

# TALLAGHT TOWN CENTRE

PROPOSED LOCAL AREA PLAN

Managers Report on  
Submissions Received  
June 2006



T  
A  
L  
L  
A  
G  
H  
T  
  
M  
A  
S  
T  
E  
R  
P  
L  
A  
N



# **TALLAGHT TOWN CENTRE**

## **PROPOSED LOCAL AREA PLAN**

**Manager's Report on Submissions**

**June 2006**



## **Table of Contents**

### **1.0 Introduction**

### **2.0 Legislative Background and Requirements**

### **3.0 Public Consultation Process**

Key Stages in the Preparation of the Tallaght Town Centre Proposed Local Area Plan

### **4.0 Submissions**

Outline of Number and Type of Submissions.  
List of persons who made submissions or observations.  
Summary of the issues raised by the persons in the submissions or observations;

### **5.0 Responses**

The individual responses the submissions or observations.  
Generic Responses to the issues raised

### **6.0 Generic Responses and Recommendation to Main Submissions**

### **7.0 Full List of the Manager's Recommendations**



## **1.0 Introduction**

The purpose of the County Manager's Report is:-

- To report on the written submissions received following the public display of the Tallaght Town Centre Proposed Local Area Plan;
- To set out the County Manager's response to the issues raised in the submissions;
- To make recommendations on changes to the Tallaght Town Centre Proposed Local Area Plan, as appropriate.

This Report forms part of the statutory procedure for the Local Area Plan as set out under Section 20 of the Planning & Development Act, 2000 as amended.

## **2.0 Legislative Background and Requirements**

Section 20(c) (i) of the Planning & Development Act 2000 as amended requires that that not later than 6 weeks after the end of the public display of the Tallaght Town Centre Proposed Local Area Plan, a Manager's report must be produced in respect of any submission/observations received in relation to the Plan and that the Report must be submitted to the Elected Members of the County Council.

Section 20 (c) (ii) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended states that the Manager's Report must: -

- List the persons who made submissions or observations;
- Summarise the issues raised by the persons in the submissions or observations;
- Contain the opinion of the Manager in relation to the issues raised, and his or her recommendations in relation to the Proposed Plan taking account of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, the statutory obligations of the local authority in the area and any relevant policies or objectives of the Government.

Section 20 (d) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended requires the Members of the Planning Authority to consider the Manager's Report and overall proposal to make, amend or revoke the Tallaght Town Centre Proposed Local Area Plan. The Proposed Plan will be deemed to be made, amended or revoked in accordance with the Manager's recommendations within 6 weeks of the date of this Report, unless the elected members, by resolution:-

- 1) Decide to make or amend the Plan otherwise than as recommended by the County Manager;
- 2) Decide not to make, amend or revoke the Plan.

Section 20 (e) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended states that in cases where the elected members of the Planning Authority resolve that a Manager's proposal to make or amend a proposed Local Area Plan must be varied or modified, and that the proposed variation or modification would be a material alteration, a further period of public display shall commence not later than 3 weeks after the passing of the resolution.

The proposed variation or modification must be displayed in public for not less than 4 weeks, during which time submissions or observations in respect of the proposed variation or modification may be made. A Manager's Report on submissions received must be prepared and submitted to the elected members within 8 weeks of the beginning of the period of public display.

The elected members of the Planning Authority then have a further period of six weeks in which to consider the proposed variation or modification and the Manager's Report.

### 3.0 Public Consultation Process

#### 3.1 Key Stages in Preparation of the Tallaght Town Centre Proposed Local Area Plan

The table below sets out the key public consultation stages leading up to the preparation of the Tallaght Town Centre Proposed Local Area Plan and the Manager's Report on the submission/observations received. The Council carried out an extensive public consultation exercise prior to and during the preparation of the Plan. Prior to the publication of the Tallaght Town Centre Proposed Local Area Plan, the Planning Department carried out two phases of public consultation which sought firstly to establish issues of relevance to Tallaght Town Centre and secondly to indicate proposed strategies as to how the relevant issues could be addressed.

Date	Stage
January and February 2005	<p>The first phase comprise of a series of Public Information Evenings and Stakeholder meetings during February and March 2005. A total of 368 persons/organisations were invited to these meetings, broken down as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 175 Businesses and Enterprises</li> <li>• 99 Community Groups</li> <li>• 50 Residents Groups</li> <li>• 18 Statutory Agencies</li> <li>• 14 Landowners/Institutions</li> <li>• 12 Transport Agencies/Interests</li> </ul> <p>Advertisements were also placed in the Tallaght Echo on the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> February 2005 in relation to the Information Evenings. These advertisements clearly stated that the Information Evenings were open to all. . Letters were set out between the 27<sup>th</sup> January and 14<sup>th</sup> February 2005 to ensure a minimum of 2 weeks notice for each respective Public Information Evening and Meeting A total of 116 persons attended these Information Meetings. Four public information evening meetings were held on the 14<sup>th</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup>, 21<sup>st</sup>and 28<sup>th</sup> February 2005and three day-time stakeholder information meetings were held on the 10<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> February and the 4<sup>th</sup> March 2005. Upon conclusion, a report of the issues raised in the Information Evenings was circulated to the Elected Members and Management of South Dublin County Council and all those who attended. A copy of the report was also available on the Council website.</p>
September and October 2005	The second phase of public consultation took place in September and October 2005. This took the form of an exhibition of



	<p>proposed strategies and possible solutions to those issues raised in the 1<sup>st</sup> Phase Consultation. As in the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of public consultation, a notice was published in the local newspaper, advertised on the Council website and invitations sent out to 368 persons and organisations previously invited. The display of the proposed strategies and possible solutions were exhibited in the Council Headquarters in Tallaght and in Clondalkin and in the Square Shopping Centre in Tallaght for the months of September and October 2005. Public workshops were held in the Council Headquarters and in the Tallaght Library Meeting Room which were open to all to attend. An A3 booklet of the display boards was available for public viewing in Tallaght Library and the booklet could be purchased for €10.</p>
27 <sup>th</sup> March 2006	<p>An outline of the Tallaght Town Centre Proposed Local Area Plan was presented to the Tallaght Local Area Committee Meeting.</p>
10 <sup>th</sup> April 2006	<p>The Elected Members of the Council made the decision to put the Tallaght Town Centre Proposed Local Area Plan on display on the 10<sup>th</sup> of April 2006.</p>
13 <sup>th</sup> April-24 <sup>th</sup> May	<p>The Tallaght Town Centre Proposed Local Area Plan was put on public display.</p> <p>The statutory phase of public consultation of the Proposed Local Area Plan and the Environmental Report commenced on the 13<sup>th</sup> April and continued up to the 24<sup>th</sup> May 2006. On four days during those 6 weeks, the display of the Proposed Local Area Plan in the Council buildings was supported by Planners between the hours of 11 a.m. and 8 p.m. to assist in answering queries. During the remainder of the display, a Planner was available to address those queries made by calling to the Planning Department or by phone. A CD Rom of the Plan was provided free of charge where people wished to consider it in their own time and the Plan was accessible on the Council website.</p>
June 2006	<p>All submissions and observations to the Tallaght Town Centre Proposed Local Area Plan were acknowledged.</p>

## **4.0 Submissions to the Tallaght Town Centre Proposed Local Area Plan**

### **Outline of Number and Type of Submissions**

The submissions received during the statutory 6 week period have been recorded and compiled in the Manager's Report, with comments and recommendations. One Hundred and four submissions were made. These submissions are made up as follows:

- **59 Individuals**
- **6 Group Petitions,**
- **10 Community/Interest/Residents Groups**
- **11 Landowners/Developers**
- **10 Statutory Organisations**
- **8 Elected Representatives**

The concerns expressed in the submissions and observations can be broadly categorised as follows;

- **Apartments, Tenure, Residential Mix and Management Companies – 44.1%**
- **Density, Plot Ratio/Building Height -14.8%**
- **Community & Social Infrastructure - 11%**
- **Traffic Management and Car Parking – 7.2%**
- **Safety & Security – 7.0%**
- **Land Use Mix and Employment: - 4.6%**
- **Consultation Process – 4.6%**
- **Cultural Heritage – 3.6%**
- **Phasing & Implementation – 1.5%**
- **Public Transport – 1.5%**

Each submission has been logged with a reference number and acknowledged. A full list of all submissions received and copy of the submission is available on the attached CD.

## **5.0 List of persons who made submissions or observations and Summary of the issues raised**

The persons, groups and organisations who made submissions on the Proposed Local Area Plan are listed below. The following report summarised the issues raised in the submissions or observations and provides the Manger's response. A generic response has been prepared for those summarised issues which form the main focus of the submissions, see Section 6. Where submissions or observations are made outside the main focus, an individual response is made. The Manager has made a series of suggested changes to the Proposed Local Area Plan and these are included in the responses where appropriate. The full set of Manager's recommendations for changes to the Proposed Local Area Plan are listed at the end of the report, see Section 7.

- \* Submission No. 1: Tommy Kielty
- \* Submission No. 2: Denise Duff
- \* Submission No. 3: Imelda Colgan
- \* Submission No. 4: Joseph Cully
- \* Submission No. 5: Tallaght Residents Petition (24)
- \* Submission No. 6: Mick Byrne
- \* Submission No. 7: Geraldine Norman
- \* Submission No. 8: Sean Hennessy
- \* Submission No. 9: Maplewood Avenue, Petition (57)
- \* Submission No. 10: Joseph Cully
- \* Submission No. 11: Anisa & Paul Dunne
- \* Submission No. 12: Val Dunne
- \* Submission No 13: Gerard Stockil
- \* Submission No 14: Karen Lenehan
- \* Submission No 15: South Dublin Chamber of Commerce
- \* Submission No 16: Board of The Square Management Limited
- \* Submission No 17: Park Developments (Dublin) Limited
- \* Submission No 18: Concerned Employees of IT Tallaght Dublin
- \* Submission No 19: Gerard Stockil, From Pastoral Councils of Three Tallaght Village Parishes, St. Mary's, St. Dominic's and St. Aengus's (Petition of 19 persons)
- \* Submission No 20: Cllr Tony McDermott and Cllr Fintan McCarthy
- \* Submission No 21: Parish Pastoral Councils of Three Tallaght Village Parishes

- \* Submission No 22: Sean Heffernan
- \* Submission No 23: Tara de Buitlear
- \* Submission No 24: Walter Butler
- \* Submission No 25: Shuna Hutchinson Edgar ( Co-signed by David Hutchinson Edgar)
- \* Submission No 26: Therese Bennett
- \* Submission No 27: John Sheehan, Tom Phillips & Associates for Jacob Fruitfield Sites
- \* Submission No 27 MAPS
- \* Submission No 28: Noel Brannigan
- \* Submission No 29: Niall Connolly ( Co-signed by 2)
- \* Submission No 30: Sinead Connolly
- \* Submission No 31: Kathleen McCann
- \* Submission No 32: William Wyse (Co-signed by 3)
- \* Submission No 33: John Giles (Co-signed by 2)
- \* Submission No 34: Martin Day (Co-signed by 2)
- \* Submission No 35: Elizabeth Brady (Co-signed by 3)
- \* Submission No 36: Paula McNaughton
- \* Submission No 37: Iris Dowling ( Co-signed by 2)
- \* Submission No. 38: John Spain Associates on behalf of Cookstown Development Partnership
- \* Submission No. 39: David Copeland, Director OBK Architects/Designers On Behalf of Cookstown Development Partnership
- \* Submission No 40: Unable to read signature.
- \* Submission No 41: Arminta Wallace
- \* Submission No 42: Burgman Packings
- \* Submission No 43: Health Service Executive
- \* Submission No 44: Blanaid Gallagher.
- \* Submission No 45: Margaret Beggan
- \* Submission No 46: Jim Lawlor
- \* Submission No 47: DPP (Development Planning Partnership) on behalf of Kerry Group PLC
- \* Submission No 48: Christopher and Phyllis Adderley & Anthony and Marie Adderley
- \* Submission No 49: Gary, Geraldine, Aimee and Eric Gibson
- \* Submission No 50: Cllr Mick Murphy
- \* Submission No 51: Lorna Doran
- \* Submission No 52: Kenneth Doran
- \* Submission No 53: Jim Lawlor (see also submission 46)
- \* Submission No 54: Patrick Kenny
- \* Submission No 55: Albert Leonard
- \* Submission No 56: Donal Brady
- \* Submission No 57: Cllr Eamonn Maloney
- \* Submission No 58: Aidan Gallagher (Quality Bus Network Project Office)

- \* Submission No 59: Enda O’Toole on behalf of Ellensborough Association
- \* Submission No 60: John Murray, Spain Courtney Doyle Building Surveying
- \* Submission No 61: Justin Corr, Tara De Butlear sent in via e-mail by Charlie O Connor TD
- \* Submission No 62: East Tallaght Combined Residents Association
- \* Submission No 63: Residents of Virginia Heights
- \* Submission No 64: GD Group
- \* Submission No 65: Joy and Derek Fitzgerald
- \* Submission No 66: Marie Ford
- \* Submission No 67: Jim O Connor Bancroft Residents Association
- \* Submission No 68: Jennifer Wann & David Cotter
- \* Submission No 69: Jim Mc Veigh County Youth Development Officer County Dublin Vocational Education Committee
- \* Submission No 70: James Ryder
- \* Submission No. 71: Old Bawn Residents Association (co-signed by 3)
- \* Submission No. 72: Rhondda Flood
- \* Submission No.73: Amanda O’ Farrell
- \* Submission No. 74: Conor Molphy, GVA Grimley, International Property Advisers, Client: Tesco
- \* Submission No. 75: Charlie O’ Connor T.D.
- \* Submission No. 76: Senator Brian Hayes
- \* Submission No. 77: Marjo Moonen, Tallaght Partnership, Communication and Policy Officer
- \* Submission No. 78: Justin Dowling, Rohan Holdings.
- \* Submission No 79: Bancroft Residents Association
- \* Submission No. 80: Pine View & Church Grove Environmental Group, (Co-signed by 2)
- \* Submission No. 81: Councillor Marie Corr, Labour Party
- \* Submission No. 82: Mr. Michael Glover
- \* Submission No. 83: Large Petition
- \* Submission No. 84: Voice, voluntary organisation
- \* Submission No 85: Fran Doran
- \* Submission No 86: Pat Rabitte TD
- \* Submission No 87: Bernard McNamara and Other Landowners
- \* Submission No 88: St Mary’s Dominican Priory
- \* Submission No 89: Ruth Pillington
- \* Submission No 90: Spatial Policy, Development Applications Unit DOE.
- \* Submission No 91: Laurence Collins OP
- \* Submission No 92: Anna Flood
- \* Submission No 93: Declan Coburn Superintendent An Garda Siochana
- \* Submission No 94: Bobby Doran
- \* Submission No 95: Paul Doran
- \* Submission No 96: Siobhan Carlisle
- \* Submission No 97: Aidan Thomas
- \* Submission No 98: St Marks Residents Association
- \* Submission No 99: Petition

- \* Submission No 100: Tara De Butlear
- \* Submission No 101: Dr. John Bell
- \* Submission No 102: Michael Clifford Textile Recycling
- \* Submission 103: Cora Bruen
- \* Submission No 104: Michael O' Mahony, The Department of Communications, Marine and Natural Resources



Submission Summary	Submission Comment
<p><b>Submission No. 1: Tommy Kieilty</b></p> <p>Plan Ref.: 3.1.2: Strongly objects to the ghettoisation of Tallaght. Council are proposing multi-storey blocks of flats, low cost, high rise rental units owned by speculators who don't live here. A quarter of houses in Springfield estate are rented out.</p>	<p>Generic responses: Density, Residential Mix and Tenure</p>
<p><b>Submission No.2: Denise Duff</b></p> <p>Plan Ref: 5.3.2: Objects to the Plan's proposal for 6,000 apartments.</p> <p>Plan Ref: 5.2.3 Opposed to the planned extension of excessive high rise developments in Cookstown, Belgard Road and Bancroft which will result in 3,000 more apartments within 1 sq.mile in Tallaght.</p> <p>Plan Ref: 5.2.8: Supports park improvements</p> <p>Plan Ref: 3.3.2: Supports social amenities</p> <p>Plan Ref: 3.2.1: Supports traffic management</p>	<p>Generic Response: Residential Mix &amp; Tallaght Town Centre Apartments.</p> <p>Generic Response: Plot Ratio/Building Height.</p> <p>Acknowledge.</p> <p>Acknowledge.</p> <p>Acknowledge.</p>
<p><b>Submission No. 3: Imelda Colgan</b></p> <p>Plan Ref: 5.3.2: Objects to the Plan's proposal for 6,000 apartments as Tallaght will become to resemble a southside Ballymun. Would be in favour of a greater residential mix.</p> <p>Plan Ref: 5.3.1 Would be in favour of more cafés and low</p>	<p>Generic Response: Residential Mix &amp; Tallaght Town Centre Apartments.</p> <p>Generic Response: Land-use Mix</p>



