abattoir, Aerodrome/Airfield, Agriculture, Bed & Breakfast, Boarding Kennels, Camp Site, Caravan Park-Residential, Cemetery, **Community Centre**, Concrete/Asphalt Plant in or adjacent to a Quarry, Conference Centre, Embassy, Fuel Depot, Guest House, Heavy Vehicle Park, Home Based Economic Activities, **Housing for Older People**, Industry-Extractive, Industry-General, Industry-Special, Live-Work Units, **Nursing Home**, Office-Based Industry, **Offices over 1,000 sq.m,** Refuse Landfill/Tip, Refuse Transfer Station, Residential, Residential Institution, **Retirement Home**, Rural Industry-Food, Science and Technology Based Enterprise, Scrap Yard, Traveller Accommodation, Wind Farm, Work-Live Units.

The combined effect of the above changes effectively changes the purpose and function of the Major Retail Centre Zoning to an Urban Town Centre type zoning where a mix of uses would be permitted in addition to those already permitted in principle or open for consideration specifically residential development. The proposed alterations to the commercial office development, while deleting office over 1000sq m from the ‘not permitted’ category have effectively omitted all types of office development from the matrix. Given that small, medium and large type office developments are each defined in the County’s land use types, this would make their status for assessment unclear should a planning application be received.

The core principle of the National Planning Framework is compact urban growth which will be delivered through the consolidation of the exiting-built footprint of settlements. The Draft Plan prioritises the development of existing zoned lands particularly within MASP Strategic Development Areas namely Adamstown, Clonburris, Tallaght, Naas Road and Fortunestown. Liffey Valley has not been identified as a Strategic Development Area within the Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan.

In regard to residential development the Core Strategy and Settlement Strategy in Chapter 2 sets out population and housing figures which must be consistent with National and Regional Planning policy as required under the Planning and Development Act. South Dublin County is anticipated to grow by 46,518 persons and a need for over 17,817 households has been identified up to 2028. Chapter 2 also confirms that the County has enough land for a further 10,470 units (79%) above the net household need and therefore there is no need to re-zone additional lands for residential purposes.

In regard to Employment zoning the Draft Plan includes a land capacity analysis under Section 2.6.8 of Chapter 2 setting out the availability of zoned land for employment purposes. Based on the assessment carried out there is potential for 31,824 jobs on existing zoned undeveloped land. The need during the lifetime of the Plan amounts to 18,336 jobs and thus there is sufficient zoned land to meet the projected need without considering further land.

The Retail Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2008 was prepared by the Dublin and the Mid-East Regional Authorities and carried over into the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy until such time as it may be reviewed. The retail hierarchy as expressed in the GDA strategy identifies Liffey Valley as a Level 2 Retail Centre with the following description - Full range of all types of retail services from newsagents to specialist shops and boutiques, department stores, food stores of all types and a high level of mixed uses including the arts and culture to create a vibrant living

place. Centres should be well connected and served by high quality public transport and should be serving population catchments in excess of 60,000 people.

Liffey Valley alongside the Square in Tallaght form the only Level 2 retail centres within the County serving a significant catchment and providing significant employment opportunities. Policy 8 Retail of the Plan seeks to *“protect the vitality and viability of existing centres in accordance with the retail framework provided by the Retail Planning Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2012, or any superseding guidelines) and EMRA RSES Retail Hierarchy* while EDE8 Objective 8 seeks “*To direct new major retail floorspace in the County to designated centres at the appropriate level within the retail hierarchy, and to further direct major retail development in designated centres into the Core Retail Areas”*. This objective is further supported specifically through EDE10 Objective 2: *To support and facilitate consolidation of the quantum and quality of the retail offering at the Liffey Valley Major Retail Centre.*

Having regard to the above it is not considered that the proposed motion either individually or in combination with Motion Item IDs 70992 and 70993 are acceptable as;

* It would conflict and undermine the provisions of the Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan which identifies Strategic Growth Areas which Liffey Valley has not been identified within,
* Chapter 2 confirms that the County has enough land for a further 10,470 units (79%) above the net household need and therefore there is no need to re-zone additional lands for residential purposes
* The Draft Plan includes a land capacity analysis under Section 2.6.8 of Chapter 2 which identifies that there is potential for 31,824 jobs on existing zoned undeveloped land with a need during the lifetime of the Plan amounting to 18,336 jobs and thus there is sufficient zoned land to meet the projected need without considering further land or amendments to existing provisions and
* The proposed amendments to the Draft Plan have the potential to undermine the designation of this area as one of only two Major Retail Centres within the County where the focus of the plan is to support and facilitate the consolidation of the quantum and quality of the retail offering in this area.
* Major Retail Centre zoning is specifically in place to differentiate from the uses in other mixed use zoning areas such at Town Centre zoning – to add in residential and to revise the zoning matrix as proposed in related motions would make it a town centre zoning and as such would make the current zoning defunct.

It is therefore recommended that this motion is not adopted.

**RECOMMENDATION:**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.

[Link to Map](https://sdublincoco.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=71aa0778ae8f4fffba16debb2eb0132d&amp;HideLayers=Motionsjuly22&amp;query=Motionsjuly22_4365%2Cid%2C70993)

[Picture (Device Independent Bitmap) 1](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=70618)

A discussion ensued with contributions from Councillors R. McMahon, P. Gogarty, M. Johansson, E. Ó Broin, L. Sinclair, L. Donaghy, S. Moynihan, J. Tuffy, L. O’Toole, D. Ó Braidaigh, C. King, G. O’Connell, and B. Lawlor

Councillor B. Lawlor **AGREED** to **WITHDRAW** all three Motions, Seconded by Councillor R. McMahon

**DPM58/0621 Item ID:70648**

Proposed by Councillor F. Timmons, Seconded by Councillor P. Kavanagh

That this Council rezones green space including football pitches at Moyle Park College to open space from current residential.

**REPORT:**

The motion seeks to rezone the green spaces including football pitches surrounding Moyle Park College Post Primary School, Clondalkin from residential to open space.

The subject lands form part of the green areas adjoining the existing school and currently comprise of playing pitches and amenity green spaces. It should be noted that it is general practice throughout the County that such institutional/school sites are zoned RES. This zoning objective does not intimate that the subject lands will be developed for residential purposes but merely seeks to recognise the existing uses on site and the potential need for expansion of such uses as required by a school over time.

It is considered that the proposed motion has the potential to unwittingly hinder or negate appropriate development of the school, with consequential negative environmental impacts for human beings.

The Draft Plan already includes sufficient protective policies and objectives to ensure the proper and sustainable development of the lands, should such development be required.

Having regard to the above it is recommended that this motion is not adopted.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.

[link to map](https://sdublincoco.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=71aa0778ae8f4fffba16debb2eb0132d&amp;HideLayers=Motionsjuly22&amp;query=Motionsjuly22_4365%2Cid%2C70648)

Following contributions from Councillors P. Kavanagh, W. Carey, E. Ó Broin, L. O’Toole C. King, Ms H. Craigie, Senior Planner responded to queries raised.

A Roll Call vote followed on Councillor Timmons’ Motion, the result of which was as follows:

**FOR 34 (THIRTY-FOUR)**

**AGAINST NIL**

**ABSTAIN 1 (ONE)**

[Motion 58 Roll Call Vote.pdf](file:///C:\Users\mdunne\Downloads\Motion%2058%20Roll%20Call%20Vote.pdf)

The Motion was **AGREED.**

**DPM59/0621 Item ID:70751**

Proposed by Councillor Eoin Ó Broin, Seconded by Councillor F. Timmons

To ensure compliance with, COS 5 Objective 4, with regard to Institutional Lands/'Windfall' Sites, to change the zoning of the eastern garden and car parks of the Church of the Immaculate Conception and St Killian off New Road in Clondalkin, marked in red on the attached map, to amenity.

[Convent1](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=70590)

**REPORT:**

This motion seeks to re-zone land from Residential (RES) to Objective OS – To preserve and provide for open space and recreational amenities based on the compliance with COS 5 Objective 4.

COS 5 Objective 4 sets out the following:

*To require the provision of public open space as part of a proposed development site area in accordance with the Public Open Space Standards (minimum) set out in Table 8.2.*

Table 8.2 of the Draft Plan requires a minimum of 20% of proposed development to be open space on institutional lands or windfall sites.

It should be noted that COS5 Objective 4 applies to all institutional lands or windfall sites irrespective of zoning and does not require land to be re-zoned to OS to ensure compliance with COS5 Objective.

In addition, the proposed amendment pertains to the grounds of Protected Structure: Presentation Convent & Church of Immaculate Conception, Clondalkin. Therefore, potential sensitivities relating to the buildings and their curtilage are also adequately protected from inappropriate development by proposed Policy 19 of Chapter 3 and associated Objectives NCBH 19-1; 19-2; 19-4; and 19-5, and by general development management policies and objectives.

