Chief Executive’s Report on Draft Plan Consultation
July 2021
In accordance with section 12 (4) (b) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended), Volume 2, Part 1 sets out a summary of all submissions (bar the Office of the Planning Regulator). Volume 2, Part 2 includes a list of persons or bodies who made submissions.
**Part 1: Summary of Submissions Received**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0001</td>
<td>Adele Shankland</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Request to change part of property from F to A zone at 68 Oakton Park, Ballybrack.
- Map attached outlines area to the western side of the property.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0002</td>
<td>Ray Coleman</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6, 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The walkway/cycleway to Stepaside should be shown through the Clay Farm Estate on Map 9.
- The existing section of the Clay Farm Loop Road adjoining Castle Court should be included as a "6 year road extension/traffic management..." objective on Map 9.
- The walkway/cycle way from the Kilgobbin Road over the M50 roundabout and on into the Sandyford estate area should be identified on Map 6.
- The traffic light system at the junction of the Ballyogan Road, Murphystown Way, and Kilgobbin Road shown on Map 6 should be improved.
- The design of the roundabout on the junction of Kilgobbin Road and Sandyford Hall should be reviewed under the 2013 Construction Regulations.
- Additional barriers should be installed along Sandyford Hall Avenue in the interest of pedestrian safety (Map 6).
- The bridge on Hillcrest Road needs to be increased in width and traffic management should also be improved (Map 5).

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0003</td>
<td>Joe Shinkwin</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- A proper pedestrian and cycle link from Belmont Estate to Old Kilgobbin Road is needed.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0004</td>
<td>D Houlihan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
The submission:
- Notes the realignment of the Shanganagh Rd from St Annes Church to the Shanganagh Bridge has been on the development plan for 30 years;
- Recommends that the delivery of the section from Broomfield Court to Shanganagh Bridge should be prioritised due to the risk to pedestrians and cyclists.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0005</td>
<td>Sean Finlay</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
The submission:
- The management and maintenance of the woodlands, open space and amenity area centred on St. Helen’s House, Booterstown is fragmented at present with the green areas maintained by various housing and apartment residents' associations. The Local Authority carries out some mowing and hedge cutting and occasionally uses the space for temporary storage.
• There are several rights of way through the area. In addition, the area is used by communities from surrounding areas for walking and cycling.
• The Council should complete a baseline inventory of the flora and fauna of the area and devise a Management Plan for the area to include the development and provision of Nature trails, information boards, seating and appropriate planning and pruning.
• The submission commends the Council for recognising the amenity value of the area in the Draft Plan and concludes by stating that the measures to enhance the space are relatively simple and cost effective and align with the Local Authorities Trees and Urban Strategy 2021-2031.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0006</th>
<th>Person: Richard Barrett</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Plan will eliminate the remaining lowland green belt of South County Dublin, extend suburban sprawl to the foot of the Dublin mountains, and remove any gap between South County Dublin and North Wicklow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The plan relies excessively on green field sites. There is a need to look at the potential of previously developed land before committing to expansion across the remaining green areas of the County.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Plan takes too little account of the value placed on green areas near Dublin by Dublin residents and tourists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed DART stop at Woodbrook will add to journey times between Dublin and Bray and will impede any proposed rail services between Dublin and the South East.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapters 2 and 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission No: B0007</th>
<th>Person: Shane Regan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A proper path and cycle lane should be installed through Woodpark Green from the junction of Kingston Estate to the shops at the Coach House in Ballinteer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission No: B0008</th>
<th>Person: Paul Colligan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New residential developments permitted in the area (Mount Merrion) may impact on the area’s harmony.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A significant attraction of the area is the harmony of the original housing estates, and this is beneficial for the valuation of properties. This is now being diminished by unsympathetic developments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0009</th>
<th>Person: Niamh Bhreathnach</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A proposal to commission a funicular (cable railway) linking Dún Laoghaire seafront to the shopping centre should be considered to encourage additional pedestrian footfall in the town centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission No: B0010</th>
<th>Person: Patrick Fitzgerald</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• An objective is required for a direct road link to the M11 from Shankill village to address traffic congestion in Shankill on foot of development in the vicinity of Shanganagh Castle.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0011</td>
<td>Fiona Bourke</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Early years childcare provision should be considered on a strategic basis and factored into all planning applications for larger developments.
- There is no childcare provision within walking distance of home in Goatstown.
- Childcare should be planned around transport hubs such as luas stops.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0012</td>
<td>Katie Kahn-Carl</td>
<td>Marsham Court Residents’ Association</td>
<td>2, 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Requests that 5 no. open spaces within Marsham Court, Stillorgan remain as open amenity areas.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0013</td>
<td>Senator Victor Boyhan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Welcomes inclusion of Dun Leary House to the Record of Protected Structures.
- Details with regard to the special interest of the site have been submitted along with historical maps of the area. 2no. attachments submitted contain:
  - ‘Historical noted of some traders and Merchants in the Kingston Area’ – this document sets out details of traders in the area around the mid 1880’s and sets out details of 14 specific traders including a summary of their business, location and skills employed at each business. It is noted that ‘Wallace Bros’ Coal Merchants’ occupied the Dun Leary House site.
  - The second attachment contains 3 historical maps (1821-1913) showing the location of Wallace’s Coal Merchant.
- Suggests that a significant curtilage is defined around the house in order to protect its setting, allow access to the ground floor, allow light into the house and protect views from within and outside of the house.
- Suggests that the house could be restored and used for a number of uses including a restaurant or niche retail.

**Dún Laoghaire – Monkstown:**
- Notes a reference to limiting expansion of Dún Laoghaire Town Centre towards Monkstown and considers it important to punctuate space between the Town Centre and Monkstown Village.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Appendix 4, Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0014</td>
<td>Julie Ascoop</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The right of way connecting Corrig Park to Northumberland Avenue is missing from Appendix 12.1
- The right of way connecting Northumberland Avenue to Sydenham Mews and onward to Corrig Avenue is missing from Appendix 12.1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0015</td>
<td>Julie Ascoop</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Promotion of natural surveillance as per PHP38 is important.
- Large enclosed gates to private properties should be actively discouraged to avoid the creation of hostile streets.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 4, Chapter 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0016</td>
<td>Dept. of Transport</td>
<td>Prescribed Authority</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Welcomes the comprehensive Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown Draft Plan.
- Policy objectives 5.4.1. and 5.4.2 refer to Smarter Travel, however, the new national sustainable mobility policy will replace the Smarter Travel policy. It is suggested that the wording of these policy objectives be updated.
- To make public transport fully accessible to people with disabilities requires a ‘whole journey approach’ and Local Authorities are a key stakeholder in this regard in the context of ensuring a universal design approach to the built environment.
- With regard to Policy Objective T10: Walking and Cycling the DMURS Interim Advice Note — Covid-19 Pandemic Response should also be referenced as it includes guidance that designers should ensure that measures align with the principles of universal design, consider Government policy on accessibility for people with disabilities and consult people with disabilities to further appraise measures.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0017</td>
<td>Gregory R. Devlin</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Following the submission dated 21 January 2020, on the ‘Have your Say’ document, several items previously raised have failed to appear in the Draft County Development Plan.
- In the “Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2016-2035” no report is evident for works carried out, or to be carried out by Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council in the area of the River Dodder, in terms of cycle ways or walkways. Work needs to be done to promote and implement the “Avoid-Shift-Improve” strategy, particularly with regard to using the proposed River Dodder Greenway.
- In terms of Orbital Cycleways, nothing is shown of the potential for cycleways along the south bank of the River Dodder. This should be addressed in the Draft Development Plan.
- The Proposed Cycle Network for the River Dodder Area, as shown on Sheet N6 of the NTA proposals, highlights the River Dodder Area as a Greenway and Primary Route in the NTA Proposed Cycle Network. This should be addressed in the Draft Development Plan.
- The southern bank of the River Dodder is not shown as a Public Right-of-Way between Clonskeagh Bridge and Classon’s Bridge and it also not shown as a Recreational Access Route between these bridges. These designations should be included in the Draft Development Plan.
- The old “Packhorse Bridge”, one of the oldest bridges in Dublin, and still in use as a pedestrian bridge, should be listed as a Protected Structure. Protected Structure designation should also be used for the weir just west of Classon’s Bridge, and for the weir just east of Waldron’s Bridge, at Orwell Walk.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 5, Chapter 9, and Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0018</td>
<td>Barry O’Neill</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Notes the ongoing excellent work of the Council, particularly during the pandemic.
- Requests that the gates at the Mount Merrion Avenue entrance are restored as originally designed as part of Waltham Terrace Architectural Conservation Area.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Appendix 4

DLR Submission No: B0019 Person: Dr. Pádraig Moran Organisation: N/A Map Nos: 4, 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The public open space at Saval Grove/Fairlawns should be made public amenity space.
- Grass strip is maintained by DLRCC.
- Concern that there will be encroachment onto the open space and excess parking following a recent exemption for a pedestrian gate.
- A map identifying the land in question is submitted.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Map 4, Miscellaneous

DLR Submission No: B0020 Person: Jane McLoughlin Organisation: N/A Map Nos: 4, 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Reference is made to works to the rear of a property in Fairlawns with regard to the insertion of a pedestrian access onto a green area on Saval Park Road.
- Concern raised that works are unauthorised and the works would lead to unauthorised possession of the green area to the rear of the property.
- Green area is not identified as public amenity.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Map 4, Miscellaneous

DLR Submission No: B0021 Person: Áine Hyland Organisation: N/A Map Nos: 4, 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Requests that a strip of land along Saval Grove and Barnhill Avenue is recognised as Public Amenity Space
- Notes that the lands has been used as amenity space.
- Notes that the grass was planted and has been maintained by DLRCC since the late 1950s/early 1960s.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Map 4

DLR Submission No: B0022 Person: Mark and Brige George Organisation: N/A Map Nos: N/A

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Supports the general gist of the Plan including, in particular, the environmental and biodiversity aspects and the 10 minute settlement concept.
- Considers that while the Plan is focused on objectives, it is not clear how the objectives are to be achieved. The Plan could be streamlined into key priorities which could be delivered over the first half of the Plan period.
- Requests more regarding how the Plan will actively engage with citizens in the future - especially around environment, biodiversity and placemaking.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Chapter 1

DLR Submission No: B0023 Person: Brian Miles Organisation: N/A Map Nos: N/A
Summary of Submission and Observation:
- There is a lack of suitable, affordable housing in DLR, with rents also high.
- Council should prioritise the building of social/affordable housing on state owned land.
- Present plan to build 1300 units, 130 to be social housing, is totally inadequate.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0024</th>
<th>Person: Paul Byrne</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Submission welcomes the publication of the Plan and in particular the strategic objectives relating to climate change and improving liveability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Submission considers that the Plan does not go far enough in terms of prioritising infill development over greenfield development. The Plan envisages significant development in green belt areas including Kilternan, Rathmichael and Old Connaught and these areas are not close enough to transport corridors. Development of these areas will lead to a more sprawled form of development, reduction in the green belt, increased car dependency and associated congestion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Recommends the prioritisation of denser development along public transport routes. Suggests that there are infill development opportunities which would allow for a greater portion of development to occur in brownfield sites. This would require the prioritisation of active travel and public transport and increased density and building heights. Suggests that this approach would result in a better connected region, where people are closer to their places of work and leisure, with associated improvements in quality of life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0025</th>
<th>Person: Alan Keogh</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,3,4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Requests that National East Coast cycle trail section on the Vico Road not be a dedicated cycle lane as this is not required. Instead the road should have cycle priority similar to Blackrock with a painted cycle symbol while also being open to car traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Considers that the coastal cycle route to Dun Laoghaire is dangerous for a number of reasons. The road should be left the way it was previously and instead a cycle lane alongside the Dart line at Seapoint through to the metals should be provided for slow moving cyclists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0026</th>
<th>Person: Peadar Curran</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ticknock is listed as a new Neighbourhood Centre. Assuming that the reference is actually to the Blackglen shopping centre, (due to the proximity of the Ticknock Hill estate to the existing centre), then this should not be named Ticknock as the townland of Ticknock is some distance away and it would cause confusion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0027</th>
<th>Person: Patricia Gaffney</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The submission relates to realignment to the boundary at the rear of the 4 houses on Willow Bank in the proposed De Vesci, Vesey and Willow Bank Architectural Conservation Area (ACA) to ensure it reflects their integrity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The submission notes that all 4 houses on Willow Bank have been afforded legal protection as Protected Structures in the 2004-2010 Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan which states that “In any case where boundary walls, gates or other such features or any building or structure are listed but not mapped, they shall be deemed to be listed. Likewise, in any case where a building or structure is mapped but not listed, it shall be deemed to be listed.”

The submission suggests the exclusion of the full back gardens, original outbuildings, courtyards, laneways, and granite boundary walls of the 4 houses at Willow Bank from the ACA is inconsistent with the objective of the ACA and contrary to the legal protection afforded these protected structures by the Planning and Development Act 2000. The submission also includes the following:

1) Photograph 1: Original lease for Upton, 3 Willow Bank dated 1
2) with Map of premises demised as per Original Lease.
3) Photograph 2: Original Granite Boundary Wall of Upton, 3 Willow Bank with No 4 Willow Bank.
4) Photograph 3: Double Coach House in original condition in the lane adjacent to Upton & Westbury.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0028</td>
<td>Richard Leekin</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Considers that Dundrum Road needs to be improved in terms of road safety including the provision of a cycle lane. Proposed development of the Dundrum Central Mental Hospital and Dundrum Phase II will only increase this need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0029</td>
<td>John Lennon</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - The submission refers to the naming regime to some properties listed on the Record of Protected Structures as follows:
  - RPS 823 Notre Dame School is now Fernbank.
  - RPS 1046 Churchtown House, Weston Park is incorrectly named The Orchard on mapping.
  - Railway Station (RPS 905), Carnegie Library (RPS 883), Taney Church (RPS 1004) and Sydenham Road, RPSs 1924/7, 1952/3 are all located in the townland of Dundrum. |

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0030</td>
<td>Niall Magee</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - The submission requests the Council update cycling routes on the roads and suggests the Council follow the Dutch approach: www.dutchcycling.nl
- The submission suggests the creation of a new walking trail, bike trails and new woodlands on the way up to Ticknock forest.
- Submission raises issues around safety of walking on main roads to Ticknock forest, provision of green space and positive impact of same on wellbeing and mental health.
- The submission includes a map which indicates two trails which, may require land acquisition, (delineated in black) from the bottom of Kellystown Road and Ticknock Road on the way to Ticknock forest. |

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5 and Chapter 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0031</td>
<td>Brendan Fitzsimons</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Local opposition to development is noted due to increased congestion in Sandyford/Kilternan and inadequacies in public transport and active travel networks. Projects such as the Blackglen Road upgrade have been delayed but not explained.

• The Plan should focus more on the delivery of physical infrastructure.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Chapter 5**

**DLR Submission No:** B0032  
**Person:** Conor Clinch  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 10

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- There should be more provision for deciduous woodland in the Plan, which has huge benefits for people’s mental health and the environment.
- Submission makes suggestions around provision of woodland along the route from Heronford Lane and along Pucks Castle lane
- The submission acknowledges the need for providing more housing and the fact that the linkages between Cherrywood and Rathmichael/Carrickgollogan are important.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Chapter 9**

**DLR Submission No:** B0033  
**Person:** Niamh O’Regan-Doyle  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 2

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Pleased that Árd na Glaise, Stillorgan Park, Blackrock has been added to the Record of Protected Structures.
- Requests that a plaque is erected at the entrance to the house to inform the public that the author Maurice Walsh lived there.
- A document detailing the historical and cultural significance of the property has been attached to the submission, including:
  - The property was the home of the author Maurice Walsh.
  - Details of the works of Maurice Walsh have been provided.
  - The attachment notes the lack of information provided in relation to Maurice Walsh in conservation reports submitted as part of development proposals.
  - The attachment includes a list of publications noting the historic value of the property.
  - The document requests the inclusion of the property to the RPS and that a plaque is provided at the entrance.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Appendix 4**

**DLR Submission No:** B0034  
**Person:** Kevin Cullen  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 5

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission refers to planning applications in the area enclosed by the Blackglen Road, Woodside Road and Slate Cabin Lane in terms of their potential impacts on the built and natural environment and the landscape.
- Submission notes that large scale developments to date have been refused permission — reference is made to specific permissions and includes an excerpt from a decision made by An Bord Plenala.
- Submission notes the zoning objective, ‘A’ of the area and the transitional nature of the area.
- The submission further notes the proximity of the area to Fitzsimons Wood (a protected habitat) and notes that the area acts as a wildlife corridor. As such there is a need to protect the area as reflected in Policy Objective GIB22 of the Draft Plan.
- The submission states that it is time to alter the zoning of the area due to its location between urban/suburban areas and the Dublin Mountains, recognising its transitional nature.
- A map of the area in question has been submitted as an attachment.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Map 5**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0035</td>
<td>Aaron Daly</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission request the Council to consider the disability community more and suggest that changing places Ireland public toilet facilities should be included in our main urban areas & coastal areas.
- The Council suggests that the Council provide some electric wheelchair bikes with custom wheelchairs to be added and used by the sea or in parks.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Chapter 5 and Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0036</td>
<td>David McWilliams</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Consider turning Dún Laoghaire into an artistic and creative centre. There are thousands of students in the Institute of Art, Design and Technology (IADT) but they have little or no presence in the town itself. The IADT should be better linked to the town centre.
- Cut rates to zero for businesses and particularly start-ups.
- Recirculate traffic away from the centre of the town.
- Make living over the shop tax efficient by offering tax incentives to renovated properties.
- Make sure that there is a combination of residential as well as retail uses in the town. It is acknowledged that the retail environment will change due to online shopping and so adjustments should be made to the mix of retail/residential uses.
- Rates of dereliction are a serious problem and should be addressed appropriately.
- Propose the introduction of a site value tax for property in Dún Laoghaire.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0037</td>
<td>Denis O’Farrell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission contends that the Coastal cycling route is being developed at the expense of the car and bus and considers that it is a backward step that this will negatively impact on tourists and visitors who wish to enjoy the views of Dublin Bay.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0038</td>
<td>David Galvin</td>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The EPA submission focuses on the findings of the SEA on the Plan.
- In the case of land use plans a ‘self service’ approach is used via the ‘SEA of Local Authority Land Use Plans – EPA Recommendations and Resources’. This should be taken into account in finalising and implementing the Plan. Three appendices are attached to this document; Appendix 1a: Links to environmental guidance/reports, Appendix 1b: Links to spatial environmental resources and Appendix II: Key National & Regional plans and programmes.
- The State of Environment Report Ireland’s Environment - An Assessment 2020 (EPA, 2020) identifies thirteen Key Messages for Ireland which align with many of the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) the relevant aspects of which should be taken into account in preparing the plan and the SEA.
- Submission welcomes the use of environmental sensitivity mapping to help inform the areas needing greater levels of protection to help avoid potential cumulative adverse environmental effects.
- Submission welcomes Policy Objective OSR8 Greenway and Blueway Network within the County and co-ordinating with adjoining authorities.
- Environmental assessments. Refers to [HSE NUIG UCD research reports](#) and associated toolkits which could be used in relation to the monitoring of the plan.
The Monitoring Programme should take into account positive and negative effects; be flexible to take account of specific environmental issues and unforeseen adverse impacts, cumulative effects and ensure effective remedial action is taken. Submission advises that guidance is available on the EPA website.

Any future amendments to the Plan should be screened for likely significant effects, using the same method of assessment applied in the “environmental assessment” of the Plan.

An SEA Statement should be prepared in accordance with the EPA Guidance and sent to the environmental authorities once the plan is adopted and should summarise:

- How environmental considerations have been integrated into the Plan;
- How the Environmental Report, submissions, observations and consultations have been taken into account during the preparation of the Plan;
- The reasons for choosing the Plan adopted in the light of other reasonable alternatives dealt with; and,
- The measures decided upon to monitor the significant environmental effects of implementation of the Plan.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

**SEA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0039</th>
<th>Person: Mark Clare</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td>Submission request the addition of a Specific Local Objective for the setting-up allotments and a community garden, with an emphasis on biodiversity education, on land on Johnstown Road, formerly known as Johnstown Pitch &amp; Putt.</td>
<td>The submission includes a map with the community land delineated in red.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

**Chapter 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0040</th>
<th>Person: Nigel Brennan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td>Charleville Green Space, Charleville, Lower Churctown Road, is currently zoned ‘A’, which contrasts with similar green spaces in the area that are zoned ‘F’. The existing green space acts as an amenity space for local residents and should be rezoned to ‘F’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

**Map 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0041</th>
<th>Person: Aine O’Dwyer</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td>Submission request an increase in tree planting on Corrig Park footpath.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

**Chapter 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0042</th>
<th>Person: John Lennon</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td>Submission requests the inclusion of sewer breather pipes erected by Rathdown Rural District Council No. 1 onto the Industrial Heritage Survey. The submission lists 3 such pipes at Sandyford Road and St. Luke’s Crescent in Dundrum and on Brighton Road, Foxrock (photos of each are attached). A later pipe at Milltown Bridge Road is also referred to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

**Appendix 4**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0043</td>
<td>Clare Kerrigan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission disagrees with the planned expansion of ‘new residential communities’ and submits that it goes against what we need to achieve in terms of more sustainable living. The approach causes sprawl and encroaches on rural land which is vital for forestry and biodiversity. Recommends we focus on higher density in existing urban areas with well-built family friendly apartment blocks.
- Existing 3 bed apartments are unsuitable for families. We need well sized 3 and 4 bed apartments with dual aspect and proper sound-proofing that a family can stay in as children get older.
- Recommends a high speed planning system for people wanting to divide semi-detached homes into apartments.
- Suggests the introduction of a vacant land tax to combat land hoarding.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 2 and Chapter 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0044</td>
<td>Conor Kelly</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Welcomes Green Infrastructure and biodiversity approach and the commitment to participate in the North West Europe Transnational Cooperation Programme focused on Carbon.
- However, the plan should be more data driven, in particular an undertaking to establish the net GHG emissions inventory of all activity and then drive that to net zero. All new builds should be certified carbon neutral, parks and wetlands optimized for carbon sequestration and existing buildings should be retrofitted with insulation, solar PV and heat pumps.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0045</td>
<td>Michael Classon</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission provides history with regard to Belfort and Melfield, Newtownpark Avenue, with regard to ownership and use of the land, now owned by the Department of Education.
- The submission noted that Melfield House is in need of works, particularly to the roof.
- The submission states that Melfield should be maintained by its current owners.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0046</td>
<td>Joseph Long</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission seeks the rezoning of land adjacent to 1 Ferncarrig Avenue, Sandyford to residential in order to build upon the site. A map is included as an attachment.
- The submission notes that they may need to house their parents.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0047</td>
<td>Alison Kennedy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Development is overly focussed on overpriced, high rise built-to-rent apartments which are inappropriately located in established neighbourhoods. Suggests that these are not the types of homes needed for our young people or families.
- Suggests there is a growing sense of disquiet at the decision-making processes in An Bord Pleanála due to the strategic housing legislation over-ruling the standards of the County Development Plan.
• Contends that taxes imposed on institutional lands have resulted in loss of green fields and walled gardens in Dundrum and across the County. Local residents are having to fund Judicial Review proceedings in an effort to protect such areas. Suggests that these taxes should be abolished and replaced with a tax on unoccupied houses and buildings. Notes that there are many houses on Dundrum Main Street being left vacant.
• Submission supports the inclusion of measures to avoid the looming environmental crisis. Suggests the Core Strategy should have focussed on healing the harm done to the environment rather than increasing the dangers already present. Submission recognises the actions of the Parks Department in DLR including stopping the use of toxic sprays and the re-wilding of park spaces, and suggests their lead is followed by other DLR Departments.
• Submission disagrees with the use of different coloured boundaries to depict different stages of architectural conservation e.g. Dundrum and suggests that all areas are preserved immediately.
• Submission seeks the protection of trees and hedgerows and tree planting initiatives.
• Submission questions the veracity of photomontages submitted with planning applications.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0048</td>
<td>Joe Sorohan</td>
<td>Sorohan Builders</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission requests that a new pedestrian and cycle link be provided from Rathmichael Road towards the Luas station at Cherrywood Business Park passing under the existing M50 motorway bridge and crossing the R116 Brides Glen road and valley via a new combined foot and cycleway bridge.
• Submission considers that approach will provide a more direct link of 0.75 km (9min walking) rather than the existing situation which is 2.8 Km in length (33min walking). The submission includes surveys, drawings, visualisations showing route plans and feasibility of the scheme.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0049</td>
<td>Dara Larkin</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission commends the Council on the innovative approach to monitoring of the Plan in Chapter 15.
• Submission considers that this monitoring needs to be strengthened and go beyond what is set out in Section 15.4 in terms of SEA monitoring of the significant environmental effects of the implementation of the County Development Plan. This should also, pursuant to Article 13J.(1-2) SI No. 436/2004 - Planning and Development (Strategic Environmental Assessment) Regulations 2004, identify at an early stage unforeseen adverse effects and to be able to take appropriate remedial action. Existing monitoring measures may be used to avoid duplication of monitoring and this should be reported on in the Mid-Term Review of the Plan. An SEA monitoring Report is required pursuant to the SEA legislation.
• Submission suggests a new policy objective to be added to Chapter 15 to address the monitoring of the significant environmental effects of implementation of the Development Plan in the 2 Year Progress Report to the members of the authority (as required under Section 15(2) of the Act and Article13J(2) of the Regulations).