<p>rise developments.</p>	
<p><b>Submission No. 4: Joseph Cully</b></p> <p>Plan Ref: 3.3.3: Proposes that the name of the centrally located millennium square be entitled “Parthenon Square” which is the historical name of Tallaght. Recommends that the identity of historical Tallaght be preserved and utilised as a unifying factor for citizens of Tallaght.</p>	<p>Generic Response on Cultural Heritage</p>
<p><b>Submission No. 5: Tallaght Residents (Petition of 24 persons)</b></p> <p>Plan Ref: 5.3.2: Objects to the Plan’s proposal for 3,000 apartments as Tallaght as the proposal would result in the tenements of tomorrow and would give rise to a population explosion in Tallaght. Reference made to Ballymun.</p> <p>Plan Ref: 5.2.3: Development of 3000 apartments would obstruct views of Dublin Mountains.</p>	<p>Generic Response: Residential Mix and Apartments and Tenure.</p> <p>Generic Response: Plot Ratio &amp; Building Height.</p>
<p><b>Submission No. 6: Mick Byrne</b></p> <p>Plan Ref: 5.3.2: Objects to the Plan’s proposal for additional apartments as these tower blocks will be the tenements of the future.</p> <p>Plan Ref: 3.3.3: Queries the provision of playing facilities, schools, Garda station for new residents.</p> <p>Plan Ref.: 5.2.3: The skyline will be eroded.</p>	<p>Generic Response: Residential Mix and Apartments and Tenure</p> <p>Generic Response on Community Facilities</p> <p>Generic Response on Plot Ratio/Height</p>

<p><b>Submission No. 7: Geraldine Norman</b>  Tenure: Approx. 850 apartments completed in Tallaght, many are investor owned. The additional 1,600 apartments under construction and the Masterplan proposals to build 3,000 more will only benefit the investors.</p>	<p>Generic Response on Apartments/Tenure</p>
<p><b>Submission No. 8: Sean Hennessy</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 1.2: Considers the cost of the Plan at €100 is prohibitive. Recommends that the closing date for submissions be extended</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: Urges the Council to provide a fully functioning public transport system</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: The LAP should include measures to take bus termini away from on-street sites into specially built facilities provided and managed by the bus operators.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: The Council should provide adequate and convenient Park and Ride sites around Tallaght Town Centre. Sites are suggested.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.1: Unhappy regarding the congestion and delays of traffic experienced with regular occurrence in Tallaght.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.1: The Tallaght LAP must make a firm commitment to a public transport system from Tallaght to Dublin Airport, this could be the metro or a dedicated two-</p>	<p>Generic response on Consultation</p> <p>Generic Response on Public Transport.</p> <p>Discussions are underway at present in relation to a Public Transport Interchange in the area immediately adjacent to the Luas terminus. The provision of a bus terminus would not be considered a suitable use in the Town Centre</p> <p>A 450 space Park and Ride facility is at present under construction at the DEZ development site.</p> <p>Generic response on Traffic Management.</p> <p>Provision has been made in the Plan for the Metro on a line along the Belgard Road.</p>

<p>way bus only corridor.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: The mix or residential accommodation should be re-examined to achieve a proper balance between residents, business, visitors and workers.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.10: The village needs people to survive. Businesses must be moved elsewhere and people returned to live in the existing houses. A pro-active programme to preserve and protect all the historic buildings and grounds in the village should be initiated.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.6 CCTV should be located properly so that it contributes positively to people's security and must always be monitored</p> <p>Other: Aircraft :LAP is silent on the matter regarding aircraft noise; this potential negative effect needs to be considered.</p> <p>Other: Emergency Services: LAP should consider emergency</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.1: No traffic solutions are proposed in Plan despite huge gridlock currently experienced.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 7.0: The LAP should incorporate the principle of reduced class sizes.</p>	<p>Generic Response on Residential mix and Apartments.</p> <p>Generic Response on Land Use Mix.</p> <p>Generic Response on Safety and Security</p> <p>All developments are required to adhere to the Building Regulations in relation to the provision of noise insulation.</p> <p>The Fire Station at Belgard Road has been recently upgraded.</p> <p>Generic Response on Traffic Management</p> <p>Generic response on Community and Social infrastructure</p>
<p><b>Submission No. 9: Maplewood Avenue, Petition (57)</b></p>	

<p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objects to the Plan’s proposal for 3,000 apartments as Tallaght as will impact negatively upon our schools, hospitals and Tallaght Garda Station.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: Would like to see more facilities for the youth of Tallaght such as indoors sports for children of all ages, music, dance and drama facilities.</p> <p>Other: Utilities</p> <p>Mobile phone masts from Airton Road to Whitestown must be removed during the rezoning phase of the Masterplan as these areas will change from industrial to residential.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.3: Should be a Heritage Museum Centre in the Masterplan area which could become a landmark for the Masterplan area and aid in the promotion of tourism.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Should be a better mix of residential units rather than just apartments.</p>	<p>Generic Response on Residential Mix and Apartments.</p> <p>Generic Response on Community/Social Infrastructure.</p> <p>It is not possible in the Plan to require the removal of the masts. If a planning application for residential development were lodged on the lands where the masts are located, their removal would then be open for consideration.</p> <p>Generic Response on Cultural Heritage</p> <p>Generic Response on Residential Mix/Apartments</p>
<p><b>Submission No. 10: Joseph Cully</b></p> <p>Same as TMP no. 4</p>	<p>Generic Response on Cultural Heritage</p>
<p><b>Submission No. 11: Anisa &amp; Paul Dunne</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objects to the Plan’s proposal for 3,000 apartments. We should be waiting for the results of the 2006 Census before we plan the next 5 years.</p> <p>Plan Ref. Other: Tenant Mix: Concerned by the amount</p>	<p>Generic Response on Residential Mix and Apartments The information from the 2006 Census will be used in the proposed mid term review of the Plan in 2009.</p> <p>Generic Response on Tenure</p>

<p>of investor units in particular as there is no registration of landlords and no means of tracking them when things go wrong.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.2.1: The Plan is not family or community orientated as families need a little outside space for children.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: Already apartments erected opposite the Square are lying empty. With additional apartments being built, where are the extra facilities such as schools, garda manpower etc.</p>	<p>Generic Responses on Residential Mix and Community and Social Infrastructure.</p> <p>Generic Response on Community/Social Infrastructure.</p>
<p><b>Submission No. 12: Val Dunne</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.15: Unhappy regarding unofficial footpath which exists across Westpark Green Space to Abberly Court Hotel due to loss of privacy and anti-social behaviour. If implemented, recommend that it be a day time thoroughfare only and closed in evening by Park Warden</p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.15: Regarding location of proposed Gateway building on corner of N81/Belgard Road, cannot see how an appropriate development could be sited here for following reasons, traffic and parking , construction and Back entrances would face Westpark.</p> <p>Plan Ref: 4.15: No confidence in proposal to using development contributions from development to fund landscaping in Westpark based on past experience. Welcomes proposals to landscape Westpark and land-bridge to Sean Walsh Park.</p>	<p><b>Recommend inclusion of objective to provide day time thoroughfare only through Westpark Green open space.</b></p> <p>Generic Response for Plot Ratio / Building Height.</p> <p>The proposal has more likelihood of success if it is an objective in the Plan.</p>

<p>Plan Ref: 3.2.1: Recommends measures to improve traffic and parking</p>	<p>Generic response on Traffic Management.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 13: Gerard Stockil</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 7.0: Publication of SEA Report and Breach of EU/2004/42 Article 4 section 1: The submission quotes EU legislation indicating that the Environmental Report shall be carried out and the consultation period provided prior to the adoption of the Plan and states that this was not done.</p> <p>Plan Ref 1.2: Dissatisfaction with Inadequate Consultation Process: States that EU legislation is being violated because the consultation period is inadequate and the process is flawed.</p> <p><b>Submission No 14: Karen Lenehan</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objection to SDCC's plan to allow a potential 3000-6000 apartments to be built in Tallaght in terms of family life, quality of life and sense of community.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Apartments are increasingly the only form of housing being built in Tallaght: young children &amp;</p>	<p>The assertion that South Dublin County Council is in breach of the legislation because the Environmental Report was published at the same time as the adopted <i>Plan</i>, arises from a fundamental misunderstanding of the situation. The Environmental Report was published on the 13<sup>th</sup> April 2006 and the Tallaght Town Centre <b>Proposed</b> Local Area Plan was published simultaneously, in accordance with the 2004 SEA Regulations, which give effect to relevant EU SEA Directive. It is critical to note that the <b>Proposed</b> Local Area Plan is a draft document for consultation. The earliest date for adoption of the <b>Proposed</b> Plan is the 10<sup>th</sup> July 2006.</p> <p>In relation to the timeframe for consultation, South Dublin County Council followed the timescales set out in Section 20 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The six week period of consultation commenced on Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> April 2006 and concluded on Wednesday 24<sup>th</sup> May 2006. See also Generic Response for Consultation.</p> <p>Generic Responses on Apartments and Community and Social Infrastructure.</p> <p>Generic Responses on Apartments and Residential Mix</p>

<p>families have no other alternative. What facilities are in place for such a concentrated influx of children?</p> <p>Plan Ref. Utilities: Apartment design has a long way to go. There is no means of drying clothes/bedding/etc in apartments, inadequate storage provided. Residents of apartments have less refuse provision than residents of houses. Apartment blocks attract illegal dumping activity. There is insufficient parking.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 6.0: There is little sense of community in apartment blocks. It is very difficult to enforce the rules and regulations. There is currently no legislation to regulate these management companies. A very strong resident's association is needed to monitor the actions of a management company. This is less likely to be in place if the apartment block is primarily inhabited by tenants.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Misguided belief that retired residents will want to vacate their homes in favor of apartments.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.10: The Tallaght area is rich in heritage and history. How are we to attract tourism to the Tallaght area if there are thousands of apartments and no additional hotels?</p>	<p>Generic Response for Management Companies</p> <p>Generic Response for Management Companies.</p> <p>Reference to earlier Generic Response on Residential Mix.</p> <p>Generic Response on Cultural Heritage.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 15: South Dublin Chamber of Commerce</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: In order to ensure that a community grows in the new apartment complexes, it is essential that many apartments are suitable for families. This can be achieved through ensuring large apartments are built i.e., the Council could require that 75% of all new apartments be 3</p>	<p>Generic Response on Apartments.</p>

<p>bed.</p> <p>Plan Ref. Tenure: 30% of apartments should be owner occupied as this will allow the development of communities.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.1: Welcome high density mixed use being utilized in the gateways to Tallaght town centre such as at Cookstown and Whitestown.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.1: Welcome the transport interchange and transport hubs identified in Plan. Accessibility both internally and externally, from all modes of transport is a key component to the ongoing success of Tallaght Town Centre.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.4.4: Future development of the town centre must cater for the private car as a means of access. Need to ensure adequate parking for those attending hospital, the County Council headquarters or those coming to town to shop or socialise. Multi-storey car parking must be planned for and increased short-term street parking must be provided.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A central transport interchange, of buses, Luas and taxi, is needed that facilitates buses both local and inter-county.</li> <li>• All local buses should call at the major points in Tallaght, e.g. Hospital, the Square, TIT etc.</li> <li>• A park and ride adjacent to the Luas terminus is essential and at all major stops on Luas in the town centre catchment area.</li> </ul>	<p>Generic Response on Tenure</p> <p>Acknowledge.</p> <p>Acknowledge and Generic Response on Traffic Management.</p> <p>Generic Response on Car parking</p> <p>Acknowledge. A 450 space Park and Ride facility is at present under construction at the DEZ development site. Generic Traffic Management response</p>
---	--



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in cycle lanes welcome. Proper delineation from walkways for the road itself would add to the safety of the cyclist. The town centre should have numerous sheltered cycle parks that are safe and user friendly.</li> </ul> <p>Plan Ref. 3.1.2: Development around key Luas stops should incorporate high density residential and commercial land uses.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.6: Need to implement a series of well lit walkways, protected and secured by the use of a visible Garda presence.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.9: Further development of the Square town centre is necessary and welcome.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of the historical aspects of the village welcome.</li> <li>• The restoration of through traffic along the Old Blessington Road that section passes St. Maelruan's Anglican Church would bring activity and added security to a section of the village that is too isolated at night.</li> </ul> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.1: Weakness of the county town is the lack of site down restaurants and night time entertainment venues. The proliferation of take away food outlets is not suitable to develop a night time environment. The County Council can use powers set out in Section 85 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 to prevent the proliferation of undesirable uses.</p>	<p>Acknowledge and insert Generic Response on Density.</p> <p>Generic Response on Safety &amp; Security.</p> <p>Acknowledge.</p> <p>Acknowledge.</p> <p><b>Recommend that Buses only restriction traffic along the Old Blessington Road that section passes St. Maelruan's Anglican Church operates from 7am to 7pm.</b></p> <p>Generic Response on Land Use with <b>recommendation to include objective to prevent the proliferation of take-away uses.</b></p>
---	--

<p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creation of an identity and a sense of place are essential to the future success of the town centre. Identity can be created by the implementation of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Design</li> <li>○ Signage</li> <li>○ Creation of a Focal Point</li> <li>○ Public Art</li> <li>○ Information and publicity.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The county town must offer community/social services.</li> <li>• Shamrock Rovers Football stadium should be developed as a multi-use sports facility.</li> </ul> <p>Plan Ref. 5.4.3.: Making county town accessible and user friendly for all citizens is important.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.3: Need to embrace multi-culturalism and to give due recognition to members of our minority communities in choosing the icons, emblems and symbols for Tallaght Town.</p>	<p>Generic Response on Cultural Heritage</p> <p>Generic Response on Community/Social Infrastructure.</p> <p>The use of the proposed stadium is constrained by the pitch dimensions.</p> <p>Acknowledge.</p> <p>Acknowledge.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 16: Board of The Square Management Limited</b></p> <p>Plan Ref .2.2: Welcomes the Plan both in principle and detail and commends the officials on its comprehensiveness, clarity and vision</p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.9: Commend the objective of creating an attractive public realm focusing on “The Square”, the</p>	<p>Acknowledge.</p> <p>Acknowledge.</p>

<p>concept of a new landmark building at the southern entry to “The Square”, the clustering of night time entertainment and leisure uses to the North and North West of “The Square” adjacent to high frequency public transport and taxi services and the establishment of residential use along the western edge of “The Square” to provide a buffer between quieter and more active areas.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.1.2: Consider it essential that the highest residential densities be confined to the Town Centre area (as advocated by the Guidelines).</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2: Agrees with the objective that “<i>pedestrian routes through ‘The Square’ should be improved</i>” subject to the proviso that they are private rather than public routes.</p>	<p>Acknowledge.</p> <p>Acknowledge.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 17: Park Developments (Dublin Limited)</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.14: Request that the third bullet point of paragraph 4.14.7 “Future Built Form and Landscape” be amended to read as follows: “<i>There is a potential for landmark buildings along the N81 and a Gateway at entrance to the Town Centre area particularly by the provision of higher structures at the Greenhills Road Extension/Tallaght Bypass Junction</i>”.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 2.2: Commend the team on the production of a clear and comprehensive document which will help to guide the positive future development of the Town Centre.</p>	<p>The two developments granted at either corner, one under construction and one under appeal reflect the gateway status of the location.</p> <p><b>Recommend that the reference to landmark buildings along the section of the N81 from the Greenhills Road Extension to the Old Bawn Road be removed.</b></p> <p>Acknowledge.</p>

<p><b>Submission No 18: Concerned Employees of IT Tallaght Dublin re SDCC Tallaght Masterplan</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: Can SDCC provide detailed figures on the effect on the population increase on local schools.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 1.2: Ask for a moratorium on major new developments until wider consultation is possible due to the rushed Nature of Process.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 7.0: Require detailed population, traffic, environmental and social analysis done of the effects of such large developments, which many feel are way too high.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 1.2: Suggest competition for Student Input to the Plan.</p>	<p>Generic response on Community and Social Infrastructure</p> <p>The Council does not accept that the process has been rushed. The imposition of a moratorium on major new developments would be unlikely to discourage or prevent future development proposals being lodged as planning applications in accordance with the County Development Plan “County Town” zoning objective</p> <p>Information on population, traffic, environmental and social aspects are included in the Environmental Report on the Plan.</p> <p>Generic response on Consultation.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 19: Gerard Stockil, From Pastoral Councils of Three Tallaght Village Parishes, St. Mary’s, St. Dominic’s and St. Aengus’s (Petition of 19 persons)</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 1.2: Object to the lack of adequate public consultation on the Plan.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objects to the Plan’s proposal for 3,000 apartments.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.2.3: Consider the building of high rise</p>	<p>Generic Response on Public Consultation</p> <p>Generic Response on Apartments</p> <p>Generic Responses on Apartments, Tenure and Community and Social</p>