Given the enclosed nature of the subject land forming part of the grounds of the Convent and Church of Immaculate Conception the purpose and benefit of the rezoning to Open Space is unclear and has not been warranted. It is therefore recommended that this motion is not adopted.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.

[Link to Map](https://sdublincoco.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=71aa0778ae8f4fffba16debb2eb0132d&amp;HideLayers=Motionsjuly22&amp;query=Motionsjuly22_4365%2Cid%2C70751)

A discussion ensued with contributions from Councillors E. Ó Broin, F. Timmons, P. Kavanagh, W. Carey, J. Tuffy, G. O’Connell, C. King, P. Gogarty.

Mr M. Mulhern, Director and Ms. H. Craigie, Senior Planner responded to queries raised. The Management confirmed they are happy for motion to go out on Draft display.

The Members unanimously **AGREED** to accept Motion **AS PUT**

**DPM60/0621 Item ID:70814**

Submitted by Councillor G. O'Connell, Councillor L. O'Toole, Councillor P. Gogarty

Amend CS3 Objective 3 to read: To provide for flexibility in achieving the housing supply targets and meeting housing demand, the Council will consider the re-distribution of housing and population figures within the settlement and Neighbourhood Areas. In this regard, where a site greater than 0.25ha has the potential to exceed the allocation for a particular Neighbourhood Area as set out under Core Strategy Table 10, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Authority that the necessary social and physical infrastructure is in place or can be provided in advance of the application to accommodate the proposed development.

Councillor P. Gogarty **AGREED** to **WITHDRAW** the Motion

**DPM61/0621 Item ID:70818**

Submitted by Councillor G. O'Connell, Councillor L. O'Toole, Councillor P. Gogarty

Amend CS6 Objective 2 to read: Promote compact growth and support high quality infill development in existing urban built-up areas by achieving a target of at least 50% of all new homes within or contiguous to the built-up area of Dublin City and Suburbs (Consistent with NSO 1, RSO 2, NPO 3b and RPO 3.2), and to ensure that the provision of any required community and retail infrastructure for the lands in question is included as part of any housing application.

Councillor P. Gogarty **AGREED** to **WITHDRAW** the Motion

**DPM62/0621 Item ID:70820**

Submitted by Councillor G. O'Connell, Councillor L. O'Toole, Councillor P. Gogarty

Amend CS6 Objective 3 to read: Promote compact growth and support high quality infill development in existing urban built-up areas, outside Dublin City and Suburbs, by achieving a target of at least 30% of all new homes within or contiguous to the CSO defined settlement boundaries (Consistent with NPO 3b and RPO 3.2) and to ensure that the provision of any required community and retail infrastructure for the lands in question is included as part of any housing application.

Councillor P. Gogarty **AGREED** to **WITHDRAW** the Motion

**DPM63/0621 Item ID:70877**

Submitted by Councillor L. Donaghy, Councillor Liam Sinclair, Councillor Peter Kavanagh, Councillor S. McEneaney

Proposed by Councillor P. Kavanagh, Seconded by Councillor L. Donaghy

Core Strategy and Settlement Strategy Motion: To insert a new objective in CS1 - To Develop Local Area Plans for the self-contained settlements of Rathcoole and Saggart.

**REPORT:**

The Draft County Development Plan states that Local Area Plans will be prepared for areas where new development requires a co-ordinated approach and in particular for areas that are likely to experience large scale residential or commercial development or regeneration.

As part of the deliverability analysis, the Core Strategy Table 10 identifies that approximately 7% of the total units to be constructed over the plan period will be located within the three settlements of Saggart, Newcastle and Rathcoole totalling 1,314 units approximately, developing at an incremental pace based on the delivery of social, physical and transport infrastructure and services.

As major development is not anticipated within the settlement of Saggart (0.5% of the total units 96 units) during the lifetime of the Draft Plan, it is considered that an objective to prepare a Local Area Plan is not justified at this time.

In regard to the area of Rathcoole, Table 10 provides for a growth of 580 units over the plan period (averaging less than 100 units/year). Rathcoole is not an area that will experience significant large-scale development, therefore, and having regard to the master planning of any Council owned or associated land, it is not considered appropriate to include a specific objective for an LAP as outlined in the above motion.

It should be noted that there is an SLO in the draft Plan to ‘Investigate the need to carry out a traffic and transport study for Rathcoole, Saggart and Newcastle and the surrounding areas following the publication of the GDA Strategy review to 2042, which will clarify the context within which the road network in the area will function’.

In line with the provisions of Chapter 5 Quality Design and Healthy Placemaking policy QDP13 it is a policy of the plan to prepare Local Area Plans as appropriate, prioritising areas that are likely to experience large scale residential or commercial development or regeneration. Having regard to the relatively low quantum of development planned for these villages, to the various policies and objectives in the Plan to ensure sensitive development and to the SLO to investigate the need for a traffic and transport study, and to the need to prioritise LAPs in areas of more significant planned development, LAPs are not required for Saggart and Rathcoole.

**CE Recommendation:**

It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.

[Link to Map](https://sdublincoco.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=71aa0778ae8f4fffba16debb2eb0132d&amp;HideLayers=Motionsjuly22&amp;query=Motionsjuly22_4365%2Cid%2C70877)

Following contributions from Councillors P. Kavanagh, E. Ó Broin, F. Timmons, L. Sinclair, C. King, Mr M. Mulhern, Director and Ms H. Craigie, Senior Planner responded to queries raised

The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED**

**DPM64/0621 Item ID:71018**

Submitted by Councillor Derren Ó Brádaigh, Councillor William Joseph Carey

Page 54, Core Strategy (CS) Policy 7, insert in Objective 4 'with a particular emphasis on public transport infrastructure' after 'phasing requirements'

Councillor D. Ó Brádaigh **AGREED** to **WITHDRAW** the Motion

**DPM65/0621 Item ID:71067**

Proposed by Councillor F. Timmons, Seconded by Councillor P. Kavanagh

Motion: Need a proactive SLO for the lands zoned regeneration in Central Tallaght - a strong mix of land uses that intensify enterprise, industry and employment is needed. The LAP and rezone has not delivered regeneration - unprecedented SHDs only have flooded in - no new jobs to regenerate or transform these lands for Tallaght. A proactive strategy and program for these lands is required to deliver intensive industry and employment into these areas as well as the SHD apartment applications.

**REPORT:**

The motions seeks a Specific Local Objective (SLO) for the lands zoned regeneration in Central Tallaght to ensure a strong mix of employment intensive uses alongside SHD apartment applications.

The Tallaght Local Area Plan (LAP), as adopted in June 2020, already contains policies to ensure the delivery of a mix of new homes and employment space to support the needs of the County. Implementing the policies in this LAP will take time to come into effect.  As such, the SLO proposed is considered to duplicate the provisions already set out in the Local Area Plan and could have the potential to mislead an applicant in preparation of a proposal for development within this area. It is therefore not considered that a new SLO is required.

**RECOMMENDATION:**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.

[Link to Map](https://sdublincoco.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=71aa0778ae8f4fffba16debb2eb0132d&amp;HideLayers=Motionsjuly22&amp;query=Motionsjuly22_4365%2Cid%2C71067)

The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **ACCEPTED** and **AGREED**

**DPM66/0621 Item ID:71062**

Proposed by Councillor F. Timmons, Seconded by Councillor P. Kavanagh

Land Development Agency insist on mixed tenure and adherence to national plans, this is not happening in Tallaght.

**REPORT:**

Housing mix and tenure is set out under Chapter 6 Housing of the Development Plan under Housing Policy 1, Objective 13 and Objective 14 and has been subject to an evidence-based approach through the interim HNDA and Housing Strategy.

The Land Development Agency, as with any development agency must have regard to the Development Plan in force which is consistent with National and Regional Planning Policy. To insert specific reference to one agency is not considered appropriate for the Development Plan, noting also that the LDA has not been involved in planning applications in Tallaght to date.

**RECOMMENDATION:**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.

The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **ACCEPTED** and **AGREED**

**DPM67/0621 Item ID:71124**

Proposed by Councillor M. Johansson, Seconded by Councillor C. King

That the section highlighted on the map (Sheet 2) at St Ronan's Crescent be zoned Open Space.

**REPORT:**

The CE Draft Plan identifies the subject lands as existing residential, RES, with an area to the south adjoining/fronting onto St. Ronan’s Avenue as Open Space. This zoning reflects the current 2016 County Development Plan.

The lands in question are subject to a Part 8 Proposal for the Development of a Social Housing Project for Independent Living for Older Persons, consisting of 9 units on undeveloped lands on Saint Ronan's Crescent, Dublin 22. The proposed development will consist of 5 no. 1 bedroom units and 4 no. 2 bedroom apartments. The closing date for submissions on this proposal is Friday the 2nd of July 2021.

It is considered that the proposal to re-zone these lands to OS from the currently proposed existing residential is inappropriate and should not be adopted.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.