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0050</td>
<td>Deirdre NiChuilleanain</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Lack of a supermarket within walking distance of Aikens Village (nearest is a 30 minute walk).
• 30,000 residents in the Aiken’s Village and Belarime areas and no supermarket.
• Thousands of apartments currently being built with inadequate car parking for residents.
• The residents will need to use a car to access a supermarket which will add to the congestion on the roads.
• A new supermarket is required to serve the population which can cater for all needs and does not require the use of a car.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0051</th>
<th>Person: Robert Casey</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission suggests that Kilgobbin Road from Ballyogan Road to Stepaside be designated a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) so as to preserve the unique rural feel.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0052</th>
<th>Person: Mary Kelly</th>
<th>Organisation: Protect Marlay Park (PMP)</th>
<th>Map Nos: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• The submission focuses on three areas of the Draft Plan, Heritage, Open Space, Parks and Recreation and Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity – the submission also includes some images from within Marlay Park. The submission welcomes the recognition of the importance of historical structures and landscapes and the clarification of what is a Protected Structure. The submission also welcomes the inclusion on the Record of Protected structures within Marlay Park of structures which had been given Ministerial recommendation for inclusion on the RPS.
• The submission also supports and welcomes the policies outlined under Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity, which are encouraging with respect to Marlay Park, and welcomes the policy statements outlined in Open Space, Parks and Recreation.
• With respect to Heritage the submission notes:
• The policies outlined in Chapter 11 and the clarification of terms are welcomed, and reflect the recommendation in the ‘Architectural Heritage Guidelines’ published by the Department of Heritage, and notes consideration will be given to adherence to the Florence Charter.
• The submission highlights the importance of Marlay Park in terms of architectural landscape and historical landscape and its importance as a tourist amenity.
• The submission welcomes the Council’s policy objective to review and update its list of Protected Structures on foot of any Ministerial recommendations and suggests that the following should also be included:
  - 60220020 Gate Lodge on Grange Road (Regional).
  - 60220021 Gate Lodge on Grange Road (Regional).
  - Clock Tower Bridges,
  - Weirs, Ha-Ha,
  - The tree belt around the pond,
  - The serpentine pond and streams flowing into the pond. (‘Rare survivors within the County of eighteenth century demesne lakes.’), and,
  - Boundary Wall.
• The submission also welcomes the inclusion of Marlay Demense to be considered as an area of Architectural Conservation (ACA), and should be designated and ACA.
• Incremental damage is being caused to the landscaped sections of Marlay due to the open-air concerts each Summer and by the Council itself.
• The proposal in the Masterplan for Marlay to build a bridge across the main pond, would completely destroy a very important characteristic of a ‘Brownian’ style landscape which is the vista from the main house of the tree belt framing the pond.
• Marlay Demesne is the finest example in the County of an 18th century ‘designed landscape’ which could play a key role in ‘education’ and ‘research.’ Since Covid 19, the Park has never been busier with more and more people gaining an appreciation of its natural and historic heritage. Marlay needs to be declared an Architectural Heritage Area.
With respect to Open Space, Parks and Recreation the submission notes:

- The policy objectives outlined in Chapter 9 are welcomed in in particular the new Open Space strategy to ‘incorporate the ecosystems services approach, along with climate considerations’ which if implemented should support the Council’s objectives in addressing biodiversity and climate change.
- Accessibility to open spaces must be at all times throughout the year, in particular the Summer months.
- No park or green space within the County should have prolonged disruption and noise for commercial events.
- The submission notes that the Draft Plan recognises the importance that regional parks play in ‘promoting and enhancing biodiversity due to their overall size and the ecosystems they sustain’,
- A community garden should be provided at Marlay.
- The tree mapping is welcomed.
- With respect to Tree Preservation the Council should, as a matter of urgency, replace the missing trees in the tree belt behind the pond where the boathouse is situated.
- The submission welcomes the policy with respect to Play Facilities and Nature-Based Play and notes that Marlay Park is large enough to support such projects.
- With respect to Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity:
  - The submission welcomes several policy objectives within the Draft Plan.
  - The submission highlights the recognition under policy 8.4.5 that the view from Marlay park to Three Rock and Kilmashogue is included on the list of most important ‘views and prospects’ within the County.
  - The view from the main house over the top of the tree belt surrounding the pond is an intentional vista in the late 18th century design of Marlay, the gaps in the tree belt behind the pond adjacent to the boat house should be replaced.
  - The submission welcomes policy 8.7.1.1 which objective is the Protection of Natural Heritage and the environment, the Council must ensure that the wildlife habitats at Marlay Demesne which include the woodlands and hedgerows, the ponds and watercourses be fully protected as per the EU Directives.
  - The submission notes that the EU Habitats Directives will inform Council Policies, and this is welcomed. In addition, all information regarding the environment should be publicly available as is required under the Aarhus Convention to which Ireland is a signatory.
  - A programme of works for all the County’s parks and green spaces should be publicly available.
  - The submission notes that the Council’s record in the protection of bats in Marlay is poor. A comprehensive Bat Policy to protect bats and to encourage their roosting opportunities must be put in place and fully implemented, in particular, in the Council’s own parks and green spaces.
  - The submission is hopeful that Marlay would provide suitable locations for the Swift boxes proposed in this draft CPD and looks forward to surveys undertaken by ‘Swift Conservation’ Ireland.
  - Concert activity must, as a matter of urgency, be removed by at least 10 metres from the banks of the main pond and all the watercourses at Marlay due to their importance as breeding and feeding habitats.
  - The objective of policy 8.7.1.13 which proposes to avoid the widespread use of chemical weedkillers, herbicides and pesticides is welcomed. In addition to this, the Council should adopt a ‘No Mow’ policy for its parks, green spaces, and road edges.
  - Commercial events, if they were to continue at Marlay, should be removed from the wildlife and heritage sensitive areas around the Serpentine Pond, woodlands and watercourses and be confined to the southern end of the Park, close to the College Road entrance.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 8, Chapter 9, and Chapter 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0053</th>
<th>Person: Diane Barker</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Requests cycle paths to be safely set back and constructed on flat corridors along with cycle parking in the vicinity of services and amenities.
- Requests the retention of mature trees in the built up areas as far as possible and retention of natural woodland in new residential areas
- Requests greater equity for community organisations in terms of some way of sharing insurance costs and also to facilitate community facilities in prominent locations.
Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 4, 5 and 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0054</th>
<th>Person: Maryrose Doorly</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission considers that the preservation of the Tivoli Terrace South sports ground as a community facility is a pressing social issue in our time. Submission understands the need for housing and is very much in favour of social housing on this land instead of the very high-end developments.
- As density in the area increases, it is requested that the open green area should be developed as a social housing/recreational park facility.
- An area of public space with recreation, amenities such as allotments, and play facilities should be provided.
- A SLO is requested to safeguard the site for social housing and parkland.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14, Map 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0055</th>
<th>Person: Keith Brennan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission queries the lack of provisions to improve the open space at Clonkeen park.
- The cycle way through this space has increased cycle traffic, which has made it dangerous for young children to play.
- Chapter 9 of the Development Plan includes an objective to create Play Facilities and Nature Based Play (under 9.4.1.5 Policy Objective OSR13), however this objective is not being met in Clonkeen Park or the surrounding area. Given that the infrastructure in the area is changing, there would be opportunity to meet additional objectives in this area to benefit the space for children to play safely.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0056</th>
<th>Person: Denise Ryan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission requests that DLR construct new 1 bedroom bungalows suitable for people with medical disabilities.
- The submission states that there are currently no property exists like this in DLR’s social housing and people with serious illnesses are required to live in unsuitable accommodation.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0057</th>
<th>Person: Mr. Pat McCoy</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4, 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Lands in private ownership at Ardbrugh Road, Dalkey do not have legal boundaries defined on development plan maps and appears to form part of the Dalkey Hill common area.
- A map has been attached to the submission outlining the lands in question.
- The legal boundary should be shown on the draft plan maps,
- The submission seeks clarification if this land is the only land in private ownership covered by the zoning in the draft plan.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0058</th>
<th>Person: Fitzgerald Kavanagh &amp;</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission requests removal of Saint Brigid’s Catholic Church, (RPS No. 2006) from the RPS as the addition would place an undue restraint on the use of the building and the curtilage / attendant grounds.
- The historic value and interest is respected, however, the active use of the building requires flexibility which would be removed if included on the RPS.
- Rather than a blanket protection, the submission suggests that individual features, such as stained glass windows, could be protected in their own right.
- The submission suggests that the unique character of the building and its setting may be better protected in the formation of an ACA.

(Note: a submission in relation to the presbytery was also received and is summarised below under B1258)

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- RPS no. 2046, Ard-na-Chree, Kerrymount Ave, Foxrock should be removed from the RPS as it has been altered and extended over the past 44 years.
- Submission states that a requirement to respond by email or online as being ‘extraordinary’.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The Eastern and Midland Regional Assembly (EMRA) welcomes the overall approach and effort of DLR County Council to coordinate and incorporate policies and objectives, so that they are consistent with the RSES and NPF. The Assembly considers that the overall Draft Plan, including its Core Strategy, is consistent with the RSES, subject to the observations and recommendations of its submission, and that it provides a robust framework for the development of an overall strategy for the proper planning and sustainable development of the County. The EMRA’s observations and recommendations broadly follow the chapter headings of the Draft Plan as follows:

Chapter 1: Introduction, Vision and Context

- The EMRA welcomes the inclusion of an introductory chapter which sets out the statutory framework and planning hierarchy through which the Draft CDP was prepared. The Assembly welcomes the inclusion of the overall Vision for the County and the 5 Strategic County Outcomes, which were drafted having regard to the National Strategic Outcomes set out in the NPF, the Regional Strategic Outcomes set out in the RSES, and the UN Sustainable Development Goals. It is considered that this approach supports the required alignment between local, regional and national planning policy.

Chapter 2: Core Strategy

- The EMRA welcomes the preparation of an evidence-based analysis of key population and housing trends, including an interim Housing Need Demand Assessment, land availability and infrastructure capacity assessments, and a rationale for the main considerations which have informed the Core Strategy. It is considered that the Core Strategy provides a robust framework in demonstrating consistency to national and regional population targets and in identifying future growth opportunities in coordination with transport and infrastructure delivery to achieve compact sustainable development.

- Population Projections: The EMRA considers that the population projections up to 2028 (up to 258,375 population or 40,375 additional growth), which are set out in Table 2.5 of the Draft Plan, are consistent with the NPF Roadmap, RSES Appendix B (high scenario) and NPO 68 of the NPF.

- Draft Housing Strategy and Interim HNDA: The EMRA considers that the ‘Draft Housing Strategy and Interim HNDA’ provides a robust evidence-based framework to inform housing policies in the Draft
Plan, along with requirements for social housing in accordance with Part V of the Planning and Development Act (as amended), and to make provision for an appropriate housing mix as per SPPR 1 of ‘Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for Apartments’ (2018).

- The EMRA welcomes the inclusion of a policy objective in the Draft Plan to review the Interim HNDA, upon the delivery of a Regional HNDA in conjunction with the other Dublin Local Authorities and following the adoption of the relevant Section 28 Guidelines.
- Residential Development Capacity Audit: The EMRA considers that the Residential Development Capacity Audit, which informs the Core Strategy, aligns with National Policy Objective (NPO) 72a of the NPF which requires a standardised, tiered approach to identify zoned land that is serviced (Tier 1) and zoned land that is serviceable (Tier 2) within the life of the CDP. The EMRA welcomes the inclusion in Appendix 1 of a ‘Tiered Approach to Land Zoning–Infrastructure Assessment’, which sets out a detailed appraisal of strategic enabling infrastructure requirements in the County.
- Housing Target: The submission highlights the publication by the DHLGH in December 2020, of Section 28 Guidelines ‘Housing Supply Target Methodology for Development Plans’, and the accompanying ESRI publication ‘Regional Demographics and Structural Housing Demand at a County Level’. The EMRA states that the Draft Plan will be required to demonstrate general consistency with the NPF Roadmap and accordingly with the related ESRI NPF housing demand scenario in the Section 28 Guidelines at Chief Executives Report and, if required, at Material Alterations stages. In this regard, the EMRA recommends that the housing target for 2020-2028 in Table 2.7 of the Draft Plan be updated to take into account the housing demand for the 6 years of the CDP plan period 2022-2028, and to set out a rationale that demonstrates consistency between the Core Strategy and the above referenced Section 28 Guidelines.
- Settlement Strategy: The EMRA considers that the settlement strategy in the Draft Plan is consistent with the RSES Settlement Strategy which seeks to consolidate ‘Dublin City and Suburbs’, and that within the existing built-up area the urban structure is aligned the Retail Hierarchy of ‘Major Town Centres’ and ‘District Centres’, set out in Table 6.1 of the RSES. It is also considered that the settlement strategy in the Draft Plan is aligned with Table 5.1 of the MASP, which identifies strategic development areas to be delivered in tandem with enabling transport and infrastructure, including lands at Woodbrook-Shanganagh, Bray - Old Connaught, Cherrywood, Sandyford, Ballyogan and Environ and Kilinnam-N-Glenamuck.
- Core Strategy Table: Subject to demonstrating general consistency with relevant Section 28 Guidelines, the EMRA considers that the Core Strategy of the Draft Plan is consistent with the RSES, is informed by a robust evidence-based assessment and makes provision for an adequate supply of zoned land and housing to meet projected population growth in the County, with a focus on brownfield/infill lands to achieve compact growth, in line with strategic objectives of the NPF and RSES.
- Employment Lands: The EMRA welcomes the evidence-based approach of the Core Strategy which considers both existing land zoned for employment purposes, and the requirement for additional employment lands based on projected population and employment growth. It is considered that the proposed employment strategy in the Draft Plan is consistent with the RSES ‘Guiding Principles for the Location of Strategic Employment’ and is informed by a robust evidence-based analysis of employment lands. The EMRA submits that Table 2.14 of the Draft Plan is aligned with the strategic employment development areas of Sandyford, Cherrywood, Ballyogan (Carrickmines) identified in Table 5.2 of the MASP and notes that this will support increased employment densities within the existing built up area, in locations that are accessible to high quality public transport corridors, existing and planned and in line with the RSES ‘Guiding Principles for the growth of the Dublin Metropolitan Area’.
- Implementation and Delivery: The EMRA welcomes the inclusion in the Core Strategy of a section on implementation, which sets out a programme for Local Area Plans (Table 2.15), a commitment to monitor the delivery of compact development within the built-up area of Dublin City and Suburbs, and the stated intention of the Planning Authority to maintain a spatial database of strategic brownfield and infill sites, to be updated and monitored as part of active land management including the Vacant Sites Register. The EMRA also welcomes the establishment of a performance management framework to assist the Council in meeting its statutory reporting requirements.

### Chapter 3: Climate Action
- The EMRA welcome the inclusion in the Draft Plan of a dedicated Chapter to support Climate Action and notes that the delivery of compact growth will play a key role in achieving more sustainable settlement and travel patterns in the County, reducing the need for unnecessary car trips and associated emissions.
The submission welcomes the Council’s adoption of the DLR Climate Change Action Plan 2019-2024, which sets out the baseline climate adaptation and mitigation assessment and target actions for energy and buildings, transport, flood resilience, nature based solutions and resource management.

The EMRA acknowledges that Codema are preparing a ‘Dublin Region Energy Master Plan’ for the Dublin Local Authorities to provide an evidence base for emissions monitoring and to inform energy and transport policies, and which will support the identification of Strategic Energy Zones and District Heating opportunities in line with RPOs 7.35 and 7.38 of the RSES.

The submission welcomes the inclusion of a Landscape Assessment Study and Landscape/Seascape Character Areas in Appendix 9 and a Wind Energy Strategy which can support delivery of projects within Strategic Energy Zones.

The Submission notes that the ‘Area of Wind Potential’ for large scale wind energy infrastructure in the County is limited and concentrated in high amenity areas, but that the Council remains supportive of offshore wind energy development and small-scale wind energy developments within urban areas. The EMRA welcome the inclusion of Appendix 14, Table 4: Implementation of SPPRs from DHPCLG (2017) Interim Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Statutory Plans, Renewable Energy and Climate Change.

The EMRA highlights the DHLGH Circular Letter LGSM01-2021 and the 2019 Climate Action Plan which requires Local Authorities to identify at least one Decarbonising Zone. The submission notes that the potential to identify decarbonising and low emission zones may be considered as part of strategic urban regeneration/brownfields and transport orientated development and incorporate measures to support increased permeability and a shift to sustainable modes of transport.

The submission welcomes the inclusion of a policy objective in the Draft Plan that outlines the Council’s commitment to include measures to assess and monitor progress on Greenhouse Gas emission (GHG) reduction targets, following the development of a robust methodology for quantifying the GHG impacts of spatial planning policies, with reference to the QGasSP ESPON EU research programme, upcoming Section 28 Development Plan Guidelines or other national Guidance.

The submission highlights the accelerated climate action measures set out in the Climate Action and Low Carbon Development (Amendment) Bill, published in October 2020, which commits Ireland to interim reductions in GHG emissions including an average 7% per annum reduction from 2021 to 2030 towards net-zero emissions by 2050.

The submission notes that the review of the CDP offers an opportunity for further integration of policies to support mode shift to sustainable mobility, and the incorporation of key targets for mode share set out in the Government’s Smarter Travel Policy.

**Chapter 4: Neighbourhood – People, Homes and Place**

The EMRA welcomes the inclusion of a dedicated Chapter which sets out detailed policy objectives to support the creation of sustainable communities, delivery of housing choice to meet a range of diverse needs and the promotion of healthy placemaking and the ‘10-minute’ settlement concept, where a range of facilities and services are accessible by walking, cycling or high-quality public transport.

The submission also welcomes the recognition given in the Draft Plan to the key role of the Council’s Local Economic and Community Plan 2016-2021 (LECP) and future LECP, for supporting community development and driving economic development for the County, with reference also to the role of the DLR’s ‘Age Friendly Strategy’, ‘Healthy County Plan’ and Public Participation Network, in planning for social infrastructure needs and creating inclusive communities.

The EMRA recognises that access to services is central to healthy placemaking and welcomes the inclusion of specific objectives in the Draft Plan for the provision of social infrastructure including the new land use zoning objective ‘SNI’ for the provision of sustainable neighbourhood infrastructure, which will support the ‘10-minute’ neighbourhood concept and ensure that quality of life for residents is enhanced through the delivery of consolidated urban growth.

The submission considers that the Draft Plan has the potential to reduce the carbon footprint of the County through its proposed policy objectives to restrict the spread of one-off housing into rural and green belt areas together with policy objectives to encourage compact growth and sustainable higher densities in proximity to high quality public transport corridors and urban centres.

The submission welcomes the inclusion of a Building Height Strategy for the County (Appendix 5), which sets out area specific guidance and performance-based criteria for building height to support delivery of increased residential densities and compact growth as part of a plan led approach.

The EMRA welcome the preparation by DLR of a HNDA as part of their Housing Strategy during a time when the HNDA guidance at national level is yet to be confirmed. The Assembly considers that the
Draft Plan is supported by a robust evidence-based methodology to inform housing policies, in accordance with NPO 37 and RPO 9.5.

- The EMRA welcomes the inclusion in Appendix 14 of a detailed statement demonstrating compliance with the policies and objectives of relevant Section 28 Guidelines. The submission makes reference to Tables 2 and 3 of Appendix 14 which set out how the Draft Plan will support implementation of SPPRS’s from the DHHLG’s ‘Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments’ and ‘Urban Development and Building Heights’ in relation to the provision of build to rent and student accommodation in suitable locations, and a more varied mix of housing type and tenure throughout the County.

Chapter 5: Sustainable Movement and Transport
- The EMRA welcomes the Council’s stated commitment to integrated transport and land use, promoting sustainable mobility, including walking and cycling and public transport, and integration of demand management and travel planning measures to facilitate sustainable travel patterns and enable modal shift.
- The submission also welcomes the commitment of the Council to incorporate Area Based Transport Assessments, which integrate national and regional transport policies and objectives into local level land use plans and significant development areas, in the preparation of Local Area Plans. The Assembly recommends early and ongoing engagement with the transport agencies to ensure the integration of transport and land use in the Draft Plan, in addition to any upcoming local land use plans, and to incorporate mode shift targets into the planning and design of future development, with reference to the Government’s Smarter Travel Policy.
- The submission highlights Section 5.6 in the RSES ‘Key Transport Infrastructure in the Metropolitan Area’ and Table 8.2 ‘Rail Projects’ which states the intention to ‘Undertake appraisal, planning and design of LUAS network expansion to Bray, Finglas, Lucan and Poolbeg’. In this context, the submission notes that the delineation of the proposed Luas Line Extension on Land Use Zoning Maps 10 and 14 may be premature to the findings of any such appraisal, and subject to the current review of the NTA Transport Strategy, and any Area Based Transport Assessment prepared as part of the future Old Connaught LAP. The EMRA recommends that the proposed LUAS Line Extension in the Draft Plan should be updated to reflect the proposed LUAS Line Extension to Bray as set out in the RSES and NTA Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2016-2035.
- The EMRA welcomes the progress made by the Council in improving walking and cycling infrastructure as part of the accelerated measures in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The Assembly supports the continued roll out of public realm and active travel interventions, which should include provision for older people, people with disabilities and young children, in line with the principles of universal design and incorporate monitoring measures to inform the implementation of permanent solutions where clear benefits are identified.
- The submission also welcomes the inclusion of a policy objective to improve access to and support the continued development of Dún Laoghaire Port as a marine related asset in accordance with the ‘National Ports Policy’ and consistent with RPO 8.23 of the RSES.

Chapter 6: Economic Development and Employment
- The EMRA welcomes the inclusion of a Chapter on Economic Development and Employment and the evidence-based approach that the Local Authority have adopted in setting out the socio-economic and employment profile of the County, which informs the economic policies in the Draft Plan. The recognition of the need for alignment between the CDP and the LECP is also welcomed, along with the role of the LEP in facilitating local economic development.
- The submission considers that the location of strategic employment lands in the Draft Plan is consistent with the settlement hierarchy in the RSES and MASP.
- The submission notes that the policy objectives in the Draft Plan relating to the equine, maritime, local services, promotion of home working/e-working, rural enterprise and diversification of local enterprise to create resilience, and transition to a low carbon economy, are supportive of the economic policies in the RSES and other government policies.
- The submission acknowledges the important role of the tourism sector and in this regard highlights the designation of Dublin Bay as a UNESCO Biosphere.

Chapter 7: Towns, Villages and Retail Development
- The EMRA considers that the retail hierarchy in the Draft Plan is consistent with the retail hierarchy for the Region as presented in Table 6.1 of the RSES and the Retail Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area.
• The submission highlights the challenges facing traditional on-street retailing, which have been accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic and welcome the efforts make by the Council to develop new and enhanced experiences and a sustainable mix of functions within commercial centres. The EMRA supports the continued roll out of measures to improve accessibility and permeability in the public realm, to support walking and cycling in response to ongoing COVID impacts including a shift towards home-working, as well as opportunities to facilitate co-working and remote-working spaces and a greater mix of daytime and night time uses in urban centres.

Chapter 8: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
• The EMRA welcomes the inclusion of a dedicated Chapter on Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity, the inclusion of a Green Infrastructure Strategy in Appendix 15 and the recognition given to Green Infrastructure as a key strategic asset which can aid in the creation of a climate resilient County. The submission welcomes the integration of an emerging Ecosystem Services Approach as part of a new Biodiversity Plan for the County and also the inclusion of the policy objective in the Core Strategy to promote an Ecosystem Services Approach in the preparation of lower-level plans, strategies and development management.
• The submission notes the intention to update the DLR ‘Green Infrastructure Strategy’ during the lifetime of the Plan, and in this regard, highlights the Green Infrastructure policies in Section 5.9 of the MASP and Table 7.1 ‘Strategic Natural, Cultural and Green Infrastructure Assets in the Region’.
• The submission welcomes the recognition given to the Dublin Bay Biosphere and Dublin Mountains Partnership. The RSES further highlights the recreational and tourism potential of natural assets and supports alignment with Fáilte Ireland’s key tourism brands.
• The EMRA commends the commitment of DLR to the principles of sustainable development and Green Infrastructure and looks forward to continued engagement with the Council to facilitate the integration of ecosystem services into policy and plan making, to improve Green Infrastructure and Ecosystem Services Mapping and support the delivery of strategic Green Infrastructure, in line with the policy objectives of the RSES and MASP.

Chapter 9: Open Space, Parks and Recreation
• The EMRA welcomes the recognition given in the Draft Plan to the role of open space and healthy placemaking in facilitating improvements to human wellbeing and quality of life, along with policy objectives to develop a comprehensive network of County Greenways linking parks and public open spaces and to link into wider strategic networks.
• The submission highlights the potential to develop the network of strategic greenways detailed in the RSES including the East Coast Trail, Wicklow Way, Dublin Mountains Way and Dodder Greenway, subject to careful routing and design to ensure the protection of environmentally sensitive sites. The submission also welcomes Appendix 12 ‘Public Rights of Way/Recreational Access Routes’ which will support additional policy development in this regard.
• The EMRA also welcomes the inclusion of policy objectives to support the objectives of public health policy including ‘Healthy Ireland’ and the ‘National Physical Activity Plan’ and the provision of enhanced open space, sports and recreation, including water based sports and play facilities across the County.

Chapter 10: Environmental Infrastructure and Flood Risk
• The submission notes that this Chapter sets out policy supports for climate action to provide adequate wastewater treatment, manage surface water in a sustainable manner, minimise waste in accordance with the principles of the circular economy and to provide flood protection measures and reduce flood risk as far as possible in the County. In this context, the EMRA highlights that the Planning Authority shall have regard to the provisions of the Climate Action Plan (2019), the National Mitigation Plan (2017) and the National Adaptation Framework (2018).
• With regard to the impact of climate change and increased flood risk and coastal erosion, the submission references RPO 7.43 of the RSES and the need to ensure the resilience of critical infrastructure that is capable of withstanding, adapting and recovering from extreme weather events, for example, coastal rail lines.
• The EMRA welcomes the stated intention of the Council to liaise as appropriate with the OPW and Climate Action Regional Office on progressing a Pilot Coastal Monitoring Survey Programme, which will inform future decisions on coastal management and defence measures in the County.
• The EMRA welcomes the Council’s commitment to the provision of high-quality infrastructure to ensure there is adequate capacity to support future development. In this regard, the EMRA will promote enhanced co-ordination between Local Authorities and infrastructure agencies for the delivery of
strategic enabling infrastructure in a plan led manner, including through the fora of the RSES and MASP Implementation Groups.

**Chapter 11: Heritage and Conservation**

- The EMRA notes the policy objective in the Draft Plan to support the preparation of a new County Heritage Plan 2021 – 2025. In this regard the submission draws the Council’s attention to the contents of the RSES which emphasises the benefits of heritage led urban regeneration (e.g. through the protection of historic urban fabric), the re-use of historic buildings, and the enhancement of places of cultural or natural interest, all of which can play a key role in driving tourism and economic development in terms of placemaking and enhance the vibrancy of historic town centres.

**Chapter’s 12 to 14**

- The EMRA considers that the development management standards, land use zoning objectives and local objectives set out in Chapter’s 12 to 14 provide a comprehensive framework for the assessment of planning applications in the County.

**Chapter 15: Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation**

- The EMRA welcomes the inclusion of a dedicated Chapter on implementation, monitoring and evaluation and the recognition given to monitoring the delivery of the Core Strategy. The submission commends the Council for the inclusion of monitoring mechanisms to be put in place to ensure effective delivery of the CDP and for greater transparency on the progress made in its implementation.

**Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) / Appropriate Assessment (AA)**

- The EMRA welcomes the preparation of the Draft Plan in tandem with the required environmental processes, namely SEA and AA.