<p>apartments will lead to social problems.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 6.3.3.2: State that the Masterplan should ensure adequate schooling facilities.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.1: Surprised at SDDC's decision not to proceed with a Traffic Study.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 6.3.3.2: There should be provision in the Plan for oratories/meditation/peace gardens etc. This should be provided particularly in high density areas. Also request the provision of swimming pools which promote health.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.2.8: Request additional open spaces/parks in the plan area.</p> <p>Plan Ref. Other: Tenant Mix: Concerned by the amount of rented to owner occupation units. Request that no further large scale development go ahead until a detail environmental impact and social study takes place that will include inputs from all groups including the Parish Pastoral Council.</p>	<p>Infrastructure.</p> <p>Generic Response re education from Community and Social Infrastructure.</p> <p>Generic response on Traffic Management.</p> <p>Generic Response on Community/Social Infrastructure. The acknowledged desirability of oratories/meditation/peace gardens is catered for by the Dominican Order in the Priory. In addition to the swimming pool at present under construction in West Tallaght by the Council, a private pool has been constructed as part of the leisure complex in the Belgard Square development.</p> <p>Generic Response on Community and Social Infrastructure.</p> <p>Generic Response on Tenure. Information on population, traffic, environmental and social aspects are included in the Environmental Report on the Plan.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 20:</b> Cllr Tony McDermott and Cllr Fintan McCarthy</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.2.2: Recommend a series of objectives in relation to building language i.e. roof forms and fenestration and energy efficiency and passive solar design.</p>	<p>Section 5.2.2 of the Plan identifies and explains what is meant by the term building language, it also sets out a number of performance criteria which every design statement which is submitted with an application should address and also contains a safeguard statement to ensure high quality design, materials and finishes are used.</p>

<p>Plan Ref. 7.0: Recommend that the plan incorporate the specific energy performance levels recently adapted in the Local Area Plan for the Cappagh area of Fingal County Council.</p> <p><b>Submission No 21: Parish Pastoral Councils of Three Tallaght Village Parishes</b>  <b>Same as No. 19. Sent from John Sewell</b></p> <p><b>Submission No 22: Sean Heffernan</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: The schools in the area are at breaking point, how does the Plan address this?</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.2: Enquires how the public transport system is going to facilitate the planned expansion of Tallaght when is already at or near capacity.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objects to the Plan’s proposal for 3,000 apartments and the pressures that it will exert on over extended garda services, schools, traffic etc.</p> <p><b>Submission No 23: Tara de Buitlear</b></p> <p>Plan Ref.: 5.2.3: Objects to the proposal for landmark buildings of up to 18 storeys high in parts of the Town</p>	<p>Section 5.3.5. sets out the Plan policy in relation to Energy Efficiency and Passive Solar Design.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Include reference to EU Directive on Energy Performance of Buildings and the forthcoming national legislation.</b></p> <p>As addressed in TMP no. 19.</p>
<p>Generic Response on Education from Social and Community Infrastructure.</p> <p>Generic Response on Public Transport.</p> <p>Generic response for Apartments and for Social and Community Infrastructure</p>	
<p>Generic Response Plot Ratio/Building Height</p>	

<p>Centre and the density proposed in the Plan Area. Has implications for services.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: There is an over-dependence on apartments as the only type of dwelling to be on offer in the Plan Area.</p> <p>Plan Ref. Other Tenancy: There has been an over use of Section 23 in the Plan Area. SDCC has had to introduce the RAS scheme to address the existing issues in this sector. Plan will exacerbate this issue.</p> <p>Notes that the estates of Seskin View, New Bawn and Bawnville are now being included in the Millbrook Lawns precinct and should be included in the Old Bawn Area.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.1: A Traffic Management Study should be carried out.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.10: No provision to bring together in a visitors centre the historical status of Tallaght. Notes that the old cottages in the village would be an obvious location.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: The residential nature of Tallaght Village should be actively restored and encouraged.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.2.6: Guidelines should be drawn up on signage for Tallaght Village.</p>	<p>Generic Responses on Apartments and Residential Mix</p> <p>Generic Response on Tenure.</p> <p>All of these areas are outside the Precinct Areas in the Plan.</p> <p>Generic Response on Traffic Management</p> <p>Generic Response on cultural heritage.</p> <p>The residential nature of Tallaght Village is encouraged in the Plan.</p> <p>The plan refers to signage within section 5.2.6 of the plan and states “signs attached to Protected Structures or buildings or historic value</p>
---	---

<p>Plan Ref. 6.0: Should be strict guidelines, licensing system and penalties for ineffective and inefficient management companies.</p>	<p>within Tallaght Village Architectural Conservation Area should be constructed of materials that are in keeping with the character of the building.</p> <p>Generic Response on Management Companies.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 24: Walter Butler</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objects to the Plan’s proposal for 3,000 apartments as it provides people with inadequate choice.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.2.3: Opposed to developments higher than 6 storeys.</p>	<p>Generic Response for Apartments and Residential Mix</p> <p>Generic Response on Plot Ratio and Height.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 25: Shuna Hutchinson Edgar ( Co-signed by David Hutchinson Edgar)</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.8: In favour of a neighbourhood park opposite the Cookstown Luas Stop.</p> <p>Plan Ref.: 4.13: In favour of enhancement of Sean Walsh Park.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.2: In favour of improvements to public transport network infrastructure.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2: Improvements in pedestrian access around Tallaght Town Centre.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objects to the Plan’s proposal for 3,000 apartments</p>	<p>Acknowledge.</p> <p>Acknowledge.</p> <p>Acknowledge</p> <p>Acknowledge.</p> <p>Generic Responses on Apartments and Residential Mix</p>



<p>Plan Ref. 3.1.2: Objects to the scale and speed of development which is untested.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.1: The Plan will result in increased congestion. Particularly given the relocation of industries elsewhere.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: Are there sufficient facilities (schools) near to new residential areas without having to cross major transport routes. The existing community and social infrastructure is already stretched without the planned increase in population.</p> <p>Plan Ref. Other Tenancy: Concern regarding proportion of rented units.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.6: A significant increase in population is likely to give rise to deterioration on in the overall crime and security situation in the area.</p>	<p>Generic Response on Phasing.</p> <p>Generic Response on Traffic management.</p> <p>Generic Response on Community/Social Infrastructure</p> <p>Generic Response on Tenure.</p> <p>Generic Response on Safety/Security.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 26:Therese Bennett</b> Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objects to the Plan’s proposal for 3,000 apartments. The plan is for tax relief investors.</p>	<p>Generic Responses on Apartments and Residential Mix</p>
<p><b>Submission No 27:John Sheehan, Tom Phillips &amp; Associates for Jacob Fruitfield Sites.</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.16: Proposal for the Fruitfield Site in Whitestown Way welcomed. Refer to para 4.16.7 and recommend that in place of residential with mixed commercial in the western part of the site, the Plan should provide for residential on both sides of the proposed new street. Revisions should increase plot ratio from 1.0:1 as</p>	<p>The Plan proposal has been set to achieve a balance between extending the partial residential use of the adjoining site to the east (under construction at present) and maintaining and creating employment opportunities in this “Employment and Enterprise” area.</p>

<p>currently proposed to a higher plot ratio to take account of the residential land use. Suggest that northern portion of site should be residential usage with a stepped down format to low density housing situated to the west of the site.</p> <p>3.2.2: Part of the Whitestown Estate is subject to the Section 49 Scheme for a bus route. Feel that this aspect of the Plan unclear.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 6.0: This site is within Phase IV and the indicative time frame 2009-2012. Request that this be changed to 2007-2010 as site likely to become vacant in 2006.</p> <p>Plan Re. 4.2: Proposal to change Airton Precinct site from existing "E" to mixed commercial should be changed to "residential" particularly where it adjoins the Belgard Road. Propose that part of the site of 7 acres be designated for a masterplan.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 6.0: Airton Precinct is not listed in the phasing of the Plan. Recommend that in addition to the proposed zoning being altered to allow mixed use along the Belgard Road interface, the phasing of this particular part of the site, along Belgard Road, be advanced to match the adjoining Phase III i.e. 2007-2010.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.2.3: The plot ratio of the western portion of the Jacobs site is low at 1.0:1 in the context of the proposed Metrowest and QBC. This portion should have a plot ratio of 1.5:1 matching that of the phase II area across the Belgard Road.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.1: In relation to Map 3.1.1-Land Use Strategy</p>	<p>The intention in the Plan is that with the exception of the part of the area fronting the N81, which may be developed for medium-scale mixed use development, the character of the area does not alter significantly from the present.</p> <p>Development proposals may be subject to Section 49 Scheme contributions for a bus route if the Scheme is introduced.</p> <p>The intention in the Plan is to firstly advance the Core Area and Cookstown Interface areas.</p> <p>The site is outside the Town Centre zoning and is not considered suitable for residential use at present.</p> <p>In terms of altering the zoning and introducing the site into the phased sequence of developments, it is considered that this will not occur until 2012.</p> <p>Any such change would be premature at present.</p> <p><b>Recommend that Map 3.1.1. be corrected to reflect the residential</b></p>
---	--

<p>indicates “Mixed Commercial” for that portion of the Whitestown Precinct occupied by the Fruitfield facility. This conflicts with the detail provided in 4.16.3 which envisages residential use on part of these lands.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2: Refers to Map 3.2.1-Street Network which indicates that new road link through the Whitestown Precinct but omits the routes proposed for the Airton Precinct at 4.2.5. The map at 4.16.5 omits the proposed “distributor/access road” which is shown in the Map at 4.16.8 (and Map 3.2.1) for the Fruitfield Site.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.2.3: The text refers to Figures 5.1.1 and 5.1.2. This should read 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 respectively.</p> <p>Plan Ref 5.2.2: It is noted that the Whitestown Precinct, specifically the Fruitfield site should carry the “4 storeys” colour code rather than the “2 storeys”.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 6.0: Map 6.2.1 does not address the phasing of Airton Precinct.</p>	<p><b>use on part of these lands.</b></p> <p><b>Recommend that The map at 4.16.5 be corrected to indicate the proposed “distributor/access road”</b></p> <p><b>Correct reference to Figures 5.1.1 and 5.1.2. to read 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 respectively.</b></p> <p>The two storey designation reflects the 1:1 plot ratio.</p> <p>See above.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 28:Noel Brannigan</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.3: Refers to Greenhills Road which has been designated with “future Key Frontages” and “mixed commercial” usage, which should be changed to residential usage as it will link into Bancroft and is consistent with recent permissions.</p>	<p>The Plan proposed the continuation of the established patterns of land use.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 29: Niall Connolly ( Co-signed by 2)</b></p>	

<p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objects to the further development of apartment blocks.</p>	<p>Generic Responses on Apartments and Residential Mix.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 30: Sinead Connolly</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objects to the further development of apartment blocks.</p>	<p>Generic Responses on Apartments and Residential Mix.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 31: Kathleen McCann</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objects to the further development of apartment blocks.</p>	<p>Generic Responses on Apartments and Residential Mix.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 32: William Wyse (Co-signed by 3)</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objects to the further development of apartment blocks.</p>	<p>Generic Responses on Apartments and Residential Mix.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 33: John Giles (Co-signed by 2)</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objects to the further development of apartment blocks.</p>	<p>Generic Responses on Apartments and Residential Mix.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 34: Martin Day (Co-signed by 2)</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objects to the further development of apartment blocks.</p>	<p>Generic Responses on Apartments and Residential Mix.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 35: Elizabeth Brady (Co-signed by 3)</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objects to the further development of</p>	<p>Generic Responses on Apartments and Residential Mix.</p>

apartment blocks.	Generic Responses on Apartments and Residential Mix.
<p><b>Submission No 36: Paula McNaughton</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objects to the further development of apartment blocks.</p>	Generic Responses on Apartments and Residential Mix.
<p><b>Submission No 37: Iris Dowling ( Co-signed by 2)</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objects to the further development of apartment blocks.</p>	Generic Responses on Apartments and Residential Mix.
<p><b>Submission No. 38: John Spain Associates on behalf of Cookstown Development Partnership</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.4.: Plan proposes Mixed Use Commercial (70% Residential) with balance of site to be used for Industrial. Requests an extension of Precinct boundary to the Cookstown Road as it would otherwise result in an inappropriate transition between the low grade low intensity industrial uses and the proposed areas of high density high quality “mixed use”. Also submission argues that this revision would take account of significant new road infrastructure to include the extension of the Embankment Road to the west of the site along the line of the LUAS. There should be a “transitional Zone” to secure an appropriate transition between industrial and mixed use areas in terms of elevational treatment massing and building heights.</p>	<p><b>Recommend an extension of the mixed use zone westwards to the Cookstown Road and the newly proposed connection to the Embankment Road to provide for a three to four storey development at 1:1 plot ratio in order to act as a transition zone.</b></p>
<p><b>Submission No. 39-David Copeland, Director OBK Architects/Designers On Behalf of Cookstown</b></p>	

<p><b>Development Partnership</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.7: Enclosed in submission is report prepared by urban planners Loci and encompasses Urban Analysis, Vision, Land use and Density and Area Frameworks. Report requests that the adjacent mixed use/residential zoning be extended to encompass the Cookstown North area with its accompany density and height requirements. Site referred to is located on the Cookstown Estate Road, west of reservoir and south of Luas line. It is argued that Cookstown Development Partnership' own a significant tract of land (4ha) and would be able to deliver an integrated masterplan for this location.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.2: Argues that the relationship between transport and land use is not fully reflected in the proposed land use and density strategies.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.7: Rational for continued industrial zoning in Cookstown North does not reflect its true accessibility to public transport. Suggested that the mixed use/residential zoning would be a more appropriate use in immediate vicinity of LUAS stations.</p> <p>Plan Ref.:5.2.1: Suggest a new block structure for the areas of Belgard Station and Cookstown North as consider Plan will reinforce existing pattern and land uses.</p>	<p><b>Recommend an extension of the mixed use zone westwards to the Cookstown Road and the newly proposed connection to the Embankment Road to provide for a three to four storey development at 1:1 plot ratio in order to act as a transition zone.</b></p>
<p><b>Submission No 40: Unable to read signature.</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Horrified with proposal to provide additional 3000 apartments</p>	<p>Generic Responses on Apartments and Residential Mix</p>

<p><b>Submission No 41: Arminta Wallace</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.10: Unhappy with the proposed changes to the ground surrounding “The Priory”</p>	<p>See Response to Submission 88.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 42: Burgman Packings</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.1: Protection of existing small business be paramount</p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.7: Council zone suitable land in the Cookstown area for commercial purposes</p>	<p>Generic Response for Employment</p> <p>Generic Response for Land Use Mix</p>
<p><b>Submission No 43: Health Service Executive</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: Requested a meeting with County Manager to discuss issues.</p>	<p>The Health Services Executive has the Tallaght Town Centre Proposed Local Area Plan and the Environmental Report and has been asked for comments. The Council are awaiting a response on this matter and will incorporate the HSE requirements into the Plan as appropriate.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 44: Blanaid Gallagher.</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: No services provided for the increase in population that the additional residential units will bring</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.1: No traffic management</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.2.3: Use of high rise apartment blocks has not worked in the past and will not work in this instance</p>	<p>Generic Response on Community/Social Infra.</p> <p>Generic Traffic management response</p> <p>Generic Response on Plot Ratio/Height.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 45: Margaret Beggan</b></p>	

<p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Area has not got the facilities to cope with 3000 additional apartments</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: No provisions for young families to buy a house with garden to raise their family</p>	<p>Generic Response on Apartments and Community and Social Infrastructure</p> <p>Generic Response on Residential Mix.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 46: Jim Lawlor</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.2.3: Plan should require high standards and not high rise buildings.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Need to accommodate family housing facilities</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: Improve public transports facilities</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Oppose the apartments proposed</p>	<p>Generic Response on plot Ratio and Height. The Plan sets out a series of standards that are of a higher quality in terms of Buildings and their Settings, Quality of Life and Access and Movement than those in the present Development Plan.</p> <p>Generic Response on Residential Mix</p> <p>Public Transport Generic Response.</p> <p>Generic Response on Apartments.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 47: DPP (Development Planning Partnership) on behalf of Kerry Group PLC</b></p> <p><b>Our submission relates to Cookstown South:</b></p> <p><b>Plan Ref. 4.7:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Propose that there should be low- medium scale buildings in residential areas and medium scale along road frontages with higher buildings at gateway locations</li> <li>• Include lands up to fourth Ave. in higher density strategy area</li> <li>• Alter the height from 3 to 5 storey's</li> <li>• Alteration of the plot ratio to 2:0:1</li> </ul>	<p>Building height on this site and adjoining sites in the Cookstown South Precinct south of Fourth Avenue should increase to 4 storeys. There is also potential for a landmark building subject to certain quality criteria at this location. There should be no change in plot ratio, in accordance with the medium density status of this area. The proposed mixed use-residential zoning allows for some commercial use.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Increase building height on this site and adjoining sites in the</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note that the land use map dissects the subject site with two land uses we feel it should be one land use and should be within the mixed use area</li> <li>Phasing timescales should be specified to development phases rather than planning application phases.</li> </ul>	Cookstown South Precinct south of Fourth Avenue to 4 storeys.
<p><b>Submission No 48: Christopher and Phyllis Adderley &amp; Anthony and Marie Adderley</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Object to the re-zoning of land to provide for 3000 apartments</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: Inadequate existing infrastructure</p> <p>Plan Ref. Utilities: Visual amenity of the area already degraded with balconies being used for clothes drying area additional apartments will worsen this.</p>	<p>Generic Response on Residential Mix</p> <p>Generic Response on Community/Social Infrastructure</p> <p>Generic Response for Management Companies</p>
<p><b>Submission No 49: Gary, Geraldine, Aimee and Eric Gibson</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: 3,000 additional apartments would be visually detrimental to the area.</p>	Generic response on Apartments and Residential Mix
<p><b>Submission No 50: Cllr Mick Murphy</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objection to the addition of 3000 additional apartments in the Town Centre as the Council have no idea of the problems caused by having such a large concentration of private rented properties in the</p>	Generic responses on Apartments and Tenure.