[Link to Map](https://sdublincoco.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=71aa0778ae8f4fffba16debb2eb0132d&amp;HideLayers=Motionsjuly22&amp;query=Motionsjuly22_4365%2Cid%2C71124)

[St Ronans Crescent Dev Plan](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=70619)

A discussion ensued with contributions from Councillors M. Johansson, F. Timmons, P. Kavanagh, J. Tuffy, C. King, W. Carey, E. Murphy, C. Bailey, Mr M. Mulhern, Director and Ms H. Craigie, Senior Planner responded to queries raised.

A Roll Call vote on the Motion followed, the result of which was as follows:

**FOR: 24 (TWENTY-FOUR)**

**AGAINST 6 (SIX)**

**ABSTAIN 4 (FOUR)**

[Motion 67 Roll Call Vote.pdf](file:///C:\Users\mdunne\Downloads\Motion%2067%20Roll%20Call%20Vote.pdf)

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM68/0621 Item ID:71276**

Submitted by Councillor Alan Hayes, Councillor V. Casserly

Proposed by Councillor A. Hayes, Seconded by Councillor R. McMahon

That South Dublin County Council pursuant to Section 11(5)(c) of the Planning & Development Act 2000 (as amended) resolves to amend the Chief Executive's Draft Development Plan 2022-2028 as follows:- • Identify lands at Aderrig, as identified in red in the aerial view and map below, for an 'Objective RES-N' land use zoning 'To provide for new residential communities in accordance with approved area plans' on Map 1 of the Draft County Development Plan. • currently zoned agricultural [objective RU].

**REPORT:**

The Core Strategy and Settlement Strategy in Chapter 2 sets out population and housing figures which must be consistent with National and Regional Planning policy as required under the Planning and Development Act. South Dublin County is anticipated to grow by 46,518 persons with an identified need for over 17,817 households. Chapter 2 also confirms that the County has enough land to accommodate this need and additional for a further 10,470 units (79%) above the net household need. Therefore, to re-zone or zone new additional lands over and above those currently set out in the Draft Plan would be contrary to National and Regional planning policy.

The proposed lands located to the west of Adamstown SDZ comprise of existing agricultural fields and are zoned RU where it is an objective of the plan *To protect and improve rural amenity and to provide for the development of agriculture.* Based on general assumptions using the prevailing Ministerial Guidelines, the re-zoning of the subject lands has an approximate potential on simple density figures, not accounting for full planning assessment of the lands, for 2,500 household units (at average gross density of 50uph x 50Ha). This has the potential to increase the excess of zoned to 12,970 units or **98%** above the net household need set by National and Regional plan level. The current excess of zoned land, without the need for further zoning, is sufficient to meet SDCC’s household requirement for 2031 and potentially up to 2040.

In this context, the motion could undermine the delivery of households within strategic residential growth sites identified within the Regional Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan at: Adamstown, Clonburris, Tallaght, Naas Road and Fortunestown which is contrary to National and Regional Planning Policy.

There is no evidence-based justification for the zoning of these greenfield lands from Rural to Residential and to do so would be contrary to national and regional policy.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.

[Link to Map](https://sdublincoco.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=71aa0778ae8f4fffba16debb2eb0132d&amp;HideLayers=Motionsjuly22&amp;query=Motionsjuly22_4365%2Cid%2C71276)

[Draft Motion- Aderrig](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=70627)

A discussion ensued with contributions from Councillors A. Hayes, P. Gogarty, L. O’Toole, M. Johansson, E. Ó Broin, J. Tuffy, L. Donaghy, G. O’Connell, C. Bailey, C. King, D. Ó Brádaigh,

Councillor A. Hayes **AGREED** to **WITHDRAW** the Motion, Seconded by Councillor V. Casserly.

**DPM69/0621 Item ID:71349**

Submitted by Councillor G. O'Connell, Councillor L. O'Toole, Councillor P. Gogarty

That the section of Cherry Orchard Industrial estate in South Dublin County Ownership be zoned from EE to REGEN with an SLO inserted to develop the area as a 'Non-residential creative enterprise hub' so as to gradually revitalise the area and, over a period of time, vary the usage of buildings from a community and employment perspective.

Councillor P. Gogarty **AGREED** to **WITHDRAW** the Motion

**DPM70/0621 Item ID:70590**

Submitted by Councillor L. Dunne

Core Strategy CS Policy 7 To amend section CS7 Objective 2: Promote & support the regeneration of underutilized industrial areas designated with zoning objective REGEN (to facilitate enterprise, to add the following: that in addition addresses the needs of the low skilled workforce and/or that provides for social and affordable residential led regen subject to a development framework or plan for the area incorporating phasing and infrastructure delivery)

Councillor L. Dunne **AGREED** to **WITHDRAW** the Motion

**Natural, Cultural Built Heritage**

**DPM71/0621 Item ID:70911**

Submitted by Councillor L. Donaghy, Councillor Liam Sinclair, Councillor Peter Kavanagh, Councillor S. McEneaney

Proposed by Councillor L. Donaghy, Seconded by Councillor P. Kavanagh

Natural, Cultural and Built Heritage - Pg. 63 Motion: To amend NCBH 1 Objective 3 as follows: To pilot an assessment of the County's natural and built heritage assets including Council owned protected structures and archaeological features; to identify and safeguard these assets from the potential impacts of climate change; and to explore possible uses as part of climate change mitigation.

**REPORT:**

The motion seeks to amend the wording of NCBH 1 Objective 3:

From: ‘To pilot an assessment of the County's natural and built heritage assets including Council owned protected structures and archaeological features and to identify and safeguard these assets from the potential impacts of climate change’.

To: ‘To pilot an assessment of the County's natural and built heritage assets including Council owned protected structures and archaeological features; to identify and safeguard these assets from the potential impacts of climate change; **and to explore possible uses as part of climate change mitigation’.**

It is considered that the proposed additional wording is acceptable.

**Recommendation:**  It is recommended that this motion is adopted to amend NCBH 1 Objective 3 to read:

To pilot an assessment of the County's natural and built heritage assets including Council owned protected structures and archaeological features; to identify and safeguard these assets from the potential impacts of climate change; and to explore possible uses as part of climate change mitigation.

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM72/0621 Item ID:71085**

Proposed by Councillor Yvonne Collins, Seconded by Councillor E. O’Brien

**NCBH 2 Objective 4**: **“**To protect our rivers and in particular to avoid overdevelopment which could have an adverse effect on the biodiversity and ecosystems of the river”

**REPORT:**

 NCBH 2 Objective 4: “To protect our rivers and in particular to avoid overdevelopment which could have an adverse effect on the biodiversity and ecosystems of the river”

This motion is proposing a new objective to be inserted in NCBH 2 Objective 4 which reads:

“To protect our rivers and in particular to avoid overdevelopment which could have an adverse effect on the biodiversity and ecosystems of the river”.

 Riparian Corridors have been included in the draft Plan and have a proven role in controlling the movement and processing of waterborne pollutants. The removal of riparian vegetation through urbanisation disrupts land-water linkages leading to reductions in water quality, less stable thermal and flow regimes, and ultimately, reduces the ecosystem integrity. Therefore, it is important to protect rivers and prevent any adverse effects on their biodiversity and eco-systems.

 The existing Draft Plan acknowledges the need for careful and/or restricted development adjacent to watercourse through the provision of various policy and objectives. It is considered that the motion will further clarify the need to protect rivers and their associated ecosystems.

**Recommendation:**  It is recommended that this motion is adopted. The new objective is:

**NCBH 2 Objective 4 -** “*To protect our rivers and in particular to avoid overdevelopment which could have an adverse effect on the biodiversity and ecosystems of the river”.*

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM73/0621 Item ID:70995**

Proposed by Councillor R. McMahon, Seconded by Councillor E. O’Brien

Section 3.3.3 Objective NCBH 3 Objective 2 1st sentence, to add in the word "adverse" to read..... will not have a significant adverse effect on a European Site.....

**REPORT:**

 This motion proposes to insert a word into the existing NCBH 3 Objective 2, from:

“To ensure that plans, including land use plans, will only be adopted, if they either individually or in combination with existing and/or proposed plans or projects, will not have a significant effect on a European Site, or where such a plan is likely or might have such a significant effect (either alone or in combination), South Dublin County Council will, as required by law, carry out an appropriate assessment as per requirements of Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC of the 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, as transposed into Irish legislation. Only after having ascertained that the plan will not adversely affect the integrity of any European site, will South Dublin County Council adopt the plan, incorporating any necessary mitigation measures. A plan which could adversely affect the integrity of a European site may only be adopted in exceptional circumstances, as provided for in Article 6(4) of the Habitats Directive as transposed into Irish legislation”.