- The submission highlights the EPA’s ‘Guidance on SEA Statements and Monitoring’ (Second Review of SEA Effectiveness in Ireland), published in 2020, which provides best practice on devising monitoring measures, suitably detailed indicators and the frequency of monitoring and reporting. The submission notes that this guidance will inform the iterative SEA process and preparation of the monitoring programme as part of the County Plan’s SEA statement.

**Appendix 14**

- The Assembly welcomes the inclusion in Appendix 14 of a statement demonstrating how the Draft Plan has implemented the relevant policies and objectives of Section 28 Guidelines.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Part 2 of Volume 1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0061</td>
<td>Przemyslaw Martyniak</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Request improved road and cycle infrastructure between Belarmine/Stepaside M50, Kilgobbin and city centre.
- Commends the exercise equipment in Fernhill Park and requests that more be rolled out in the area in parks adjoining playgrounds to promote health.
- Cycle infrastructure should be better distinguished from roads and footpaths.
- Travellers accommodation objective should be removed from the social housing development which is under construction in Belarmine due to the population density.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Chapters 5, 9, 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0062</td>
<td>Liam Harris</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- New development should be focused within the existing built up area of the County. The Plan should aim for over 75% of new housing within existing or regenerated neighbourhoods on infill and brownfield sites where there are existing services, amenities and infrastructure.
- Greenfield development at the periphery should be avoided, with the exception of the Ballyogan area adjacent to the LUAS Green Line. Development in areas outside the M50 (e.g. Kiltiernan, Old Connacht) should be reduced.
- Suburban Dublin needs increased density to combat urban sprawl. This can be achieved through a range of housing types in buildings of 5 to 8 storeys, with a smaller number of areas designated for taller structures e.g. Dundrum, Stillorgan, Blackrock, Dun Laoghaire and Sandyford. These areas benefit from existing services and are better connected with public transport than the proposed new areas of development.
- The area around Sandyford has potential to incorporate more residential in a mixed neighbourhood, given the brownfield land bank in the Sandyford Business Park and Central Park areas.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0063</td>
<td>Emma Linnane Colgan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- There is a lack of wildlife zones in the Plan.
- The submission states that there are limited parks in the County, such as Marley, Balawley or thin strips along rivers such as the Slang, which are completely inadequate for biodiversity, the health of our environment and consequently our own health.
- Having to rely on private gardens for pollinators etc. is ineffective. There must be more preserved and better (un)managed green space.
- Trees need more protection and more planting should be provided.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 8 and 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0064</td>
<td>Susan and Paraic O'Toole</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- There appears to be a misunderstanding about the building listed for protection under RPS No. 2121, Farmhouse at Kiltiernan Villa, Ballybetagh Road.
- In 2014 (at the time of the NIAH report) the property was uninhabitable – a number of defects are listed in the submission. The property has subsequently had a number of refurbishment works carried out and living spaces have been restructured.
- The submission notes that works have endeavoured to retain the period look and feel.
- The submission requests that there would be no restriction to the demolition and extension of part of the building in the future.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0065</td>
<td>Nick Baird</td>
<td>St Brigid’s Boys School Foxrock</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Delighted that the school is being added to the RPS as this will protect the legacy of the school.
- Submission noted that prefab buildings are in a poor state of repair and improvements to the school are required.
- Assurances are sought that the protection of the structure would not hinder upgrading of the school or on-site facilities.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0066</td>
<td>GF Irvine</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission requests that a group of townhouses on St Patricks Rd, Dalkey, are re-zoned from mixed use (NC) to residential to protect the residential amenity of the area.
- Submission queries the compatibility of the existing zoning with proper planning and raises concern with regard to potential future development at that location.
- Submission considers the zoning to be an anomaly in mapping.
- A map is included outlining the site in question.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0067</th>
<th>Person: Ann Lynch</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission seeks the retention of the zoning of the sports field on Tivoli Terrace South as “G1- To preserve and provide for open space with ancillary active recreational amenities”.
- Submission notes the history and recreational use of the site.
- Submission notes that this site was accessible to locals and request that it remains accessible.
- Submission states that the site is the last remaining green area in central Dún Laoghaire and notes the importance of access to green space during the past 12 months.
- Submission refers to the vision of the draft Plan - ‘championing of the quality of life through healthy placemaking’ and notes that the creation of a new public park on Tivoli Terrace South would align closely with those objectives.
- Submission notes higher densities in Dún Laoghaire, existing and permitted residential developments in Dún Laoghaire with limited or no outside space, school with no green space and local nursing homes.
- Submission argues that the space should be taken into dlr ownership and developed as a public park.
- Submission suggests a number of uses for the site that would benefit local communities including:
  - Recreational / sports / play ground
  - Planting trees, orchard, community garden
  - Provision of seating / walking area mainly for the elderly.
- Submission suggests that synergies between the site and the training centre could be developed.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0068</th>
<th>Person: Brendan Donohue</th>
<th>Organisation: St. Attracta’s National Schools</th>
<th>Map Nos: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission expresses appreciation for the retention of exiting F zoning adjacent to St Attractas National schools, Broadford Road noting that the lands have played an important role in the development of pupils.
- Submission notes that a condition was placed on the lands in 1974 that the lands would be preserved for school purposes and in 1977 the lands were dedicated as public open space and is maintained by dlr parks.
- Submission notes a refusal of planning permission for houses on the lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0069</th>
<th>Person: Philip Lardner</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission states that The Ochra, Thornhill Rd (RPS No. 1977) was constructed between the 1930’s – 1950’s and notes that it was poorly constructed and states that there is evidence of subsidence.
- Notes that the character of the building would be significantly altered if external insulation were to be applied.
- Notes that the building was refurbished in the 1990’s, however the property remains substandard and improvements would be prohibitively expensive – replacing the structure would be more effective.
Having regard to the reasons above, it is requested that the structure is removed from the RPS.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0070</th>
<th>Person: Fitzgerald Kavanagh and Partners on behalf of Fr. Tom Dalzell P.P.</th>
<th>Organisation: Arch Diocese of Dublin</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission requests a review of Church of Saint Stephen, Killiney Hill Rd. (RPS No. 1636) that is listed on the RPS.
- The structure was opened in 1984, it is not listed on NIAH and a rationale for its protection cannot be established.
- The building has local value and interest however it is inactive as a place of worship and requires a degree of flexibility which is not in keeping with its listing on the RPS as a church.
- Concerns raised that future changes to the building are reduced due to its listing and request that the structure is removed from the RPS.
- Suggests that items of interest, such as a stained glass window and sanctuary furniture, are listed individually.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0071</th>
<th>Person: Kieran O’Malley and Co. Ltd</th>
<th>Organisation: On behalf of Godfrey Doyle</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission relates to lands located at 135 Ballyogan Road, Carrickmines. The lands comprise a residential use fronting onto Ballyogan Road and a creche and Montessori at the rear. Site development context and planning history information pertaining to the site is provided. Notes that under the Draft CDP, the buildings on site including the dwelling and creche are zoned Objective ‘A’, while the access drive, car park and external area at the rear are zoned Objective ‘E’.
- Requests the re-zoning of the Objective ‘E’ zoned lands to Objective ‘A’.
- Makes the case that the re-zoning is supported by Policy Objective PHP1 of the Draft CDP and also Section 2.6.2.1 which refers to the potential of infill and brownfield lands. Suggests the re-development of the site for residential purposes would represent the sustainable development of a brownfield site.
- Additional factors which support the case for re-zoning include: it would facilitate the creation of a larger residential site with development potential; access and services are available; there is existing high quality public transport and cycle and pedestrian infrastructure; the site is located in an established neighbourhood with existing services, amenities and community facilities; the re-zoning would comprise a relatively minor addition to residential zoned land in the County; and, it would accord with the Avoid/Shift/Improve model for transport and mobility in Chapter 5 of the Draft CDP.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0072</th>
<th>Person: Paul Meany</th>
<th>Organisation: Old Conna Golf Club</th>
<th>Map Nos: 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission welcomes the proposed development in the area (of Old Conna Golf Club).
- The submission requests that an additional local objective be included in the County Development Plan as follows:
  “That there shall be a buffer zone of 50 metres between any development under this Plan and the border of Old Conna Golf Club”.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0073</td>
<td>Bowler Geraghty and Co.</td>
<td>SF Trust Ltd./The Franciscan Order in Ireland</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission re: Dún Mhuire Seafield Road, Killiney (RPS No. 2134) requests that only part of the building could be listed.
- It is requested that the lodge, library and outhouses are exempted from the RPS.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):** Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0074</td>
<td>Bro. Jesse O’Neill, SM</td>
<td>The Marianists of Ireland</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- There is no right of way over the lands or any part thereof at St. Laurence College, Wyattville Park, Loughlinstown.
- No reference to any such Right of Way should be included in the Development Plan.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):** Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0075</td>
<td>Mary Kelly-Borgatta and Armando Borgatta</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission request that the sports field at Tivoli Terrace South be used as a public park, retain its recreational zoning objective and be given a SLO to ensure that is doesn’t become rezoned.
- Submission notes the importance of parks, particularly over the past 12 months and notes that parks have been used to capacity in Dún Laoghaire.
- Submission states that ‘staycationing’ will find more people using local public spaces.
- Submission raises concern in relation to how our parks will cope given the numbers using them and notes that we will need to manage this through investing in more green spaces.
- Submission notes that many local residents have no access to a garden, a local school has no access to a sport ground and older, less mobile residents have to drive access a public park.
- Submission notes objectives of the draft plan in relation to access to a network of open spaces and provision of a hierarchy of parks that protect and enhance open space.
- Submission requests that the site continues to be used for active and passive recreation to serve a growing population and notes a number of opportunities for the site such as planting, sports and play.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):** Chapter 9, Chapter 14, Map 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0076</td>
<td>Patrick Donnelly</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Request the inclusion of the ‘Ballyedmonduff Green Road’ as a public right of way. This ancient route starts at the entrance to the Paddocks Riding Centre, Ballyedmonduff, and runs south east for approx. 300m to the hamlet of Carthy’s Green.
- The submitter includes an extract from the 1843 1st Edition 6 inch map, showing the route as well as an extract from a newspaper article written in 1965 by JP Malone, in which he describes the route as ‘the nearest and finest example of a green road, as far as the city centre is concerned and long may it continue so’.
- Have frequently used this route for the past 50 odd years, and while it’s in poorer condition now, it is used extensively by walkers, cyclists and horse riders.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Welcome the development of Bloomfields/Myrtle Square, which creates an attractive centre point.
- A new public space should be created at Boylan Community Centre, Sussex Street (could include residential, retail, parking). This is currently a no-go area due to antisocial behaviour.
- The area outside the St. Michaels Church property could be developed as a public space, public seating/feature fountain/floral planting.
- Suggest a property forum to encourage businesses and property companies to consider locating their clients in Dún Laoghaire. Sell the “good news” story.
- Larger retail and office units should be developed to satisfy the demand from multinational retailers and commercial businesses.
- Reduce the red tape in relation to outdoor seating, etc and offer rates holidays for new businesses.
- Owners of derelict stores need to be encouraged to develop prominent and valuable sites e.g. Dunnes.
- Dún Laoghaire Shopping Centre is in need of major development – the HSE, while not an ideal tenant, will bring footfall to the Town Centre.
- DLBA surveys have identified the shortage of quality ladies fashion retailers as having a major impact on attracting female shoppers to Dún Laoghaire.
- Develop IT systems to improve the parking situation/security, infrastructural services and measure pollution. For example, smart parking and traffic management systems.
- The number of parking spaces needs to be increased. There are continuous complaints by customers of inadequate parking spaces near the town centre.
- Any plans to create pedestrian areas will need consultation with the Business Community and an extensive traffic management plan.
- A link should be created between the IADT and its Campus and Dún Laoghaire Town. IADT should be encouraged to expand some student locations to the Town Centre.
- Dún Laoghaire’s role as an educational centre should be expanded (IADT, language schools, Digital Marketing Institute but also primary and secondary schools).
- Suggest the relocation of the HSE Methadone Clinic – Patrick Street location in a Town Centre, beside a primary school, is unsuitable and hurts the perception of the Town.
- People’s Park Market should revert to a “Farmers Market” so as not to be in direct competition with the rate paying businesses in the Town.
- Develop a “night-time economy” with outdoor seating & improved lighting on the streets.
- Is the current County Development Plan proactive in increasing the residential offering in the town, particularly the promotion of “living over retail” developments?
- While the town’s conservation and heritage are very important, it should not be used as a reason to oppose viable developments.
- The aim to connect the waterfront with the town centre is a difficult one as Marine Road is not the most attractive entrance way, but the new connection ways particularly to Sussex Street via Harbour lodge is important.
- The Council has been proactive in the promotion of public transport and a bicycle modal shift. While the Business community supports providing high quality access to the town by public transport, good car access and legible paths to parking provision is fundamental to the town’s function as a Major Town Centre.
- The temporary measures of one-way traffic systems & wide cycle ways on the coastal routes will need to be reversed once the traffic volumes increase post Covid.
- Look at examples from strong French cities which encourage quick and direct access to the town centre for all modes of travel, to support vibrant commercial cores. The emphasis of policy must be on making it as easy and attractive as possible for all modes of transport to access the town centre.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Appendix 8
Summary of Submission and Observation:

- **Cornelcourt’s role as District Centre is underspecified.** The District Centre zoned lands only include Dunnes Stores’ Cornelscourt Shopping Centre. The relevant portions of the Plan, namely Table 7.2 and Section 7.5.3 provide negligible detail about the role of the Cornelscourt District Centre. The Plan does not mention the relationship and connections with the village centres of Cornelscourt and Cabinteely.
- **The core of that district is not just the superstore in the middle; it includes the two village centres and access to the park.** The zoning should be expanded non-contiguously to include this mix of areas that better reflects the district and this would allow for more meaningful goals to be set for the district.
- **The zoned lands do not meet the criteria for a District Centre as laid out in Section 7.5.3 as the zone contains no leisure amenities, no financial services, no non-retail employment, minimal comparison shopping and no mixed uses beyond retail.** Furthermore, Cabinteely Park, the only nearby leisure amenity, which is a requirement for a District Centre, is not mentioned.
- **The entirety of the District Centre zoning should not be owned and operated by a single company.** It inhibits the objective that “District Centres should progressively develop as mixed-use urban centres” as it ties the success of the District Centre to the success of the company.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

**Chapter 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0079</th>
<th>Person: Shaun Tracey</th>
<th>Organisation: Dublin Rathdown Sinn Féin</th>
<th>Map Nos: 1,2,5,6,9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

**SHD Legislation and Section 28 Guidelines**

- **Strategic housing legislation combined with Ministerial Guidelines on building heights have enabled developers to bypass LAPs and has undermined the consultation process on the CDP as it can be disregarded or overlooked.**
- **Believe that SHD legislation should be reversed.**
- **The CDP and associated LAPs, with their democratic underpinning, should be adhered to in planning applications.**

**Housing**

- **Solving the housing crisis in Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown should be a top priority for the Council.** While recognising that many planning applications for housing currently bypass local authority planning laws, the Council should argue for the maximum possible social and affordable units to be incorporated into each development that gets planning permission.
- **The Council should use all appropriate public land available to build public and affordable housing to rent and buy including land at the former Central Mental Hospital in Dundrum which the Land Development Agency (LDA) currently plans to develop.** The LDA model cannot deliver the level of public and affordable units that is required.
- **The Council should develop the Mount Anville site in its entirety for public and affordable housing to rent and buy.**
- **The Council should pursue Horse Racing Ireland to hand over unused land at Leopardstown Racecourse that is zoned residential and has the potential for up to 450 units for public and affordable housing to rent and buy.**

**Public services**

- **Concern that public services will be stretched to breaking point, particularly with regard to public transport and school places, as a result of ongoing development, including SHD development, along the Green Luas Line, the N11 and the M50.**

**Public Transport**

- **As the Luas Green Line was developed the 44, 48A, and 63 routes were curtailed. However, the Luas Green Line is now over capacity at peak times (outside of Covid lockdowns), with many passengers unable to board trams.** The service will also be unable to return to pre-Covid levels of crowding. Therefore, **public transport services should be extended on the 14, 44, 44B, 47, 48A, 63, 75 and 114 routes.**
- **Would also like to see the return of the 44 to Ballyogan along with other measures to promote sustainable transport forms as set out in the Government’s Sustainable Transport policy.**

**Schools**

- **Concern regarding a potential lack of school places as the local population continues to grow.**
Concerned at the delay in the delivery of a permanent school building for Stepaside Educate Together Secondary School.

**Recreation**
- Support the inclusion of Phase 2 of the Samuel Beckett Civic Centre in the County Development Plan.
- Support the continuing work on the Meadowbrook Swimming Pool to ensure its reopening when Covid-19 restrictions are lifted, but would like to see similar urgency in relation to Glenalbyn Swimming Pool.

**Culture and Heritage**
- A plaque should be erected at St Nessans in Sandyford Village in honour of the life of Máire Comerford, who was a lifelong republican, and spent much of her life at the house.
- Markievicz Cottage on the Blackglen Road should be declared a National Monument and added to the Record of Protected Structures.
- The Old Cottages at The Hill in Stillorgan should be added to the Record of Protected Structures.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 4, 5, 11, Miscellaneous, Appendix 4

---

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission requests that the Council support and include plans for a playground for the Clonkeen Park. This would serve the many existing housing estates in the area and would be a good use of space and for physical activity and general health of our children.
- Having regard to the plans for new apartments in the Clonkeen Park area of Deansgrange, plus the welcome upgrades of the native woodlands, cycling and walking, a playground at this location would be in keeping with the 10-minute neighbourhood concept.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 9

---

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission notes that the sports field at Tivoli Terrace South has recently been sold and raises concern in relation to the future plan for the green area.
- Submission requests that the existing recreational zoning is retained.
- Submission notes that this area of Dún Laoghaire does not have adequate green space noting the development of the area in recent years, nursing homes and older, less mobile population
- Submission notes the focus on open spaces due to the pandemic and notes the impact of not having easy access to green spaces.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 3

---

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Resident of “Weisford” at Marino Avenue West for 20 years and acknowledge that members of the public have used Marino Avenue West during that period as a right of way (ROW) for pedestrian traffic.
- No objection to the preservation of Marino Avenue West as a public ROW in respect of pedestrians and under the strict understanding that the ROW is restricted to foot traffic.
- No vehicular traffic has passed along Marino Avenue West in exercise of any public ROW and Marino Avenue West is a cul de sac for vehicular traffic. Seek confirmation that the ROW will be preserved and limited to pedestrian traffic as has always been the case.
- Questions the timing of the proposal and also why it only pertains to Marino Avenue West and not to Marino Avenue East.
- Seeking information regarding any potential consequences for residents and in particular with regard to the provision by the Council of a continued indemnity in respect of any accidents or injury to members of the public that might occur while exercising the ROW.
• Concern that members of the public might injure themselves while exercising the ROW having particular regard to the fact that the local authority has not taken this road in charge.
• Understand that the Road Traffic Act of 1993 provides that a public road is a road over which the public may exercise the right of way and that the obligations therefore to maintain that road rests with the local authority and seek confirmation that this is the position and that the Council will continue to provide public liability insurance and/or indemnity to residents. This is particularly important in view of its inclusion in the County Development Plan 2022.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0083</td>
<td>Patricia Stewart</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Seeking amendment to Appendix 8, Section 8.5.6 George’s Place, which refers to redevelopment of the former Council Depot, to insert the phrase “without loss of parking in Stable Lane” following the sentence:
  “Any redevelopment will include upgrades to the public realm along Georges Place to include traffic calming, extensive tree planting, pollinator planting schemes, creative water attenuation, wider paving, improved surfaces and new public lighting to create a stronger sense of place”.
• There are 28 households living in the curtilage of Stable Lane, most of which have no off-street car parking and have always relied on the 11 no. parking spaces on Stable Lane.
• Many of the residents have parking permits and many are large households with more than one car.
• There is no other parking on Crofton Road on the same side and spaces on the opposite side are limited.
• While there is currently no right of way through the emergency gate between Stable Lane and George’s Place, the development plan anticipates the connection. If this is put in place it is only fair that residents do not have their homes further devalued and their residential amenity further reduced by loss of long-standing adjacent parking.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0084</td>
<td>Stiofan Caomhanach</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission seeks the addition of Taylors Three Rock, 16 Grange Rd, Rathfarnham to the RPS.
• Submission noted the potential for redevelopment of the site.
• Submission states that this is one of the largest thatched buildings in Dublin and states that is was built in 1640. Its former use as a coaching house, its original flagstone floor and timbers are noted as items of interest.
• Photos of the structure, a window and floor are attached.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0085</td>
<td>Georgina Roche</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Welcomes Policy Objective T22: Roads and Streets and requests that Falls Road is included in Table 5.3 6 Year Road Objectives and shown on Map no 10 as there is presently no footpath and lighting is inadequate.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0086</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deirdre Ni Chuillenanain

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Requests more protected cycle lanes, especially on Sandyford Road. This would provide safe access to schools in the area and Dundrum Town Centre, which would reduce car dependency.
- Requests Sandyford village be made one way with a contra flow bike lane.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

DLR Submission No: B0087  Person: Conor Keeling  Organisation: N/A  Map Nos: 2, 3

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Concerned at the proposal to drop the S2S cycle route.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

DLR Submission No: B0088  Person: Gemma Finlay  Organisation: N/A  Map Nos: 2

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The objective for the S2S at the seafront should be reinstated. The walkway which adjoins Blackrock Park on the seafront is only approximately 100 metres long. This should be extended so that there is a promenade with similar benefits to the promenade at Salthill (Galway) from Booterstown-Blackrock-Seapoint at a minimum.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

DLR Submission No: B0089  Person: David Hall  Organisation: N/A  Map Nos: 10

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Welcomes Policy Objective T22: Roads and Streets and requests that Falls Road is included in Table 5.3 6 year Road Objectives and shown on Map no 10 as there is presently no footpath and lighting is inadequate.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

DLR Submission No: B0090  Person: P. Lucas  Organisation: N/A  Map Nos: 2, 3

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Concerned at the proposal to drop the S2S cycle route on the seafront and replace it with the East Coast Trail. Both the commuter cycleway on existing roads and the S2S as envisaged in earlier development plans are required.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

DLR Submission No: B0091  Person: Hilary Wardrop  Organisation: N/A  Map Nos: N/A

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- A cycle path for commuters should be one which gets the cyclist from A to Z in the shortest possible distance. A cycle path/walkway should have adequate passive surveillance, be well lit and sheltered from strong wind. Women are especially vulnerable in this regard eg Blackrock Park area near the railway is not suitable after dark.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0092</td>
<td>Patrick Vivion Tarrant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Concerned that the Draft has abandoned the S2S and replaced it with the East Coast Trail, a plan for a cycleway without a walkway, not on the Seafront but inland mostly on existing roads. The commitment to the S2S should be reinstated.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0093</td>
<td>Liam Egan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Concerned that the S2S has been dropped from the Draft and that Policy T13 has replace it with a cycle only facility with no provision for pedestrians and partially located inland as well as on the coast. It seems to serve commuting cyclists only. It is noted that the S2S is in the Capital Programme of dlr.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0094</td>
<td>Nesta Butler</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission notes the difference between Blackrock and Dún Laoghaire relative to green space and the availability of private gardens.
- Submission comments on the population of Dún Laoghaire relative to available green space and little or no garden availability, particularly at the northern end of the town.
- Submission suggests that forward thinking by the council is required to improve the situation.
- Submission notes the recent sale of the sports ground at Tivoli Terrace South and requests that this land retains its recreational zoning objective.
- Submission states that the site attracts birds and would be perfect for wildlife conservation and a potential aid for local schools.
- Submission suggests a number of uses for the site including it being replanted with trees, play, exercise space, allotments and notes the importance of green spaces with an increase in population.
- Submission requests that the narrow lane to the rear of nos. 11-13 Tivoli Terrace North and to the side of the rear garden of no 11 is not included as part of the sports ground and zoned F as it is private.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0095</td>
<td>Dr Eilis Humphreys, Executive Director</td>
<td>Le Chéile Schools Trust - Patron of St. Laurence College.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Expresses a very strong objection to the inclusion of a right of way through the school grounds as shown on the map of the proposed County Development Plan 2022-2028.
- The existing path is an entrance to the school for the students and staff and not a public ROW.
- The proposed ROW passes directly under the windows of classrooms.
- The school suffers from significant vandalism on a daily basis, but particularly at weekends and is advised to secure the premises as a result. This would not be possible with an ROW in place.
- The Patron of the school has the responsibility to ensure that the school and its occupants are fully covered by insurance. If the ROW were to be introduced it would not be possible to insure the property as is required under legislative and governance requirements. The Department of Education advises, and the insurance company requires, that school property is protected which includes the ability to secure the premises when the school is not in operation. This would not be possible if there was a public ROW.
During the Covid-19 pandemic, it is important to keep the number of people who enter the school premises to a minimum. The outdoor spaces are used by the school community and it would be impossible to maintain safety with an ROW in place.

The submission also included an attachment in the form of a letter from the school’s insurer, Allianz. The letter states that:

- This is an unusual and unwelcome proposal and raises serious concerns.
- The public ROW makes it more difficult to secure school property and protect against vandalism, theft, arson and related damage.
- There was a recent break in at the school and the ROW would increase future risk and make risk improvement measures considerably more difficult to implement.
- The school should look to reduce uninvited public access both during and outside of school hours in order to reduce the risks of property damage and access to staff and pupils.
- Special consideration would need to be given to the safety of staff that work outside School hours.
- The school’s safeguarding policy would need to be reviewed.
- A Covid-19 risk assessment would need to be carried out in order to assess the additional risk factors that the public ROW would present through unrestricted access to school grounds.

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Surprised and displeased by the reference to the ‘preservation of a public right of way’ on school grounds. The school is situated on private property and no right of way exists on the land.
- Strongly object to the inclusion of a public right of way on private property of the school.
- The existing pathway is for the sole use of those who attend the school and not for use by the general public.
- A public right of way through school grounds would undermine the Principal’s ability to meet statutory obligations for the health, safety and welfare of the school community, as well as parental expectations, whilst they are in the school’s care.
- Child Protection legislation requires that everyone who interacts with students is Garda Vetted and the students utilise the full campus to fulfil their curricular needs.
- In recent months the school has suffered from burglary, daily anti-social behaviour, vandalism and theft of property.