<p>middle of Tallaght.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 6.0: Council does not regulate the Management companies.</p>	<p>Generic Response for Management Companies</p>
<p><b>Submission No 51: Lorna Doran</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objection to proposed 3000 apartments and request a more balanced view of the housing needs of people in the area.</p>	<p>Generic responses on Apartments, Residential Mix and Social and Community Infrastructure.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 52: Kenneth Doran</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objection to proposed 3000 apartments and request a more balanced view of the housing needs of people in the area</p>	<p>Generic responses on Apartments, Residential Mix and Social and Community Infrastructure.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 53: Jim Lawlor (see also submission 46)</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Need to accommodate family housing facilities</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.2: Improve public transport facilities</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Oppose the apartments proposed</p>	<p>Generic responses on Apartments and Residential Mix,</p> <p>Generic Response on Public Transport.</p> <p>Generic Response on Apartments.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 54: Patrick Kenny</b></p> <p>Plan Ref.4.14: Building height threshold should be increased to 4 – 5 stories along lands bordered by The Foxes Covert, the new pedestrian Boulevard and the</p>	<p>The two and three storey heights proposed along this section of the Village are intended to maintain the architectural integrity of the Village.</p>

<p>Greenhills Rd Extension.</p>	<p><b>Submission No 55: Albert Leonard</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. Tenure: Apartment development will be bought by property developers who will let them as short term renting and this will not allow for the vibrant community as stated in the vision statement.</p> <p>Plan Ref. Tenure: Ask again to look at what control you have over who occupies these buildings.</p>	<p>Generic Responses on Apartments and on Tenure.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 56: Donal Brady</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.1.2: The density of apartments proposed is out of sync with the housing trend associated with suburban living and will also not encourage families to set up home but short term lessee's with no sense of community.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.2.3: The height restriction of 18 stories is far too high for Tallaght and would be more suited to urban areas.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.1: No traffic management study has been carried out.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: A proper assessment of the impact on traffic with the proposed 3000 apartments should be carried out.</p>	<p>Generic response on Density and Residential Mix.</p> <p>Generic Response on Plot Ratio / Heights.</p> <p>Generic Response on Traffic Management.</p> <p>Generic Response on Apartments and Residential Mix.</p>	
<p><b>Submission No 57: Cllr Eamonn Maloney</b></p>		

<p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: It is unlikely that developers will be attracted to financing additional apartments if the market forces change.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 6.0: Phasing/implementation section to be adhered to rigorously.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: The plan should propose some form of venue for residents to come together.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.1: Employment of local labour should continue.</p> <p>Plan Ref.5.3.6: Policing and CCTV system are essential and this should be a condition of the plan.</p> <p><b>Submission No 58: Aidan Gallagher (Quality Bus Network Project Office)</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.2: Supports the plan and its approach to public transportation development.</p> <p><b>Submission No 59: Enda O'Toole on behalf of Ellensborough Association</b></p>	<p>There is no indication nationally of a reduction in the demand for housing.</p> <p>Generic Response on Phasing.</p> <p>In section 3.3.2 it is an objective of the Council to <i>“Facilitate the expansion and enhancement of existing community facilities and to facilitate the provision of a range of new community facilities to meet the needs of both existing and future residents of Tallaght”</i>.</p> <p>The objective to encourage a community focus in all new apartment developments of 75 or more units will be realised by means of requiring a managed community meeting room which will be made available to the residents of the development.</p> <p>Generic Response for Employment.</p> <p>Generic Response for Safety and Security.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 58: Aidan Gallagher (Quality Bus Network Project Office)</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.2: Supports the plan and its approach to public transportation development.</p> <p><b>Submission No 59: Enda O'Toole on behalf of Ellensborough Association</b></p>	<p>Acknowledge.</p>

<p>Plan Ref.3.1.2: Density is far too high, past experience has shown that they don't work, appears that the Luas is a reason for increased densities.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Will the apartments be owner occupied or will developers own the majority of them??</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: No provisions made for new schools with the increase in residential units will come increased need for services.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: Where are the green spaces? Each development should have its own green space</p> <p>Plan Ref 4.10: Policy in the development plan aims to try and protect/preserve villages within the county however this appears not to be the case for Tallaght Village</p>	<p>Generic Response on Density.</p> <p>Generic Response on Tenure.</p> <p>Generic Response on Education in Social and Community Infrastructure.</p> <p>Generic Section on Parks From Community/Social.</p> <p>Generic Section on Cultural Heritage</p>
<p><b>Submission No 60: John Murray, Spain Courtney Doyle Building Surveying</b></p> <p><b>Plan Ref. 4.9: Map A</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feel that higher density should apply along the spinal route. The spine route is believed to be The Belgard rd.</li> <li>• Submit that additional landmark locations should be cited at the following locations: Corner of Belgard Walk and Belgard Rd., To the car park at the front of the Abberley Court Hotel</li> <li>• Also suggest that this location to the front of the Abberley would be better suited to tourist/civic</li> </ul>	<p>The max. plot ratios and floor heights proposed along the Belgard Road are 1.5:1 – 2.0: 1 and four – five storey respectively although a 20% floor space bonus can be achieved if there is a significant public gain.</p> <p>See above.</p> <p>See above.</p>

<p>amenity and also suitable for a 360 degree panoramic restaurant/bar on top of the tower.</p> <p><b>Plan Ref. 4.6: Map B</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area between Cookstown Way and Embankment Rd should be brought to Phase 1. Developing along the Luas line should be fast tracked in terms of planning.</li> <li>• Submit that the landmark building should be upgraded to 2x threshold. There are no residential buildings surrounding the site and would also help the adjoining helicopter landing area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Plan Ref. 4.2: Map C</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit that the proposed gateway location of Airton Rd and Greenhills Rd should be increased to 5 storeys.</li> <li>• Plot ratio of surrounding grounds should be increased to 1.2.</li> </ul>	<p>Generic Response for Phasing.</p> <p>The three categories of landmark building height have been arranged to be high in the Core area and decrease in height as the distance from the Core area increases.</p> <p>The height of the proposed gateway location of Airton Rd and Greenhills Rd is four stories, a particular element of which may be increased to six stories to allow a gateway effect.</p> <p>Higher intensity development within the area would not be in accordance with the principles of sustainable development whilst access to services and public transport is relatively poor.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 61: Justin Corr, Tara De Butlear sent in via e-mail by Charlie O Connor TD</b></p> <p><b>Justin Corr</b> Plan Ref. 3.3.2: No public transport to cater for the increase in population,</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Tallaght will become “Ghettoised”.</p> <p><b>Tara De Butlear</b> Plan Ref. 4.10: Support the plan to preserve the historical</p>	<p>Generic Response for Public Transport.</p> <p>Generic Response for Apartments, Tenure and Residential Mix</p> <p>A place based Local Framework has been developed with regard to</p>

<p>village of Tallaght and the increase in the provision of services to the residents of Tallaght.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.2.3: Opposed to the excessive high rise apartment blocks proposed.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: No new housing developments with outside gardens for young people with young families.</p>	<p>different precincts within the town centre these and this provides for detailed guidance on any future development within these areas. The precinct which includes old Tallaght Village has both been identified and labeled as “The Historic Precinct”. The boundary of this precinct follows that of the Architectural Conservation Area designated under the County Development Plan 2004–2010.</p> <p>In order to remain a vibrant part of the town centre the existing mix and of residential and commercial uses along the Main St. within the Historic Precinct should remain, however as stated under section 4.10.3 of this chapter any additional “<i>conversion of existing residential uses to commercial uses should be discouraged.</i>”</p> <p>Generic response on Culture and for Social and Community Infrastructure.</p> <p>Generic Response on plot Ratio and Height.</p> <p>Generic Response on Apartments and Residential Mix</p>
<p><b>Submission No 62: East Tallaght Combined Residents Association</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Additional 3000 apartments would adversely affect environmental well being of the area as a whole.</p> <p>Plan Ref. Tenure: Local authority has no control over the rental market and the apartments will only provide for a transient community which will in turn result in a lack of community.</p>	<p>Generic Response on Apartments and on Residential Mix.</p> <p>Generic Response on Tenure.</p>

<p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Anti-social problems occur with Urban sprawl and over population and a lack of community spirit.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: Services and infrastructural improvements should be developed in tandem with the residential units as in the case with Adamstown a monitoring community is not enough.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.1.2: There was no analysis provided in the published document in relation to high rise and high density creates flooding in surrounding low-lying areas.</p> <p>Plan Ref. Utilities: Water pressure is a current problem with the area and an additional 3000 apartment will intensify this problem.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2: Concept of wide streets will not be attainable due to existing constraints and established road constraints.</p>	<p>Generic Response on Apartments.</p> <p>Generic response on Community/Social.</p> <p>No development being proposed in flood plain areas.</p> <p>The existing infrastructure combined with the Boherboy Water Supply Scheme will be more than adequate for the estimated growth.</p> <p>Generic Response on Traffic Management.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 63: Residents of Virginia Heights</b></p> <p><b>Positives:</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.2.8: Development of Neighbourhood Park,</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.2.8: Enhancement of Sean Walsh Park,</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.2: Improvements to public transport infrastructure,</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2: Improvements in pedestrian access around Tallaght Village</p>	<p>Acknowledge</p> <p>Acknowledge</p> <p>Acknowledge</p> <p>Acknowledge.</p>



<p><b>Negatives</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 6.0: Scale and speed of development is unprecedented</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.1: Additional residents will add to already bad traffic congestion.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: School places should be adjacent to demand rather than playing catch up as this will involve residents crossing major transport routes.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.1: Relocating existing industries will give a loss in local employment</p> <p>Plan Ref. Tenure: Transient community rather than a stable one in relation to leasing of apartments.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.6: Increase in population without Garda numbers will give rise to an increase in crime and security in the area.</p>	<p>Generic Response on Apartments and Land Use Mix.</p> <p>Generic Response on Traffic Management.</p> <p>Generic response on Education in Social and Community Infrastructure.</p> <p>Generic Response on Employment.</p> <p>Generic Response on Tenure</p> <p>Generic Response on Safety/Security.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 64: GD Group</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.1: Safeguarding employment and ensuring successful businesses are not compromised by new developments should be paramount.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.6: Security issues and antisocial behaviour would escalate with this development</p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.16: That the proposed walkway along the stream be railed in order to keep the area secure.</p>	<p>Generic response on Employment.</p> <p>Generic response on Safety and Security.</p> <p><b>Recommend that the proposed walkway along the Whitestown Stream be railed in order to prevent unauthorised access to</b></p>

	adjoining premises.
<p><b>Submission No 65: Joy and Derek Fitzgerald</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Object to the building of 3000 additional apartments.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: Need for additional services within Tallaght and additional schools.</p> <p>Plan Ref. Tenure: Transient community rather than a stable one in relation to leasing of apartments.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.6: Increase in population without Garda numbers will give rise to an increase in crime and security in the area</p>	<p>Generic response on Apartments and Residential Mix</p> <p>Generic response on Social and Community Infrastructure</p> <p>Generic response on Tenure</p> <p>Generic response on Safety and Security.</p>
<p><b>Submission No 66: Marie Ford</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.2.8: Plan does not give the community additional green space.</p>	<p>It is an objective of the Plan and the Council to provide and implement a hierarchy of parks and public squares within the Town Centre. The hierarchy of parks takes the form of Sub-regional Parks, Neighborhood Parks, Pocket Parks, Public squares, Greenways and linear Parks. Each of the parks proposed will be subject to a Landscape Plan and also a design statement will be required to be submitted in conjunction with these. Provision of Public open space will be assessed on a site by site basis. For larger sites a Pocket Park or Civic Square will be required to be incorporated within the site.</p> <p>Additional areas of communal or semi-private open-space refer to areas of open space within residential apartment complexes which are not open to the public these spaces will generally take the form of internal</p>

<p>Plan Ref. 4.8: The area marked as open spaces are inadequate and misleading, in particular the areas around Cookstown Way.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.11: A “Peoples Park” located at or near the hospital would be of benefit to the doctors and patients</p> <p><b>Submission No 67: Jim O Connor Bancroft Residents Association</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2: Concept of wide streets will not be attainable due to existing constraints and established road constraints.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.2.3: Building heights be reduced to that of low density</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: No need for 3000 additional apartments</p>	<p>courtyards and roof gardens. These communal open spaces also have a set of guidelines and design rationale to comply with and should be so designed to take account of a number of topics and rationale for their design. The size of the space should relate to the needs of the residents and the scale of development, include a range of facilities to cater for active and passive uses with areas of more active play in order to accommodate smaller children. These areas should be located to the rear of the residential area to ensure that they are clearly defined from the public realm. Areas should include screening devices to ensure privacy levels are maintained for both the users of the open space and the surrounding residential blocks but should remain accessible to all residents.</p> <p>The intention in the Plan is that the existing open space around Cookstown Way with limited facilities would be upgraded and that the possibility of using the top surface of the reservoir as an amenity space be investigated.</p> <p>A new public square at the main hospital entrance is one of the proposals in the Plan. The retention of private open space in the hospital as an amenity is also included.</p>
	<p>A number of the existing wide roads, such as the Belgard Road, can be transformed into urban boulevards.</p> <p>Generic Response on Height and Plot Ratio.</p> <p>Generic Response on Apartments</p>

<p>Plan Ref.: 5.4.4: Parking standards should be the same as that in the development plan 1.5 spaces and not 1 as proposed in the Masterplan.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Ways should be found to accommodate small scale housing with lower densities.</p>	<p>Generic Response on Parking</p> <p>Generic Response on Residential Mix</p>
<p><b>Submission No 68: Jennifer Wann &amp; David Cotter</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.3: Public art should also reflect Tallaght's historical and cultural past.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.10: Conservation plan for the Priory site and St Maelruans be conducted by an independent expert as part of a public consultation process.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.9: Height of buildings near the Belgard Rd should reflect the existing and should be no higher than 3 storeys'.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.4: Landmark building adjacent to Belgard station should only be three storeys' in height</p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.10: Wooded area of the Priory lands should be open space.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.10: All buildings and trees at the Priory site should be retained as they are of great Archaeological value.</p>	<p>Generic response on Cultural Heritage</p> <p>A Conservation Plan would be required for both of the areas in the context of development proposals. The input of local expertise and comments on the Conservation Plan could be availed of during the planning application process.</p> <p>Generic response for plot ratio/building height. The intention in the Plan is that the Belgard Road becomes a major urban boulevard with an appropriate scale of development to match. The intended heights are four to five storeys.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>Acknowledge. See also Generic Response for the Priory.</p> <p>Acknowledge</p>

<p><b>Submission No 69: Caroline Hope, Tallaght Youth Service</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: Proposed that land be allocated to build a Youth Centre Facility we would welcome an opportunity to speak about this with SDCC</p>	<p><b>Recommend that the objective to cooperate with and facilitate the TYS in providing a Youth Centre Facility be included in the Plan.</b></p>
<p><b>Submission No 70: James Ryder</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Against the idea of providing additional 3000 apartments</p> <p>Plan Ref. Tenure: Will become Ballymun</p> <p>Plan Ref. Utilities: No proper facilities for drying clothes and they will end up out on the Balcony with will deter from the visual amenity.</p>	<p>Generic response on Tallaght Town Centre Apartments</p> <p>Generic response for Tenure</p> <p>Generic response for Management Companies</p>
<p><b>Submission No. 71: Old Bawn Residents Association (co-signed by 3)</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objects to the proposal of 3,000 apartments. Would like a greater residential mix as apartments encourage a transient community.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.2.3: Height proposed constitutes a health hazard for future generations.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 6.0: Management companies are ineffective in a lot of apartments and are causing unsightly living conditions. : Council have not addressed current issue of absentee landlords.</p>	<p>Generic response for Apartments and Residential mix</p> <p>Generic response for ratio/building height</p> <p>Generic response for management companies.</p>