To:

To ensure that plans, including land use plans, will only be adopted, if they either individually or in combination with existing and/or proposed plans or projects, will not have a significant adverse effect on a European Site, or where such a plan is likely or might have such a significant effect (either alone or in combination), South Dublin County Council will, as required by law, carry out an appropriate assessment as per requirements of Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC of the 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, as transposed into Irish legislation. Only after having ascertained that the plan will not adversely affect the integrity of any European site, will South Dublin County Council adopt the plan, incorporating any necessary mitigation measures. A plan which could adversely affect the integrity of a European site may only be adopted in exceptional circumstances, as provided for in Article 6(4) of the Habitats Directive as transposed into Irish legislation.

This amendment is considered acceptable.

**Recommendation:** It is recommended to adopt this motion so that NCBH 3 Objective 2 reads:

To ensure that plans, including land use plans, will only be adopted, if they either individually or in combination with existing and/or proposed plans or projects, will not have a significant adverse effect on a European Site, or where such a plan is likely or might have such a significant effect (either alone or in combination), South Dublin County Council will, as required by law, carry out an appropriate assessment as per requirements of Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC of the 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, as transposed into Irish legislation. Only after having ascertained that the plan will not adversely affect the integrity of any European site, will South Dublin County Council adopt the plan, incorporating any necessary mitigation measures. A plan which could adversely affect the integrity of a European site may only be adopted in exceptional circumstances, as provided for in Article 6(4) of the Habitats Directive as transposed into Irish legislation.

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM74/0621 Item ID:70996**

Proposed by Councillor R. McMahon Seconded by Councillor E. O’Brien,

Section 3.3.3 Objective NCBH 3 Objective 3 1st sentence, to add in the words "adverse" (2 places) and "Site" to read... will not have a significant adverse effect on a European Site, or where such development proposal is likely or might have such a significant adverse effect.

**REPORT:**

This motion proposes to insert a word into the existing NCBH 3 Objective 3, from:

“To ensure that planning permission will only be granted for a development proposal that, either individually or  in  combination  with  existing  and/or  proposed  plans  or  projects,  will  not  have  a  significant effect  on  a  European, or where such a development proposal is likely or might have such a significant effect (either alone or in combination), the planning authority will, as required by law, carry out an appropriate assessment as per requirements  of  Article  6(3)  of  the  Habitats  Directive  92/43/EEC  of  the  21  May  1992  on  the  conservation  of  natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, as transposed into Irish legislation. Only after having ascertained that the development proposal will not adversely affect the integrity of any European site,  will  the  planning  authority  agree  to  the  development  and  impose  appropriate  mitigation  measures  in  the  form  of  planning  conditions. A development proposal which could adversely affect the integrity of a European site may only be permitted in exceptional circumstances, as provided for in Article 6(4) of the Habitats Directive as transposed into Irish legislation”.

To:

To ensure that planning permission will only be granted for a development proposal that, either individually or  in  combination  with  existing  and/or  proposed  plans  or  projects,  will  not  have  a  significant adverse effect  on  a  European Site, or where such a development proposal is likely or might have such a significant adverse effect (either alone or in combination), the planning authority will, as required by law, carry out an appropriate assessment as per requirements  of  Article  6(3)  of  the  Habitats  Directive  92/43/EEC  of  the  21  May  1992  on  the  conservation  of  natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, as transposed into Irish legislation. Only after having ascertained that the development proposal will not adversely affect the integrity of any European site, will the planning authority agree to the development and impose appropriate mitigation  measures  in  the  form  of  planning  conditions. A development proposal which could adversely affect the integrity of a European site may only be permitted in exceptional circumstances, as provided for in Article 6(4) of the Habitats Directive as transposed into Irish legislation”.

This amendment is considered acceptable.

**Recommendation:** It is recommended to adopt this motion to amend Objective NCBH 3 Objective 3 to read:

To ensure that planning permission will only be granted for a development proposal that, either individually or  in  combination  with  existing  and/or  proposed  plans  or  projects,  will  not  have  a  significant adverse effect  on  a  European Site, or where such a development proposal is likely or might have such a significant adverse effect (either alone or in combination), the planning authority will, as required by law, carry out an appropriate assessment as per requirements  of  Article  6(3)  of  the  Habitats  Directive  92/43/EEC  of  the  21  May  1992  on  the  conservation  of  natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, as transposed into Irish legislation. Only after having ascertained that the development proposal will not adversely affect the integrity of any European site, will  the  planning  authority  agree  to  the  development  and  impose  appropriate  mitigation  measures  in  the  form  of  planning  conditions. A development proposal which could adversely affect the integrity of a European site may only be permitted in exceptional circumstances, as provided for in Article 6(4) of the Habitats Directive as transposed into Irish legislation”.

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM75/0621 Item ID:71118**

Submitted by Councillor E. O'Brien, Councillor Shane Moynihan

Proposed by Councillor S. Moynihan, Seconded by Councillor E. O’Brien

That this Council investigates the feasibility of extending the current Liffey Valley Special Amenity Order Area with particular regard to incorporating the lands known as the Demesne in the Special Amenity Order Area

**REPORT:**

 Policy NCBH 7 Objective 3 seeks:

‘To improve and extend the Liffey Valley Special Amenity Area Order and promote its tourism potential subject to the protection of its biodiversity and ecological value’.

The motion is considered reasonable, subject to the addition of the wording ‘within the Liffey Valley area’ for clarification purposes.  Therefore, existing NCBH 7 Objective 3 should be amended to incorporate the intent of the motion along with the foregoing amendment, such that it reads as follows:

‘To improve and extend the Liffey Valley Special Amenity Area Order with particular regard to investigating the feasibility of incorporating the lands known as the Demesne; and to promote its tourism potential subject to the protection of its biodiversity and ecological value’.

**Recommendation:**  It is recommended that the motion is adopted with amendments.  Existing Policy NCBH 7 Objective 3 in the CE Draft Plan should be amended to incorporate the intent of the motion along with an amendment, such that it reads as follows:

*‘To improve and extend the Liffey Valley Special Amenity Area Order****, with particular regard to investigating the feasibility of incorporating the lands known as the Demesne;*** *and* ***to*** *promote its tourism potential subject to the protection of its biodiversity and ecological value’.*

[Link to Map](https://sdublincoco.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=71aa0778ae8f4fffba16debb2eb0132d&amp;HideLayers=Motionsjuly22&amp;query=Motionsjuly22_4365%2Cid%2C71118)

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM76/0621 Item ID:71195**

Submitted by Councillor G. O'Connell, Councillor L. O'Toole, Councillor P. Gogarty

Proposed by Councillor G. O’Connell, Seconded by Councillor P. Gogarty

It shall be an objective of the County Development Plan 2022 - 2028 , recommended in the Liffey Valley SAAO, to bring the lands within the SAAO into public ownership either through land swop, purchase or some other means.

**REPORT:**

Motions Item ID 70838 and 71106 seek to amend Policy NCBH Objective 6 to delete the word ‘consider’ and replace it with ‘actively pursue’ such that the objective reads:

*‘Consider* ***Actively pursue*** *the extension of public owned lands, either by direct purchase or land swap within and adjacent to the Liffey Valley Special Amenity Area to create a linked series of park land and open spaces’* and the recommendations are for the motions to be adopted.

The intent of this motion is similar and it is considered that it is dealt with by the amendment proposed to NCBH Objective 6.

**The motion is considered acceptable.**

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that the motion is adopted.

**NCBH Objective 6 : *Actively pursue the extension of publicly owned lands, either by direct purchase or land swap within and adjacent to the Liffey Valley Special Amenity Area to create a linked series of park land and open spaces’.***

[Link to Map](https://sdublincoco.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=71aa0778ae8f4fffba16debb2eb0132d&amp;HideLayers=Motionsjuly22&amp;query=Motionsjuly22_4365%2Cid%2C71195)

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM77/0621 Item ID:71106**

Proposed by Councillor Alan Hayes, Seconded by Councillor E. O’Brien

Chapter 3. P 72. Amend NCBH 7 Objective 6: Consider the extension of public owned lands, either by direct purchase or land swap within and adjacent to the Liffey Valley Special Amenity Area to create a linked series of park land and open spaces. Amend to replace the first word from consider to actively pursue: Actively pursue the extension of public owned lands, either by direct purchase or land swap within and adjacent to the Liffey Valley Special Amenity Area to create a linked series of park land and open spaces.

**REPORT:**

The motion seeks to amend Policy NCBH Objective 6 to delete the word ‘consider’ and replace it with ‘actively pursue’ such that the objective reads:

*‘Consider* ***Actively pursue*** *the extension of publicly owned lands, either by direct purchase or land swap within and adjacent to the Liffey Valley Special Amenity Area to create a linked series of park land and open spaces’.*

It is noted that Motion Item ID 70838 is seeking the same amendment.

**The motion is considered acceptable.**

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that the motion is adopted.