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The Board of Management is responsible for the health, safety and welfare of all in the school community and are responsible to the parents / guardians of students for the safety of their children while in the school’s care.
- Shocked and surprised by the reference to ‘preservation’ of a ‘public right of way’ as no such public ROW exists.
- Object in the strongest possible terms to the inclusion of a public ROW on the private property of the school.
- The pathway is for the sole use of those who attend the school and to visitors from time to time. It is not available for public use.
- Students use the school grounds on a daily basis for sport and co-curricular activities and use the pathway for access and egress.
- A public ROW situated in the immediate vicinity of the school entrance and next to classroom accommodation would be unthinkable and in contravention of the School’s responsibilities.
• Child Protection legislation requires that all of those who engage with students are ‘Garda Vetted’ for
Child Protection purposes. A public ROW on a site that minors use for the purpose of education on a
daily basis would be irresponsible in the extreme.
• The school’s site map, as attached to its insurance policy, makes no reference to a right of way on the
site and as such takes no account of the possible risks that would present.
• The Board of Management have recently been advised that the school grounds should be secured and
that gates should be erected at the entrances, in response to the level of vandalism and damage that
has been occurring after school hours, in the evenings and at weekends.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0098</td>
<td>Claire Lenihan</td>
<td>Silchester Park Residents Association</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission requests that Silchester Park field is rezoned for recreational purposes.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0099</td>
<td>Valerie Griffey</td>
<td>Silchester Park Residents Association</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission requests that Silchester Park field is rezoned to F as the field is used for recreation and
sporting activities by the residents of Silchester Park.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0100</td>
<td>Eric Conroy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Disappointed that the S2S is not mentioned in the Draft and asks for it to be reinstated. The Blackrock
to Sandycove temporary route is very popular – it should be kept on a permanent basis as part of the
S2S.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0101</td>
<td>Seamus and Eleanor Noonan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Welcomes Policy Objective T22: Roads and Streets and requests that Falls Road is included in Table 5.3
and shown on Map no 10 as there is presently no footpath and lighting is inadequate.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0102</td>
<td>John Hickey</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission requests that the rezoning of Bulloch Harbour in the last plan is reversed from a public
utility point of view and tidal overflow.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 3
### DLR Submission No: B0103

**Person:** Tim King  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 10

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Reference to S2S has been dropped in favour of the East Coast trail using inland roads. 80% of the route is in place and it is short sighted not to complete.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):** Chapter 5.

### DLR Submission No: B0104

**Person:** Genesis Planning Consultants  
**Organisation:** On behalf of Nijinsky Property Company  
**Map Nos:** 13

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission relates to c. 90ha of land located to the south of Kilternan and makes the case that the lands are suitable for re-zoning for uses including residential, community infrastructure/nursing home/healthcare facility along with tourism and hospitality developments. The submission divides the landholding into three zones and submits varying requests for each zone.
- An overview of the site is set out at both the regional and local level and it is submitted that the lands are strategically located and provide a clear opportunity for development.
- An analysis of the overall landholding is provided in the context of the NPF, the RSES, the Draft CDP and the Kilternan-Glenamuck LAP 2013-2019.
- Requests the re-zoning of c. 22ha of land (identified in the submission as Zone 1) from Objective ‘G’ to Objective ‘A’ and the inclusion of a key site requirement under the land use zoning matrix to enable the provision of nursing homes/healthcare facilities. An extensive rationale is provided to support the re-zoning request including: site context; local connections; appropriate sequential development and delivery of the Core Strategy housing target. A comprehensive rationale for a nursing home and healthcare facility is also provided including: demographic requirements and existing demand; supply shortages; and a range of supporting material from publications relating to the requirement for residential care for our ageing population. A concept plan for the delivery of the proposed residential and healthcare uses at the lands is included.
- Requests the re-zoning of c. 22ha of land (identified in the submission as Zone 2) from Objective ‘G’ to Objective ‘E’ and the inclusion of locational policies and zoning objectives under the land use zoning matrix to enable provision for tourism, mixed use recreational facilities and associated residential. The lands subject of the request include the incomplete Kilternan Hotel. The submission sets out the planning history pertaining to the area and suggests it demonstrates the lands are appropriate in physical terms for development of tourism and associated residential uses. A concept plan for the delivery of tourism and associated residential uses at the lands and a comparative case study of Macreddin Village is included.
- Requests the ‘G’ zoning pertaining to an area of c. 46 ha (identified in the submission as Zone 3) is maintained but seeks the inclusion of locational policies and zoning objectives under the land use zoning matrix to enable provision for equestrian facilities and associated tourism facilities. The submission sets out the planning history pertaining to an existing equestrian centre permitted in the area and submits that the lands are appropriate in physical terms for further development of equestrian facilities and associated tourism uses. A concept plan for the delivery of equestrian and tourism uses at the lands is included.
- A number of supporting extracts and documents are contained in an Appendix, including: an extract from the NPF relating to the tiered approach to land zoning; a GeoDirectory Report from Q4 2020; and, a CBRE Healthcare Report from July 2020.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):** Map 13

### DLR Submission No: B0105

**Person:** John Fitzsimons  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 2, 3

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- S2S should be saved, a dedicated off road seafront route is required.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):** Chapter 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0106</th>
<th>Person: Conor White</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- S2S should be retained in the Plan as per previous development plans. Both the S2S and an inland cycle route for commuters is required. The S2S should be incorporated into a new seawall to protect the railway which is under threat due to rising sea levels and storms.

*Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0107</th>
<th>Person: Marci Comerford</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Opposed to the proposal to create a public park on the lands of Stillorgan reservoir. The reservoir lands are elevated and overlook Stillorgan Heath resulting in a loss of privacy. Concern also with the risk of a terrorist event arising from public access to the water supply.

*Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0108</th>
<th>Person: Alison Dunne</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Against the proposed use of lands at Stillorgan Reservoir for Public Amenity Purposes due to an increase the litter in the area and loss of privacy due to overlooking.

*Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0109</th>
<th>Person: John and Aileen Regan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission noted that the owners are happy that the main house at Killsallagh, Kerrymount Avenue, Foxrock (RPS No. 1966) is added to the RPS, however, it is requested that later flat rood additions area excluded to allow for future changes.

*Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0110</th>
<th>Person: Connaughton</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission relates to the Stillorgan reservoir.
- Includes a letter from an elected member regarding SLO8S as contained in the Draft Plan, Letter states that a public park on the site would overlook gardens and bedroom windows and that that there was no public consultation with the residents prior to inclusion in the Draft.

*Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0111</th>
<th>Person: Kevin Cullen</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission notes that the current Development Plan 2016-2022 clearly recognises the importance of wildlife corridors to the fauna and flora diversity throughout the County. Section 5.2.1 of the Plan.

- The existence of the wildlife corridor connecting the Three Rock Mountain area with Fitzsimons Wood (pNHA) via Woodside Road, and the Blackglen Road is well known. The presence of the corridor is clearly recognised with the Council’s ‘Deer Crossing’ signs on the Blackglen Road.
- The importance of this wildlife corridor has been raised in the past in relation to planning proposals in this area.
- The presence and importance of deer to the biodiversity of Fitzsimons Wood is well illustrated in the Council’s publication on the Biodiversity Education Programme relating to Fitzsimons Wood.
- The submission requests that the Council continue to include a specific objective in the 2022-2028 Development Plan to protect wildlife corridors generally throughout the County in compliance with the Habitats Directive.
- Furthermore, as with recognised Rights of Way, all known and established wildlife corridors, such as that connecting Three Rock Mountain and Fitzsimons Wood, should be clearly identified on the maps that accompany the Plan or as text within the Plan where the wildlife corridor is less well physically defined.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0112</td>
<td>David Lawlor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Concerned about the safety and congestion issues of the current East Coast Cycle Trail route through Corbawn and the impact on residents. Welcomes DLR’s commitment for a feasibility study to re-route the East Coast Cycle trail by the coast at Corbawn and incorporate into coastal protection works between Corbawn Lane and the new Woodbrook Dart station.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0113</td>
<td>Louise Irwin</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Resident of Weirview drive opposed to the proposal to create a public park on the lands of Stillorgan reservoir. The reservoir lands are elevated and will overlook properties at Weirview Drive resulting in a loss of privacy, security and residential amenity.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0114</td>
<td>Rosalind Lunney</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1, 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Congratulate the Council and staff on the commitment to preserving built and natural heritage.

Rights of Way
- Rights of way are of vital importance in allowing people to access archaeological monuments, open space and natural landscapes.
- Attempts to close rights of way, as in the area of Kilmashogue, must be resisted.
- Rights of way are as important a part of our heritage as the likes of Marlay House or similar assets, given that most of our ancestors were more familiar with the ROW they used to get water, walk to church or to market.
- Local authorities should strenuously defend existing ROWs and should extend the network throughout the County.
- Local schools could be encouraged to teach children how to traverse farmland to reduce the risk of uncontrolled dogs, litter and dog fouling.

Prospects and Views
- Notwithstanding the difficulties associated with protecting prospects and views, they must be at the forefront of planning decisions.
• It should be remembered that views are in two directions, both to and from elevated sites and mountains.
• Indiscriminate high-rise buildings will cut off the inspiring and reassuring views of the hills that surround us.

**Boundaries & ditches**
• There are a number of ancient boundary ditches around the County which may or may not be protected. Some may be townland boundaries or gentry estate boundaries and there is a possibility that some stretches may have formed part of the Pale defences.
• These assets are generally much older and more extensive than the gate piers and railings of suburban houses which are currently listed and should be added to the record of protected structures.
• The submission includes 2 no. photographs of ditches in the Rathfarnham area.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 8, Appendix 4, 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0115</th>
<th>Person: Lawrence Connaughton</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resident of Stillorgan Heath, concerned with SLO 85 and proposal to turn the covered reservoir into a public park without consulting the residents in the area. Wildlife habitats have been destroyed during construction, bats are gone and residents have endured two years of dust and dirt from construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0116</th>
<th>Person: Rachel Daly</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerned about the safety and congestion issues of the current East Coast Cycle Trail route through Corbawn and the impact on residents. Welcomes DLR’s commitment for a feasibility study to re-route the East Coast Cycle trail by the coast at Corbawn and incorporate into coastal protection works between Corbawn Lane and the new Woodbrook Dart station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0117</th>
<th>Person: Tara Fernandes</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • The submission commends the Council on the excellent video and overall communication on the new Plan.  
• The submission requests that the Council insist that adequate on-street parking be provided for developments. The desire to move away from a car dependent society is acknowledged, however the timeline to deliver this is beyond the scope of the proposed plan.  
• The submission also requests that provision is made for adequate road widths as part of any planning development.  
• The submission notes that the residents of Jamestown Cottages Kilternan are surrounded by houses on 100mb broadband services, but they are still in ADSL ~7mb, this has not been resolved. The submission requests that if any planned works under the Plan could take this anomaly in our community into account in case there are requirements to lay wiring etc. (e.g., while roadworks are in progress). | | | |
| **Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):** | | | |
| Chapter 12 | | | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0118</th>
<th>Person: Brian Gaughan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39
• Concerned with negative impact in terms or litter, noise, loss of green space, etc of the trail going through Corbawn Drive, a quiet residential area. Welcomes the proposal to reroute close to the coast and incorporate it with coastal protection works. A balanced approach is needed in terms of the needs of residents and visitors.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0119</td>
<td>Padraic Murray</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Welcomes the proposal to reroute the path and cycle route close to the coast and incorporate it with coastal protection works rather than through Corbawn Estate.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0120</td>
<td>Paul Barry</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission suggests that the garden to the rear of No. 16 Sydney Avenue be excluded from the proposed Sydney Avenue ACA. Since 2006, the garden has been negatively impacted by three separate developments on the north west side at Nos. 2, 4 and 6 Green Road, which were higher and much more extensive developments compared with the previous houses that occupied the individual sites.
- The existing dwelling at No. 4 in particular, was only a fraction of its current size and allowed much more daylight into the garden of No. 16. (photographs of the rear garden have been attached to this submission). Notwithstanding our objections planning permission was granted for the three developments.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0121</td>
<td>Emer Hunt</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The land to the left (west) of the right of way from Torca Road to Knocknacree Road needs to be included in the Proposed Natural Heritage Area 'Dalkey Coastal Zone and Killiney Hill/Rocheshill'. Otherwise the heritage area does not connect Dalkey Village with Killiney Hill and Rocheshill amenities.
- All public rights of way need to be signposted.
- Double yellow lines need to be enforced. For instance, cars often park near amenities or villages, ignoring yellow lines and spilling into the nearest residential road.
- Local buses must be smaller (e.g. the 59 bus is too big to turn at the roundabout in Killiney Village).
- The pandemic lockdown has highlighted the problems associated with sharing narrow roads between cars, pedestrians and cyclists e.g. at Killiney Hill Road and Vico Road. Traffic calming measures need to be put in place for cars and for bicycles.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5 & Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0122</td>
<td>Alan Tuohy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5, 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Welcome the objective to maintain the sylvan character of Kilgobbin Road from Violet Hill house to Stepaside Village.
- Access to historic sites in the County is problematic. It is almost impossible to visit Kiltieran and Brennanstown Dolmens, or Old Rathmicheal Church. More should be done to open up these sites to responsible visitors.
- Develop formal walking and cycling trails in the historic Barnacullia area above the Blue Light Pub.
• Undertake a formal review of public rights of way. For instance the Dingle Glen ROW, Kilmashogue hill ROW, Ballybetagh Hill ROWs will be lost if action is not taken.
• Prevent further urban sprawl up into the Kilternan and Ballycorus hills by protecting high amenity upland areas and no further rezonings. Green spaces have been particularly important during lockdown.
• Enhanced protections are needed for our remaining hedgerows along old county lanes.
• Carrickmines Castle requires a site plaque and cleanup.
• Parking is almost impossible at the weekends across all the Dublin mountain way sites due to huge popularity. Can the council address access to these sites via new bus routes or working with Coillte to open up further parking areas?
• Plans should be made to encourage higher density house development close to Dun Laoghaire town to rejuvenate the area, too many nearby architectural conservation areas are damaging the town centre.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5, 8, 9, 11, 13 & Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0123</td>
<td>Warren Blackburn</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Welcomes the proposal to reroute close to the coast and incorporate it with coastal protection works. Concerned with negative impact in terms of the trail going through Corbawn Drive in terms of congestion and impacts on residents.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0124</td>
<td>Peter Minogue</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
Regarding extending the East Coast Cycle Trail via Corbawn Drive Shankill. The proposed initial plan is to bring this trail through Corbawn Drive. The new draft plan proposes a feasibility study to assess an alternative route using the planned coastal defenses prefers the latter but in the event that option takes considerable time to develop, the former should be developed in the interim. Against the routing through Corban Drive for the following reasons:
• Corbawn Drive this is a narrow cul de sac in a quiet residential area which is not suitable to have a cycle way through it. Concerned that:
• A cycle way through Corbawn Drive would only be used by leisure cyclists and therefore wouldn’t achieve modal change. Needs of the residents should be considered before cyclists, particularly settled neighbourhoods.
• Limited road space with cars parked on both sides of this narrow road, a growing number of young children living on the road and an increasing number of walkers heading to the local parks which can not also accommodate a 3-4 m cycleway.
• There is no coastal route beyond Corbawn Drive. The ideal option is to bring the cyclist via Corbawn Lane to Shankill village and from there on towards Bray and the coastal route.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0125</td>
<td>Tony Bamford</td>
<td>Dot Opportunity Nominees 3 Limited</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission objects to the addition of The Gables, Westminster Court and Torquay Road, Foxrock (RPS No. 1961) to the RPS and requests that it be removed.
• Submission notes that the owners of the property were not notified as per the requirements of the Planning and Development Act and it is not therefore protected and should be removed from the RPS.
• The submission notes the NIAH description of the building and considers that the merits of the structure refer only to its exterior.
Submission notes that the property is already within the Foxrock ACA which affords ample protection to the character of the exterior of the building – this has been demonstrated in previous planning applications for works to the existing building. The ACA and planning permission should be taken into account in the merits of the building for inclusion onto the RPS.

Details of an extant planning permission for extensions to the property, Reg. Ref. D17A/1084, have been provided within the submission.

The submission notes previous uses of the building and the need for greater flexibility for future development – it is considered that the protection of the building would add a further level of needless inquiry for any works to the interior of the building which are deemed inequitable in the current economic climate.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0126</td>
<td>Willie Byrne</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission requests the re-zoning of lands in Rathmichael from Objective ‘G’ to residential. Site context is provided including proximity to public transport, the road network, community infrastructure and amenities. Relevant planning policy context is provided, and it is suggested the lands meet the conditions of the ‘ten-minute neighbourhood concept’ and are suitable for development in accordance with the criteria set out in the Draft CDP.
- Highlights the lands are situated between two residentially zoned areas and considers the lands to comprise natural “infill”. Suggests there would be no negative visual impact caused by development of the land.
- Reference is made to a submission made in respect of the landholding as part of the CDP plan-making process in 2004. The document, which comprises an Appendix to the subject submission, comprises a comprehensive analysis and plan relating to a wider landholding with recommendations for development primarily confined to areas of lower elevation. It is these lands that are the primary focus of the subject submission and it is suggested that these lands would be suitable for re-zoning and residential development similar to other residential schemes in the immediate area (relevant planning documentation is provided).
- Requests an indication of appropriate unit densities pertaining to residential zoned lands in their ownership at Quarry Road which were re-zoned under the 2004 CDP.
- Suggests that SLO 92 is quite restrictive and requests that should the SLO be retained in the final CDP that no further restrictions and/or limitations be imposed within it.
- States that SLO 93 does not appear to have been applied to other residential developments within the catchment which were granted permission with wastewater systems (specific schemes are referenced). Highlights that their existing landholding of residentially zoned land was rezoned for development before permission was granted for these residential schemes. Requests the removal of SLO 93 from their land, thereby allowing for development in line with the precedence of residential development set in the area.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0127</td>
<td>Susanne Lalor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Stillorgan reservoir is at an elevated level to Weirview Drive. Concerned about home and garden being directly overlooked by any public park and also negative impact on privacy, security property value.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0128</td>
<td>David Cotter</td>
<td>RMS Leinster Memorial Committee</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
The submission provides a history to the RMS Leinster Memorial Committee and notes there is no dedicated memorial to the RMS Leinster.

It is the Committee’s objective that a new dedicated named memorial be located on the Carlisle Pier.

A proposal for a named memorial to the RMS Leinster would be in keeping with the spirit of Specific Local Objectives 26 and 116 and would support the maritime historical significance of the Carlisle Pier.

The submission requests that this memorial is located between the two entrances to the Carlisle Pier with appropriate planning in a landscaped setting and has attached photographs as part of the submission.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission opposes the addition of Eglinton Lodge, RPS No.2094, to the RPS as it would place an onerous burden on the owner and have financial implications.

- No evidence of historical, family or architectural interest relative to the property have been identified.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission re: the addition of Pillars and Walls at 1 Ballinteer Gardens (RPS No. 2132) to the RPS, requests that an old existing vehicular entrance, close to the entrance to Ludford Estate, is taken into account on the mapped extent of the wall.

- Photos of the wall and access point are attached to the submission.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The issues of water quality, fisheries habitat and angling tourism should be given due priority.

- The CDP must recognise that protection of the aquatic environment/habitat not only requires the protection of water quality but also necessitates the protection and maintenance of physical habitat and hydrological processes/ regimes.

- DLR is traversed by regionally important salmonid systems. Many main river channels and their tributaries are exceptional in the area in supporting Atlantic salmon, Sea trout and Brown trout populations. Data also indicates the presence of spawning populations of European Eel Sea River and Brook lamprey in DLR. It is essential that development in the area will not have a deleterious effect on aquatic ecology in these systems.

- Sufficient treatment capacity must be available both within the receiving sewerage systems locally and downstream of wastewater treatment plants over the full duration of the plan in order that the ecological integrity of the ultimate receiving waters are protected.

- It is essential that IFI be contacted in relation to all works that may have an impact on surface waters.

- To ensure that impacts from development/change in land use practices (including flood plain development) do not interfere with the aquatic environment it is essential that those areas adjacent to waterways (riparian buffer zones) are managed in a manner which will lessen impacts to these habitats. Currently the EPA has classified the Shanganagh and Carrickmines system as moderate status (3-4). Excessive siltation and compaction of the instream substrate was observed. Extensive construction is being carried out within this catchment and IFI welcomes plans stated in the CDP such as creating buffer strips along the Carrickmines River which will help protect the system.

- IFI welcomes the CDP policy objectives that will commit to protecting local biodiversity and natural heritage and their recognition that biodiversity is not just contained within specifically Designated Areas.
and a council commitment to reject proposals that would interfere with natural floodplains. For instance:

The CDP states that the “River Dodder to the Mountains” planned Greenway offers a potential prospect to open long culverts on The Little Dargle under the Grange Golf Course and at Loreto Park. IFI would be greatly in favour of this initiative and would assist in any way possible to help open up culverted waterways in the county.

- **Policy Objective GIB8: Coastline Parks and Harbours** “It is a Policy Objective to continue to upgrade recreational and tourism-related amenities in the public parks and harbours along the coastline, including improved accessibility by the general public” and Policy Objective EI25: Coastal Defence “providing any new coastal protection infrastructure and to assess the performance of existing coastal protection”. It is vitally important that the Fisheries Service is involved at as early a stage as possible. Any development plans for these areas should involve consultation with IFI to ensure they are carried out without a negative effect on local fishery amenities.

- **The impacts of poorly designed river/stream crossing structures can be serious in terms of habitat loss** - bridges and bottomless culverts have the least impact on fish passage. IFI recommends that the Plan should include a clear policy on the use of clear span structures on fisheries waters and that IFI should be consulted on any such proposed developments.

- **Road Drainage**, particularly on National Routes should ensure adequate attenuation measures are in place and silt and petrol interceptors, constructed wetlands and swales should be employed where appropriate to reduce pollutants from the road entering watercourses. IFI is anxious that all roads and pipelines are constructed in such a manner so as not to pose a threat to waters either through pollution, loss of fisheries habitat or through interference with the passage of migratory fish species and/or spawning beds. Consultation with IFI on road and pipeline infrastructural projects should commence as early as possible and continue throughout the planning and construction stage of the project.

- IFI requests that the provision of parking areas for anglers be considered in future road schemes where the opportunity arises near key angling locations.

- IFI suggest that new forestry developments, except for broadleaf, would be discouraged in proposed/candidate and adopted NHAs, SACs and SPAs, in water quality and fisheries sensitive areas”. This would apply to forestry’s in the plan area such as Ticknock forest, Three and Two Rock Mountains and Glencullen.

- An on-going challenge for IFI which is particular to summer months when river and stream flows are often low is wide scale unregulated water abstraction. This practice may have significant ecological implications if large volumes of water are abstracted over a short period of time from small nursery or spawning streams. It is imperative that Dun Laoghaire County Council maintain an abstraction register.

- Angling is a popular recreational pastime in the county enjoyed by native and visiting anglers. Angling not only contributes to tourism in the county but also provides employment in the form of Charter Boats, Tackle Shops, Guides and Instructors. The plan could provide for close co-operation with IFI in relation to development, promotion and marketing of the angling product in the county.

- IFI have recently published the following guidelines which should also be referred to in the CDP - “Planning for watercourses in the urban environment” and “River Restoration Works - Science based Guidance centred on Hydromorphological Principles in an Era of Climate Change – 2020”

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapters 5, 6, 8, 10, SEA, AA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No.</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0132</td>
<td>Gavin Ó Briain</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No.</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0133</td>
<td>Nicole Kinane</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Statement of support for the Draft Development Plan.
Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Map 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Map 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Map 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The County Plan can be ignored and negated by developers and the LDA, given their ability to apply directly to An Bord Pleanála through the SHD process. For example, at the Central Mental Hospital (CMH) site, it is proposed to have 14 storey apartment blocks with a high population density (1,300 apartments in total), which is accompanied by a lack of adequate parking. This is totally out of character with the existing area and indeed south Dublin.
- There is a lack of a park/green space in the Windy Arbour area, a far better proposal for the CMH would be to retain the wall and have a division of one third housing, one third park and one third parking for the park and LUAS (park & ride).
- Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown appears to be the subject of a significant proportion of SHD developments e.g. the CMH, the Goat, and student residences on the Goatstown Road.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Chapter 4, 9

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Map 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
Chief Executive’s Report on Draft Plan Consultation

Volume II – Summary of Submissions Received

- Submission contends that the powers given to An Bord Pleanála under the Strategic Housing Development legislation render the County Development Plan prepared by DLRCOCO as largely irrelevant. Notes that for SHD applications, An Bord Pleanála can ignore and overrule zoning and other objectives set out in the CDP. Submission alleges that the Local Authority does not defend its CDP, subsequent to any over ruling by An Bord Pleanála, and that defence is left to the public through Judicial Review proceedings.
- In consideration of the above, the submission disagrees with the merit of preparing the County Development Plan and suggests that resources expended on the preparation of the Plan would be better spent in providing other services.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Miscellaneous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0140</td>
<td>Elizabeth &amp; Pat O’ Daly</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0141</td>
<td>Michael Shiell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Dismayed as a cyclist at the amount of plant and tree growth from all parts of the buildings along Georges street surrounding streets. The Council needs to undertake a review to identify on Georges Street and surrounding streets which properties are at different levels of risk from plant growth and take action before it is too late.
- Shocked at the new infill / replacement buildings that are being permitted and which have no harmony or respect for the adjoining Victorian buildings.

Town Centre
- Dun Laoghaire (Kingstown) was originally built to the highest standards of its day but now largely features charity and pound shops and fast food outlets. There appears to be no long term vision for the area or to preserve, promote and enhance Dún Laoghaire as a tourist living heritage town. A 50 year plan is required.
- Need to bring people back living in Dun Laoghaire, it is now a ghost town at night, this could be done by converting and restoring residential over retail shops with the support of tax incentives.

Heritage
- Heritage is not just events and activities it is a way of living, a quality of life, a determination to keep improving and enhancing what we have and saving it for future generations enjoyment and delight. All properties over 100 years old in Dun Laoghaire should be listed and it should be designated as a heritage town. The submission provides a number of ‘best in class’ international examples for review.

Retail
- The pandemic has had a significant effect on the retail sector and a moratorium of perhaps 10 years should be placed on new retail development. The town was weak even before the pandemic.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Appendix 8, Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0142</td>
<td>Des Swords</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Map 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0143</td>
<td>Eoin Ferris</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0144</td>
<td>Grace O’ Donnell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0145</td>
<td>Ken Ryan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0146</td>
<td>Deirdre Horlacher</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0147</td>
<td>Kathleen O'Brien</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that the green, social amenity area at Charleville, Lower Churchtown Road is rezoned from A to F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes that this is the only green area off Lower Churchtown Road and is essential for recreation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0148</td>
<td>Neal Boland</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0149</td>
<td>RK</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policy Objective T12: County Cycle Network (5.5.3 in Chapter 5) (&quot;POT12&quot;) should be either:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(a) deleted from the Development Plan in its entirety; or
(b) amended to remove reference to the "Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown Cycle Network Review"; or
(c) amended to clarify that the securing of improvements to the County Cycle Network is subject to DLRCC being legally entitled to carry out the works / development necessary to do so. This clarity can be achieved by inserting the words "[subject to the Council being legally entitled to do so]" between "Cycle Network Review" and "whilst supporting the NTA..."