<p><b>Submission No. 72: Rhondda Flood</b> Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objects to the proposal of 3,000 apartments. Requests a more balanced approach to our housing needs.</p> <p><b>Submission No.73: Amanda O’ Farrell</b> Plan ref. 5.3.2: Expresses objection to the proposal to provide 6000 apartments with a maximum height of 18 storeys</p> <p><b>Submission No. 74: Conor Molphy, GVA Grimley, International Property Advisers, Client: Tesco</b> Plan Ref. 3.2.1: Welcomes the proposal of a land bridge across the N81.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.16: Welcomes the mixed commercial zoning on the Whitestown Industrial Estate lands. Considers the relocation of Tesco from the Square S.C. to this site would achieve the vision for this area. Their relocation would encourage south-north pedestrian movement. The zoning of this site should make provision for large-scale retail use.</p> <p><b>Submission No. 75: Charlie O’ Connor T.D.</b> Plan Ref. 3.2.1: the issue of density and apartments is causing concern to residents and urges caution and consideration.</p>	<p>Generic response for Apartments and Residential Mix</p> <p>Generic response for Apartments along with plot ratio/building height.</p> <p>Acknowledged</p> <p>Mixed Commercial Uses is defined in Section 3.1.1.in the Plan as follows,” <i>This designation is primarily located around major routes into the Core Area and reflects the emerging pattern of offices, retail warehousing, showrooms, recreational facilities and small shops which serve employees and visitors. This designation will also allow car borne retail activities to be located in the Town Centre without drawing cars into the Core Area</i>”.</p> <p>Generic response for Density and Tallaght Town Centre Apartments</p>
--	---

<p>Plan Ref. 3.2.1.: Huge concern regarding traffic management in Tallaght.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.4.4: Car parking already at a premium in Tallaght without planned developments.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.10: Tallaght village deteriorated in recent times, paved foot paths need to be reinstated and action taken to restore the residential amenity of the Village. There also needs to be meaningful discussion with the Dominicans in the Priory lands.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 1.2: Need for proper liaison with the Health Service Executive, Department of Education and other agencies.</p> <p><b>Submission No. 76: Senator Brian Hayes</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.1.2: Considers that it is premature for the Council to advance a plan for a radical increase in apartment development before the Government have introduced new guidelines on density and quality for apartment development.</p>	<p>Generic response for Traffic Management.</p> <p>Generic response to Car Parking.</p> <p>As stated in section 5.4.3, street surfaces are to be design to the highest quality taking a number of considerations into account such as, being highly durable and easy to maintain, designed so as to have equal access for disabled and encumbered users, include attractive barriers so as to avoid card parking on footpaths and clearly distinguish between vehicle and pedestrian users.</p> <p>With regard to the village and its historic nature, the plan outlines that there is limited scope for change to the local street network and places emphasis on the upgrading of the existing networks and enhanced links to the village green.</p> <p>Generic Response to Community and Social Infrastructure.</p> <p>The South Dublin County Council Planning Department have consulted by the Department of the Environment in relation to the new proposed standards and are in accordance with the Department in specifying minimum average apartment size. The Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government has welcomed the publication of the</p>
---	--

<p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: 3,000 apartments built in close proximity to the town centre would have a negative impact on already pressurised key infrastructure.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: There are inadequate educational facilities to meet such a radical increase in population numbers in such a small area.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.2.4: Opposed to proposal for a landmark building of up to 18 storeys high.</p> <p><b>Submission No. 77: Marjo Moonen, Tallaght Partnership, Communication and Policy Officer</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Focus of Plan on apartments will bring a concentration of one type of resident in the area which is more transient.</p> <p>Plan Ref. Other, Tenancy: Type of tenure is an issue with a concentration of people living on rent allowance. Measures to prevent one type of tenure should be developed.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: No facilities for the young people.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.2: Need for a comprehensive network of uninterrupted cycle lanes in Tallaght. Should be complemented by safe and secure parking facilities.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.2.4: Expresses preference for landmarks in form of square, arch, clock or fountain rather than</p>	<p>Proposed Local Area Plan.</p> <p>Generic Response for Apartments and Community and Social infrastructure</p> <p>Generic Response for Community and Social infrastructure</p> <p>Generic response for plot ratio/building height</p> <p>Generic Response to residential mix and tenure.</p> <p>Generic Response for tenure and also management companies</p> <p>Generic Response for Community and Social Infrastructure</p> <p><b>Recommend that the requirement for cycle parking facilities for both occupiers and users of all Town Centre uses be included in the Plan.</b></p> <p>A series of objectives and standards in relation to Landscaping, Parks and Open Space, Communal and Semi-private Open Space and Private</p>
--	---



<p>landmarks of high buildings.</p> <p><b>Submission No. 78: Justin Dowling, Rohan Holdings.</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.16: As managing agents for South City Business Park, have experienced problems with vandalism against units in the Park. Express concern regarding the proposed opening of linear park for reasons of anti-social behaviour. Recommend that any proposed access point to the business park be for occupiers only. Concerned that the rear of Business Park vulnerable as only a low fence bounding linear park.</p> <p><b>Submission No 79: Bancroft Residents Association:</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 7.0: Publication of SEA Report and Breach of EU/2004/42 Article 4 section 1: The submission quotes EU legislation indicating that the Environmental Report shall be carried out and the consultation period provided prior to the adoption of the Plan and states that this was not done.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 1.2: Dissatisfaction with Inadequate Consultation Process: States that EU legislation is being violated because the consultation period is inadequate and the process is flawed.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: Population Planning for Primary and</p>	<p>Open Space, which can accommodate features as described, are set out in the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommend that the proposed walkway along the Whitestown Stream be railed in order to prevent unauthorised access to adjoining premises.</b></p> <p>The assertion that South Dublin County Council is in breach of the legislation because the Environmental Report was published at the same time as the <i>adopted</i> Plan, arises from a fundamental misunderstanding of the situation. The Environmental Report was published on the 13<sup>th</sup> April 2006 and the Tallaght Town Centre <b>Proposed</b> Local Area Plan was published simultaneously, in accordance with the 2004 SEA Regulations, which give effect to relevant EU SEA Directive. It is critical to note that the <b>Proposed</b> Local Area Plan is a draft document for consultation. The earliest date for adoption of the <b>Proposed</b> Plan is the 10<sup>th</sup> July 2006.</p> <p>South Dublin County Council followed the timescales set out in Section 20 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The six week period of consultation commenced on Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> April 2006 and concluded on Wednesday 24<sup>th</sup> May 2006. See Generic Response for Consultation.</p> <p>The Dept. of Education initially indicated declining school enrolments</p>
--	---

<p>Preschool Places Queries the lack of information on population increases and school places in the “East Tallaght Village”. States that the Council rather than the Department of Education has the primary responsibility for estimating the population increases that are used in determining primary school provision. Requests that the Council monitors drop out rate of local students and disseminate information to policy makers etc.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 2.2: Population Projections, Traffic Density and Census 2006 Preliminary Results: The submission queries the occupancy per apartment figure used in calculation the population estimates. Suggests that Council await the preliminary results of the Census 2006.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 7.0: National Climate Strategy: How can increased traffic congestion reduce the emission of greenhouse gases?</p> <p>Plan Ref. 7.0: National Development Plan Compliance: How can increasing the population density of the centre in South Dublin ease the pressure on urban infrastructure?</p>	<p>in Tallaght since the late 1980’s. Of 22 schools located within 1km of the Town Centre, combined enrolments are down more than 20% over 10 years. In response to the Planning Department providing population projections, the Department has recently indicated a requirement for two sites to be reserved.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Two school sites will be identified and reserved in the Plan as required by the Department of Education.</b></p> <p>On the basis of the Census 2002 figures the population of Tymon (the DED area that encapsulates Bancroft) is 5,604 persons. The population in this area has fallen by 10.9% since 1991. Based on the average occupancy rate of 2 persons per apartment (derived from the occupancy of apartments across the County in 2002 i.e. 2.06), the current apartments under construction will increase the population by 756 persons. The outcome of the 2006 Census returns will not alter the fundamental necessity of maintaining and increasing the population density in the County Town. The Census 2006 figures will be available for the mid-term review in 2009.</p> <p>The emission of greenhouse gases is achieved by infrastructure by reducing the need to travel by developing housing in close proximity to employment opportunities</p> <p>Compliance with the National Development Plan, the Strategic Planning Guidelines for the Greater Dublin Area 2000 – 2016 (SPG) and the Regional Planning Guidelines for the Greater Dublin Area 2004 – 2016 (RPG) and Local Agenda 21 is achieved by accommodating the projected additional population and households through measures including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consolidation of the three western towns of Tallaght, Lucan-Clondalkin and Blanchardstown to their approximate design</li> </ul>
---	--

<p>Plan Ref. 1.2: Local Agenda 21 Completely Ignored: States that Bancroft Residents never had any consultation from the Council for inputs to the Plan and that the initial input into the Pre plan consultation was ignored.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 2.2: No Explicit Mention of National Sporting Strategy</p> <p><b>Submission No. 80: Pine View &amp; Church Grove Environmental Group, (Co-signed by 2)</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2: Welcome promotion of a more accessible Tallaght by foot.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.13: Welcome further development of Sean Walsh Park.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.2.4: Opposed to provision for a landmark building of up to 18 storeys in height.</p>	<p>populations;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-development of brownfield sites and infill development within the existing built-up area; and</li> <li>• Increasing occupancy rates in existing residential areas.</li> </ul> <p>Reducing the demand for additional transport infrastructure by reducing the need to travel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resisting scattered settlement patterns, which are costly to service.</li> </ul> <p>See response above re. consultation</p> <p>While there is no explicit mention of the National Sporting Strategy in the Proposed Local Area Plan, the Council has appointed a full time Sports and Recreational Officer and a sports strategy for the county is being developed. Emphasis is being placed on the promotion of sport and recreation especially in areas of disadvantage. A significant amount of funding for the swimming pool at present under construction in West Tallaght is being funded from the resources generated by the urban renewal developments in Tallaght Town Centre.</p> <p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>Generic Response for Plot Ratio/Building Height.</p>
--	---

<p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Opposed to high density and over dependence on apartments.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.1.2: Opposed to density and concentration of dwellings within 1 mile sq.</p> <p>Plan Ref. Other, tenancy: Over use of Section 23.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.2.5: Recommend restrictions on the streetscape and design of future developments such as the provision of free laundry facilities in all basements of apartments; waste management should be considered carefully; pitched roofs would soften visual impacts of dwellings adjacent to two storey dwellings and open nature of balconies should be revised to afford nearby residents privacy.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.1: Traffic management study required before plan is evaluated/adopted.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.10: Requirement for visitors centre to pull together historic aspects of Tallaght and countryside. Requirement for an artists village of small studios with special rental agreements, Tallaght Village is considered ideal.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 2.2: Dodder Valley should have been included in the Masterplan Area. Sean Walsh Park should be expanded to balance heavy construction in centre of Tallaght.</p>	<p>Generic Response to Density and Residential Mix.</p> <p>Generic response on Density and Tallaght Town Centre apartments.</p> <p>Generic response to Tenure.</p> <p>Generic response to management companies.</p> <p>Generic response to traffic management.</p> <p>Generic response to Cultural Heritage.</p> <p>The Dodder Valley Park is outside the study area of the Plan. The provision of the land-bridge from the Town Centre to Sean Walsh Park will ensure a major expansion in the accessibility of the Park.</p>
--	--

<p>Plan Ref. 6.0: Recommends strict control and licensing of Management Companies.</p> <p><b>Submission No. 81: Councillor Marie Corr, Labour Party</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 6.0: Phasing of development critical to the provision of facilities. Requests that SDCC impose a ban on the operation of Management Companies in the Town Centre with respect to services that the Local Authority would normally take in charge.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.2.8: Concerned that there is inadequate provision of high quality amenity spaces in the Plan. In particular, there should be an obligation on developers to create a minimum “kickabout” space in or around all new residential developments in the Tallaght Area. Requests that a focus of the Plan be on the provision of Youth – friendly locations with facilities such as skate-parks, areas for inline skating, gathering places for open-air events etc. Also recommends further exploration of the provision of provision of facilities for the celebration and cultivation of ethnic diversity.</p>	<p>Generic response to management companies</p> <p>Generic Response for management companies and phasing and implementation</p> <p>It is an objective of the Plan and the Council to provide and implement a hierarchy of parks and public squares within the Town Centre. The hierarchy of parks takes the form of Sub-regional Parks, Neighborhood Parks, Pocket Parks, Public squares, Greenways and linear Parks. Each of the parks proposed will be subject to a Landscape Plan and also a design statement will be required to be submitted in conjunction with these. Provision of Public open space will be assessed on a site by site basis. For larger sites a Pocket Park or Civic Square will be required to be incorporated within the site.</p> <p>Additional areas of communal or semi-private open-space refer to areas of open space within residential apartment complexes which are not open to the public these spaces will generally take the form of internal courtyards and roof gardens. These communal open spaces also have a set of guidelines and design rationale to comply with and should be so designed to take account of a number of topics and rationale for their design. The size of the space should relate to the needs of the residents and the scale of development, include a range of facilities to cater for active and passive uses with areas of more active play in order to accommodate smaller children. These areas should be located to the rear of the residential area to ensure that they are clearly defined from the public realm. Areas should include screening devices to ensure</p>
--	---

<p>Plan Ref. 3.1.2: Believes that the development of apartments/high density residential areas will only succeed where many conditions are imposed by the Council and phasing of development ensures that provision of facilities keeps pace with housing developments.</p> <p>Plan Ref. Other, Tenancy: It is recommended that with resources that SDCC acquire from PRTB regarding properties privately rented and located in Tallaght, should be channelled towards ensuring that tenancies are registered and are part of the system through awareness raising and other appropriate methods such as inspections. This should be an LAP objective.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: Public services such as transport, education, policing and health are inadequately addressed. All planning applications should be addressed using the concept of An Garda Siochana-CPTED-Crime Prevention through Environmental Design.</p> <p><b>Submission No. 82: Mr. Michael Glover</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.10: Objects to the compulsory purchase of land in Tallaght for the town centre expansion and this land has been given by the people to the Dominican Fathers in order to allow them to carry on the community and other church work in area.</p> <p><b>Submission No. 83: Large Petition</b></p>	<p>privacy levels are maintained for both the users of the open space and the surrounding residential blocks but should remain accessible to all residents.</p> <p>Generic Response to Apartments, Phasing and Social and Community Infrastructure</p> <p>There is at present a legal requirement on the Council to monitor the standards of private rental accommodation. The existence of an up to date register of private rental accommodation (maintained by the PRTB) would facilitate this requirement.</p> <p>Generic response for Social and Community Infrastructure and Safety &amp; Security.</p> <p>There is no proposal in the Plan to compulsory acquire Priory land to facilitate Town Centre expansion. See Response to Submission 88.</p>
--	---

<p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objects to 3000 apartments.</p> <p><b>Submission No. 84: Voice, voluntary organisation</b> Plan Ref. 4.13:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Argued that the householders who bought their houses in Old Bawn and Aylesbury were forced to pay a portion of the original purchase price to cover the overall costs of the estate, including all lands set aside for infrastructure such as churches, schools etc. Therefore it is considered that they should have been properly consulted about how those lands are to be developed or disposed before changes are made. In relation to Shamrock Rovers, despite its proximity to Old Bawn, have never been invited to any public consultation.</li> <li>The development of a landbridge would give rise to parking on the narrow estate roads of Old Bawn.</li> </ul> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.1: The issues of traffic signal co-ordination, bus corridors, extra buses, provision of public transport, road markings etc. are not considered in the Plan. Furthermore, the clear risks that Tallaght Hospital are taking, which is probably under the civil flight path for Baldonnel, has not been addressed.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.2: The Plan should be revised to include of Tallaght in the public transport planning. Plan should include recommendations for the SDCC Transportation Strategic Policy Group.</p>	<p>Generic Response for Apartments</p> <p>Generic Response for Consultation</p> <p>There is no reason why the land bridge would attract more parking on the narrow estate roads of Old Bawn than at present generated by the existing pedestrian bridge.</p> <p>Generic Response to Traffic Management.</p> <p>Generic Response for Public Transport</p>
---	--