Amend Policy NCBH Objective 6 to read:

**‘*Actively pursue the extension of public owned lands, either by direct purchase or land swap within and adjacent to the Liffey Valley Special Amenity Area to create a linked series of park land and open spaces’.***

[Link to Map](https://sdublincoco.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=71aa0778ae8f4fffba16debb2eb0132d&amp;HideLayers=Motionsjuly22&amp;query=Motionsjuly22_4365%2Cid%2C71106)

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM78/0621 Item ID:70838**

Submitted by Councillor G. O'Connell, Councillor L. O'Toole, Councillor P. Gogarty

Proposed by Councillor L. O’Toole, Seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell

Amend NCBH 7 Objective 6 to read: To actively pursue the extension of public owned lands, either by direct purchase or land swap within and adjacent to the Liffey Valley Special Amenity Area to create a linked series of park land and open spaces.

**REPORT:**

The motion seeks to amend Policy NCBH Objective 6 to delete the word ‘consider’ and replace it with ‘actively pursue’ such that the objective reads:

*‘Consider* ***Actively pursue*** *the extension of public owned lands, either by direct purchase or land swap within and adjacent to the Liffey Valley Special Amenity Area to create a linked series of park land and open spaces’.*

It is noted that Motion Item ID 71106 is seeking the same amendment.

**The motion is considered acceptable.**

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that the motion is adopted.

Amend Policy NCBH Objective 6 to read:

 ‘*Actively pursue the extension of publicly owned lands, either by direct purchase or land swap within and adjacent to the Liffey Valley Special Amenity Area to create a linked series of park land and open spaces’.*

[Link to Map](https://sdublincoco.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=71aa0778ae8f4fffba16debb2eb0132d&amp;HideLayers=Motionsjuly22&amp;query=Motionsjuly22_4365%2Cid%2C70838)

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM79/0621 Item ID:71548**

Submitted by Councillor E. O'Brien, Councillor Shane Moynihan

Proposed by Councillor S. Moynihan, Seconded by Councillor E. O’Brien

That this Council reaffirms its commitment to the protection of the Liffey Valley and directs the Chief Executive where possible to designate lands within the area as publicly owned parkland and to make efforts to acquire lands which could be incorporated into such parkland.

**REPORT:**

Motions Item ID 70838 and 71106 seek to amend Policy NCBH Objective 6 to delete the word ‘consider’ and replace it with ‘actively pursue’ such that the objective reads:

*‘Consider* ***Actively pursue*** *the extension of public owned lands, either by direct purchase or land swap within and adjacent to the Liffey Valley Special Amenity Area to create a linked series of park land and open spaces’* and the recommendations are for the motions to be adopted.

The intent of this motion is similar and it is considered that can be dealt with by the amendment proposed to NCBH Objective 6.

**The motion is considered acceptable.**

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that the motion is adopted as follows:

**Policy NCBH Objective 6: *Actively pursue the extension of public owned lands, either by direct purchase or land swap within and adjacent to the Liffey Valley Special Amenity Area to create a linked series of park land and open spaces’* and the recommendations are for the motions to be adopted**

[Link to Map](https://sdublincoco.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=71aa0778ae8f4fffba16debb2eb0132d&amp;HideLayers=Motionsjuly22&amp;query=Motionsjuly22_4365%2Cid%2C71548)

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM80/0621 Item ID:71658**

Submitted by Councillor G. O'Connell, Councillor L. O'Toole, Councillor P. Gogarty

Proposed by Councillor L. O’Toole, Seconded by Councillor P. Gogarty

That South Dublin County Council will take the lead role and involve Dublin City Council, Fingal and Kildare County Councils and the Office of Public Works in developing A Liffey Valley Park during the lifetime of this Development Plan, along the lines of the Lagan Valley in Belfast (i.e. incorporating both public and privately owned land) as envisaged in the 2006 ERM Report “Towards A Liffey Valley Park”.

**REPORT:**

There is an existing objective NCBH 7 Objective 4 which facilitates this motion.

The existing objective reads:

“To facilitate and support the development of the Liffey Valley (Zoning Objective ‘HA – LV’) as an interconnected green space and park in collaboration with Dublin City Council, Fingal County Council, Kildare County Council, the OPW, existing landowners and community groups to include the identification and designation of possible future new pedestrian routes and footbridge locations in accordance with Towards a Liffey Valley Park (2007) or any superseding plan.  Universal accessibility for all should be balanced with ensuring that environmental and built heritage sensitivities are not negatively impacted upon”.

It is noted that motion 70661 also relates.

**RECOMMENDATION:** It is recommended that this motion is adopted to read:

NCBH 7 Objective 4 (as may be amended by motion id 70731).

“To facilitate and support the development of the Liffey Valley (Zoning Objective ‘HA – LV’) as an interconnected green space and park in collaboration with Dublin City Council, Fingal County Council, Kildare County Council, the OPW, existing landowners and community groups to include the identification and designation of possible future new pedestrian routes and footbridge locations in accordance with Towards a Liffey Valley Park (2007) or any superseding plan.  Universal accessibility for all should be balanced with ensuring that environmental and built heritage sensitivities are not negatively impacted upon”.

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM81/0621 Item ID:70731**

Proposed by Councillor M. Johansson, Seconded by Councillor E. O’Brien

To amend NCBH Objective 3 to read: To facilitate and support the development of the Liffey Valley (Zoning Objective 'HA-LV') as an interconnected green space and park in collaboration with Dublin City Council, Fingal County Council a, Kildare County Council, the OPW, existing landowners and community groups to include the identification and designation of possible future new pedestrian routes and footbridge locations, including the Silver Bridge/Farmleigh Bridge, in accordance with Towards a Liffey Valley Park (2007) or any superseding plan. Universal accessibility for all should be balanced with ensuring that environmental and built heritage sensitivities are not negatively impacted upon.

**REPORT:**

It is noted that this motion has referenced the wrong objective number. The correct reference is NCBH 7 Objective 4.

The existing objective reads:

“To facilitate and support the development of the Liffey Valley (Zoning Objective ‘HA – LV’) as an interconnected green space and park in collaboration with Dublin City Council, Fingal County Council, Kildare County Council, the OPW, existing landowners and community groups to include the identification and designation of possible future new pedestrian routes and footbridge locations in accordance with Towards a Liffey Valley Park (2007) or any superseding plan. Universal accessibility for all should be balanced with ensuring that environmental and built heritage sensitivities are not negatively impacted upon”.

The proposed amendment is as follows:

“To facilitate and support the development of the Liffey Valley (Zoning Objective 'HA-LV') as an interconnected green space and park in collaboration with Dublin City Council, Fingal County Council , Kildare County Council, the OPW, existing landowners and community groups to include the identification and designation of possible future new pedestrian routes and footbridge locations, including the Silver Bridge/Farmleigh Bridge, in accordance with Towards a Liffey Valley Park (2007) or any superseding plan. Universal accessibility for all should be balanced with ensuring that environmental and built heritage sensitivities are not negatively impacted upon”.

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that this motion is adopted.

[Link to Map](https://sdublincoco.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=71aa0778ae8f4fffba16debb2eb0132d&amp;HideLayers=Motionsjuly22&amp;query=Motionsjuly22_4365%2Cid%2C70731)

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM82/0621 Item ID:70743**

Proposed by Councillor Eoin Ó Broin Seconded by Councillor E. O’Brien ,

Add 'Paddle Boarding' after 'Rowing' in NCBH 9 Objective 2 (Page 75).

**REPORT:**

 This motion seeks to insert additional wording into NCBH 9 Objective 2.

The motion proposes to change the wording from:

“To facilitate the appropriate development of the Grand Canal as a recreational route for walking, cycling, nature study and water-based activities including fishing, canal boating, rowing and canoeing/kayaking, subject to environmental safeguards and assessments”.

To: To facilitate the appropriate development of the Grand Canal as a recreational route for walking, cycling, nature study and water-based activities including fishing, canal boating, rowing, paddle boarding and canoeing/kayaking, subject to environmental safeguards and assessments”.

The spirit of the objective is broad ranging to encompass paddle boarding as a recreational amenity on the Grand Canal, however in this instance the motion is agreed.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that this motion is adopted as follows:

NCBH 9 Objective 2: To facilitate the appropriate development of the Grand Canal as a recreational route for walking, cycling, nature study and water-based activities including fishing, canal boating, rowing, paddle boarding and canoeing/kayaking, subject to environmental safeguards and assessments

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM83/0621 Item ID:71541**

Submitted by Councillor G. O'Connell, Councillor L. O'Toole, Councillor P. Gogarty

Proposed by Councillor P. Gogarty, Seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell

Insert: To review the number of Tree Preservation Orders within the County and maintain the conservation value of trees and groups of trees that are the subject of any Tree Preservation Order.

**REPORT:**

It is considered that Policy NCBH 11 and Objective NCBH 11 Objective 1 already contain the contents of this motion.