- DLRCC’s proposed implementation of the Active School Travel Programme, and the inclusion of Policy Objective T12 demonstrate that DLRCC proposes to establish a specific Policy Objective which will require it to demolish the boundary wall between the Belmont and Ardagh estates which the Council does not have ownership of.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

### DLR Submission No: B0150
Person: Joy Poulose
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0151
Person: Orla Blackburn
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 10

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Concerned about the safety and congestion issues of the current East Coast Cycle Trail route through Corbawn and the impact on residents. Welcomes DLR’s commitment for a feasibility study to re-route the East Coast Cycle trail by the coast at Corbawn and incorporate into coastal protection works between Corbawn Lane and the new Woodbrook Dart station.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

### DLR Submission No: B0152
Person: Grainne Springael
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission notes the history of Monaloe and areas round Clonkeen with regard to the area being open plan, having access to pitches and community and respect.
- Submission notes issues with vehicular access.
- Submission states that there is a need for a planned sustainable neighbourhood infrastructure respecting wildlife and the social / cultural aspects of the community.
- Submission requests the pitches at Clonkeen College are saved for sporting purposes and open spaces area respected.
- Submission requests that community space isn’t impacted by commercial development and suggests that development for health, sport, leisure or culture would be a better use for the local community.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 4, Chapter 5, Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0153
Person: David Martin
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 2, 3

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Concerned with the removal of the S2S coastal cycle and walkway which has been in all DLRCC development plans since 2004.
- Coastal route (not inland and on roadways) has benefits:
  - Dublin’s own “greenway”
  - amenity accessible in a controlled way
  - tourist attraction with new business opportunities
- Protect coastal erosion of the rail tracks with a public amenity
- Bring population closer to the special conservation area that is Dublin Bay
- Plan should commit to delivering on the S2S Cycle and Walkway along a true coastal route be included in the 2022-28 Development Plan for delivery within the life of the plan

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0154</th>
<th>Person: Gina Meagher</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0155</th>
<th>Person: Peter Dempsey</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0156</th>
<th>Person: Andrew O’Kane</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The submission notes that the current Development Plan 2016-2022 clearly recognises the importance of wildlife corridors to the fauna and flora diversity throughout the County. Section 5.2.1 of the Plan highlights the legislative backing for the protection of wildlife corridors as set out in the Habitats Directive 1992 (92/43/EEC).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The existence of the wildlife corridor connecting the Three Rock Mountain area with Fitzsimons Wood (pNHA) via Woodside Road, and the Blackglen Road is well known. The presence of the corridor is clearly recognised with the Council’s ‘Deer Crossing’ signs on the Blackglen Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The importance of this wildlife corridor has been raised in the past in relation to planning proposals in this area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The presence and importance of deer to the biodiversity of Fitzsimons Wood is well illustrated in the Council’s publication on the Biodiversity Education Programme relating to Fitzsimons Wood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The submission requests that the Council continue to include a specific objective in the 2022-2028 Development Plan to protect wildlife corridors generally throughout the County in compliance with the Habitats Directive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Furthermore, as with recognised Rights of Way, all known and established wildlife corridors, such as that connecting Three Rock Mountain and Fitzsimons Wood, should be clearly identified on the maps that accompany the Plan or as text within the Plan where the wildlife corridor is less well physically defined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0157</th>
<th>Person: Naomi O’Kane</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The submission notes that the current Development Plan 2016-2022 clearly recognises the importance of wildlife corridors to the fauna and flora diversity throughout the County. Section 5.2.1 of the Plan highlights the legislative backing for the protection of wildlife corridors as set out in the Habitats Directive 1992 (92/43/EEC).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- The existence of the wildlife corridor connecting the Three Rock Mountain area with Fitzsimons Wood (pNHA) via Woodside Road, and the Blackglen Road is well known. The presence of the corridor is clearly recognised with the Council’s ‘Deer Crossing’ signs on the Blackglen Road.
- The importance of this wildlife corridor has been raised in the past in relation to planning proposals in this area.
- The presence and importance of deer to the biodiversity of Fitzsimons Wood is well illustrated in the Council’s publication on the Biodiversity Education Programme relating to Fitzsimons Wood.
- The submission requests that the Council continue to include a specific objective in the 2022-2028 Development Plan to protect wildlife corridors generally throughout the County in compliance with the Habitats Directive.
- Furthermore, as with recognised Rights of Way, all known and established wildlife corridors, such as that connecting Three Rock Mountain and Fitzsimons Wood, should be clearly identified on the maps that accompany the Plan or as text within the Plan where the wildlife corridor is less well physically defined.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Chapter 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0158</td>
<td>Barbara Dutton</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- No comment entered in text box
- No document attached

**Response and Recommendation to issues:**
No issues have been raised to include in Volume I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0159</td>
<td>Peter Dempsey</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.
- Development on these pitches will destroy the environment and will add stress and destroy enjoyment of homes and surrounding areas.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Map 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0160</td>
<td>Patrick Price</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Opposes the development of a site in the Deansgrange/Foxrock area into residential blocks.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Miscellaneous**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0161</td>
<td>Brian Murphy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Map 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0162</td>
<td>Cathy Murphy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.
### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0163</td>
<td>Fergus Clune</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0164</td>
<td>Rita Byrne</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0165</td>
<td>Robbie Byrne</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0166</td>
<td>Jean Cantwell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0167</td>
<td>Paul Flannery</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0168</td>
<td>Fiona Fullam</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0169</td>
<td>Tony Dutton</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0170</th>
<th>Person: Dermot &amp; Elizabeth Jordan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0171</th>
<th>Person: Matthew Murphy</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0172</th>
<th>Person: Daragh Lavelle</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0173</th>
<th>Person: Harry McAlinden</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0174</th>
<th>Person: Aisling Feeney</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0175</th>
<th>Person: Conor Murphy</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7
### DLR Submission No: B0176
**Person:** Pat O’Connell  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Supports the change in zoning from ‘residential’ to Sustainable Neighbourhood Infrastructure.
- States that the planning application for 380 housing units would negatively impact on the community, wildlife and biodiversity.
- The change in zoning offer an opportunity to improve the social, recreational, leisure, cultural and civic needs.
- If the zoning is not change, existing infrastructure will be impacted upon.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0177
**Person:** Alacoque McMenamin  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0178
**Person:** Jade Earle  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0179
**Person:** Richard Earle  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0180
**Person:** Rowena McCormack  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.
- Submission notes that there is a need for more playgrounds and open green space.
- Submission recognizes the positive work in the area with new cycle paths.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 5, Chapter 9, Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0181
**Person:** John Murphy  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the Plan and notes there is an excess of residential zoned land.
- Notes the importance of the retention of green open spaces.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 9,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0182</td>
<td>Barney Roche</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0183</td>
<td>Maria Gibbons</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0184</td>
<td>Glynis Wilson - Moore</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0185</td>
<td>Glynis Wilson - Moore</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0186</td>
<td>Rebecca Lambert</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0187</td>
<td>Stuart Hynes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0188</td>
<td>Rita McAlinden</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.
### DLR Submission No: B0189

**Person:** Sandra Dutton  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.  
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Map 7

---

### DLR Submission No: B0190

**Person:** Anne Murphy  
**Organisation:** Monaloe Residents Association  
**Map Nos:** 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.  
- Submission requests that residential is not open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Map 7

---

### DLR Submission No: B0191

**Person:** Niall McKnight  
**Organisation:** Monaloe Residents Association  
**Map Nos:** 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.  
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Map 7

---

### DLR Submission No: B0192

**Person:** Tara Spain  
**Organisation:** Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII)  
**Map Nos:** N/A

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

#### Policy Objective T23: Motorway and National Routes
- The supporting text to Policy Objective T23 does not refer to the protection of national road junctions which is required by national policy. In the ‘Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities’ (2012), it states that Development at National Road Interchanges or Junctions Interchanges/Junctions are especially important elements of national roads infrastructure that development plans and local area plans and the assessment of applications must take account of and carefully manage to protect the capacity of the efficiency of the network. In terms of the N11/M11 Junction 4 to 14 improvement scheme there is a need for a stated policy to protect the potential route corridors and thereafter the preferred route corridor to prohibit development which could prejudice the future delivery.

#### Road Proposals, Tables 5.3 and 5.4
- The accompanying text to Section 5.3.2 misrepresents the inclusions in the non-statutory NTA Bray and Environs Study in relation to road infrastructure. The roads and traffic management measures are subject to further evaluations to ensure that they do not have a negative impact on the strategic function of the national road network. There is a particular concern in terms of the new road link from the M50 Cherrywood Interchange to Rathmichael, Ferndale Road to Dublin Road, Shanganagh link road. TII requests that the planning authority amend the written statement to reflect the above issues especially with regard to section 5.3.2, page 102 and road schemes Table 5.3 and 5.4.

#### Dublin Eastern Bypass (DEBP) Chapter 12 and 14 SLO 4
- Welcomes the inclusion of the DEBP in the Draft. Recommends the inclusion of the requirements of the Corridor Protection Study 2011 in Chapter 12 and SLO 4.

**Section 7.6 Assessment of Retail Development Proposals**
Chief Executive’s Report on Draft Plan Consultation

Volume II – Summary of Submissions Received

- It is national policy to retain the capacity of national roads and their junctions. National Guidelines require that LAPs and development proposals and zoning at or close to interchanges are thereby carefully assessed. There is a presumption against large out of town retail development in particular, in accordance with the Retail Planning Guidelines. Recommends that in Sections 7.6 and 12.6 of the Draft that these issues are highlighted and the preference for high trip generating activity should be within established town and district centres.

**EI20 Overhead cables (national roads and Luas)**

- Grid/cable connections accommodated on National Roads can result in technical road safety issues, ability and cost of general maintenance. Recommends under policy EI20 Overhead cables that an assessment of all alternatives for grid/cable connection routing should be undertaken and national roads and Luas lines are only used when no other alternative is available.

**Luas**

- The importance and fixed line nature of the Luas system is set out. Recommends that the Luas TII’s Light Rail Environment – Technical Guidelines for Development PE-PDV-00001 December2020.doc within or in the vicinity of Luas lines in Section 5.4.7 Policy Objective T9 Rail Stations/Luas Stop and Section 12.4 Transport and 12.9.4 Construction Management Plans.

**M50 Junctions 14 and 15 and Luas**

- M50 Corridor is high trafficked and minor increases in traffic volumes can result in significant impacts in terms of congestion on M50, its junctions and within the local networks within the vicinity. Concerns have been previously raised during the making of the Ballyogan LAP in terms of the impact of the proposed development on the capacity issues at junctions 14 and 15 along with the Luas in conjunction with planned development at Cherrywood and Kiltiernan Glenamuck. TII identified a number of critical matters which need to be resolved in the Ballyogan area especially the “Racecourse South lands” to meet this growth which relate to the need for the careful management of both national road and Luas infrastructure. There is a reliance on the use of Junction 15 for vehicular access via the link road to the M50 Carrickmines interchange as set out in the in Table 5.4 for Race Course South lands and also the Race Course Luas stop on a permanent basis and the use of the Luas over bridge of the M50 for pedestrians and cyclists which it was not designed to accommodate. Therefore, the means of sustainably unlocking this land for development has not been resolved by the adopted LAP or the Draft Plan.

- Recommends that a more detailed and collaborative assessment and plan be prepared for this area by the planning authority which will avoid undermining of the safe and efficient operation of the national road and light rail networks and in turn; deliver a new sustainable community. Such an assessment should be carried in accordance with Area Based Transport Assessment (ABTA) Guidance Notes (2018, TII publication PE-PDV-02046).

**Accessibility and Permeability**

- It is national policy to achieve modal shift from car to more sustainable modes of transport this includes optimising accessibility to public transport stops and station. Recommends in relation to Policy Objective PHP 41: Design Statements should include a ‘Permeability and Accessibility Review’ and within Sustainable Neighbourhood Infrastructure under 12.3.2.1 & 12.3.2.2, that permeability should be demonstrated both within and through the lands especially related to access to active travel and public transport stops.

**Advertising and signage**

- It is important that advertising and signage does not interfere with the safe operation of the Luas. Recommends that Sections 12.6.8 Shopfronts, Signage, Advertising and Public Art and 12.9.10 Public Lighting be reviewed to take account of this in terms of placing of signage, lighting or any other structure along roads running parallel or buildings alongside the railways. In this regard reference to and requirements of TII’s ‘Code of engineering practice for works on, near, or adjacent the Luas light rail system’ and TII’s Light Rail Environment - Technical Guidelines for Development PE-PDV-00001 December 2020, should be made.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Chapter 5, 7, 10, 12

---

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person: Michael Duffy</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0194</td>
<td>Colin Riordan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission calls the Plan as a comprehensive vision for the council area.
- Submission welcomes the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Submission notes important to ensure that there are ample facilities and amenities for our growing population.
- Submission notes the Clonkeen College site has provided great educational and cultural value to the community and enhanced over the years ahead.
- Submission suggests a portion of the site be considered for primary school needs within the area.
- Submission claims that the current zoning is inconsistent with the needs of the community, current and future.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 4, Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0195</td>
<td>Elizabeth Hurley</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Submission considers the community requires buildings and centres for social, educational, recreational/leisure, cultural and civic needs of all the groups and ages of the County.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 4, Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0196</td>
<td>Valerie Merriman</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission objects to the addition of Ivy Grove, Eglinton Terrace (RPS No. 2092) onto the RPS.
- Submission notes that the property was built in 1861, however, it has undergone a number of changes and there is no reason to have it added to the RPS.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0197</td>
<td>Joe &amp; Deirdre Duffy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission requests that Jamestown House, Enniskerry Rd (RPS No. 2043) is removed from the RPS.
- Submission notes that the dwelling was built in 1906 and has been extended a number of time and is currently undergoing renovation works.
- Submission refers to a planning application, Reg. Ref. D19A/0659 and a conservation report by Mr. John Redmill, submitted with the application – this appraisal has been attached to the submission which includes:
  - A description of the property (exterior and interior), date of construction and family ownership.
  - Details of extensions to the property from 1964 onwards.
  - NIAH description and appraisal and commentary in relation to same – inaccuracies in the NIAH description are pointed out within this commentary.
  - An opinion with regard to the property in that the house has no architectural character or significance, it is not an exemplar building and does not warrant becoming a Protected Structure.
The submission noted that DLR has neither questioned nor commented on the NIAH description and noted that it is incorrect to refer to it as a farm house.

Submission noted that Mr. Redmill maintains the opinion and assessment provided in the conservation report submitted with D19A/0659.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

### DLR Submission No: B0198
Person: Deirdre MacEvilly  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**  
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.  
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0199
Person: Anne McCarthy  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**  
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.  
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0200
Person: Paul Deery  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 10

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**  
- Re: East Coast Cycle Route/Coastal Protection at Corbawn  
  Welcomes the East Coast Cycle Route but impractical to take the cycle route down Corbawn Drive and then along Quinns Lane behind Tennis Courts as the road is too narrow and the laneway and the behind tennis courts is officially designated as a “Country Lane” and the laneway is extensively used by walkers. The exit from the cul-de-sac at end of the Drive is strictly an emergency exit only.  
- Support the idea of putting the cycleway along the coast in conjunction with coastal protection. This will protect the coast, prevent the loss of valuable green recreation area as well as giving protection to the sewage pipeline which passes through the green and be a more scenic route.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

### DLR Submission No: B0201
Person: Edward Conmy  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**  
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.  
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0202
Person: Alan Kinane  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**  
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0203
Person: Beatriz Byrne  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: N/A
Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Welcomes the seafront being more socially orientated by cycling lanes and walks, coffee shops, promoting the use of public transport etc. Concerned about the facilities for the elderly, those with young children and others with physical disabilities. Requests more car park facilities for them, to avoid exclusion.
- Many cyclists who do not abide by the rules of the road; perhaps we need more cycling rules enforcement.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

DLR Submission No: B0204
Person: Clare Lynch
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

DLR Submission No: B0205
Person: Joe Williams
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

DLR Submission No: B0206
Person: Byomakesh Parida
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: N/A

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- No comment entered in text box
- No document attached

Response and Recommendation to issues:
No issues have been raised to include in Volume I.

DLR Submission No: B0207
Person: Noel Corcoran
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 5

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission states that there is a need for a mix of housing / apartments for social, affordable and private ownership on lands close to Kingston Hall in order to ensure integration in the residential area.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4

DLR Submission No: B0208
Person: Anne-Marie Keady
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Submission notes that the provision of sustainable neighbourhood infrastructure and green areas should be protected.
- Submission notes that Brent geese land there and it is used for local sports teams, etc which was stopped when a development was planned.
- Submission considers there are enough houses being built to meet residential needs, but there are not enough green areas.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4, Chapter 8, Map 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0209</td>
<td>Euan Dempsey</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Notes there is a need for more parks during Covid times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLR Submission No:</td>
<td>Person:</td>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Map Nos:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0210</td>
<td>A.Gormley</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLR Submission No:</td>
<td>Person:</td>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Map Nos:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0211</td>
<td>Daniel O’ Farrell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLR Submission No:</td>
<td>Person:</td>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Map Nos:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0212</td>
<td>Conor Richardson</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLR Submission No:</td>
<td>Person:</td>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Map Nos:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0213</td>
<td>Mr Roderick Aherne</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes concern that the area would be negatively impacted should the land remain zoned as it currently is.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLR Submission No:</td>
<td>Person:</td>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Map Nos:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0214</td>
<td>Niamh Duffy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLR Submission No:</td>
<td>Person:</td>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Map Nos:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0215</td>
<td>Victor Lynch</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0216</td>
<td>Edel Flannery</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0217</td>
<td>Dr. Selina Guinness</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

• The submission notes that as amenity pressure continues to increase along the Dublin Mountain Way, and visitor numbers to Coillte facilities increase, the Council need to consider the competing interests of those farming in the B zone.

• Submission highlights that the pressures from visitors include:
  - Parking across field entrances / driveways / on narrow roads to impeded emergency vehicles.
  - Nuisance by dogs.
  - Nuisance by trespassers
  - People flying drones.

• The submission considers that greater credit needs to be given to work done by farmers to protect the landscape through existing farm plans (GLAS), and stronger protection for their livelihoods and agricultural practices under Zone B.

• Submission expresses concern in relation to commercial development that is extending into the G zoning objective (high amenity areas).

• The submission further notes that the Coillte re-planting programme for the Dublin Mountains is welcome in shifting to broadleaf forests. However, while amenity use is increased through the Dublin Mountain Partnership, there is no increase in resource allocation for rangers and for monitoring public use.

• The risk to adjoining properties (and private forestry adjacent) through fire, theft, and trespass has not been addressed by the Dublin Mountain Partnership in any meaningful way to date, and landowners are being asked to bear the costs of increased public access without any steps taken by the local authority and the area being poorly managed by the Council.

• The submission requests that the following be carried out as part of the Plan:
  - A survey of the biodiversity along the upland watercourses in the County.
  - The carrying out of a full and proper heritage inventory of upland features within the Kilmashogue Valley.
  - Proper mapping and protection of the Kilmashogue Valley Landscape Character Area 1.
  - The development of a proper Local Area Plan as was completed for Glencullen.
  - Further traffic restriction measures be put in place along Cloragh Road, Mutton Lane, and Tibradden Lane to allow for safe access for farm vehicles, livestock, and emergency vehicles - yellow lines & parking monitoring.
  - A system of strong fines, and enforcement measures, for dogs allowed off the leash in any Zone B or Zone G areas as a measure to prevent dog attacks on livestock.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapters 13, Miscellaneous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0218</td>
<td>James Hedderman</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0219

| Person: Pat Smith | Organisation: Board of Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown Sports Partnership | Map Nos: N/A |

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission highlights the key objectives of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown Sports Partnership.
- The submission references the National Sports Policy 2018-2027, its actions and that local authorities are key stakeholders in the context of the public spaces which are widely used for sport and physical play.
- The submission notes that traditional team sports will continue to provide the bedrock for sports participation in Ireland, however the concept of and participation in sport is undergoing change and the County Development Plan must acknowledge, lead, and support this change.
- Care is required so that in the midst of the many positive advances and changes in sport participation, the visible engagement of some sectors of society does not hide the lack of engagement and opportunities for others.
- Sporting infrastructure needs to be designed, located, built, maintained, and operated to appropriate standards if we are to make real advances in reaching all target groups. When providing outdoor public sporting, leisure, or recreational facilities such as those provided at dlr Leisure sites, it is important to incorporate appropriate supervision of these facilities to minimise anti-social issue or vandalism.
- When developing public spaces, it is important to link in existing schemes and initiatives that can improve and leverage the participation benefits that this new development will bring.
- Appropriate and well maintained footpaths and kerbs, are another infrastructural concern that will impact the decision making process as to whether a particular route or location is safe in particular for a person with a disability.
- Sport must be easily accessible in the community, at the home and in the workplace. It is also essential that in the planning of new developments, consideration and resources are given to providing fit-for-purpose multi-use areas (both indoor and outdoor) for the communities that will be living in and around them.
- The Sport Ireland Active Cities concept is built on the principles of the Global Action Plan for Physical Activity, GAPPA, developed by the World Health Organisation in 2018, and it contains four key pillars. The Active Dublin initiative will look to progress and aims of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown Sports Partnership
- The submission would strongly encourage that participation in sport and physical activity be incorporated into this new County Development Plan as an important objective in its own right.
- The County Development Plan should encourage county level responses which integrate and plan the various participation, performance and facility needs within the context of the national framework of priorities.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 9

### DLR Submission No: B0220

| Person: Michelle Dowling | Organisation: N/A | Map Nos: 7 |

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0221

| Person: Fergal MacCabe | Organisation: N/A | Map Nos: N/A |

Summary of Submission and Observation:
The submission commends the Draft Plan. States that from the strategic goals to the local objectives, it is a well-considered and well-made Plan. Notes that the Plan builds on the solid achievements of its predecessor and is a credit to those who prepared it and the public representatives who ratified it. The individual comments that they look forward to the implementation of the Plan.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0222</td>
<td>Loracan Aherne</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.
- Submission requests the completion of the development at Cherrywood/Lehaunstown prior to further residential development taking place.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 2, Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0223</td>
<td>Noel Murphy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.
- Considers residential zoning on the site is not appropriate.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0224</td>
<td>Fiona Boland</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0225</td>
<td>Sam Donnelly</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission requests a correction to land use zoning at a residential property, adjacent to Circle K, Windsor Motors (Dublin Rd, Bray), currently zoned E should be zoned A.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0226</td>
<td>Michelle Twomey</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0227</td>
<td>Michael Stewart</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Welcomes DLR’s commitment for a feasibility study to re-route the East Coast Cycle trail by the coast at Corbawn and incorporate into coastal protection works between Corbawn Lane and the new Woodbrook Dart station.
• Concerned about the safety and congestion issues of the current East Coast Cycle Trail route through Corbawn and the impact on residents.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0228</th>
<th>Person: Avril Claffey</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0229</th>
<th>Person: Fran Murphy</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0230</th>
<th>Person: Shane Fitzgibbon</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The submission welcomes the Council policy to strictly control the expansion of the suburbs into rural and high amenity areas but considers that some elements of the Draft Plan contradict this objective. The submission notes that there has already been significant expansion around the Ballyogan and Stepaside areas and that development at the proposed new growth areas of Kiltiernan-Glenamuck, Rathmichael and Old Connaught would cause the continued expansion of the suburbs into rural and high amenity areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission disagrees with development in the outer reaches of the County when national policy is to prioritise compact growth. Considers that development in these areas would increase sprawl resulting in increased congestion and journey times, negative environmental impacts, a reduction in green space and visual impact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recommends focussing development and increasing residential densities within the existing built up footprint of the County. Considers that this approach would better facilitate transport planning and make investments in public and active transport improvements more economical.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0231</th>
<th>Person: Melania Fedeli</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0232</th>
<th>Person: James Lunney</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The submission notes the high demands housing has on amenities and infrastructure. Considers that the supply of new housing will have a detrimental effect on existing neighbourhoods, heritage, landscape and natural habitats. Urges decision-makers to consider the effects of allowing inappropriate and overscale developments.