<p>Plan Ref. 7.0: LAP should be amended to take full account of the impact of industrial, recreational, traffic and other sources of noise that exceed the WHO standards. LAP should demand conditions that meet the WHO guidelines of 50 dBLAeq in daytime and 45 dBLAeq at night. Reference is made to aircrafts to Baldonnel flying at 1,000 ft. There should be policy regarding Baldonnel and designated helicopter routes in the vicinity of Tallaght Town Centre.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.6: LAP should be amended to examine and report, with recommendations, on all aspects of security for Tallaght, including Tallaght Town Centre. Plan should examine and report on the provision of emergency services for SDCC. Consideration should be given to Casement Aerodrome, Baldonnel and possible status change from military to civil airport.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 1.2: Disappointed at format of public consultation, in particular, sparseness of displays, the difficulties with printing from the internet to A4 and cost of the Plan. Unhappy that all submissions will only be available under Freedom of Information.</p> <p><b>Submission No 85: Fran Doran</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Further 3000 apartments will not solve the housing crisis would ask the Council to redress this issues and put forward a more balance approach to the housing needs</p> <p><b>Submission No 86: Pat Rabitte TD</b></p>	<p>All developments are regulated by the Building Control Regulations which specify standards in relation to noise insulation.</p> <p>Generic response for Security. The future status of Baldonnel is outside the scope of the LAP.</p> <p>Generic Response for Consultation</p> <p>Generic Response for Apartments and Residential Mix</p>
---	--



<p>Plan Ref. 4.14: Opposed to the building heights, Tallaght village should not be overshadowed by excessively high buildings in the village green area it should be limited to three storey's</p> <p>Plan Ref. 6.0: Phasing and implantation of plan: The Core area/Cookstown South should be developed as priority. Development of the Cookstown Luas precinct should be postponed until a review of the Tallaght Masterplan in 2009. Opposed to the building of high rise buildings at the Belgard Luas precinct that would overshadow the existing buildings.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.2: Sustainability and public transport: It is essential that a medium term review of this plan to consider how the current 3000 apartments have affected the congestion and transport routes in Tallaght.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Future home for Tallaght Residents: Despite current housing output there are and will be thousands of Young Tallaght residents who cannot afford to buy a home in the area. In terms of housing provision this plan does not meet this groups need for housing.</p> <p><b>Submission No 87: Bernard McNamara and Other Landowners</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.7: Suggests that the Masterplan should</p>	<p>Generic Response for Plot Ratio and Height</p> <p>Generic Response for Phasing</p> <p><b>See mid term Review Recommendation as part of Generic Response for Apartments</b></p> <p>15% of all residential units built under the Plan will be Social and / or Affordable. The availability in supply of housing in Tallaght will help keep prices more affordable than if there was a scarcity of supply.</p> <p>This submission on behalf of a consortium of landowners includes</p>
--	--

<p>promote mixed use development throughout the site (a collection of sites at present split between the Core Precinct and the Cookstown South Precinct).</p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.7: Suggests that allowing more flexible densities on the site would be consistent with the Residential Density Guidelines, the proximity to LUAS line and the precedent already established by the granting of a number of high density permissions within the Core Area.</p>	<p>several sites not in their ownership or control, including a substantial site in the ownership of South Dublin County Council and a site subject to a separate submission to this Plan on behalf of the Kerry Group.</p> <p>The comprehensive nature of the submission is welcomed and highlights the potential of the lands immediately north of the current developing Town Centre area. However, the submission departs from the proposed Plan in a number of key areas.</p> <p>Objectives of the proposed Plan include the provision of a green public space or small park as the focal point of this area, rather than a hard public space and narrow boulevard as in the submission.</p> <p>The proposed Plan also seeks to promote a strong north-south route as part of a hierarchy of routes connected to the wider road network that accommodate vehicular and pedestrian movement. The submission proposes an even grid distribution of routes with an east-west boulevard as the dominant route.</p> <p>The east-west boulevard appears to be based on a future Metro or Luas station to the east of the site, which has yet to be determined. It is likely that a future metro station would be to the south of the site in question.</p> <p>With regard to density and height, the proposed Plan seeks to promote as plot ratio of up to 2:0:1 and buildings of up to 5 storeys on this site, with the potential for some taller landmark buildings, subject to quality criteria. Whilst the submission seeks to increase this further, the intensity of development proposed in the Plan is considered appropriate in accordance with the overall strategy outlined. It is agreed that building height on the eastern part of the Uniphar site adjoining Belgard Road could increase to 5 storeys.</p> <p>Whilst it is intended that the proposed Plan strategy will determine future development on this site, it is expected that there will be a</p>
--	---

<p><b>Submission No 88: St Mary's Dominican Priory</b>  <b>Plan Ref. 4.11:</b>  The Community of St Mary's Priory object to the following elements in the Proposed Plan;</p> <p>The various proposals in the proposed Plan which threaten the unity of the Priory site and the continued work of the Dominican community (a comprehensive description of the past and present activities of the community are given).</p>	<p>reasonable degree of flexibility at the design stage, subject to compliance with the principal controlling elements of the Plan. Further discussion in relation to this site would be welcomed.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b>  Increase building height on the eastern part of the Uniphar site adjoining Belgard Road (i.e. the portion of the site to the east of the embankment) to 5 storeys.</p> <p>The Council fully acknowledge the positive role of the Dominican community in Tallaght, past and present, and look forward to their continued presence and dynamic role in the future. The Council also acknowledge the Priory as a living community of Dominican Friars and the integral nature of the existing buildings and enclosed garden in their monastic life.</p> <p>The strategy advanced in the Proposed Local Area Plan does not intend in any way to threaten the activities of the Dominicans but to indicate, in the event of a change of circumstance, the development management framework that should be applied to the site (a possible change in circumstance, outlined by the community itself, in a submission dated the 30<sup>th</sup> November 2005 i.e. <i>“Our work and needs may vary in the future, as they have in the past. To raise funds to continue this work, it may at some stage be necessary to sell some more of our land for development”</i>).</p>
---	--

<p>The impression in the proposed Plan that part or all of the Priory land is surplus to the Order's needs and so is available for compulsory purchase.</p> <p>The description of the walled garden and Retreat House garden as “<i>semi-private open space</i>” and “<i>Priory Open Land</i>” respectively and the description of the Priory as “<i>an extensive high amenity area of semi-private open space</i>”.</p> <p>The exclusion of two archaeological features on the site i.e. a souterrain and a section of the Pale defence.</p> <p>The false presentation of the boundary between the Priory and the ITT.</p>	<p>The development management framework basically repeats what is already in the County Development Plan in relation to the Priory and to any change to the use of protected structures. It adds to the Plan by indicating where a limited amount of development could be permitted i.e. in the eastern section of the site. The primary strategy in relation to the Priory land in the event of significant development proposals is “<i>A detailed Conservation Plan shall be submitted in relation to the Priory site .....in advance of any significant future development being considered. The Conservation Plan shall thoroughly assess the impact of any development and demonstrate how it will contribute to the conservation of historically significant structures and landscape elements.</i>”</p> <p><b>See recommendation below.</b></p> <p>The Proposed Local Area Plan does not set out to list all known or possible sites of archaeological/architectural interest in the Priory site or on any other site in the Town Centre as that is one of the functions of the Development Plan. In the event of any development proposal on the section of site where the Dominican submission indicates additional archaeological features, the Conservation Plan will require archaeological assessment as part of any initiative.</p> <p>It is stated in the opening paragraph on the Historic Precinct that “<i>The boundary of the precinct follows that of the Architectural Conservation Area designated under the SDCC Development Plan 2004-2010. The area includes and the traditional village centre of Tallaght and lands associated with two of Tallaght's oldest institutions, the Dominican</i></p>
---	--

*Priory and St Maelruans.*” It is clear that it was not intended to indicate an ownership boundary. Nonetheless as it is a valid argument that the boundary of the Conservation Area should reflect the full curtilage of land surrounding the Protected Structures, it is recommended that the boundary be amended accordingly. This amendment will address the concerns expressed by the Dominican Community as all of their land will be in the Historic Precinct and not split between two precincts.

The suggestion to use compulsory purchase powers to acquire the walled garden of the Priory.

There is no mention (or intention) in the Proposed Plan to compulsory acquire land in the Priory. While it is stated that *“It is an objective of the SDCC Development Plan to provide a new town park on the Priory land adjoining Old Blessington Road (Refer to part 3, Specific Local Objective 78(b))”*, this is qualified by the statement that *“Full public access to the Priory lands may conflict with the needs of the Dominican Order. However public access on a limited and supervised basis should be encouraged”*.

Plan Ref. 7.0 The absence of reference to the compulsory purchase of the walled garden in the Environmental Report.

The Environmental Report makes no reference to the compulsory purchase of the walled garden because this is not proposed in the Plan.

Plan Ref. 3.2: The submission supports the proposal in the Plan to route the Zip pedestrian way outside their ownership.

Acknowledge.

**Recommendation:**

**The description of the existing land use in 4.10.2 be amended to *“The Priory functions as a living community of Dominican Friars who are involved in a wide variety of educational, social, cultural as well as religious activities. The enclosed garden and the Retreat***

<p><b>Submission No 89: Ruth Pillington</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Object to the number of apartments proposed and also the height of the proposed urban blocks.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 2.2: Serious reservations about the pace of development and overdevelopment of Tallaght will have repercussions for the existing residents.</p> <p><b>Submission No 90: Spatial Policy, Development Applications Unit DOE.</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 1.2: Support the plan.</p> <p><b>Submission No 91: Laurence Collins OP</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 1.2: Lack of adequate consultation in relation to the plan more time is needed for consideration of the issues.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: It is not clear as to the increase in provision of services that will occur in order to sustain the increase in population.</p>	<p><i>House garden are an integral part of their monastic role.”</i></p> <p>The boundary of the Historic Precinct be amended to include the full ownership of the Dominican Order and the Conservation Area be extended accordingly.</p> <p>The “<i>ITT Open Land</i>” and “<i>Priory Open Land</i>” designation in Map3.3.2 be amended to “<i>ITT Open Private Land</i>” and “<i>Priory Open Private Land</i>” respectively</p> <p>Generic response for Apartments and Plot Ratio</p> <p>Generic response for Phasing and Implementation</p> <p>Acknowledge</p> <p>Generic response for public consultation</p> <p>Generic response for Social and Community Infrastructure</p>
--	--

<p>Plan Ref. Tenure: Vast majority of the apartments both current and proposed will be rented to a transient community which could alter the social fabric of the place dramatically.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.2.1: No adequate traffic management plan in place to deal with the increase in the additional traffic from the increase in population.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: Spiritual needs of the society are not being met.</p> <p><b>Submission No 92: Anna Flood</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Object to proposed apartment. State the need for student accommodation</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.1: Need for facilities retail commercial and employment</p> <p>Plan Ref. Tenure: Apartments will bring absentee landlords and a transient community</p> <p><b>Submission No 93: Declan Coburn Superintendent An Garda Siochana</b></p> <p><b>Plan Ref. 5.3.6:</b> Make recommendations in regard to the need for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CCTV cameras</li> <li>• Safety in design of public car parks appropriate lighting</li> <li>• Existing business watch Programme expanded to ensure liaison with commercial outlets</li> </ul>	<p>Generic response for Tenure</p> <p>Generic response for Traffic Management</p> <p>The Council are fully supportive of the Religious and other groups that are attempting to cater for the spiritual needs of Tallaght people.</p> <p>Generic response for Apartments</p> <p>Generic response for Land use mix and Employment</p> <p>Generic response for Tenure</p> <p>Generic response for Safety and Security</p>
--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure a safe and frequent public transport.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission No 94: Bobby Doran</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Further 3000 apartments will not solve the housing crisis would ask the Council to redress this issues and put forward a more balance approach to the housing needs</p> <p><b>Submission No 95: Paul Doran</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Further 3000 apartments will not solve the housing crisis would ask the Council to redress this issues and put forward a more balance approach to the housing needs</p> <p><b>Submission No 96: Siobhan Carlisle</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 2.2: Objects to the plan as it is totally unsuitable for the future good of the area.</p> <p><b>Submission No 97: Aidan Thomas</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Too many apartments. Will give rise to social problems</p> <p>Plan Ref. tenure: Will not be bought for young families but by developers and rented giving Tallaght a transient population which will not help build any sense of community.</p> <p><b>Submission No 98: St Marks Residents Association</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 3.3.2: The level of residential facilities</p>	<p>Generic response for Public Transport</p> <p>Generic response for Apartments and Residential Mix</p> <p>Generic response for Apartments and Residential Mix</p> <p>Generic response for Apartments and Residential Mix</p> <p>Generic response for residential mix and apartments</p> <p>Generic response for Tenure</p> <p>Generic response for Community and Social Infrastructure</p>
---	---



<p>outweighs the Provision of services. No infrastructure improvements to accommodate the increase in population</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.6: Garda numbers are insufficient currently and the council propose additional housing.</p> <p>Plan Ref. Tenure: Restrictions should be put on the number of apartments which can be sold to developers/letting agencies.</p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.1: Priority should be given to employment and ensure no jobs are lost due to re-location.</p> <p><b>Submission No 99: Petition</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objects to the additional 3000 apartments proposed.</p> <p><b>Submission No 100: Tara De Butlear</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See submission No 61</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission No 101: Dr. John Bell</b></p> <p>Appalled at the proposal to develop the lands at the priority and wish to register strongest possible objection to the proposals.</p> <p><b>Submission No 102: Michael Clifford Textile Recycling</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 4.6: Area between Colberts Fort and Belgard Luas Station to be designated for Residential, to ensure protection of existing resident's amenity from noise and</p>	<p>Generic response for Safety and security</p> <p>Generic response for Tenure</p> <p>Generic response for Employment</p> <p>Generic response for Apartments</p> <p>See Submission no 61</p> <p>See Response to Submission no 88.</p> <p>Colbert's Fort is in a Precinct of its own as a means of protecting and maintaining the character of the area.</p>
--	---

<p>pollution emissions and reduce the feeling of isolation to residents of Colberts Fort.</p> <p><b>Submission 103: Cora Bruen</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 5.3.2: Objects to the additional 3000 apartments</p> <p>Plan Ref. Tenure: Plan encourages absent landlords.</p> <p><b>Submission No 104: Michael O' Mahony, The Department of Communications, Marine and Natural Resources</b></p> <p>Plan Ref. 7.0: No major concerns in relation to environmental issues arising as result of plan.</p>	<p>Generic response for Apartments</p> <p>Generic response for Management Companies</p> <p>Acknowledge</p>
---	--



## 6.0 Generic Responses and Recommendations to Main Submissions

### Tallaght Town Centre Apartments

The proposed Plan envisages that an average of 420 dwellings per annum will be constructed in Tallaght Town Centre over the next six years. This estimate is based on the average rate of construction over the last six years from 2000 to 2006. These housing units are required to ensure that the population in the area is maintained and that existing and future residents in Tallaght have a choice of dwelling unit in which to reside. The construction of apartments in the Town Centre optimises the use of the existing infrastructure e.g. the LUAS, shopping, employment opportunities.

The census 2002 indicates that, in 2002, 96% of the total numbers of housing units in the South Dublin area were conventional semi-detached, terraced and detached units and only 2.6% were apartments/ flats of any kind. This presents limited choice for those who may not wish or need to live in a three or more bedroom house designed to serve at least a five-person household. It operates to exclude groups such as first-time buyers, singles, retired people, couples with no children and small families from the housing market. It restricts the supply of suitable rented accommodation to the extent that areas of existing family housing are the only option to accommodate single tenants sharing rented houses. It also severely limits the supply of new residential accommodation within walking distance of the LUAS, the proposed Public Transport Interchange, bus terminus and all of the town centre amenities which are very attractive to new home purchasers.

While the existing 2509 apartments built and under construction have the benefit of tax incentives and are more likely to attract investors rather than owner-occupiers, there is no such weighting in relation to future apartments proposed in the Plan. The safeguards proposed in terms of ensuring high quality in the Plan are a significant advancement on the current County Development Plan 2004 – 2010 in terms of

- A requirement for an on site concierge/caretaker/security presence with dedicated accommodation for future apartment developments over 150 units in size
- A requirement for increased minimum floor areas for apartments and duplexes,
- A requirement for a minimum average floorspace for apartments and duplexes,
- the provision of a hierarchy of managed children's play facilities in all new residential developments of 25 or more apartment or duplex units.
- CCTV in addition to concierge/security unit as a requirement for developments over 150 units.
- A requirement for a utility room of at least 2.9sq.m. approx. (31sq.ft.) to accommodate two appliances and a drying area in all dwelling units of 2 bedrooms or more. Drying area may be internal (must adjoin an external wall for ventilation) or external (must be screened by opaque glass or wintergarden).

It is proposed to remove the possibility of providing a community space at the expense of crèche space due to the potential costs involved in underutilising this space.