Policy NCBH 11 – *Review Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) within the County and maintain the conservation value of trees and groups of trees that are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order while also recognising the value of and protecting trees and hedgerows which are not subject to a TPO*

*And*

 NCBH 11 Objective 1 – *To review Tree Preservation Orders within the County and maintain the conservation value of trees and groups of trees that are the subject of any Tree Preservation Order*.

 It is considered that the intent of this motion is fully reflected in the existing policy and objectives in the Plan

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that this motion is adopted

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM84/0621 Item ID:71059**

Proposed by Councillor Yvonne Collins, Seconded by Councillor E. O’Brien

**NCBH 11 Objective 2**: **“**To regularly evaluate and identify trees of amenity value within the County with a view to making them the subject of TPOs or otherwise protecting them and further, to furnish information to the public in this regard.

**REPORT:**

**NCBH Objective 2 currently reads:**

**“To identify trees of amenity value within the County and use whatever mechanism is available for their protection.”**

**The motion proposes to amend this to read:**

**“**To **regularly evaluate and** identify trees of amenity value within the County **with a view to making them the subject of TPOs or otherwise protecting them and further, to furnish information to the public in this regard.**

Having regard to NCBH 11 Objective 1 ‘To review Tree Preservation Orders within the County and maintain the conservation value of trees or groups of trees that are the subject of any Tree Preservation Order’ it is recognised that the intention to review trees of amenity value is already an objective.  Therefore, the amendments to NCBH 11 Objective 2 are considered reasonable and continue to provide for the original intent of the objective.

**Recommendation:** **It is recommended that the motion is adopted and that the amended NCBH 11 Objective 2 will read:**

**“**To regularly evaluate and identify trees of amenity value within the County with a view to making them the subject of TPOs or otherwise protecting them and further, to furnish information to the public in this regard

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM85/0621 Item ID:70879**

Submitted by Councillor G. O'Connell, Councillor L. O'Toole, Councillor P. Gogarty

Proposed by Councillor P. Gogarty, Seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell

Amend NCBH 11 Objective 3 to read: To protect existing trees, hedgerows, and woodlands which are of amenity and/or biodiversity and/or carbon sequestration value and/or contribute to landscape character and ensure that proper provision is made for their protection and management taking into account Living with Trees: South Dublin County Council's Tree Management Policy (2015-2020) or any superseding document.

**REPORT:**

The existing NCBH 11 Objective 3 reads -

“To protect existing trees, hedgerows, and woodlands which are of amenity or biodiversity value and/or contribute to landscape character and ensure that proper provision is made for their protection and management taking into account Living with Trees: *South Dublin County Council's Tree Management Policy* (2015-2020) or any superseding document”.

The proposed amendment is as follows:

**“To protect existing trees, hedgerows, and woodlands which are of amenity and/or biodiversity and/or carbon sequestration value and/or contribute to landscape character and ensure that proper provision is made for their protection and management taking into account Living with Trees: South Dublin County Council's Tree Management Policy (2015-2020) or any superseding document.**

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that this motion is adopted.

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM86/0621 Item ID:71039**

Submitted by Councillor Alan Edge, Councillor M. Duff, Councillor P. Kearns

Proposed by Councillor M. Duff, Seconded by Councillor A. Edge

NCBH13 Objective 2. Delete 'that is of significant interest'.

**REPORT:**

The current objective NCBH 13 Objective 2 reads:

‘To ensure that development is designed to avoid impacting on archaeological heritage that is of significant interest including previously unknown sites, features and objects’.

The motion amends the wording to the following:

‘To ensure that development is designed to avoid impacting on archaeological heritage including previously unknown sites, features and objects’.

**This change in wording is considered acceptable.**

**Recommendation:**It is recommended that this motion is adopted.

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM87/0621 Item ID:71042**

Submitted by Councillor Alan Edge, Councillor M. Duff, Councillor P. Kearns

Proposed by Councillor P. Kearns, Seconded by Councillor M. Duff

NCBH 6: Objective 6 delete the words 'as appropriate' and add the phrase 'and support alternative methods of stock control on the commonage.' to read: 'To enhance and protect our rural traditions by preserving traditional common grazing grounds in Bohernabreena and to encourage the grazing of such areas by local farmers and support alternative methods of stock control on the commonage'.

**REPORT:**

The current objective reads:

'To enhance and protect our rural traditions by preserving traditional common grazing grounds in Bohernabreena, as appropriate, and to encourage the grazing of such areas by local farmers’.

The motion amends the wording to the following:

'To enhance and protect our rural traditions by preserving traditional common grazing grounds in Bohernabreena, as appropriate, and to encourage the grazing of such areas by local farmers and support alternative methods of stock control on the commonage.

This change in wording is considered acceptable

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that this motion is adopted so that NCBH 6 Objective 6 reads:

*'To enhance and protect our rural traditions by preserving traditional common grazing grounds in Bohernabreena and to encourage the grazing of such areas by local farmers and support alternative methods of stock control on the commonage’.*

It was **AGREED** to take Motion 88 (ID 70835) in conjunction with Motion 87 (ID 71042)

**DPM88/0621 Item ID:70835**

Submitted by Councillor G. O'Connell, Councillor L. O'Toole, Councillor P. Gogarty

Proposed by Councillor P. Gogarty and Seconded by Councillor G. O’ Connell

Add at end of NCBH 6 Objective 6: To enhance and protect our rural traditions by preserving traditional common grazing grounds in Bohernabreena, as appropriate, and to encourage the grazing of such areas by local farmers, in an environmentally sustainable way.

**REPORT:**

It is proposed to amend the current objective from:

'To enhance and protect our rural traditions by preserving traditional common grazing grounds in Bohernabreena, as appropriate, and to encourage the grazing of such areas by local farmers’.

To the following:

'To enhance and protect our rural traditions by preserving traditional common grazing grounds in Bohernabreena, as appropriate, and to encourage the grazing of such areas by local farmers, **in an environmentally sustainable way’.**

This change in wording is considered acceptable. The new wording should be combined with the proposed wording associated with motion 71042 to create new wording for NCBH 6 Objective 6.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that this motion is adopted so that NCBH 6 Objective 6 reads:

***'* *To enhance and protect our rural traditions by preserving traditional common grazing grounds in Bohernabreena, and to encourage the grazing of such areas by local farmers, in an environmentally sustainable way and support alternative methods of stock control on the commonage’.***

An amendment to the Motions was proposed by Councillor R. McMahon and Seconded by Councillor C. Bailey as follows:

**To insert the words “and the Glenasmole Valley” after Bohernabreena…**

NCBH 6: Objective 6 delete the words 'as appropriate' and add the phrase 'and support alternative methods of stock control on the commonage.' to read: 'To enhance and protect our rural traditions by preserving traditional common grazing grounds in Bohernabreena **and Glenasmole Valley** and to encourage the grazing of such areas by local farmers and support alternative methods of stock control on the commonage'.

Ms. H. Craigie, Senior Planner confirmed this was acceptable.

The Motions **AS AMENDED** were **AGREED**

**DPM89/0621 Item ID:70906**

Submitted by Councillor L. Donaghy, Councillor Liam Sinclair, Councillor Peter Kavanagh, Councillor S. McEneaney

Proposed by Councillor L. Sinclair, Seconded by Councillor P. Kavanagh

Natural, Cultural and Built Heritage Motion: To Amend NCBH 17 as follows: NCBH 17 Objective 1: To promote the use and visibility of the Irish Language.

**REPORT:**

NCBH 17 Objective 1 states *‘To promote the use of the Irish Language’.* The motion seeks to add the wording *‘and visibility’* so that the objective reads: *‘To promote the use* ***and visibility*** *of the Irish Language’.*

**The motion is considered reasonable.**

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that the motion is adopted

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM90/0621 Item ID:71627**

Submitted by Councillor L. Donaghy, Councillor Liam Sinclair, Councillor Peter Kavanagh, Councillor S. McEneaney

Proposed by Councillor P. Kavanagh, Seconded by Councillor S. McEneaney

To Amend NCBH 17 Objective 2: To support the preparation and implementation of an Irish Language Plan for Líonra Gaeilge Chluain Dólcáin / Clondalkin Irish Language Network Area, consistent with RPO 9.28 of the RSES.

**REPORT:**

The motion seeks to amend NCBH 17 Objective 2 to add the wording ‘Líonra Gaeilge Chluain Dólcáin /’ so that the objective reads *‘To support the preparation and implementation of an Irish Language Plan for* ***Líonra Gaeilge Chluain Dólcáin /*** *Clondalkin Irish Language Network Area, consistent with RPO 9.28 of the RSES’.*

*Líonra Gaeilge Chluain Dólcáin* is the Irish translation for *Clondalkin Irish Language Network Area,* and as such, its addition to the motion does not change the intent. The motion is therefore acceptable

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that the motion is adopted.