Raises concerns regarding development in the Kilternan area and suggests that where development is permitted that strict control of planning, layout and protections is applied, and sanctions issued for any breaches.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0233</td>
<td>Damien Mara</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0234</td>
<td>Nigel Bell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0235</td>
<td>John Purcell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.
- The lands are a critical source of benefit to the community in terms of social, recreational and civic amenity.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0236</td>
<td>Brian Manners</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission notes that there has been a recent increase in the purchase of Radio Control Cars by young and old and clubs have been inundated with new membership requests despite not operating due to the pandemic.
- Marley park had a dedicated space for the Dublin Model Car Club (Electric Radio Control cars) beside the top car park, however this was relocated. A large purpose-built track exists in St Anne’s Park, Raheny for “Petrol” Radio Control Cars and “Electric” Car Tracks.
- The Council should consider a purpose-built track for “Electric” Radio Control Cars in Marley Park beside top car park. The location is ideal beside as the naturally raised hill provides the ideal viewing platform for drivers, photographs of the proposed located are included in the submission.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0237</td>
<td>Chanel Grant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0238</th>
<th>Person: Siva Ramalingam</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0239</th>
<th>Person: Patricia Morrison and Paul Morrison</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3, 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:
• The submission requests that the Council amend the Marlborough Road cACA to incorporate suitable redevelopment of the 20th century buildings to satisfy modern living with energy efficient structures that address Ireland's 2050 legally binding climate change commitment.
• Consideration should also be given to maintain the overall visual impression of Marlborough Road. Development of sufficient architectural design that compliments the area should be considered.
• The Council should clarify that extensions of any properties on Marlborough Road is not restricted by any cACA requirement. This can be done by maintaining the cACA boundary along the front of the properties or by stating that extensions are not of material concern for the ACA.
• The submission requests that the Council amend the Marlborough Road ACA to incorporate a wider area including the lands along Adelaide Road and Station to restore the integrity of designation of the land between Marlborough Road and Silchester Road. A justification is set out and a map is included.
• The extension of the ACA also accords with the advice in the Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities, at par 3.2.5 that “The boundaries of a candidate ACA should make physical, visual and planning-control sense”.
• The submission states that without the modifications detailed in the submission they are wholly opposed to the cACA at Marlborough Road.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0240</th>
<th>Person: Kevin McCarthy</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0241</th>
<th>Person: Éibhín Crowe</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0242</th>
<th>Person: Anita Dowling</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
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Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0243</td>
<td>Ian McEnroe</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0244</td>
<td>Jennifer Conlon</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission welcomes the inclusion of Marlborough Road ACA in the Draft County Development Plan (CDP).
- However, there is a concern that the boundaries of the proposed ACA have been too restrictive.
- The large houses on Adelaide Road are of considerable heritage value and they constitute the link between the developments of Silchester Road and Marlborough Road.
- The inclusion of the properties along Adelaide Road in the Marlborough Road and Adelaide ACA represented a logical continuum of the established Silchester Road ACA. The symbiotic relationship of the railway with the 19th century development of the development of the Glenageary area was expressed by incorporating most of the length of Station Road into the candidate ACA.
- The submission, therefore, considers that the approach to adopt the ACA now proposed whereby Marlborough Road would be designated a stand-alone ACA, excluding substantial adjoining lands along Station Road and Adelaide Road, is likely to fragment the unity of the original legacy of the 19th century town planning and may lead to significant adverse impacts on the architectural heritage of the area. In this regard it is noted that the majority of the 19th century houses along Adelaide Road are not designated Protected Structures.
- The submission, therefore, requests that the Council amend the Marlborough Road ACA to incorporate a wider area including the lands along Adelaide Road and Station.
- It would also accord with the advice in the Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities, at par 3.2.5 that “The boundaries of a candidate ACA should make physical, visual and planning-control sense”.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0245</td>
<td>Laura Nyhan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0246</td>
<td>Alan Deegan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0247</td>
<td>B &amp; C Fitzsimons</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Urge the council to deliver on the promise of sustainable development and to protect the existing green spaces throughout the county.
- Kilternan is an area of natural beauty enjoyed by many and not just by local residents, however, natural wildlife habitats have been eroded by development and views of mountains and trees are declining.
- The Biodiversity crisis means flora and fauna in the area require protection. Urge the council to use its powers accordingly.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0248</td>
<td>Sarah Freeman de Malavé</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Concerned with proposal to use Stillorgan Reservoir for public amenity as it will overlook the dwellings and gardens of Stillorgan Heath. Concerned with public nuisance and security.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0249</td>
<td>Dr. Clare Glanville and Trish Smullen</td>
<td>Geological Survey Ireland, Department of Environment, Climate and Communications</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Geological Survey Ireland is the national earth science agency and is a division of the Department of the Environment, Climate and Communications. We provide independent geological information and advice and gather various data for that purpose. We recommend using these various data sets, when conducting the EIAR, SEA, planning and scoping processes. Use of our data or maps should be attributed correctly to ‘Geological Survey Ireland’.
- In the SEA environmental report, we are pleased to see the 12 DLRCC County Geological Sites listed in Section 4.8.1 ‘Geological Sites’ and delineated in map form in Figure 4.8 ‘County Geological Sites’.
- In Chapter 8 ‘Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity’ of the CDP, we commend the inclusion of geological sites as Policy Objective GIB26: Geological Sites.
- We welcome the comment that DLRCC “will endeavour where appropriate, to encourage, facilitate and support access and public Rights-of-Way to geological, and geomorphological features of heritage value.”
- We would encourage the inclusion of County Geological Sites in the following policy objectives:
  - Policy Objective GIB14: Public Rights-of-Way
  - Policy Objective GIB18: Protection of Natural Heritage and the Environment
  - Policy Objective GIB21: Designated Sites
- The Geological Heritage Programme views the Local Authorities as critical partners in protecting, through the planning system, those CGS which fall within their county limits. Listing in the CDP provides protection of the sites against potentially damaging developments that normally require planning permission. It is also important that the democratic process of public consultation and approval by councillors of the CDP means that stakeholders in the sites and all the local community can buy into the process.
- Over the past number of years geology has become a large part of Irish tourism. We would encourage DLRCC to continue this trend, and to use the geological audit information making it easily available to the general public. We would encourage geology to be a significant part of any tourism initiative that may be introduced
- We note in the Policy Objective GIB17: ‘Trails, Hiking and Walking Routes’ the objective to promote waymarked and signposted walking routes/trails. We would ask that the design of any future signage to consider the use of information panels as appropriate to highlight the significance of a County Geological Site or an area of geological and/or geomorphological interest that are in the vicinity of waymarked and signposted walking routes/trails.
• Stone Built Ireland is a 2 year research collaboration agreement between GSI, TCD & the OPW. The project aims to document building and decorative stone in Ireland to inform government agencies, building owners and conservationists of the sources for suitable replacement stone in restoration work and to develop a greater awareness among the general public.

• Proposed developments and plans should consider any potential impact on specific groundwater abstractions, groundwater flooding, and on groundwater resources in general. We recommend using the groundwater maps on our map viewer.

• In the SEA environmental report, we are pleased to see use of our Groundwater data sets in Sections 4.9.5 ‘Ground Water’ and 4.9.6 ‘Aquifer Vulnerability and Productivity’ and as maps in Figure 4.12 ‘Groundwater Vulnerability’ and Figure 4.13 ‘Groundwater Productivity’. Please ensure that use of our data or maps is attributed correctly to ‘Geological Survey Ireland’.

• Under Circular Letter SP5/03, Local Authorities are required to include and refer to Groundwater Protection Schemes to make sure that ‘development proceeds in a manner that offers the best possible environmental protection, including protection of groundwater quality’. DLRCC should include the Groundwater Protection Scheme information within the Plan via a combination of the land mapping provided in the submission and the groundwater protection responses for potentially polluting activities available on our website.

• We note the inclusion of specific reference to ‘groundwater strategy for the Glencullen aquifer (2018)’ under policy objective EI8: Groundwater Protection and Appropriate Assessment, and for the Rathmichael area under policy objective EI11: Rathmichael Groundwater and Surface Water Protection.

• Geohazards eg. Flooding, coastal erosion, can cause widespread damage to landscapes, wildlife, human property and human life. We recommend that geohazards be taken into consideration, especially when developing areas where these risks are prevalent, and we encourage the use of our data when doing so.

• The data from the national Groundwater Flooding project may be useful in relation to Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and management plans.

• In the SEA environmental report, we are pleased to see use of our online mapping data sets for Landslide Events and Landslide Susceptibility in Section 4.8.3 ‘Landslides’ and as a map in Figure 4.9 ‘Landslide Susceptibility and Previous Landslide Events’. Please ensure that use of our data or maps is attributed correctly to ‘Geological Survey Ireland’.

• Geothermal energy harnesses the heat beneath the surface of the Earth for heating applications and electricity generation, and has proven to be secure, environmentally sustainable and cost effective over long time periods. We recommend use of our Geothermal Suitability maps to determine the most suitable type of ground source heat collector for use with heat pump technologies.

• The Assessment of Geothermal Resources for District heating in Ireland and the Roadmap for a Policy and Regulatory framework for Geothermal Energy in Ireland documents have been developed to support the Government’s commitments under the Climate Action Plan 2019 and the Programme for Government. These datasets would be of benefit to the objectives and policies in Chapter 3 Climate Action, Section 3.4.2 ‘Renewable Energy’ of the CDP and in Section 4.11.7 ‘Renewable Energy Potential’ of the SEA environmental report.

• In the SEA environmental report, Section 4.11.8 ‘Minerals and Aggregates’, we are pleased to see mention of our Aggregate Potential Mapping dataset and our Mineral map in Figure 4.19 ‘Minerals Localities’. We commend the recommendation to use our Aggregate Potential Mapping, Bedrock mapping, Quaternary and Physiographic mapping, National Aquifer and Recharge mapping datasets when planning and assessing the environmental aspects of projects.

• DLRCC has two historic mine sites in the county - the chimney flue at Ballycorus and the leadmines at Carrickgollogan. The data from the “Historic Mine Site - Inventory and Risk Characterisation (HMS - IRC)” project would be of benefit when assessing and/or promoting the Industrial Heritage of DLRCC in Section 4.12.2 ‘Architectural Heritage’ of the SEA environmental report. Reports and maps available at https://www.epa.ie/enforcement/mines/. The project provides an understanding of the impacts of historic mining sites in Ireland and their status at the time of the study.

• Our marine environment is hugely important to our bio-economy, transport, tourism and recreational sectors. Geological Survey Ireland’s Marine and Coastal Unit in partnership with the Marine Institute, jointly manages INFOMAR, Ireland’s national marine mapping programme; providing key baseline data for Ireland’s marine sector. We would recommend use of our Marine and Coastal Unit datasets available on our website and Map Viewer, and the INFOMAR website.
• The information and datasets contained in both the Marine and Coastal Unit and Coastal Vulnerability Index may be of benefit to Policy Objective EI25: Coastal Defence and Section 10.8 ‘Coastal Protection’ in Chapter 10 ‘Environmental Infrastructure and Flood Risk’ of the draft CDP.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters, 3, 6, 8, 10. SEA/AA, Appendix 16

DLR Submission No: B0250  
Person: Anne-Marie Healy  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 9

Summary of Submission and Observation:  
Seeking the protection of ROWs as follows:
• Enniskerry Rd to Ballybetagh Road - A medieval mass path that enables people to travel to Kileagar safely as the Ballybetagh road is dangerous due to lack of a footpath. ROW is currently blocked by the owners who have lodged a planning application for business/residential uses. Oppose the removal of the ROW and the development of the lands.
• Dingle ROW path from Ballycorus Rd to the Dingle Nature Reserve - Previously extended to the Glenamuck road but that is not marked on the CDP map. Concern is to retain the existing ROW. The land close to the Dingle should be a greenbelt to protect the natural reserve.
• Access to the Kilternan Dolmen – Ireland’s 2nd largest dolmen and important national monument, access across the property of Bishopsland has already been removed. Seeking reinstatement.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 12

DLR Submission No: B0251  
Person: Ian McFetridge  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:  
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.
• Submission considers that road access, traffic volume and noise volume would exceed an already burdened area.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

DLR Submission No: B0252  
Person: Orla Ryan  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:  
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

DLR Submission No: B0253  
Person: Dan and Gill Buckley  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 10

Summary of Submission and Observation:  
• Objects to the proposed widening of Cherrywood Road North as set out in the Draft as it would result in the loss of some of our existing front garden, parking space, mature trees and increase in noise.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

DLR Submission No: B0254  
Person: John Spain  
Organisation: On Behalf of Central bank of Ireland  
Map Nos: 5

Summary of Submission and Observation:  
• Submission relates to the currency centre, Sandyford. The strategic importance of the site is set out. A strategic review of the operations located on the subject lands is currently underway.
• The Strategic Review has identified two primary options, either a new facility on a portion of the lands or a new facility on different lands. It is noted that the second option is not considered a probable outcome at this juncture.

• Request that the currency centre lands in Sandyford be rezoned from E back to A as the lands are suitable for residential development.

• Details in relation to the lands suitability for residential development are set out including the fact that lands are well served by, amenities, schools, services, public transport, walking and cycling facilities and present an opportunity to increase the provision of residential use on an infill site in the area to support the existing significant employment uses in Sandyford.

• Considers current use does not readily fall within the definition of other uses and in itself is a use; however may be considered under the broad ‘light industrial’ use.

• Requests that along with the maintenance of the A zoning objective, that a Specific Local Objective be included as follows: 
  “To provide for the ongoing operation of the Currency Centre in a new facility within the lands and to provide for residential use should the continued operation of the Currency Centre facility on all or part of the lands not be required.”

• The SLO will provide clarity for future residential development on the site.

• Request that currency centre be included as a permissible use under the A zoning objective, with afootnote linking this provision solely to the requested SLO.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0255</td>
<td>Barbara Scully</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0256</td>
<td>Barbara Scully</td>
<td>Monaloe Longmeadow Residents Association</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0257</td>
<td>Imelda Hennessy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0258</td>
<td>Gail Rossiter</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0259</td>
<td>Claire Gilnagh</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Concerned with the use of Stillorgan reservoir for a public park. Privacy will be negatively impacted upon due to overlooking of house and garden, security issues and emotional distress. This public amenity area is not needed as there is ample room in the vicinity of St Raphaels.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0260</td>
<td>Evelyn McMurray</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10 &amp; 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission notes the ambitious Local Area Plan programme included in Table 2.15 and questions whether all the LAPs meet the provisions of Section 19(1)(a) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).
- Welcomes the commitment to the preparation of a LAP for Rathmichael and sets out the history of when the lands were first zoned and the commitments to the delivery of strategic infrastructure projects at that time.
- Submission refers to sections from the Draft CDP and the submission from the EMRA which details the current position with regards infrastructure provision in the Old Connaught / Rathmichael areas. A list of the main infrastructure interventions and policy interventions to unlock Old Connaught, Rathmichael, and Woodbrook is set out.
- Notes that no LAP boundary has been indicated for the Rathmichael LAP area and considers this inconsistent with the approach taken for other LAP’s included in the LAP programme. Furthermore, residents are left unclear as to the potential future impact the LAP designation might have. Recommended that this omission be rectified, and the LAP boundary included.
- Submission makes the case for the inclusion of the boundary in line with the Rathmichael LAP boundary identified in the 2010-2016 CDP with minor changes at the southern end including adjoining the proposed boundary for the Old Connaught LAP. A map is included illustrating the LAP boundary proposed.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Maps 10 and 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0261</td>
<td>Ruth Tracey</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission argues that lands zoned objective GB between Crinken Lane and the Wilford Roundabout (of c.29Ha) no longer makes sense in terms of existing and planned infrastructure, delivery of housing and proximity to high frequency public transport.
- Submission requests that the lands are rezoned from GB to A and SNI and sets out a rationale for same.
- Submission states that the existing GB zone is an ineffective use of strategically located land.
- Submission notes that the GB zoning is a legacy issue dating from the 1970’s and does not reflect a change in spatial circumstances.
- Submission sets out planning and infrastructure changes to this part of the county including the A1 zoning at Woodbook and Old Conna, Shangagangh WWT facility, transport infrastructure and the submission refers to Appendix 1 of the Draft plan which sets out the current position
- Submission sets out both the physical infrastructure and policy interventions that would ‘unlock’ the development potential of the area including National, Regional and local policy.
- Submission refers to the EMRA submission to the draft plan which acknowledges commitment to strategic growth areas including Woodbrook/Shanganagh and Old Conna.
- Submission sets the locational context of the lands relative to strategic growth areas, infrastructure projects and objectives in the draft plan.
- Submission notes the proximity of the lands to Shanganagh Park, existing and planned community/social infrastructure and amenities such as schools and existing and planned neighbourhood centres / Bray town centre.
• Submission states that rezoning the area would align with the NPF, RSES and MASP in terms of progressing residential development along public transport corridors and compact growth on strategic growth corridors.

• Submission queries the application of the SNI objective rather than rezoning Woodbrook College.

• Submission acknowledges that there area challenges associated with the area including flooding and protected structures, however, it is argued that these can be dealt with and examples of residential development on sites containing protected structures are provided.

• Submission states that the application of SLO 118 is questionable and queries if this SLO is ultra vires. The removal of this SLO is requested.

• The submission notes that there are 2 no. SLO 104’s on map 14 and suggests that the SLO 104 on the Woodbrook Lands should be SLO 103.

• A map detailing the requested rezoning of the area and the various infrastructure developments has been submitted.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14, Map 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0262</th>
<th>Person: Patrick Derivan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0263</th>
<th>Person: Frances Derivan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0264</th>
<th>Person: Joseph McMahon, Scalp Wood Nurseries</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission reference the plan-making process of the 2016 CDP which re-zoned lands at the Scalp Wood Nurseries from Objective G – ‘To protect and improve high amenity areas’ to Objective B – ‘To protect and improve rural amenity and to provide for the development of agriculture’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests the re-zoning of additional lands adjacent to the Scalp Wood Nurseries from Objective G to Objective B. The submission is accompanied by maps identifying the site in question.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests support from the Council for the Scalp Woods Nurseries to remain operating successfully and sustainably on the lands and notes that enterprise currently employ 5 people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0265</th>
<th>Person: Wendy Tuthill (Mrs)</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7
**Chief Executive’s Report on Draft Plan Consultation**

**Volume II – Summary of Submissions Received**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0266</td>
<td>David and Alma Devlin</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The submission welcomes the inclusion of Marlborough Road ACA in the Draft County Development Plan (CDP).
- However, there is a concern that the boundaries of the proposed ACA have been too restrictive.
- The large houses on Adelaide Road are of considerable heritage value and they constitute the link between the developments of Silchester Road and Marlborough Road.
- The inclusion of the properties along Adelaide Road in the Marlborough Road and Adelaide cACA represented a logical continuum of the established Silchester Road ACA. The symbiotic relationship of the railway with the 19th century development of the development of the Glenageary area was expressed by incorporating most of the length of Station Road into the candidate ACA.
- The submission, therefore, considers that the approach to adopt the ACA now proposed whereby Marlborough Road would be designated a stand-alone ACA, excluding substantial adjoining lands along Station Road and Adelaide Road, is likely to fragment the unity of the original legacy of the 19th century town planning and may lead to significant adverse impacts on the architectural heritage of the area. In this regard it is noted that the majority of the 19th century houses along Adelaide Road are not designated Protected Structures.
- The submission, therefore, requests that the Council amend the Marlborough Road ACA to incorporate a wider area including the lands along Adelaide Road and Station.
- It would also accord with the advice in the Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities, at par 3.2.5 that “The boundaries of a candidate ACA should make physical, visual and planning-control sense”.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Appendix 4

--

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0267</td>
<td>Justin Lowry</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Submission requests that large residential developments are not catered for on land at Clonkeen College.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Map 7

--

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0268</td>
<td>Erika Fitzpatrick</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Map 7

--

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0269</td>
<td>Frank Hegarty</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Concerned that the emphasis on the seaside walking/cycling route has been downplayed in the Draft Plan. This is important to enhance beach by attracting residents and tourist to the safe, traffic free area.
- The design of the walkway could protect birds from dogs and has the potential to address heavy swells.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Chapter 5

--

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0270</td>
<td>Suzanne Holmes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0271</th>
<th>Person: Christine Cosgrave</th>
<th>Organisation: Imagine Dundrum</th>
<th>Map Nos: 1, 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
Overview
• Welcome the Development Plan Vision, the inter-related Strategic County Outcomes and the recognition of the intrinsic links between climate resilience, planning policy, mental and physical health, green space, and community infrastructure. Implementation of the Plan, especially in relation to Development Management, must be measured robustly against these outcomes.
• Welcome the strong commitment to the concept of neighbourhood and the emphasis on Placemaking and on community.

Proposals
• The submission sets out a range of proposals for amendments to the draft development plan, numbered 1-34.

Post-Pandemic Thinking
• The experience of 2020-21 has demonstrated how a pandemic can reshape lives and planning guidelines and standards must take account of this e.g. the need for adequate open space.
• Proposal 1: That a statement re: post pandemic thinking should be added to Table 1.4 Creation of a Climate Resilient County. The issue should also be addressed Chapter 3 Climate Action.

Neighbourhood Concept
• Welcome the strong commitment in the draft County Development Plan to the neighbourhood concept (PHP 4.1.1. Overarching Policy Objective PHP1. P67), but propose that this section is amended to include the term ‘community building’ as follows (proposed additional text underlined):
• Proposal 2: That the opening sentence of the third bullet point under 4.1.1 be updated to state ‘Embed the concepts of neighbourhood and community building into the spatial planning of the County’…

Placemaking
• Welcome the emphasis on Placemaking, but the draft should be amended to emphasise that Placemaking is something that the Council does with people and not for people.
  Proposal 3: That the following definition (or similar) is included at Section 4.4 Place, page 92: ‘Placemaking is the process through which we work together to shape our public spaces. Rooted in community-based participation, Placemaking involves the planning, design, management and programming of shared use spaces.’ (rethinkurban.com/placemaking).

Children and Young People
• Concern that planning policy at a national level takes limited account of the needs of children and families, apart from formal playground provision in Apartment Guidelines. While the needs of children and young people are addressed in general in the development plan, it is requested that this issue is given a distinct heading in Chapter 4 People, Homes and Places, referencing the specific needs of this group.
• Proposal 4: That children’s interests be explicitly covered in the County Development Plan and that proposals for urban design and placemaking, movement, social and community facilities, open space and recreation, are drawn together under one heading in Chapter 4 as well as appearing in the relevant sections of the Plan.

Climate Change
• Welcome the stated intention that ‘climate thinking’ must become integral to all aspects of planning and decision-making.
• Note that the DLRCC development Plan must reflect the ‘Climate Action and Low Carbon Development (Amendment) Bill 2021’ and that Local Authority Development Plans must align with their Climate Action Plan.
• Strongly support Section 3.4.1.1. PO CA5 Energy performance in buildings; Section 3.2.1.3. PO CA7 Construction materials and Section 3.4.4.1 Urban greening (Policy Objective CA17). These principles are supported for the whole County (not just new builds) and specifically for Dundrum. Proposal 5: insert
new SLO on Map 1 to state that the foregoing must be fundamental to the redevelopment of the Old Shopping Centre and other buildings in Dundrum Village.

- While the Plan acknowledges the challenges associated with climate change it fails to recognise the urgency of the situation, given that Ireland declared a climate emergency in 2019 and international experts are warning that the current decade offers the last chance to avert catastrophic effects.
  
  **Proposal 6**: That the language of Chapter 3 would more strongly reflect the urgency of climate action.

- **Proposal 7**: That the draft CDP acknowledges clearly that County-level targets and plans will need to be strengthened once the new Climate Bill is enacted, and the subsequent, more ambitious, national Climate Action Plan put in place. That the CDP will also align with the DLRCC Climate Action Plan. The Climate Action and Low Carbon Development Bill 2021 requires each local authority to update their Climate Action Plan every five years.

- **Proposal 8**: That the County Development Plan commit resources to ensuring that essential methodologies specifically for integrating ‘climate change issues’ into the Development Plan process (p.53) and for quantifying GHG impacts of spatial planning policies (3.2.3 CA3) are developed and made available as rapidly as possible.

- **Proposal 9**: That clear definitions of “sustainability” and “sustainable growth” should be included in Chapter 3 as well as an acknowledgement that even ‘compact’ forms of development and improved transport infrastructure etc. may have undesirable impacts on the environment.

**Building Height – General**

- Welcome the statement that ‘Building height, footprint, form, site coverage and compactness determine the density of an area. However, high density does not necessarily require high-rise buildings; tall buildings are only one possible model for high density.’ (Appendix 5, page 9).

- Accept that densification is necessary in the DLR context, but this need not mean high rise, though national planning policy and guidelines suggest otherwise. This has been demonstrated through international examples (e.g. The Netherlands – high density, low rise).

**Height and Climate Change**

- In the light of the publication of the Climate Action and Low Carbon Development (Amendment) Bill all buildings must be built to be as energy efficient as practical. Studies have shown that this favours buildings of limited height of up to 10 stories (the submission quotes various sources in support of this position).

- Embodied carbon emissions are an important driver of climate change and can account for up to 75% of a building’s total emissions over its lifespan. However, there is no requirement in current building regulations or planning policy for emissions to be calculated over the life expectancy of any development. It is proposed (**Proposal 10**) that additional criterion be added to Appendix 5, Section 5 as follows:

  *Proposals must demonstrate maximum energy efficiency to align with climate policy. Building height must have regard to the relative energy cost of higher buildings and expected embodied carbon emissions over the lifetime of the development. The latest building energy efficiency studies should be considered when proposed development is submitted.*

**Height and Affordability**

- Note the serious affordability issue facing families wishing to buy or rent in the county (Appendix 2). Also note the significant body of data highlighting the higher costs of higher/taller apartment buildings.

- **Proposal 11**: Amend Appendix 5, Section 5 to include additional performance based criterion as follows:

  *Proposals must demonstrate how any proposed building height impacts on the affordability of units in the development, having regard to the County Development Plan Housing Strategy.*

**Building Height in Dundrum/Dundrum LAP**

- Concerned that Dundrum does not have a local policy base to guide future building height aside from its general status as a Major Town Centre in the County Development Plan. Note that as a Major Town Centre, Dundrum “should be considered for increased height in line with the requirements of the Guidelines”.

- The majority of the MTC zoned land falls within the boundaries of Dundrum Village, including Main Street and the old Shopping Centre. An LAP should be prepared to ensure the protection of the character of Main Street and in light of impending and current development, should be prepared urgently.

- Residential buildings of six to eight stories in Dundrum generally should be considered only where they will be in harmony with the other buildings in the immediate area.
Welcome the role for the Dundrum LAP as set out in the draft County Development Plan in relation to Main Street that: ‘The upcoming Local Area Plan will provide more specific guidance for building heights in the town particularly on what is called the Town Centre phase 2 site taking cognisance of the need to protect the existing character of the Main Street while providing for stepped back buildings of scale’. Support this approach to deciding on building heights along Main Street.

**Proposal 12:** To amend SLO 9 as follows (additions underlined): *To ensure that any future redevelopment in Dundrum Village, including on the old shopping centre lands, takes cognisance of the character and streetscape of the Old Main Street, and maintain where appropriate, and possible existing buildings and/or facades. Building Heights alongside Main Street must be in keeping with the original relatively low-rise streetscape, in keeping with its character, scale and Candidate Architectural Conservation Area status.*

**Housing Mix and Housing Tenure in Dundrum**

- Welcome Policy Objective PHP26 regarding achieving a wide variety of housing and apartment types, sizes and tenures.

**Unit Size**

- Welcome the acknowledgement that in order to foster community and build sustainable neighbourhoods, an acceptable proportion of larger flexible housing units is needed, and that lifetime adaptable housing will be promoted in all new residential developments (p88/89).
- Also welcome the provision in Chapter 12, Development Management (p231), that in built up areas, developments will be required to have a minimum of 20% of 3-bedroom units, which will go some way toward addressing the needs of families.

**Housing for Older People and People with Disabilities**

- Strongly welcome Policy Objective PHP29 Housing for All, and the emphasis on housing options for older people and people with disabilities as well as the emphasis on ‘age friendly housing’. These issues are particularly relevant in Dundrum given the local age profile.
- Note the provisions in Chapter 12 Development Management, Section 12.3.3.1 Residential Size and Mix, however, it is unclear whether these requirements place an onus on developers to deliver the housing types referenced (housing for older people, people with disabilities, adaptability, multigenerational living). Furthermore, the implementation of these policies is compromised by the proportion of high-cost build to rent apartments, mainly one and two-bedroom units and a lack of affordable housing.

**Proposal 13:** That Chapter 12 should propose a requirement to have a stated minimum proportion of homes that meet the needs specified above, reflecting the proportion of older people and people with disabilities in the population.

**Proposal 14:** Include a new SLO on Map 1 for Dundrum as follows - That in the redevelopment of the Old Shopping Centre, as a Strategic Regeneration Site, a proportion of residential units, to be agreed with the Planning Authority, will provide for lifetime adaptable homes, homes built to Universal Design Standards, and Supported Accommodation and that the proportion will be set down in the forthcoming Local Area Plan.