**Recommendation: Commit in the Plan to a definite review in 2009 in the light of the number of residential developments granted and built under the Plan and the delivery of the key infrastructural requirements.**

**The provision of a concierge/security unit and CCTV would be a requirement for developments over 150 units.**

**Require the provision of a 3m.sq. utility space in all dwelling units of 2 bedrooms or more.**

**Remove the possibility of providing a community space at the expense of crèche space**

### **Tenure**

The achievement of a balanced tenure in the proposed residential developments is far more feasible in the Proposed Local Area Plan than in the previous Tallaght Integrated Area Plan (IAP). In the IAP, the Government designated Urban Renewal tax incentives provided a more beneficial incentive to investors than to owner occupiers. As the Urban Renewal Scheme is in the process of being terminated, none of the new developments will have the benefit of tax incentives and thus any potential owner occupiers and investors will be on an equal footing.

The Council is committed to the introduction of a percentage threshold to limit the numbers of agreements entered into by the Council in any particular estate or significantly seized development with landowners in the Study Area under the Rental Accommodation Scheme (RAS). This measure provides a dis-incentive to investors as the potential rental use of the property by tenants on income supplement will be governed by the threshold. The property will as a result be more attractive to owner occupiers.

**Recommendation: Introduce an objective in the Plan that a minimum of 50% of the residential units would be owner occupier.**

**Include in the Plan the Council commitment to the introduction of a 10% threshold to limit the numbers of agreements entered into by the Council in any particular estate or significantly seized development with landowners in the Study Area under the Rental Accommodation Scheme (RAS). The potential rental use of the property by tenants on income supplement will be governed by the threshold.**

### **Management Companies**

Up to the present the Council's interest in Management Companies related to apartment management agreements (standard condition attached to all apartment applications). These agreements are primarily for legal and financial reasons and to ensure a proper standard of residential development and the maintenance of the private areas within the development and are in existence to protect the apartment owners interests. However a vibrant, properly resourced and well-run management company can add considerably to the quality of life in an apartment complex.

**Recommendation: It is appropriate that when the details of the management company are being submitted to the Planning Authority for approval under the Proposed Plan, that it will be a requirement to provide a permanent concierge / security station and an dedicated CCTV arrangement or linking in with adjoining uses in a well managed security set-up. The**

**Plan will seek to require that the concierge/security unit will be available the Management Company / Managing Agent and that the unit will be located in a ground floor location readily accessible to the occupiers, adjacent to post boxes etc. It will seek to require that the developer sets up and hands over the Management Company after a certain proportion of the units are occupied. It will seek to require that the developer specifies the projected Service Charge which will operate when the Management Company assume full responsibility for the planned maintenance and management of the building.**

### **5.3.1 Residential Mix**

The Proposed Local Area Plan considered the issue of residential developments comprehensively. As a reflection of the designation of the Town Centre as the County Town of South Dublin and the indication in the Census that in 2002, 96% of the total number of units in the South Dublin area were conventional semi-detached, terraced and detached units and only 2.6% were apartments, the Plan proposes that the residential units to be located in the core areas shall comprise principally of apartments and in the outlying areas apartments and double duplex units. The present range of residential mix operates to exclude groups such as first-time buyers, singles, retired people, couples with no children and small families from the housing market. It restricts the supply of suitable accommodation closest to all of the Town Centre facilities to the extent that areas of existing family housing are more likely to accommodate single tenants sharing rented houses. It also ultimately leads to greater demand for social housing.

In order to ensure that the apartments appeal to an array of potential purchasers/owner occupiers from young to old, the Plan requires a minimum average floor area of 75 sq.m. (807 sq. ft) per apartment in all significant residential developments. This would typically equate to a two bedroom unit and is 20 sq.m. above the minimum requirement in the Government “Residential Density” Guidelines. It is intended that this safeguard will increase the flexibility of apartments to life stages and families. An additional measure is the proposal in Section 3.2.2 of the Proposed Local Area Plan where for every 75 residential units a dedicated concierge/caretaker/security apartment or similar (to be subject to legal agreement) will be sought as part of a planning application. This seeks to ensure that the residential development is actively managed by a caretaker in conjunction with residents.

The design standard for such developments will be high as the applicant will be required to demonstrate consideration of issues such as modern architecture, high quality materials, roof form, continuity, communal/private open space and environmental sustainable design. Furthermore, the Plan provides for a high quality of life associated with future apartment schemes with the inclusion of children’s play areas, crèche facilities and/or on site management/security. In the medium/lower density zones such as Cookstown South, the Plan provides for alternative residential units such as double duplex units i.e. three bedrooms two storey houses on top of one another. It is intended that such units would be attractive to families or couples trading down. The Plan Area is bounded by traditional three and four bedroom houses. Therefore, a range of residential units to appeal to all stages in the life cycle will be available in the Town Centre area ensuring its sustainability and vitality.

### **5.2.3 Plot Ratio/Building Height**

A number of constructed developments within the Town Centre are higher in scale than the traditional form of mixed use buildings. This Proposed Local Area Plan seeks to provide greater controls when permitting higher scale developments. In accordance with the precincts set out in the Plan, a range of heights are considered from 1.5 storeys to 6 storeys, the latter to be located in

the core area only. The Plan does make provision for a 20% floor space bonus where the proposal demonstrates compliance with strict criteria. These criteria include the dedication of part of the site for public open space, the creation of streets and links, major upgrades to streets surrounding the site or other public domain improvement works. This will ensure that quality of life and environmental considerations are integral to all planning applications. Furthermore, the Design Statement to be submitted with a planning application will guarantee quality design.

In addition, the Plan makes provision for several landmark or gateway buildings which are illustrated on Map 5.2.3 of the Plan. The term landmark/gateway buildings refer to the footprint of one building rather than a block and are generally located at key transport nodes. The proposal for an 18 storey building is only permissible in one location in the core area along the N81 and in accordance with strict criteria i.e. the delivery of a significant land-bridge linking the Town Centre area to Sean Walsh Park and the provision of direct access to the Square Shopping Centre from the N81.

There are 16 gateways identified in the Plan Area all located along major transport routes such as the Belgard Road. These gateways are intended to provide a distinctive entrance to a particular area. The Plan proposes that the gateway buildings may normally exceed the height threshold for a particular area by a maximum of 2 storeys.

**Recommendation: Restrict the development of residential developments in general to no higher than 6 storeys.**

**More clearly indicate that there is only one possible landmark building of up to 18 storeys (i.e. for office/hotel type use) This is firmly tied in to the development of Phase IV of The Square and the delivery of a number of key outcomes listed, such as the Land-bridge to Sean Walsh Park and the dedicated underground vehicular access to The Square Shopping Centre from the N81.**

### **3.1.2 Density**

The Study Area was identified as a County Town in the South Dublin County Development Plan 2004-2010. The intensity and mix of uses are intended to reflect that status. The rate of growth assumed in the Plan is based on the growth experienced in the period 2000-2005

The Plan provides for policies specific to the Town Centre area and additional controls with which to manage development in the area. The Plan's proposal of 15 precincts within the Town Centre with varying intensities of development is a reflection of such control measures. It is intended that a higher intensity of development will be facilitated at the core and main transport nodes (Belgard and Cookstown Luas Stations) and lower intensities focused around Colbert's Fort and areas remote from public transport. Therefore, greater cognisance is taken of the existing development and existing infrastructure within that precinct.

There are a significant amount of development control measures included in the Plan to ensure that higher intensities of development are not permitted in lieu of quality of life and environmental considerations. Rather the Proposed Local Area Plan includes measures such as the requirement for a Design Statement to be submitted with each application which shall address sustainability principles of intensification, diversity, accessibility, design quality and integration. Another measure is the demonstration by applicants of a Site Analysis for new development on sites of 500 sq.m. or above or in circumstances where height standards are being exceeded.

Furthermore, the provision of higher densities is only permitted where the development will result in significant public gain. This may include:-

- The dedication of part of the site for public open space including parks and plazas.
- The creation of streets and links that provide access through and access to a site.
- Major upgrades to streets surrounding the site including works such as road widening, new enhanced junctions and crossing points and realignments.

These and other measures will ensure that every aspect of the development is comprehensively addressed by developers and analysed by the Council at application stage and if permitted will contribute to the sustainable development of Tallaght Town Centre.

## **1.2 Consultation**

The Council carried out an extensive public consultation exercise prior to and during the preparation of the Plan. Prior to the publication of the Draft Plan, the Planning Department carried out two phases of public consultation which sought firstly to establish issues of relevance to Tallaght Town Centre and secondly to indicate proposed strategies as to how the relevant issues could be addressed. The first phase comprise of a series of Public Information Evenings and Stakeholder meetings during February and March 2005. A total of 368 persons/organisations were invited to these meetings, broken down as follows:

- 175 Businesses and Enterprises
- 99 Community Groups
- 50 Residents Groups
- 18 Statutory Agencies
- 14 Landowners/Institutions
- 12 Transport Agencies/Interests

Advertisements were also placed in the Tallaght Echo on the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> February 2005 in relation to the Information Evenings. These advertisements clearly stated that the Information Evenings were open to all. A total of 116 persons attended these Information Evenings. Upon conclusion, a report of the issues raised in the Information Evenings was circulated to the Elected Members and Management of South Dublin County Council and all those who attended. A copy of the report was also available on the Council website.

The second phase of public consultation took place in September and October 2005. This took the form of an exhibition of proposed strategies and possible solutions to those issues raised in the 1<sup>st</sup> Phase Consultation. As in the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of public consultation, a notice was published in the local newspaper, advertised on the Council website and invitations sent out to 368 persons and organisations previously invited. The display of the proposed strategies and possible solutions were exhibited in the Council Headquarters in Tallaght and in Clondalkin and in the Square Shopping Centre in Tallaght for the months of September and October 2005. Four workshops were held in the Council and in the Tallaght Library Meeting Room which was open to all to attend. An A3 booklet of the display boards was available for public viewing in Tallaght Library and the booklet could be purchased for €10.

The Elected Members made the decision to put the Tallaght Town Centre Proposed Local Area Plan on display on the 10<sup>th</sup> of April 2006. The statutory phase of public consultation of the Proposed Local Area Plan and the Environmental Report commenced on the 13<sup>th</sup> April and



continued up to the 24<sup>th</sup> May 2006. On four days during those 6 weeks, the display of the Proposed Local Area Plan in the Council buildings was supported by planners between the hours of 11 a.m. and 8 p.m. to assist in answering queries. During the remainder of the display, a planner was available to address those queries made by calling to the Planning Department or by phone. A CD Rom of the Plan was provided free of charge where people wished to consider it in their own time and the Plan was accessible on the Council website. The submissions received during the statutory 6 week period have been recorded and compiled in a Manager's Report, with comments and recommendations. This is a public document and is intended to assist the Elected Members in their consideration of the Draft Plan.

There have been multiple opportunities for the public, the elected representatives, the statutory agencies and landowners/developers to participate in the preparation of the Tallaght Town Centre Proposed Local Area Plan.

### **5.3.2 Land Use Mix**

The Proposed Local Area Plan provides for a diversity of land uses in the Town Centre. These are commercial, mixed use, residential, institutional, open space and industrial land uses. This provision within the Plan has progressed from the previous zoning which applied to the Town Centre area, which provided for town centre uses and industrial land uses. The implementation of the Proposed Local Area Plan will ensure that an array of uses can be located in the town centre from residential to cafes, home office units to D.I.Y. stores, which will allow people to live, work and recreate within 1 square mile. This range of land uses within the Town Centre area ensures that a diversity of activities and employment opportunities can be located in Tallaght and contribute to the viability and vitality of the town centre.

#### **Employment:**

The employment profile in Tallaght is changing. With the development of the Town Centre since the 1990's, there have been a significant number of people employed in the office, retail, health and educational sectors as well as the traditional industrial sectors. There are now a series of industrial uses in and adjoining the Town Centre which are low rise, sprawling, inefficient in their use of important land resources, dependent on deliveries/collections by large trucks and where site constraints are impacting negatively upon their successful operation. The Council is seeking to replace these land uses with more labour intensive employment opportunities such as commercial and mixed use land uses. These uses are more efficient in their use of the site and offer higher skilled labour. According to an estimate of the employment sector carried out in 2005 of Tallaght Town Centre, there are 9,500 persons employed. This is broken down into the following:

- Approximately 2,500 people (27%) are employed in Offices
- Approximately 2,500 (27%) are employed in the Retail Sector, with 1,717 being employed in the Square.
- Approximately 2,500 (26%) are employed in the area of Health, with most being employed in the Adelaide and Meath Hospital.
- Approximately 1,000 people (10%) are employed in Manufacturing/Warehousing/Distribution type employment.
- Approximately 600 people (6%) are employed in education, over 400 of those being employed in the Tallaght Institute of Technology.
- Approximately 250 (3%) are employed by Financial Institutions.

- Approximately 150 people (2%) are employed in the Community Sector.

The Council has broadened the focus of Tallaght beyond traditional industrial jobs. Rather, the Plan incorporates opportunities for a greater choice of employment with new opportunities created in the Commercial, Mixed Use and Mixed Use/Predominantly Residential land uses. In these zones, uses such as retail warehousing showrooms, recreational facilities, retail, local shops, cafes and live-work units (where people can work from home) are accommodated. However, the traditional role of industries in Tallaght has been maintained with industrial land uses remaining at the fringes of the Town Centre area and in the adjoining industrial estates.

On the basis of land use zoning and worker : floor-space ratios devised and used by the Dublin Transportation Office, it is estimated that the growth of jobs across the time-span of the Plan (2006-2012) will be approximately 5,600 jobs if a similar rate of growth is maintained as in the last six years.

Within the current Urban Renewal Integrated Area Plan in Tallaght, there is considerable liaison and co-operation between the Council and the Local Employment Services Network in terms of employment and training. Although the leverage of tax certification as a means of encouraging developers to work with the LESN will no longer exist in the proposed Plan, the Council will continue this approach.

**Recommendation: Commit in the Plan to continue working with the LESN Network in terms of employment and training.**

### 3.3.2 Community & Social Infrastructure

There has been considerable public investment in community and social infrastructure in Tallaght over the years and this is ongoing. Whilst there was a time lag in the provision of a full range of infrastructure after the initial wave of population growth, this has been addressed and there is now a strong case for the continued growth of the population of the Town Centre in particular. At the highest level, the Town Centre contains several major elements of Regional community/social infrastructure, such as:-

- The Hospital (for both adults and children)
- The Institute of Technology
- South Dublin County Council Headquarters
- The County Library (about to be increased by 50%)
- The Civic Theatre

Construction is nearing completion of a major new Swimming pool and leisure centre in Jobstown, less than 1km west of the Town Centre and has just commenced on a new County Arts Centre adjoining County Buildings. *There is also a major FAS training facility just north of the Town Centre in Cookstown, in respect of which planning permission was granted for a major upgrade in 2005.* The Hospital has permission for a significant A&E extension and new teaching facility. The ITT are developing an incubation/enterprise centre. A network of community and enterprise centres have been completed in a number of the major neighbourhoods surround the Town Centre. In addition, the Fire Station on the Belgard Road was recently upgraded and it is understood that Tallaght Garda Station is shortly due to be expanded as part of redevelopment.

In relation to school provision, as stated in the Plan there are 18 primary and 5 secondary schools within 1km of Tallaght Town Centre. If new schools are required, South Dublin County Council

is willing to identify sites for them and devise mechanisms to ensure that they can be provided. In this context, the Council consulted the Department of Education and informed them of the population projections for the Study Area. In their initial response, the Department of Education stated that there is sufficient capacity in schools in the area during the time frame of the Plan (combined enrolment in the primary schools decreased by 20% over the past 10 years and 33% over the past 15 years). A similar situation applies to secondary schools with enrolments down by 24% over ten years and all schools now operating at numbers below capacity, some significantly. The most recent response from the Department of Education indicates that two sites should be reserved in the Plan for primary school use.

In relation to Healthcare, the Council consulted the Health Services Executive regarding their requirements in the context of the proposals contained in the Plan. However, the Council are awaiting a response on this matter. In any event there is a significant land reservation on the hospital campus to enable significant additional facilities to be provided. Aside from this, planning permission was granted in 2005 for an emergency medical treatment facility as an extension of the A & E Department of Tallaght Hospital. This permission has yet to be implemented. As part of the Plan, the Council also proposes the relocation of the existing helipad at the Hospital to be on part of the covered reservoir at Cookstown.

The Plan seeks to expand upon these recent developments in community and social infrastructure. A number of new concepts are proposed.

In relation to the provision of community facilities, the Plan has considered childcare, healthcare, meeting rooms and leisure. In accordance with Government Guidance issued in 2000, all new residential developments provide 1 x 20 child capacity childcare facility for every 75 residential units. This will continue to be applied. However, one of the measures of the plan is to allow the childcare requirement to be reduced to not less than 1 x 20 child facility for every 150 dwellings units in the Town Centre, provided that all schemes of 75 units or more provide floorspace that would be required for the childcare facility in the form of a dedicated concierge/caretaker/security apartment of similar and adjoining managed community meeting room at a rate of 0.3 sq.m. per dwelling. The objective here is to encourage stability and security in apartment developments in the Town Centre. The provision of a community room will also encourage a community focus and facilitate communal activity in apartment developments in the Town Centre.