Amend NCBH 17 Objective 2 to read *‘To support the preparation and implementation of an Irish Language Plan for* ***Líonra Gaeilge Chluain Dólcáin /*** *Clondalkin Irish Language Network Area, consistent with RPO 9.28 of the RSES’.*

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM91/0621 Item ID:71628**

Submitted by Councillor L. Donaghy, Councillor Liam Sinclair, Councillor Peter Kavanagh, Councillor S. McEneaney

Proposed by Councillor P. Kavanagh, Seconded by Councillor L. Sinclair

To Amend NCBH 17 Objective 4: To promote local heritage by supporting names for new residential developments that reflect the local and historical context of their siting and include the Irish Language.

**REPORT:**

The motion seeks to amend NCBH 17 Objective 4 by adding the wording *‘and include the Irish Language’* so that the objective reads as follows: *‘To promote local heritage by supporting names for new residential developments that reflect the local and historical context of their siting* ***and include the Irish Language’****.*

It is noted that NCBH Objective 3 in the CE Draft Plan states *‘To continue to promote use of the Irish language in the naming of new residential developments.’*

In the context of the overall policy NCBH regarding the Irish language and already existing policy for naming the motion is acceptable.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that the motion is adopted

**Amend NCBH 17 Objective 4 to read as follows: *‘To promote local heritage by supporting names for new residential developments that reflect the local and historical context of their siting and include the Irish Language’.***

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM92/0621 Item ID:70926**

Submitted by Councillor L. Donaghy, Councillor Liam Sinclair, Councillor Peter Kavanagh, Councillor S. McEneaney

Proposed by Councillor L. Donaghy, Seconded by Councillor P. Kavanagh

Natural, Cultural and Built Heritage - pg. 88 Motion: To amend NCBH 16 Objective 2 as follows: To conduct a field survey of sites of industrial heritage within the County to identify structures, features and their related artefacts and plant, and to actively seek the addition of industrial heritage structures or complexes, or elements of significance, to the Record of Protected Structures.

**REPORT:**

This motion proposes to amend NCBH 16 Objective 2 from:

“To conduct a field survey of sites of industrial heritage within the County to identify structures, features and their related artefacts and plant, and to consider adding industrial heritage structures or complexes, or elements of significance, to the Record of Protected Structures”.

To:

“To conduct a field survey of sites of industrial heritage within the County to identify structures, features and their related artefacts and plant, and to *actively seek the addition of* industrial heritage structures or complexes, or elements of significance, to the Record of Protected Structures”.

An Industrial Survey has been carried out via the South Dublin County Heritage Plan. Any items of industrial features/buildings of significance identified at that time were identified and listed on the Record of Protected Structures. Any new items of industrial heritage discovered would have to be assessed, justified, and merited to be included on the Record of Protected Structures.

The additional wording of this proposed motion is considered acceptable.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that this motion is adopted.

New wording of NCBH 16 Objective 2 is:

“To conduct a field survey of sites of industrial heritage within the County to identify structures, features and their related artefacts and plant, and to actively seek the addition of industrial heritage structures or complexes, or elements of significance, to the Record of Protected Structures

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM93/0621 Item ID:70928**

Submitted by Councillor L. Donaghy, Councillor Liam Sinclair, Councillor Peter Kavanagh, Councillor S. McEneaney

Proposed by Councillor L. Sinclair, Seconded by Councillor P. Kavanagh

Natural, Cultural and Built Heritage - pg. 100 Motion: To amend NCBH 26 Objective 2 as follows: To protect, preserve, maintain and promote industrial heritage features including weirs, millraces, and mills along the River Dodder and River Liffey.

**REPORT:**

This motion proposes to amend NCBH 26 Objective 2 from:

“To protect, preserve and maintain industrial heritage features including weirs, millraces, and mills along the River Dodder and River Liffey”.

To:

“To protect, preserve, maintain *and promote* industrial heritage features including weirs, millraces, and mills along the River Dodder and River Liffey”.

The additional wording of this proposed motion is considered acceptable.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that this motion is adopted.

New wording of NCBH 26 Objective 2 is:

“*To* *protect, preserve, maintain and promote industrial heritage features including weirs, millraces, and mills along the River Dodder and River Liffey”.*

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM94/0621 Item ID:70927**

Submitted by Councillor L. Donaghy, Councillor Liam Sinclair, Councillor Peter Kavanagh, Councillor S. McEneaney

Proposed by Councillor L. Donaghy, Seconded by P. Kavanagh

Natural, Cultural and Built Heritage - pg. 90 Motion: To amend NCBH 18 Objective 1 as follows: To establish an environment for promoting cross cultural awareness, racial harmony, mutual understanding and appreciation of all religious and ethnic traditions within the County, including development of public spaces with cross-cultural appeal and relevance.

**REPORT:**

This motion proposes to amend NCBH 18 Objective 1 of the Draft Plan from:

“To work towards establishing an environment for promoting cross cultural awareness, racial harmony, mutual understanding and appreciation of all religious and ethnic traditions within the County.

To:

“To *establish* an environment for promoting cross cultural awareness, racial harmony, mutual understanding and appreciation of all religious and ethnic traditions within the County, *including development of public spaces with cross-cultural appeal and relevance”.*

The establishment of an environment for promoting cross cultural awareness and racial harmony can be achieved through the promotion of quality urban design policies and objectives to achieve spaces and places to facilitate social and cultural diversity and interaction. There are a number of existing policies and objectives in the Draft Plan to support this, such as:

QDP 4 Objective 2 “Promote a high standard of building and urban design, creating public spaces that are distinctive, safe accessible and facilitate social and cultural diversity and interaction”.

COS Policy 1: “Promote social inclusion and community development and encourage active participation and social integration of minority and marginalised groups, consistent with RPO 9.1 and RPO 9.2 of the RSES”.

COS 1 Objective1: “To provide appropriate and accessible community facilities to meet the needs of all citizens of the County, including an ageing population, consistent with NPOs28 and 30 of the NPF”.

COS 1 Objective 3: “To support and facilitate the implementation of local plans and programmes (and any superseding documents) with a social inclusion and community development focus including:

−Social Inclusion and Community Activation Programme (2018-2022)

−South Dublin County Council Integration Strategy (2019-2023) – A More   Inclusive County

− The South Dublin County Traveller Accommodation Programme (2019-2024)

−South Dublin Disability Accommodation Strategy

−South Dublin Age Friendly Strategy (2020- 2024)

−A Strategy for a Healthy South Dublin (2019-2022)”.

However, the proposed amendment is considered acceptable

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that this motion is adopted to amend NCBH 18 Objective 1 to read:

“To establish an environment for promoting cross cultural awareness, racial harmony, mutual understanding and appreciation of all religious and ethnic traditions within the County, including development of public spaces with cross-cultural appeal and relevance”.

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM95/0621 Item ID:70746**

Proposed by Councillor Eoin Ó Broin, Seconded by Councillor E. O’Brien

Insert, 'River Camac' after 'River Dodder', in NCBH 26 Objective 2. (Page 100)

**REPORT:**

To

“To protect, preserve and maintain industrial heritage features including weirs, millraces and mills along the River Dodder, *River Camac* and River Liffey”.

Having regard to the South Dublin County Council Industrial Heritage Survey, the inclusion of the River Camac in this objective is considered agreeable.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that this motion is adopted.

NCBH 26 Objective 2 - “To protect, preserve and maintain industrial heritage features including weirs, millraces and mills along the River Dodder, River Camac and River Liffey

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM96/0621 Item ID:70640**

Proposed by Councillor Alan Hayes, Seconded by Councillor E. O’Brien

Chapter 3: (P88) Section 3.4.5 Industrial Heritage First paragraph, insert "Mill Race" amongst mills, weirs, bridges.

**REPORT:**

The existing section 3.4.5 Industrial Heritage reads:

“South Dublin County is particularly rich in industrial heritage, much of which dates from the 18th and 19th centuries.  A desktop survey of the industrial heritage of the County was carried out in 2012.  The industrial heritage inventory that resulted includes bridges, infrastructure relating to water and sewage, waterways including the Grand Canal, weirs, bridges, mills, and railways”.

The proposed amendment is as follows:

South Dublin County is particularly rich in industrial heritage, much of which dates from the 18th and 19th centuries.  A desktop survey of the industrial heritage of the County was carried out in 2012.  The industrial heritage inventory that resulted includes bridges, infrastructure relating to water and sewage, waterways including the Grand Canal, weirs, bridges, ***mill races****,* mills, and railways.

This motion is considered acceptable.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that this motion is adopted.

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM97/0621 Item ID:71069**

Proposed by Councillor Yvonne Collins, Seconded by Councillor E. O’Brien

**NCBH 26 SLO1**: To carry out sympathetic improvements to the area around and including the Mill Race Bridge in Rathfarnham.

**REPORT:**

This area around the Mill Race Bridge at Rathfarnham is currently managed by SDCC, however the area has not been taken in charge by the Council and therefore is not within its ownership.