**Housing Tenure Mix**

- Note the text on PHP 26 (p89) states that “over proliferation of a single housing tenure’ should be avoided by ‘a balanced mix of private, build-to-rent, and social housing to accommodate the needs of a mixed and balanced community”. However, there isn’t a definition of ‘proliferation’. In addition, the description of a balanced mix is unduly restrictive in referencing ‘private, build-to-rent, and social housing, and in particular the reference to the build-to-rent scheme as if it is a tenure. The following amendments are proposed:

**Proposal 15:** That in PHP 26, p89, and in Chapter 12 Development Management, the description of tenure mix be amended to read “a balanced mix of units and unit sizes providing for home ownership, home rental and social housing to accommodate the needs of a mixed and balanced community”.

**Proposal 16:** That the County Development Plan should indicate the approach that will be taken to measuring ‘proliferation’ and embed this definition in Chapter 12, Development Management.

**Proposal 17:** That the County Development Plan should state the need for arrangements for formal inter-agency agreements to facilitate supported housing for older dependant people and people with disabilities, to ensure an integrated approach between DLR and the HSE.

**Transport and Mobility**
• Welcome the provisions of the draft County Development Plan in relation to Transport and Mobility in broad terms and in particular Section 5.5.2 Policy Objective T11: Footways and Pedestrian Routes. The progress made thus far in Dundrum Village is welcome in this regard.
• Imagine Dundrum has engaged proactively with the NTA in relation to recent Busconnects proposals which are seen as detrimental to the future of Dundrum Village and contrary to T11.
• In relation to 5.4.7 Policy Objective T9: Rail Stations/Luas Stops which refers to improvement and further development of railway stations and Luas stops in the County, there is concern (as raised previously) regarding the condition of the Luas Station in Dundrum. Accordingly, the following proposal is made:
  • *Proposal 18: Insert new SLO on Map 1 – That the Dundrum Luas Station will be significantly upgraded and that the detailed design proposals are incorporated into the Local Area Plan for Dundrum.*

Towns, Villages, and Retail Development

• Welcome the strong focus on the towns and villages in Dun Laoghaire Rathdown and the shift in focus to multifunctional centres that cater for community needs and infrastructure as well as retail and housing development.
• Also welcome the policy commitment to ensuring that development results in a high-quality public realm and sense of place, the need for retail development to have regard for the unique character of our towns and villages and to provide a distinct sense of place (Section 7.2.3.3).
• The emphasis on placemaking and on enhancing the unique character of Main Streets is particularly welcome as is the content of Policy Objective RET4 Major Town Centres, as it refers to Dundrum.
• Note the elements of the strategy for Dundrum as set out in Section 7.5.2.1 pages 145-147 and in particular the proposal for the development of a new community, cultural and civic hub.

Nomenclature relating to Dundrum

• While the terminology relating to Dundrum has improved considerably in the Draft Plan, there remains some difficulty. The only term that relates to Dundrum appears to be the zoning term Major Town Centre. There is no entity called Dundrum Village in the draft CDP. There is one reference (7.4.2 bullet point 1) to Dundrum as ‘the Town’. There is a need for Dundrum to be a place, and for its name and identity to be clear.
• *Proposal 19: That the nomenclature referring to Dundrum would be further clarified in order for Dundrum to have a clear identity and referred to as follows: That Dundrum Village consists of the Main Street and the old Shopping Centre, including Waldemar Terrace. That ‘Dundrum Town’ consists of Dundrum Village and the Dundrum Town Centre Shopping Centre.*

Description of the boundaries of the Dundrum MTC

• Dundrum is covered by the MTC zoning in the draft County Development Plan, however, there is no clear definition or description of the boundaries of the MTC. In Chapter 7 (7.4.2 Core Shopping Areas, the core shopping area for Dundrum ‘corresponds to the MTC Zoning objective for the Town and includes the area between Main Street and Dundrum Bypass and from Waldemar Terrace to Wyckham Way’. However, in Map 1, the MTC Zoning appears as going farther north than Waldemar Terrace.
• *Proposal 20: That the boundaries of the Dundrum MTC are clearly described in the County Development Plan as well as shown on a map.*

William Dargan Bridge Redevelopment

• The draft CDP (p147) refers to the need for comprehensive redevelopment of the William Dargan Bridge Undercroft, Usher House and Waldemar Terrace. While welcoming the intent, it is noted that Waldemar Terrace and Usher House are in private ownership, the P&T building is a state-owned building and the roadway at Waldemar Terrace is in use as a bus interchange. It is also noted that the area is one of the options proposed in the CCCAP for the Civic Centre, and that the area falls within the terms of reference of the Dundrum Area Based Transport Study. Imagine Dundrum has separately made proposals as part of a Busconnects submissions. *Proposal 21 states that the future of this important gateway to the Village should be clarified in advance of the publication of the County Development Plan.*

Bus Traffic on Main Street

• Dundrum Main Street cannot sustain two-way traffic or significant bus traffic on Main Street and there is concern at the equivocal position in the draft CDP (page 148), which states that ‘future bus routes in the area should be considered in the context of the traffic volumes on Dundrum Main Street and the potential to increase the utilisation of the Dundrum Bypass in this regard.*
• **Proposal 22:** That the text on page 148 be amended to read (proposed additional text is underlined) ‘future bus routes in the area should be considered in the context of the traffic capacity on Dundrum Main Street and the potential to increase the utilisation of the Dundrum Bypass in this regard.’

**Living Over the Shop**

• Additional residential uses including Living Over the Shop are envisaged for Dundrum MTC (p147). There would be scope in the redevelopment of the old Shopping Centre, and, in particular, any retail redevelopment along Main Street to design in opportunities for living over the shop (as distinct from reuse of existing premises). This would require own door provision as well as other design features.

• **Proposal 23:** The option of Living Over the Shop as a new design form, and not only a re-use, should be provided for in this Chapter, and in Chapter 12 Development Management (12.3.8.9), in relation to Dundrum redevelopment, as well as more widely.

**Connectivity**

• Effective use of the Bypass for bus and other traffic management on Main Street is dependent on permeability through the redeveloped old Shopping Centre.

• **Proposal 24:** Add new SLO to Map 1: Permeability through all major developments on the east side of Main Street should ensure pedestrian/cycle links between Main Street and the Dundrum Bypass.

**Public Realm Improvements**

• **Proposal 25:** New SLO Map 1: In the context of any redevelopment of the Old Shopping Centre, that power lines on Main Street will be undergrounded.

**Planning and Health Policy**

• Welcome the integration of health policy into the planning process as referenced in Chapter 8., drawing on the National Planning Framework, but this vital interrelationship should cut more explicitly across all aspects of the County Development Plan, and particularly in the Chapters on Parks and Open Spaces, and Chapter 12 Development Management.

**Increasing citizens’ awareness – Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity**

• Welcome the recognition of the necessity for “increasing awareness among all sections of the population of the importance of the County’s green infrastructure, landscape, and biodiversity” (draft CDP p 155)

**Green Infrastructure**

• Overall vision for green infrastructure is welcome. The urban environment, and the public realm within it, should not be excluded from Green Infrastructure thinking. The Plan should highlight how the County’s urban/built areas can become key nodes in a County-wide network of green places and spaces. Dundrum is on or near many proposed green routes and can link to waterways and parks.

• **Proposal 26:** Add a new SLO to Map 1: A redeveloped and ‘greened’ Dundrum should be a node/hub in the Green Infrastructure for the West side of the County, with links to proposed green routes, waterways and parks.

**Biodiversity**

• Welcome the overall intentions of the draft CDP with regard to biodiversity and the aims and objectives of the forthcoming DLR Biodiversity Action Plan 2021-26, however, there should be greater acknowledgment of the starting point: the crisis caused by Ireland’s overall failure to protect its biodiversity over the last two or three decades despite international, EU and national commitments to do so.

• To restore, protect and enhance the County’s natural assets, citizens must become active custodians of our environment. The Council must go beyond citizen education, and promote practical citizen involvement in developing, maintaining and monitoring the growing green infrastructure, and in protecting our biodiversity.

• Given the likely scale of new development and the requirement to prioritise brownfield and infill sites, recommend incorporating a requirement for biodiversity audits on brownfield sites into the new Biodiversity Action Plan.

**Open Space, Parks and Recreation**

• Welcome the fact that the current Open Space Strategy (written in 2011) is to be reviewed and ask that open space requirements in built up areas be re-considered in the light of the pandemic lockdown experience and increasing population.

• The link between spatial planning and health policy should be made more explicit in the CDP.

• While the Plan assumes additional development and density quality of life and overall health will be undermined unless adequate open space is provided

**Inclusive design**
• Request that green open spaces be (inter alia) inclusive in design. Emphasis on inclusive design needs to be much stronger, at present the reference to inclusivity is in 9.2.1.2. PO OSR 2 where it is defined as being ‘accessible’ and ‘at a convenient distance from... home and/or... work’ and in broad terms in 9.3.1.1 (Open Spaces should be inclusive).

Proposal 27: That the concept of inclusive design in relation to Parks and Open Spaces will be more fully developed and will include a broad range of facets of inclusive design in these spaces (e.g. providing for age, gender, disability).

Reimagining and fully utilising green amenity space
• There is a huge need in the suburban surroundings of Dundrum Village to reimagine and more fully utilise green amenity space, beginning with an audit of these spaces. The core of Dundrum is seriously lacking in open space of any kind but has many such assets which could be extremely beneficial to local people if the spaces were more fully utilised, for example, small playgrounds, community gardens, seating, teenage spaces.

Proposal 28: That the County Development Plan should provide that all existing green amenity space will be the subject of audit and will engage with residents to bring forward proposals for fuller uses of green amenity spaces.

The role of trees in new development and redevelopment
• Welcome the development of the new County Tree Strategy and supports the ‘urban forest’ approach, especially for Dundrum.

• Tree planting should be a prerequisite for planning decisions on new developments.

Clarification of descriptions and definitions of Public Open Spaces
• The draft CDP, Table 9.1 the Hierarchy of Public Open Spaces sets out clearly the types of public open space, ranging from Greenways through regional parks, to Civic spaces. However, the terms ‘public open space’ and ‘open space’ are used interchangeably throughout Section 9.2. and this is confusing. Is ‘public open space’ the same thing as ‘open space’?

• The confusion is compounded in Chapter 12 Development Management where Section 12.8 sets out Open Space and recreation requirements for planning applications. Here the hierarchy (12.8.2) is for Open Space as the higher order term. In this section, the term ‘Public open space’ is introduced which is a subset of Open Space. ‘Public open space’ in this section is different from Public Open Space in 9.1.12.3.1.1. relating to design criteria (bullet point 12) is an example of the provisions which particularly requires to be clarified.

Proposal 29: That the terminology applying to various forms of public/open space in Chapter 9 and Chapter 12 be revisited and a new terminology be devised in which the terms are distinct with distinct meanings and without duplication in differing contexts.

Public open space requirements for residential development
• Chapter 12 proposes (12.8.3.1) that where it is not possible to provide for public open space requirements within a development, the Council may seek a Development Contribution under s 48 of the Planning Act 2000, which will be used to provide open spaces in the vicinity. However, the development plan does not define what constitutes ‘the vicinity”? Families living in apartments need play and open space for children where they live and not at some remove. It should not be acceptable to increase densities in apartment proposals at the expense of the open space.

Proposal 30: That every development will be required to manage density so as to provide the required public open space as part of the development.

Environmental Infrastructure
• Welcome the move away from waste management to the focus on the circular economy and reuse/recycling and strongly support DLR plans to expand recycling facilities and support new recycling businesses.

• Note the urgent need to improve the range of materials that can be collected for reuse or recycling and ask that the County develop plans for reducing the use of plastic in all forms and reflects this intent in the County Development Plan.

Water pollution
• Propose monitoring road runoff into rivers (especially the Slang) as it can be a serious cause of pollution. Draft CDP 10.4.3 PO EI17 refers to complying with national and EU directives etc. “DLR will endeavour (not ‘will’) to improve the water quality in rivers and other watercourses, including ground water”.

Air pollution
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- Request monitoring of air pollution on Main Street and Bypass noting the threat to health, proximity to schools. Also wish to see this provision in the forthcoming Local Area Plan.

**Light pollution**
- Seeking a review of current programme of LEDs replacing older street lamps and adapting programmes in line with expert advice (national dark sky scientific group).
- The Council should trial lower lighting, and reconsider all-night lighting.
- Section 10.4.2. Policy Objective EI16 is weak, stressing only good design and minimising light spillage.
- **Proposal 31:** That the County Development Plan will adopt a stronger policy on light pollution, which takes into account the serious impacts on biodiversity and human health of inappropriate night-time light levels. In the short term, a review of the current programme in line with expert advice and best practice should be undertaken.

**Heritage/Candidate ACA Proposals for Dundrum**
- Welcome the policy framework contained in the draft County Development Plan in relation to the conservation and protection of heritage buildings and protected structures.
- Especially welcome the proposals for most of Main Street Dundrum to be designated as a candidate ACA, but propose that the candidate ACA be extended on the street front so as to join with the existing ACA on the east side and the candidate ACA on the west side.
- Propose that the existing candidate ACA area be progressed to full ACA status as a matter of urgency.
- Welcome 11.4.2.6 Policy Objective HER18: Development within a Candidate Architectural Conservation will be assessed having regard to the impact on the character of the area in which it is to be placed.
- Waldemar Terrace is not included in the proposed candidate ACA area, however, it contains the best of example of wigging in the area uniquely Irish way of pointing cheap bricks.
- **Proposal 32:** That the Main Street Proposed Candidate Architectural Conservation Area be extended on the street front to join with the existing ACA on the east side and the cACA on the west side.
- **Proposal 33:** That the candidate ACAs in Dundrum be moved to full ACA status as a matter of urgency.
- **Proposal 34:** That consideration be given to finding ways of protecting and preserving the fine example of wigging at Waldemar Terrace.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 3,4,7,8,9,10,12,14, Appendix 4, 5

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0272</th>
<th>Person: Ian Moore</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3, 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests that the field at Silchester Park is rezoned from A to F.
- Submission notes that this field was provided for the residents for the purposes of sports and recreation and has been used and maintained as such.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 3

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0273</th>
<th>Person: Kathryn Connaughton</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0274</th>
<th>Person: Marese Murphy</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Request the re-instatement of the Heidelberg Cul de Sac/Boundary. Land was released from the Dublin Eastern Bypass (DEBP) Road Reservation to O Malley Construction. The DEBP Knockrabo should become part of the Ardilea Crescent and Knockrabo Developments by connecting the two road networks which have been created within these two developments, so that the Heidelberg Cul de Sac/ Boundary can be reinstated.
## DLR Submission No: B0275
**Person:** Edel Bell  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 7

### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.  
- Submission requests that the land is no longer zoned Residential.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Chapter 5

---

## DLR Submission No: B0276
**Person:** Charles Williams  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 2,3

### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Concerned with the alteration of the S2S as originally envisaged, the original coastal proposal was much better than the uncoordinated proposal set out in the Draft.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Chapter 5

---

## DLR Submission No: B0277
**Person:** Eoin Collins  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 7

### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.  
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Map 7

---

## DLR Submission No: B0278
**Person:** Conor Lavelle  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 7

### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Concerned with the removal of the S2S walkway and cycle way on the shoreline.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Chapter 5

---

## DLR Submission No: B0279
**Person:** David Byrne  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 2,3

### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.  
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Chapter 5

---

## DLR Submission No: B0280
**Person:** Lynda Duggan  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 7

### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Map 7

---

## DLR Submission No: B0281
**Person:** Ruth Dunne  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 7

### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.  
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.
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Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

DLR Submission No: B0282  Person: John Owens  Organisation: N/A  Map Nos: 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

DLR Submission No: B0283  Person: Briain Mo  Organisation: N/A  Map Nos: 3

Summary of Submission and Observation:
Dún Laoghaire
- Pedestrianise Georges St with time-controlled delivery access.
- Facilitate an increase in food and beverage units along the street and provide outdoor seating. The retail units in the town are particular size and dimension which work well for dining / small scale retail and these uses should be encouraged.
- Facilitate an increase in living over the shop and change of use projects to allow a greater residential density in the town centre.
- Provide zonal reconfigurations providing residential priority areas in the town centre / along Georges St which will facilitate an increased density in retail / f&b / cultural uses elsewhere.
- Provide an enhanced public realm along Georges St lower (west end) with increased footpath widths and potentially restricted car access.
- Remove the large granite bollards along Georges St lower which make the footpaths feel constricted
- Redevelop the Carnegie library as a council run project - coworking, local offices? Or allow private commercial redevelopment. This is a magnificent building which could form an anchor to the west end of the town.
- Masterplan the redevelopment of lands around the West pier

General
- Continue to provide high quality, segregated cycling infrastructure throughout the borough
- Run a pilot scheme similar to DCC to allow community use bike storage bunkers in on street locations
- Increase the rollout of EV charging points

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 8

DLR Submission No: B0284  Person: Olga Maguire  Organisation: N/A  Map Nos: 5

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission notes that the area between Blackglen Rd, Slate Cabin Lane & Woodside Rd (as outlined on a map included with the submission) is not suitable for high rise, high density development and a rezone of the area is sought. There is a need to recognise the transitional status of the area.
- Submission sets out the context and character of the area noting that it is predominantly one off housing, has a role in acting as a wildlife corridor, has poor public transport links, contains mountain walks and views.
- Submission references and includes details of planning decisions from dlr and An Bord Pleanála with regard to impacts of development on the area and its transitional nature noting concerns in relation to height, scale and massing.
- Submission notes the proximity of the area to Fitzsimons Wood – a protected habitat and emphasises the role the area plays as a wildlife corridor between the wood and the mountains. Policy objective GIB2 of the draft plan is referenced in this regard together with Section 5.2.1 of the current 2016-2022 plan that refer to Article 10 of the Habitats Directive.
- Submission reference a specific site of concern which would have a serious impact on existing homes, would block views of Howth and devalue property.
• Submission states that the area is only suited to low density development.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0285</th>
<th>Person: Jackie Long</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0286</th>
<th>Person: Brian Doody</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission considers development on this site would lead to traffic issues for the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0287</th>
<th>Person: John Martin</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerned with the removal of the S2S in the Draft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0288</th>
<th>Person: Carmen O'Donovan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that residential is not open for consideration and that there are not enough amenities to accommodate more residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 4, Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0289</th>
<th>Person: Susan and Ian Stuart</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong> Owners of Valparaiso, Marino Avenue West. No objection to the preservation of Marino Avenue West as an ROW, subject to the following conditions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• That the Council will provide an indemnity in respect of any future third party claims which might occur whether cause by non-feasance or misfeasance of otherwise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• That the Council will be solely responsible for maintaining Marino Avenue West.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• That the parking of motor vehicles shall be prohibited and that double yellow lines will be provided on both sides of the road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• That the ROW shall serve pedestrian traffic only, except for use by the adjoining residents and subject to the current rights of adjoining owners being maintained in every respect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• That the Council will take Marino Avenue West in charge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The owner of Valparaiso shall retain all present rights over Marino Avenue West pursuant to their title documents which include the right to pass and repass at all times and for all purposes, with or without vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Note that the ROW can be appealed to the Circuit Court if unhappy with the proposed conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0290</th>
<th>Person: Maura Reynolds</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0291</th>
<th>Person: Jolanta Jaworska</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0292</th>
<th>Person: Senator Victor Boyhan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: various</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission raises concerns with regard to the proposed new land use zone – SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes that many of the land owners subject of the new zoning objective were not notified by the council, it is considered that while there is no statutory obligation to do so, that the council has been remiss in not alerting land owners of the change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that more detail on the rationale for the SNI designation is provided and that there should be a period of meaningful engagement with land owners to ensure that a consensus is reached with regard to the sustainable development of the areas in question.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission includes an attachment that sets out the SNI land use zoning table, highlighting that residential development is not permitted in principle. This attachment lists 149 sites where the SNI zoning has been applied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0293</th>
<th>Person: Joanna Marsden</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Request DLR to take a more wide-ranging and integrated whole-town approach to cycling and walking in Dun Laoghaire, so that schools can be accessed and the whole town can be enjoyed safely by cyclists and pedestrians rather than focusing so much on coastal cycling facilities for leisure. Submission expresses concern regarding the narrowness of Tivoli Road and the footpaths and seek changes to traffic management in the area including the coastal area and the centre of Dun Laoghaire.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0294</th>
<th>Person: Ciara McAlinden</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DLR Submission No: B0295
Person: Emma O'Mahony  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):** Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0296
Person: Paul Duggan  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):** Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0297
Person: Mary D'Arcy  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):** Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0298
Person: Denise Manning  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):** Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0299
Person: Sinead O’Neill  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):** Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0300
Person: D & M Kennedy  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):** Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0301
Person: Colum Colbert  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Summary of Submission and Observation:

- IFA oppose any increase in Development Charges for once off Rural Housing as rural dwellers cannot access the amenities and services of people living in urban areas.
- IFA requests that people who buy or build a house in the countryside should agree to abide by a countryside lifestyle and not impede or object to normal farming practice.
- It is fundamentally important that all farm families have the right to build a house and live in their local area.
- IFA requests that landowners should retain the right to sell a site should they need/want to and requests that more consultation should take place between the planning officers and prospective applicants prior to application for planning permission.
- Agricultural (including farm buildings), equestrian and all forestry development should continue to be exempt from Development Charges.
- IFA suggest that that broadband is made available to all farmers and rural dwellers.
- IFA requests that rural road networks should be maintained to an acceptable standard equitable to road standards in urban areas. If a complaint is made in relation to road quality; a process to investigate the complaint should be put in place.
- IFA requests DLR to acknowledge that every farmer in the county has a right to bore a well on his land. Where DLR maintain a bore hole for public use, any restrictions on a landowner in that area needs to be dealt with and proper compensation for income and capital loss needs to be addressed.
- Any Greenway projects should only be implemented after extensive consultation with landowners and adjoining landowners without the use of CPO.
- The newly drafted IFA code of practice should be implemented at all times.
- IFA requests that the annual start-up date for hedge cutting is moved to 1st August.
- DLR should facilitate and encourage the micro generation of renewable energy and the exemption of development charges should be increased to 1 megawatt.
- IFA supports the development of renewable energy initiatives and DLR should have a proactive approach.
- A proper planning system must be put in place to cater for all stakeholders in future developments / planning permission for new entrants into forestry.
- A biomass industry must also take precedence in the county as the future growth of forest and other natural waste can be converted into a clean green energy source.
- Farmers, who wish to start a rural business on their farms, should be looked at more favourably by DLRCC when planning issues arise.
- New business start-ups should receive an exemption from local authority rates for the first three years of operation, to support local enterprise development in rural areas. To support the commercial regeneration of village and town centres, which have been decimated in the recession, double tax relief on rental expenditure should be provided for businesses establishing in these areas.
- DLR should:
  - Have stronger penalties to tackle litter dumping
  - Enforcement of anti-littering laws
  - Changes to litter legislation (remove the threat of fines and persecution of farmers on whose land others dump)
  - Establish a network of strategically located skips on outskirts of towns/villages
  - Public campaign for anti-littering in the countryside
- IFA compliment the co-operation that exists with DLRCC on the issue of dog attacks on sheep.
- DLR need to formulate a plan to deal with the decline of rural villages in the County:
  - Incentives such as exemption of development charges and rates
  - Rural innovation hubs
  - Provision of high-quality ICT infrastructure,
• Enhanced town and village renewal supports
• Assistance of community services
• Rural link transport service needs to be promoted and assisted
• Importance of ports, jetties, quays and piers to the local economy needs more attention
• A National Strategic Plan, with environmental and climate policies of importance will be introduced on 1st January 2022. Thus, IFI asks DLRC to rethink the resolution and give more credence to the working of the specific SPC administered by DLRCC in the future.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 3,5,6,7,8,9, 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0303</td>
<td>Olivier Mainardis</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0304</td>
<td>Kevin O’ Hagan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports initiatives to enhance the health and wellbeing of all citizens.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0305</td>
<td>Harry Crowe</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0306</td>
<td>Lorna Whelan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The submission notes that the current Development Plan 2016-2022 clearly recognises the importance of wildlife corridors to the fauna and flora diversity throughout the County. Section 5.2.1 of the Plan highlights the legislative backing for the protection of wildlife corridors as set out in the Habitats Directive 1992 (92/43/EEC).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The existence of the wildlife corridor connecting the Three Rock Mountain area with Fitzsimons Wood (pNHA) via Woodside Road, and the Blackglen Road is well known. The presence of the corridor is clearly recognised with the Council’s ‘Deer Crossing’ signs on the Blackglen Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The importance of this wildlife corridor has been raised in the past in relation to planning proposals in this area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The presence and importance of deer to the biodiversity of Fitzsimons Wood is well illustrated in the Council’s publication on the Biodiversity Education Programme relating to Fitzsimons Wood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The submission requests that the Council continue to include a specific objective in the 2022-2028 Development Plan to protect wildlife corridors generally throughout the County in compliance with the Habitats Directive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Furthermore, as with recognised Rights of Way, all known and established wildlife corridors, such as that connecting Three Rock Mountain and Fitzsimons Wood, should be clearly identified on the maps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that accompany the Plan or as text within the Plan where the wildlife corridor is less well physically defined.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0307</td>
<td>Lorna Whelan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission refers to planning applications in the area enclosed by the Blackglen Road, Woodside Road and Slate Cabin Lane in terms of their potential impacts on the built and natural environment and the landscape.
- Submission notes that large scale developments to date have been refused permission – reference is made to specific permissions and includes an excerpt from a decision made by An Bord Plenala which raises concern in relation to building height, scale and mass.
- Submission notes the zoning objective, ‘A’ of the area and the transitional nature of the area.
- The submission further notes the proximity of the area to Fitzsimons Wood (a protected habitat) and notes that the area acts as a wildlife corridor. As such there is a need to protect the area as reflected in Policy Objective GIB22 of the Draft Plan.
- The submission requests that the zoning for the area is changed having regard to its transitional status.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0308</td>
<td>Eleanor Morton</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0309</td>
<td>Carrie Whelan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0310</td>
<td>Artur Jaworski</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0311</td>
<td>Darach Connolly</td>
<td>Map 2,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Draft Plan does not show S2S, this is unacceptable.
- The benefits outweigh the purported environmental concerns.
- Pandamenic has shown us that new approaches are possible and that outdoor space are essential for any city.
- S2S would open up Dublin Bay itself for cyclists, commuters etc.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
### Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0312</th>
<th>Person: Orla Fullam-Smith</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0313</th>
<th>Person: Thomas O'Connor</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The addition of more houses in an already overly built up area would further cause traffic chaos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What’s needed is for the green spaces to be left alone and stop greed tearing apart our beautiful area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0314</th>
<th>Person: Carol Scott</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10, 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A member of the Shankill Biodiversity Project which was formed recently in collaboration between Shankill Tidy Towns and SAGE – Shankill Action for a Green Earth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shankill is facing a period of significant change with increased housing stock and population – this could have a major impact on the community, environment and biodiversity of the village.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DLR needs as a matter of urgency to introduce measures to protect Shankill from additional inappropriate ad hoc development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In addition, Shankill is a major transport corridor (North-South Corridor, BusConnects, railway line, future Luas line, motorway, flight path), has a wastewater treatment plant and future crematorium and connection to the proposed windfarm – Shankill is carrying a significant burden of infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BusConnects would dis improve pedestrian and cyclist facilities and the public realm would be negatively affected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need to separate pedestrian and cyclist facilities from each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The CDP ignores the existence of Shankill and the impact of the above on the community, particularly the noise impact and there is no emphasis on village improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shankill should be treasured and protected as it has retained its village atmosphere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No recognition of the beauty of Shankill and its environmental sensitivity – we should celebrate its flora and fauna and increase the amount of green space available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The sylvan nature of the area and its environmental sensitivity is under threat and this needs to be addressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flora and fauna of the coastline and spectacular views, and also significant tree coverage, of which very few trees are protected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shankill should be given the status of an Area of High Environmental Sensitivity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The entire planning process needs to be reviewed so that applications are assessed holistically and not in isolation from each other and the communities they serve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would urge DLRCC to instigate an enlightened policy of putting nature first when it comes to development – buildings should be designed to fit the existing landscape.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DLRCC could take the following actions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Purposed directional lighting only when and where it is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All car parks should be permeable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planning permission should be required for any hard surfaces over a certain scale.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plastic grass should be discouraged.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Put nature first and plan sites accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pollinating plants to be grown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Buildings to re-use grey water and water butts used for gardening.
- Encouragement of reduce, reuse, recycle.
- Encouragement of electrification of vehicles.
- Use of solar panels and white roofs.
- Noise/vibration/pollution – impact assessments to be carried out.
- Create a vision for Shankill in a holistic and biodiversity and carbon secure way.
- A Biodiversity Officer should be appointed to oversee the development of Shankill.
- Wicklow Outdoor Strategy 2020 has some useful ideas.
- Need the creation of Designated Areas of Local Biodiversity within Shankill.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 8, 9, 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0315</td>
<td>Kenneth Binley</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Welcome DLR’s commitment for a feasibility study to re-route the East Coast Cycle trail by the coast and incorporate into coastal protection works between Corbawn Lane and the new Woodbrook Dart station.
- Concerned about the safety and congestion issues of the current East Coast Cycle Trail route through Corbawn and the impact on residents.
- Attached is a map showing an existing and alternative East Coast Cycle Trail.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0316</td>
<td>Fiona Burke</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0317</td>
<td>Miriam Fitzsimons</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0318</td>
<td>Gwen Thomas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission objects to the addition of Beauchamp Lodge (RPS No. 2042) to the RPS.
- Submission notes that the property was in a poor state of repair and has been renovated over the past 7 years.
- The submission considers that the property does not warrant protection as is does not have “special architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, social or technical interest”.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0319</td>
<td>Clara Clark</td>
<td>DLR Cycling Campaign - part of Dublin Cycling Campaign</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Welcomes that the Draft is more progressive towards active travel than the existing plan.