On the issue of children's facilities, the Plan proposes new concepts such as the requirement of managed children's play facilities in all new residential development of 25 or more apartment or duplex units. This will comprise the following:

- A young children's area for play (YCAP) with an activity space of about 100 sq.m. specifically directed at toddlers and young children.
- A local equipped area for play (LEAP) with a minimum activity area of 400 sq.m. and providing play facilities for children up to 8 years of age. This will be found in new residential developments of 150 units or more.
- A neighbourhood equipped area for play (NEAP) with a minimum activity area of 1000 sq.m. and will provide play facilities for a broader range of children. This would be expected within each residential development of 500 units or more and should be located with LEAP as above.

It is proposed that these facilities will be required pro-rata per number of residential units. The Council is also committed to monitoring the demographics of the Plan Area to identify any additional facilities that may be needed to cater for the specific needs of the population.

**Recommendation: Two school sites will be identified and reserved in the Plan as required by the Department of Education.**

### **5.3.6 Safety & Security**

Safety and security in the Town Centre is essential to the future development of Tallaght. The Planning Department undertook several meetings with the Gardai in relation to the proposal for the town centre and incorporated their recommendations relating to CCTV as described below. The Council has considered the issue of safety and security in great detail and the Plan incorporates the following measures:

- The Council is committed to undertaking a CCTV study with Camera infrastructure to be provided as part of developments. This camera network will be established in the Core Area and other areas to enhance safety. Specific areas will be identified by the Council for night time activities such as bars, restaurants, theatres and cinemas in the Plan Area. These areas will be located in close proximity to transport nodes, which in turn will ensure that people do not feel isolated and where transport options are readily accessible.
- In areas of other buildings with public and semi public spaces, the Council through development control mechanisms will ensure that all applications for the development of new buildings and public or semi public spaces are designed with regard to “Safer by Design principles”. This safer by design principles are supplemented and supported by passive security measures such as buildings being positioned so as to overlook areas of public open space, all areas of public space should be well lit, pedestrians should have a clear surveillance of walking routes, all publicly accessible facilities should be centrally located and overlooked and also where appropriate development should contain a range of land uses that promote around the clock activity.

The combination of well considered design and safety measures will contribute to the Tallaght’s attraction as a place to visit, work and recreate.

### **3.2.1 Traffic Management**

Access and movement in the Town Centre area is considered an essential aspect of the Proposed Local Area Plan. The Plan envisages the opening up of the Cookstown Industrial Estate to the Town Centre through the provision of a series of new inter connecting routes and connecting the Cookstown Industrial estate to the proposed Embankment Road. This change of use will result in reduction in heavy goods vehicle numbers in the future in the Town Centre area. The Plan was also informed by the Council commissioned Dublin Transportation Office Traffic Model carried out in 2005. As stated in the Environmental Report Para. 4.77, this Study highlighted issues of road capacity along Belgard Road, Cookstown Way, Greenhills Road, N81 and Belgard Square North. The Council address the issue of congestion, both current and anticipated, within the Town Centre by establishing a hierarchy of street networks which allows for different modes of transport. The new street network provides for pedestrian/cycle movement only, access streets where car traffic is limited, through streets with cars and urban boulevards which aim to circulate cars and buses. This new network will improve permeability within the Town Centre. The implementation of this street hierarchy will occur in phases as sites are redeveloped.

Other Traffic Management Measures in the Plan are as follows:

- Tallaght Zip project, which is a pedestrian priority route connecting the Luas Terminus to Bancroft Park. This is being carried out by the Council in the short term.

- The proposed pedestrian land-bridge connecting Sean Walsh Park to the Square thereby encouraging greater use of this Park and to improve its connections with the Town Centre.
- An underground vehicular entrance to the southern part of the Square will provide direct access from the N81 to an underground car park which will be a pre-requisite for any redevelopment of the Square.
- A north-south pedestrian priority route will be facilitated from Sean Walsh Park via the Square Shopping Centre and South Dublin County Council's Civic Building site to a New Town Park to be provided in the Cookstown development area. This will intersect with the aforementioned east-west Zip project.

The importance of Tallaght as a part of the public transport network has been recognised by the Government in relation to the Transport 21 Strategy. The expansion of the public transport network will be facilitated through a number of different improvements:

- An improved Quality Bus Corridor network both within and at key access points, ensuring that existing routes and frequencies of service are reviewed as the development of the town intensifies.
- To assist the Rail Procurement Agency in developing a route for Metrowest through Tallaght Town Centre and linking Tallaght directly with Citywest.
- The investigation of a Section 49 Development Contribution Scheme for the provision of a local bus service focused on the Town Centre.
- The Council will also identify opportunities for a transport interchange which will include a park and ride, bus stops, taxi ranks, bicycle parking etc in conjunction with major development proposals in the Town Centre.

Therefore, the Plan has adopted a comprehensive approach to traffic management in the Town Centre which will accommodate all modes of transport and mobility and will result in the town centre being a more viable attractive place to live and work with safe, well populated pedestrian areas.

#### **5.4.4 Car Parking**

The car parking standards in the Plan have been complied taking account of a number of considerations such as greater access to public transportation, people living in closer proximity to the necessary facilities, and its location where people will be able to fulfil a number of tasks while only having to complete one trip to the town centre. In this context, the typical car parking standards have been reduced, however to ensure that all developments are adequately served by public/private transport, the Plan incorporates a number of measures:

- Each application that is submitted to the Council will be assessed on its particular location and type of development. This will incorporate assessment of factors such as proximity of the site to public transport, the levels of car dependency generated by the particular uses within a development, the potential catchment of the development and the ability of residents to live in close proximity to the workplace.
- Each application that requires 50 car parking spaces or more will be required to carry out and complete a traffic impact statement. The traffic impact statement shall provide a clear rationale for the proposed level of parking in relation to the development.

- Basement car parking will be required as part of any significant developments. Where this is proposed, the applicant will be required to submit a design statement and demonstrate consideration of external and internal design.
- The Council will provide on-street parking on new streets and where existing streets are to be substantially upgraded.

### **3.3.3 Cultural Heritage**

The cultural heritage of Tallaght Village and environs is recognised in the Proposed Local Area Plan. The Plan makes provision for the protection of historical buildings, the division of the area into precincts with streetscape and landscape guidance particular to that area will create a cultural identity/uniqueness within that precinct and the identification of sites for major public squares, parks and other civic spaces with the inclusion of public art will heighten the cultural identity of that area. The Plan also requires that such squares/civic spaces include facilities that cater for regular events such as markets or performances. In relation to any significant development on the Priory site and St. Maelruans a Conservation Plan will be required by the Council in advance of such proposals.

Whilst Tourism is not considered as a separate issue within the Plan it underlines cultural heritage which encapsulates issues such as ensuring that the historical nature of Tallaght is promoted, the location of public art, markets and periodic events.

### **Public Transportation**

Currently there is a number of existing public transport networks which travel through and terminate in Tallaght. The frequency and quality of services vary; many currently only provide a limited service, this is largely due to the relative low population density which exists in the town. It is however envisaged when the Town Centre grows it will form a public transport hub and the provision of additional services will become more viable, particularly those which link Tallaght to other major centres in the Dublin region.

The importance of Tallaght as part of the public transport network has been recognised by the Government in relation to the Transport 21 Strategy.

The expansion of the public transport network will be facilitated through a number of ways:

- Ensuring that the existing routes and frequencies of services are reviewed as the development and population of the town centre intensifies and also the creation of new and supplementary routes being provided by Dublin Bus and the possibility of additional bus operators.
- An improved QBC network both within and at key access points to the town centre along routes such as the N81, old Bawn Road, Belgard Square North and west and the Greenhills Road. A one way bus loop in the area to the North of the Square shopping centre which would allow interchanges with the Luas and the future Metro.
- Discussions have taken place with Bus Atha Cliath (BAC) on provision of additional local bus routes in the context of BAC's overall route review, as a result of which it is existing routes (2 no.) will be revised and an additional route provided.

- Investigation of a possible Section 49 Development Contributions Scheme for the provision of local bus services focused on the Town Centre. This would mean that future developments in a defined area would have to contribute to funding specified bus services. This requires a specific proposal to be approved by the elected members of the County Council.
- Support for the proposed Luas spur to Citywest and to ensure that the new line is also linked directly to the town centre.
- Working with the Rail Procurement Agency design teams in developing the route for the Metrowest through the Town Centre area linking Tallaght directly to the proposed Citywest Spur.
- Identifying opportunities for interchange including park and ride, bus stops, taxi ranks, bicycle parking where appropriate in conjunction with major development proposals in the town centre.

These objectives to improve the public transport network have also been reiterated and incorporated into each relevant precinct policies and objectives in relation to future access and movement.

## **6.0 Phasing & Implementation**

Phasing and implementation of developments in the Town Centre is considered in detail in the Plan. In the interests of sustaining growth in the town centre and managing development that occurs, the Plan incorporates a phasing programme. Six phases of development are identified in the Plan (Chapter 6) and each phase will deliver a series of key outcomes for that phase:

1. Phase I: Incorporates the Square Development (Phase III), the redevelopment of Woodies site and the “Zip” project. The key outcomes in this phase include a new town square, a new pedestrian street linking the Woodies site to the new town square amongst others. It is anticipated that this will occur in 2006-2009.
2. Phase II: Incorporates the Core Area and Cookstown South and will comprise o the redevelopment of the South Dublin County Council site, the vacant or underdeveloped parts of the Tallaght Hospital site and several large vacant industrial sites. The key outcomes in this phase include a new street link from Belgard Square East to Fourth Avenue and a new Town Park in Cookstown South amongst other key requirements. It is anticipated that this will occur in the phase 2007-2010.
3. Phase III: Refers to Cookstown South and the redevelopment of the current small-scale industrial sites and possible intensification of Belgard Retail Park. Key outcomes in this phase include a new street link from Airton Road to Cookstown Road and a pedestrian link from Cookstown Road to a new Town Park in Cookstown South amongst other requirements. It is anticipated that this will occur in phase 2008-2011.
4. Phase IV: Refers to the redevelopment of the Square and the vacant Fruitfield site in Whitestown Business Park. Key outcomes in this phase include a pedestrian landbridge from Sean Walsh Park to the Town Centre and a vehicular interchange on the N81 to provide direct access to the Square amongst other requirements. It is expected that this will occur in phase 2009-2012.
5. Phase V: Refers to the redevelopment of sites in the vicinity of Cookstown Luas and north of the Hospital. The key outcomes required in this phase include the embankment road extension and new access to the Cookstown Industrial Estate. It is anticipated that this phase will proceed in 2010-2013.
6. Phase VI: Refers to the redevelopment of site in the vicinity of the Belgard Luas and Belgard Road. The key outcomes in this phase are the embankment road extension and

new access to the Cookstown Industrial Estate. It is expected that this phase will occur in 2011-2013.

7. Other: The development of the ITT lands and the redevelopment of key sites fronting the N81 south of the Village will occur in 2007-2014 and is dependent on factors such as controlled public access through the ITT site from the Belgard Road to Greenhills Road and a new east-west shared surface street and public space in the Village Green area.

**Recommendation: Strengthen the phasing section of the Plan by stating that permissions for the redevelopment of sites in the vicinity of the Cookstown Luas and Belgard Luas precincts will not be granted until the key road infrastructure is in line to allow these areas operate as an extension of the Town Centre and not as new district centres. The road infrastructure required will be the Belgard Square East/North connection to Fourth Avenue, the Airton Road Extension to Cookstown Road, the Embankment Road Extension and new access to the Cookstown Industrial Road from this extension.**





## **7.0 Full List of the Manager's Recommendations**

- 1) Recommendation on Tenure: A) Introduce an objective in the Plan that a minimum of 50% of the residential units would be owner occupier.**
- 2) Recommendation on Tenure: B) Include in the Plan the Council commitment to the introduction of a 10% threshold to limit the numbers of agreements entered into by the Council in any particular estate or significantly seized development with landowners in the Study Area under the Rental Accommodation Scheme (RAS). The potential rental use of the property by tenants on income supplement will be governed by the threshold.**
- 3) Recommendation on Apartments: A) Commit in the Plan to a definite review in 2009 in the light of the number of residential developments granted and built under the Plan and the delivery of the key infrastructural requirements.**
- 4) Recommendation on Apartments: B) The provision of a concierge/security unit and CCTV would be a requirement rather than an option for developments over 150 units.**
- 5) Recommendation on Apartments: C) Require the provision of a 3m.sq. utility space in all dwelling units of 2 bedrooms or more.**
- 6) Recommendation on Apartments: D) Remove the possibility of providing a community space at the expense of crèche space**
- 7) Recommendation on Height Plot Ratio: A) Restrict the development of residential developments to no higher than 6 storeys.**
- 8) Recommendation on Height Plot Ratio: B) More clearly indicate that there is only one possible landmark building of up to 18 storeys (i.e. for office/hotel type use) This is firmly tied in to the development of Phase IV of The Square and the delivery of a number of key outcomes listed, such as the Land-bridge to Sean Walsh Park and the dedicated underground vehicular access to The Square Shopping Centre from the N81.**
- 9) Recommendation on Community Infrastructure: Two school sites will be identified and reserved in the Plan as required by the Department of Education.**
- 10) Recommendation on Management Companies: It is appropriate that when the details of the management company are being submitted to the Planning Authority for approval under the Proposed Plan, that it will be a requirement to provide a permanent concierge / security station and an independent CCTV arrangement or linking in with adjoining uses in a well managed security set-up. The Plan will**

**require that the concierge/security unit will be available the Management Company / Managing Agent and that the unit will be located in a ground floor location readily accessible to the occupiers, adjacent to post boxes etc. It will require that the developer sets up and hands over the Management Company after a certain proportion of the units are occupied. It will ensure that the developer specifies the projected Service Charge which will operate when the Management Company assume full responsibility for the planned maintenance and management of the building.**

- 11) Recommendation on Phasing: Strengthen the phasing section of the Plan by stating that permissions for the redevelopment of sites in the vicinity of the Cookstown Luas and Belgard Luas precincts will not be granted until the key road infrastructure is in place to allow these areas operate as an extension of the Town Centre and not as new district centres. The road infrastructure required will be the Belgard Square East/North connection to Fourth Avenue, the Airtown Road Extension to Cookstown Road, the Embankment Road Extension and new access to the Cookstown Industrial Road from this extension.**
- 12) Recommendation on Employment: Commit in the Plan to continue working with the LESN Network in terms of employment and training.**
- 13) Recommend inclusion of objective to provide day time thoroughfare only through Westpark Green open space.**
- 14) Recommend that the “Buses Only” restriction traffic along the Old Blessington Road on the section that passes St. Maelruan’s Church operates from 7am to 7pm.**
- 15) Recommend to include objective to prevent the proliferation of take-away uses in the Town Centre.**
- 16) Recommend that the reference to landmark buildings along the section of the N81 from the Greenhills Road Extension to the Old Bawn Road be removed.**
- 17) Recommend to include reference to EU Directive on Energy Performance of Buildings and the forthcoming national legislation.**
- 18) Recommend that Map 3.1.1. be corrected to reflect the residential use on part of these lands.**
- 19) Recommend that The map at 4.16.5 be corrected to indicate the proposed “distributor/access road”**

- 20) Recommend that reference to Figures 5.1.1 and 5.1.2. be corrected to read 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 respectively.
- 21) Recommend in the Belgard Precinct an extension of the mixed use zone westwards to the Cookstown Road and the newly proposed connection to the Embankment Road to provide for a three to four storey development at 1:1 plot ratio in order to act as a transition zone.
- 22) Recommend that the proposed walkway along the Whitestown Stream be railed in order to prevent unauthorised access to adjoining premises.
- 23) Recommend that the objective to cooperate with and facilitate the Tallaght Youth Service in providing a Youth Centre Facility be included in the Plan.
- 24) Recommend that the requirement for cycle parking facilities for both occupiers and users of all Town Centre uses be included in the Plan.
- 25) Recommend that the building height on this site and adjoining sites in the Cookstown South Precinct south of Fourth Avenue be increased to 4 storeys.
- 26) Recommend that the building height on the eastern part of the Uniphar site adjoining Belgard Road (i.e. the portion of the site to the east of the embankment) be increased to 5 storeys.
- 27) Recommend that in the Historic Precinct, the description of the existing land use in 4,10.2 be amended to *“The Priory functions as a living community of Dominican Friars who are involved in a wide variety of educational, social, cultural as well as religious activities. The enclosed garden and the Retreat House garden are an integral part of their monastic role.”*
- 28) Recommend that the boundary of the Historic Precinct be amended to include the full ownership of the Dominican Order and the Conservation Area be extended accordingly.
- 29) Recommend that in the Historic Precinct, the *“ITT Open Land”* and *“Priory Open Land”* designation in Map 3.3.2 be amended to *“ITT Open Private Land”* and *“Priory Open Private Land”* respectively