The intent of the motion is acknowledged, and it is considered that this motion for the inclusion of an SLO is deemed acceptable.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that this motion is adopted. It is recommended to include a new SLO in NCBH 26 SLO 1 – ‘*To carry out sympathetic improvements to the area around and including the Mill Race Bridge in Rathfarnham’.*

[Link to Map](https://sdublincoco.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=71aa0778ae8f4fffba16debb2eb0132d&amp;HideLayers=Motionsjuly22&amp;query=Motionsjuly22_4365%2Cid%2C71069)

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM98/0621 Item ID:71043**

Submitted by Councillor Alan Edge, Councillor M. Duff, Councillor P. Kearns

Proposed by Councillor A. Edge, Seconded by Councillor M. Duff

NCBH15 Objective 2 - delete the word 'considerably'.

**REPORT:**

The current objective NCBH15 Objective 2 reads:

‘To require a Landscape/Visual Assessment to accompany all planning applications for significant proposals that are likely to considerably affect views and prospects’.

The motion proposes to amend the wording to the following:

‘To require a Landscape/Visual Assessment to accompany all planning applications for significant proposals that are likely to considerably affect views and prospects’.

**All planning applications will affect views and prospects in one way or another due to the introduction of a new structure within the setting/context of an area. However, this objective specifies planning applications of significant proposals. In this context, the change in wording is considered acceptable**

**Recommendation:**It is recommended that this motion is adopted to amend NCBH 15 Objective 2 to read:

***‘To require a Landscape/Visual Assessment to accompany all planning applications for significant proposals that are likely to affect views and prospects’***

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM99/0621 Item ID:71310**

Submitted by Councillor E. O'Brien, Councillor G. O'Connell, Councillor Joanna Tuffy, Councillor L. O'Toole, Councillor P. Gogarty, Councillor V. Casserly

Proposed by Councillor G. O’Connell, Seconded by Councillor E. O’Brien

• Page 91 Objective 4 To amend NCBH 19 To support alternative uses for Protected Structures including former institutional sites in order to provide continued security of the heritage value of these buildings, attendant grounds and associated landscape features. And add in the following: To this end, the relaxation of site zoning restrictions may be considered in order to secure the preservation and conservation of the protected structure where the use proposed is compatible with the existing structure and where the proposed development is consistent with best practice conservation policies and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

**REPORT:**

 It is proposed to amend NCBH 19 Objective 19:

To support alternative uses for Protected Structures including former institutional sites in order to provide continued security of the heritage value of these buildings, attendant grounds and associated landscape features.

And to add the following:

To this end, the relaxation of site zoning restrictions may be considered in order to secure the preservation and conservation of the protected structure where the use proposed is compatible with the existing structure and where the proposed development is consistent with best practice conservation policies and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

It is considered that this proposed amendment is a positive one and would help with the sensitive conservation of protected structures within the context of proper planning and the sustainable development of the area within which they are located.

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that this objective is adopted

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM100/0621 Item ID:71225**

Proposed by Councillor R. McMahon, Seconded by Councillor E. O’Brien

Section 3.5.2 NCBH 19 Objective 5 To insert the word "very" to read To prohibit demolition and inappropriate alterations of Protected Structures unless in very exceptional circumstances.

**REPORT:**

NCBH 19 objective 5 states “to prohibit demolition and inappropriate alterations of Protected Structures unless in exceptional circumstances”.

The motion has amended the objective to state: “to prohibit demolition and inappropriate alterations of Protected Structures unless in very exceptional circumstances”.

This wording reflects the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines 2011 which states that the demolition of a Protected Structure will only be considered in ‘exceptional circumstances’.  Notwithstanding this, it is considered that this motion is acceptable.

Objective to be amended to read: “to prohibit demolition and inappropriate alterations of Protected Structures unless in *very* exceptional circumstances”.

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that this motion is adopted.

“To prohibit demolition and inappropriate alterations of Protected Structures unless in ***very*** exceptional circumstances”.

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM101/0621 Item ID:71217**

Submitted by Councillor Derren Ó Brádaigh, Councillor William Joseph Carey

Proposed by Councillor D. Ó Brádaigh, Seconded by Councillor W. Carey

Page 95 Policy NCBH 20 To ensure proposals for shopfronts and retail signage within ACAs adhere to best practice and achieve high quality designs which respect the character of the area. In this regard, applicants shall have regard to South Dublin's Shopfront Design Guide. Replace with To ensure proposals for shopfronts and retail signage within ACAs adhere to best practice and achieve high quality designs which respect the character of the area. In this regard, applicants shall be required to have regard and adhere to the principles laid out in South Dublin's Shopfront Design Guide.

**REPORT:**

 The motion proposes to amend the wording of NCBH 20 Objective 7 from:

“To ensure proposals for shopfronts and retail signage within ACAs adhere to best practice and achieve high quality designs which respect the character of the area. In this regard, applicants shall have regard to South Dublin's Shopfront Design Guide”.

To:

“To ensure proposals for shopfronts and retail signage within ACAs adhere to best practice and achieve high quality designs which respect the character of the area. In this regard, applicants shall be required to have regard and adhere to the principles laid out in South Dublin's Shopfront Design Guide.

It is considered that the proposed additional wording is acceptable.

**Recommendation**: It is recommended that this motion is adopted.

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM102/0621 Item ID:70745**

Proposed by Councillor Eoin Ó Broin, Seconded by Councillor E. O’Brien

Insert '(including walls)' after word, 'treatments' in NCBH 20 Objective 1. (Page 94)

**REPORT:**

This motion proposes to change the wording of NCBH 20 Objective 1 from:

‘To avoid the removal of distinctive features that positively contribute to the character of Architectural Conservation Areas including building features, shop fronts, boundary treatments, street furniture, landscaping and paving.

To:

“To avoid the removal of distinctive features that positively contribute to the character of Architectural Conservation Areas including building features, shop fronts, boundary treatments *(including walls*), street furniture, landscaping and paving”.

The spirit of the objective is broad ranging and walls are considered to be encapsulated within the term boundary treatments, however in the interest of clarify this motion is agreed.

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that this motion is adopted.

“To avoid the removal of distinctive features that positively contribute to the character of Architectural Conservation Areas including building features, shop fronts, boundary treatments (including walls), street furniture, landscaping and paving”.

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM103/0621 Item ID:70965**

Proposed by Councillor Alan Hayes, Seconded by Councillor E. O’Brien

Chapter 3. P62 Section 3.1: Heritage in South Dublin County The County's rich built heritage assets contribute to our understanding and appreciation of the past and make a valuable contribution to the character and visual amenity of the County as well as to sustainability and climate action through their continued use and adaptation. It is therefore essential to safeguard for future generations the many and varied components of our built heritage including our protected structures, architectural conservation areas, country houses and estates and vernacular buildings. Amend to include the words "review and" in the second sentence as shown below. The County's rich built heritage assets contribute to our understanding and appreciation of the past and make a valuable contribution to the character and visual amenity of the County as well as to sustainability and climate action through their continued use and adaptation. It is therefore essential to review and safeguard for future generations the many and varied components of our built heritage including our protected structures, architectural conservation areas, country houses and estates and vernacular buildings.

**REPORT:**

. The motion refers to the preamble of section 3.1 of Chapter 3.

The existing preamble reads -

“The County's rich built heritage assets contribute to our understanding and appreciation of the past and make a valuable contribution to the character and visual amenity of the County as well as to sustainability and climate action through their continued use and adaptation. It is therefore essential to safeguard for future generations the many and varied components of our built heritage including our protected structures, architectural conservation areas, country houses and estates and vernacular buildings”.

The proposed amendment is as follows:

“The County's rich built heritage assets contribute to our understanding and appreciation of the past and make a valuable contribution to the character and visual amenity of the County as well as to sustainability and climate action through their continued use and adaptation. It is therefore essential to review and safeguard for future generations the many and varied components of our built heritage including our protected structures, architectural conservation areas, country houses and estates and vernacular buildings”.

This is considered acceptable.

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that this motion is adopted

The Motion was **AGREED**

**DPM104/0621 Item ID:71361**

Proposed by Councillor Shane Moynihan, Seconded by Councillor E. O’Brien

To amend the Development Plan - Chapter 3, Policy NCBH 21 to be amended to replace 'encourage' with 'ensure'

**REPORT:**

The existing Policy NCBH 21 reads “Encourage appropriate design of new-build elements and interventions in historic buildings and environments”.

It is proposed to amend the objective to read “**Ensure** appropriate design of new-build elements and interventions in historic buildings and environments”.

This motion is acceptable.

**Recommendation**: It is recommended that this motion is adopted as follows:

“**Ensure** appropriate design of new-build elements and interventions in historic buildings and environments”

The Motion was **AGREED**

The meeting concluded at 20.30

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

**Mayor**

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