Chapter 3
• Welcomes a standalone chapter on Climate Action. Recognises the role of transport emissions. Given the urgency of the climate crises the Plan must require a significant modal shift by building cycling infrastructure quickly. The importance of active travel and modal shift should be included in chapter 3.

Chapter 4
• Welcomes the 15 minute city model, mixed use development near local services, high density development and services within 15 mins of every home. New homes should have secure sheltered Sheffield or on-street bike bunkers outside each front door.

Chapter 5
• To increase cycling as an option submission suggest that there is a need to design with everyone in mind, providing a network of connected cycle routes for all. Needs include segregated cycling that is sufficiently wide to deal with the volumes and varieties of users, low traffic routes and well designed junctions. A high quality network will do more than address safety but will show that cycling is being taken seriously and this will enable a more diverse range of people to cycle.
• Provide high quality, secure and convenient public cycle parking to encourage more people to cycle. Dlr should:
  - exempt cycle sheds/bunkers from needing planning permission
  - have an objective to retrofit existing residential areas/areas to be taken in charge with semi-public bike parking/bike bunkers.
  - include new cycle standards in CDP.
• 5.5.4 Provide a commitment to provide a cycleway the whole way along the coast, liaising with Wicklow County Council to complete the Shanganagh Park to Bray portion.
• 5.6 Implement a plan to reduce car parking, with annual targets.
• New housing should have loading facilities for taxis and delivery drivers to limit antisocial parking.
• Implement traffic calming in line with DMURS.
• Have an objective to discourage illegal parking through design.

Chapter 9
• Sets out views of the purpose of parks, greenways and open space. Open spaces should be considered destinations along the general cycle network. Space for biodiversity, travel, relaxation and play is important.
  - Greenway networks are welcomed; important to remove all barriers and kissing gates that preclude access. Linkages are very important.
  - Regional parks - it is important to remove all barriers and kissing gates that precludes access, linkages and signage is essential along with seating, cycle parking, litter bins, off leash dog areas.
  - District Parks – need lots of local amenities including cycle parking, litter bins, skate parks etc for older teenagers.
  - Blackrock Park – Upgraded surfaces are welcomed, the Deepwell tunnel is still a problem and the pinch point along the Dart line for passing bicycles, buggies of all types, CPO is needed to address this.
  - Local Parks – In addition to playgrounds there is a need for seating, litter bins, trees etc. Local parks should be available for schools for outdoor activities and nature learning.
  - Amenity Open Spaces need to be more practical with picnic tables, seating, trees and bushes and landscaping for nature base play.
  - Civic Spaces – welcomes additions to Blackrock, Dundrum and Glasthule. All public spaces should be age friendly and welcoming.

Chapter 15
Welcomes the commitment to performance measuring in this chapter. There is an opportunity to link to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) and their climate change targets, especially SDG11.2: “By 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons.”

Section 15.5.5
The inclusion of baselines and specific targets around the change in transport modal share over the five year plan.
• Request that a mode share target of 25% of trips by bike be included in the plan;
Accountability and transparency in the process around how KPIs are monitored and evaluated, with details of stakeholders involved in the review and subsequent decision-making processes;
- Census provides excellent and comprehensive data, but is only available every five years. Would welcome a data collection system that supports the formal feedback loop envisaged in the draft plan. This could draw on information available on a daily basis (e.g., cycle counters, the WeCount project) to support annual monitoring, adaptation, and refinement of initiatives.

Welcomes the focus on improvements to the DLR County Cycle Network, progress in relation to pedestrian/cycle footbridges over the M50/M11, and progress on to the development of the Dublin Bay Trail and request that specific targets be included that will enable the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of these policy objectives, over the course of the plan.
- Overall, in line with SDG 11.2, request that consideration be given to how regular data can be collated about how people in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities, and older persons are being supported and facilitated to make cycling a part of their everyday lives.

**Specific Local Objectives**

SLO 18 – where is the S2S? Both on road and off road S2S proposals on the seafront are needed. There has been a gradual blurring of the two routes since the 2012. Request an SLO to outline DLRCC Plans for the S2S.

UCD – There is a need for a cycle lane from Booterstown Dart Station to UCD and also more covered bicycle stands and a dedicated cycle network through the campus. Woodbine/Trimelston – this is a rat run for motorists – it should be made one way, traffic calming and modal filters.

Trimelston/Fosterbrook - a permeability link is needed to allow access for pedestrians/cyclist to have a more direct link to local schools.

Cross Ave – should be made one way between Chesterfield and Blackrock College.

Stillorgan – Welcomes new cycle facilities from the shopping centres to Lr Kilmacud Road but there is no safe cycling up or down to N11 and N11 from Brewery Road to Stillorgan Road is substandard.

Monkstown/Dún Laoghaire – SLO 29 – Deansgrange LAP needs to prioritise active travel and the ‘Park to Park’ route needs to be an SLO with a suggested wording of: “To introduce a one-way system on Deansgrange Road, along with the provision of a dedicated two-way cycle lane.”

More priority should be given to pedestrian and cyclists in Dun Laoghaire harbor and both sides of the coastal mobility route should be connect both sides of the Coastal Mobility Route by reallocating space on Crofton Road in front of the DLR council.

Sandyford/Foxrock - segregated cycling lanes, with priority cycle traffic lights are required on the N11/Leopardstown Road junction. The extra traffic lane on the N31 should be reallocated to cycling. Various detailed proposals to cycle access and egress to South County Business Park and Central Park and also the extra traffic lane on Burton Hall Road should be converted into a cycle track.

Map 7 – SLO 18 is welcomed it should be accessible for all. Coastal defenses could be addressed by adding the S2S promenade as originally planned to the benefit of the railway and the environment.

SLO 30 Better cycling infrastructure should be provided for the DLIADT, including a dedicated cycling lane from Dún Laoghaire Dart station to the campus.

SLO 43 – improvements to Clonkeen Park are welcomed however we ask that the paths are delineated to separate cyclist and pedestrians. Cycling infrastructure is poor in the surrounding areas and needs to be improved; including Rochestown Ave, Sallynoggin village and Johntown Ave. Suggest an SLO with the following wording: “To introduce fit-for-purpose pedestrian and cycle facilities in Sallynoggin that will link to adjacent neighbourhoods and village centres, and that will enable people to access retail and recreational space, educational facilities, and employment zoned areas by active transport.”

SLO 65: LAP for Sallynoggin - Future local area plan needs to prioritise cycling and active transport infrastructure in the area. Sallynoggin has been particularly neglected, by comparison with other parts of DLR, but has a high volume of active travel in spite of this.

Request the inclusion of a specific SLO on protecting the Mountains to Metals active travel route, with the following suggested wording: “To introduce traffic calming measures and reduce the vehicular traffic flow through O’Rourke Park, Sallynoggin, to safeguarding the Mountains to Metal safe walking and cycling route”

Request the inclusion of a specific SLO: - “To construct segregated cycle lanes on Rochestown Avenue”

SLO 68 - request a time line for this

SLO 69 Cherrywood SDZ cycling infrastructure is insufficient and should be redesigned for all ages and abilities including the links to the N11.
SLO 70 Killiney Hill Park welcome measures to prioritise people arriving by active travel and the introduction of permanent vehicular traffic restrictions at certain times.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 3, 4, 5, 9, 12 and 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0320</td>
<td>Jane Coghlan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0321</td>
<td>Hughes Planning and Development Consultants</td>
<td>Windsor Motors</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission includes a detailed report in support of a request to rezone the Windsor Motors, Bray, from E to A2. This report is summarised as follows:
  - The report sets out the site location, function and context and includes a number of images to illustrate the surrounding area.
  - The report considers that the site comprises an underutilised services site within an established residential area with a range of amenities and services within walking distance and located on a strategic transport link including a new DART station at Woodbrook, Bus Connects and the future extension of the Luas green line to Bray.
  - The report considers the area to be suitable for high density residential development.
  - The report incorporates planning history for the site and adjoining lands at Wilford Court.
  - The report sets out relevant National and Regional objectives as contained in the National Planning Framework and Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy noting that development on the site would align with the objectives, notes population targets relative to Bray and the location of Bray on the North-South Corridor of the MASP.
  - The report references the Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines (2018), specifically with regard to the location and role of increased heights.
  - The report references ‘Rebuilding Ireland –Action Plan for Housing and Homelessness’ (2016) with regard to the rezoning of the site responding to housing need.
  - The report sets out the zoning objective (E) of the site together with the uses permitted in principle and open for consideration within this zoning objective.
  - The report notes the relationship with the Woodbrook-Shanganagh LAP and considers that the policies and objective in that plan would influence development of the subject site. A number of such policies and objectives are set out in the report noting that residential development within the site would be more appropriate given the proximity of the site to the LAP.
  - The report notes a change in the Draft Plan with regard to the location of the bus corridor along the Dublin Road and a ‘dezoning’ of land at the front of the site to facilitate same. The population targets for the county are referenced and a number of SLO’s within the surrounding area are set out.
  - The report references a number of policy objectives within the Draft Plan with regard to sustainable neighbourhoods, the 10-minute neighbourhood concept and transport infrastructure.
  - The report notes that support the proper planning and sustainable development of the county through the provision of adequate housing in strategic locations, close to public transport and job centres. As such, it is considered that the site would be appropriate for the rezoning objective A2 “to provide for the creation of sustainable residential neighbourhoods and preserve and protect residential amenity.” The report considers the site to be suited to residential or mixed use development.
- The report considers the current use of the site is inefficient given its location and notes that the nature of car sales is changing with single brand dealer becoming unviable and being consolidated into large scale garages requiring larger purpose built premises.
- The report refers to correspondence from the OPR which notes that Bray is identified as one of three areas where there is an allowance for additional population numbers.
- A letter from Windsor Motors is attached to the submission that details the changing nature of the motor trade with a move toward merged wholesale and retail operators in single sites and a move away from smaller sites.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0322</td>
<td>Niamh Gibbons</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- S2S on the seafront and the commuter cycleway on existing roads should be included in the County Development Plan. Infrastructure such as the S2S is critical in making cycling a safe and friendly activity for all members of the community, while the commuter cycleway is necessary to facilitate modal shifts away from the private car.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0323</td>
<td>Philip Redmond</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2, 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission notes that the area known as Mullens Field has been used as a public park since the 1950’s and requests that it is not built upon.
- Submission notes that there is a much bigger park in Merville that could be used, or Deerpark in Mt Merrion.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0324</td>
<td>Dónal Crowe</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission welcomes the mix requirements for residential development noting that it will be vital for achieving long-term sustainable communities.
- Submission queries if the mix will apply to BTR schemes or if SPPR 8 of the Design Standards for New Apartments will take precedence – as reference to SPPR 8 is set out in the submission.
- Submission notes that BTR has a part to play in the housing market, however lower standards would be to the detriment of other typologies. An over provision of high rent 1-2 bed units would not solve affordability in dlr.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0325</td>
<td>Sarah Robertson</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Request that the S2S is not moved away from the seafront. The "inland" proposals are unsafe and will bring hardship to many residents and businesses of DLRCC. Considers that the deviations from the S2S imposed in Blackrock last summer show the very real impact on the local businesses.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0326</td>
<td>Dervla King</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The submission welcomes the proposal for a Local Area Plan for the Sallynoggin area. The submission highlights that any future local area plan needs to prioritise cycling and active transport infrastructure in the area.
- The submission notes the excellent developments in the County i.e. biodiversity initiatives in the parks; the Coastal Mobility Route; new street furniture in Blackrock/Dun Laoghaire/ Glasthule/ Dalkey; proposals for safe cycling routes to schools, etc. and would welcome the chance to bring some of these initiatives into the Sallynoggin area.
- The submission welcomes the policy objective to support the Estate Management structures and programmes.
- With respect to SLO 43 – the submission highlights that cycling infrastructure provision is extremely undeserved, and dangerous. In addition, footpaths, and entrances to retail units do not prioritise pedestrians making it a very hostile environment for pedestrians, cyclists, and other road users.
- SLO 43 should be amended as follows:
  - “To introduce fit-for-purpose pedestrian and cycle facilities in Sallynoggin that will link to adjacent neighbourhoods and village centres, and that will enable people to access retail and recreational space, educational facilities, and employment zoned areas by active transport”.
- The Plan should include a specific SLO on protecting the Mountains to the Metals with the following suggested wording, “To introduce traffic calming measures and reduce the vehicular traffic flow through O’Rourke Park, Sallynoggin, in order to safeguard the Mountains to Metal safe walking and cycling route”.
- In line with Chapters 3 and 4 of the Draft Plan the residents are eager to see the development of the public realm within the Sallynoggin area and this should be considered as part of Plan for examples public lighting, seating in public spaces for example.
- The submission supports the Nature Based Play Philosophy and highlights that the current playground situated in ‘Joey’s’ (i.e. St Joseph’s Football Club), is quite limited for the population of Sallynoggin and could do with modernisation.
- There is also a lack of civic spaces in Sallynoggin and this should be considered in any future Local Area Plan.
- The lanes in the Pearse Estates need to be improved which would enhance the area.
- The planning for biodiversity and greening of urban spaces are of interest to the Sallynoggin Estate Management Forum and the recent community-led initiatives include the creation of a common garden in Sallynoggin Park, and the appointment of a biodiversity officer on the Estate Management Forum should be noted.
- The following SLO’s should be considered for inclusion in the Plan:
  - “To upgrade the green spaces in the Sallynoggin area, in a manner that maximises their potential use for recreation and exercise by children, teenagers, women, older people, and people with other mobility requirements.
  - To enhance biodiversity within the Sallynoggin area, through promoting wilderness areas in existing green spaces and the conversion of at least part of the Pearse Estates lanes into green spaces with wildflower planting”.
- The problems with litter in the Sallynoggin area should be addressed, the new “dlr Parklet” installed on Sallynoggin Road has attracted increased litter and needs to be accompanied by a bin.
- In addition, the submission would welcome more dog fouling signs in the area and regular road sweeping of main roads and laneways.
- The work carried out by Parks/Waste Management of the Council is acknowledged.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4, 5 8 9 and Chapter 14

| DLR Submission No: B0327 | Person: Justin McKenna | Organisation: N/A | Map Nos: 2,3 |

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Request that the Plan does not abandon the S2S proposals.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
### Chapter 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0328</td>
<td>Maurice Dockrell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission in support of the Kearns family, 12 Pine Lawn, Blackrock.
- Submission notes a zoning anomaly of the property and requests that the entire property is designated for residential use.
- It is noted that the property was zoned for residential use at the time it was granted planning permission.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0329</td>
<td>Keith Long</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0330</td>
<td>Robert English</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0331</td>
<td>Helen Burrows</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Welcomes the proposed east coast cycle route from Corbawn Drive to along the edge of the coast and to incorporate coastal preservation/protection works as part of the project. The cycle way along Corbawn Drive would have a negative impact on the local residents. The coastal protection works need to be done so it makes sense to do it together especially as the rate of erosion is increasing.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0332</td>
<td>Benjamin Halsall</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission notes that Marlborough Road was developed from 1870 onwards, in three phases. The dwelling in the ownership of the observer is one of the 20th century dwellings, which are smaller than those of 19th century with a simpler finish.
- The dwelling contributes to the architectural heritage of the area by virtue of its location, its design and finishes being generally consistent with other houses and its site layout and boundary treatment.
- The dwelling needs to be upgraded including its energy performance, and possibly extended in the near future. The proposed ACA designation may prove unduly restrictive in this respect.
- The submission requests that the character appraisal report for the ACA is amended stating that proposals for extensions to the houses within the ACA, particularly those of 20th century, will be treated favourably provided that such are visually subservient to the original and employ materials which are in keeping with the existing.
- The submission welcomes the inclusion of Marlborough Road ACA in the Development Plan, save for this caveat.
### Summary of Submission and Observation:

#### DLR Submission No: B0333
**Person:** Rebecca Smyth  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 7

- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

**Appendix 4**

#### DLR Submission No: B0334
**Person:** Sorcha  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 5, 9

#### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- **SNI:** Submission requests that a CPO is put on the "Blue House" site in Ballinteer (Between Broadford Rise, Our Lady's and Applegreen) to provide a community use such as a scout den, noting that an existing den no longer has green space and such a facility could host other services.

#### Libraries:
- Submission states that a library is needed in the Ballyogan / Stepaside area.

#### Inclusion:
- Submission requests that people with disabilities should have opportunity to inform development with a similar approach for Travellers, including those with disabilities.

#### Density:
- Submission requests that an obsession with high density is stopped as it results in poor quality of life – it is only appropriate in certain locations and storage space is required.
- Submission states that the suburbs and rural areas should contain that form of design.
- Submission states that medium-high density is isolating and excludes people with disabilities, older people and families.

#### Housing for All:
- Submission states that housing for all is possible – this would require applying higher standards.
- Submission requests that Traveller accommodation policy removes local connection requirements.
- Submission states that additional refuges are required including men’s and juniors’ refuges and safe houses for those who do not qualify for a refuge.
- Submission requests that high support units are required for people with certain care needs.

#### Housing Mix:
- Submission requests that housing development contains 10% single storey units.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

**Chapter 4, Chapter 12**

#### DLR Submission No: B0335
**Person:** David Fitzgerald  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 7

- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

#### DLR Submission No: B0336
**Person:** John Spain Associates  
**Organisation:** Secretary of State for Foreign Commonwealth and Development Affairs of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland  
**Map Nos:** 6

### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission relates to the addition of The Glasshouse (RPS No. 2000) and The Walled Garden (RPS No. 2079) at Glencairn House, Murphystown Way.
- Submission notes a number of structures already included as protected structures on the RPS.
- Submission notes that notices with regard to the addition of the structures onto the RPS was received and that these additions are on foot of a Ministers recommendation.
- Submission sets out the site context and provides a description of the property including the house and grounds and notes that a permitted development to the north and east is currently under construction.
- Submission details the location and NIAH description of the walled garden and glasshouse.
- The submission requests that the addition of these structures to the RPS is reconsidered as they are already located within the curtilage of a protected structure – Glencairn House.
- The submission sets out the definition of a protected structure as per Section 13.1.1 of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines noting that all structures within the curtilage of a protected structure are included under the protection afforded. It is therefore submitted that the walled garden and glasshouse already benefit from adequate protection.
- Submission states that the addition of the structures to the RPS should not solely be taken on foot of the NIAH inclusion but should reflect an assessment undertaken by the local authority.
- Submission notes 3 extant planning permissions that refer to the newly defined curtilage of Glencairn House each of which gave careful consideration to existing protected structures. It is noted that any further developments would continue to follow this approach.
- Submission further requests that consideration be given to the operational requirements of the diplomatic premises which requires a level of security and flexibility.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0337</th>
<th>Person: Louis Hemmings</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Request that road engineers cycle the areas DLRCC are planning for cyclists in a variety of weather conditions and times of the day to understand cycling conditions. Concern with built-out junctions, cement “islands” and roundabouts design. Looking forward to using a much safer, cycling-friendly infrastructure, in the DLRCC catchment area.
- Attached a document with a poem entitled “In many ways bikes are better…”

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0338</th>
<th>Person: Joanne Morrissey</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
The submission is requesting that:
- Unused areas of public parks are planted with fruit trees to benefit both park users, quality of life, biodiversity, and wildlife.
- The planning of orchards and fruit trees to be a condition in any future housing development schemes – this will benefit children growing up in these developments.
- These developments also contain communal working garden allotments, which would contribute greatly to the development of strong communities in large apartment complexes, such as Cualanor.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0339</th>
<th>Person: Michael F. Curley</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7
### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission seeks the provision of a free public skate park in Dún Laoghaire. It could be located within the ferry terminal or indeed on the Carlisle pier and could be closed to users after 10.30pm to prevent other engaging in anti-social behaviour.
- Currently, the only free activities for young people in the area are cycling, swimming and walking. Skateboarders are serious sportspeople (now an Olympic sport) with no accessible facilities. The skate park would harness the positive energy of young citizens and enhance their lives.
- Submission considers that significant amounts are spent on big sailing events in Dún Laoghaire. These events are sporadic and it’s questionable how much revenue is generated for the town. A state of the art Skate park facility would attract users from all over the country all year round putting Dun Laoghaire on the map as the top Irish destination for this sport.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 8**

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Seeking the deletion of the first 10 lines (first four sentences) of Section 8.5.6 George’s Place, which refers to the redevelopment of the former Council depot and a proposed future pedestrian connection through Stable Lane to the seafront.
- Opposed to the opening of the emergency door from the former Council depot through to Stable Lane and the creation of a pedestrian connection for the following reasons:
  - Increase pedestrian traffic to and from the lane which will have a negative impact on the privacy of the lane as it’s currently a quite cul de sac/private laneway.
  - Impact on parking for residents as there is no off-street parking available.
  - Increased pedestrian traffic/access will impact on the security of homes on Stable Lane and increase the potential for antisocial behaviour, while diminishing the peace and calm of the lane.
  - The connection is unnecessary as there is already connectivity available to the seafront a very short walk away e.g. at Kelly’s lane.
- Note that Stable Lane has not been taken in charge (the submission refers to an attached letter which does not appear to have uploaded).

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 8**

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The submission welcomes work the Council are doing with respect to the completion a Wildlife Corridor Plan for the County.
- The submission notes that the Supplementary Map B1 that accompanies the current Draft of the Development Plan is to be updated with the output from the Council’s Wildlife Corridor Plan and looks forward to updated details with respect to the wildlife corridor that connects Fitzsimons Wood with Three Rock Mountain clearly displayed on the amended Supplementary Map B1.
- It is assumed that this will accompany the next Draft of the 2022-2028 Development Plan.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 8**

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0344</td>
<td>Michael Casey</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field is not retained as public open space and not rezoned, noting its important amenity value.
• Submission notes the loss of local amenities in the area.
• Three photographs of people attending events were attached with the submission.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0345</td>
<td>Helen Toner</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.
• Submission considers residential development on the lands at Clonkeen College will have an adverse impact on residents and student’s safety, traffic congestion and parking due to increased traffic volume.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4, Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0346</td>
<td>John Ryan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission notes that lands to the south of Slate Cabin Lane are zoned B for rural development and agriculture, however the character of the lands does not comply with that description, rather it consists of houses on sites of varying size and the development plan should reflect the current character.
• Submission notes that the lands to the north of the lane are zoned A where the character is identical to the south. It is therefore requested that both sides of the lane share the same zoning.
• Submission notes that different zonings differ in objectives in terms of character, arrangements for traffic, pedestrian and services.
• Submission notes the sense of community in the area and considers that a consistent zoning would ensure the cohesion of the community.
• The submission suggests that a shared zoning along the south side of the lane, should be confined to lands which have their access from the lane.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0347</td>
<td>Jane Jenkinson</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0348</td>
<td>Judith Hally</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission notes that Marlborough Road was developed from 1870 onwards, in three phases. The dwelling in the ownership of the observer is one of the 20th century dwellings, which are smaller than those of 19th century with a simpler finish.
- The dwelling contributes to the architectural heritage of the area by virtue of its location, its design and finishes being generally consistent with other houses and its site layout and boundary treatment.
- The dwelling needs to be upgraded including its energy performance, and possibly extended in the near future. The proposed ACA designation may prove unduly restrictive in this respect.
- The submission requests that the character appraisal report for the ACA is amended stating that proposals for extensions to the houses within the ACA, particularly those of 20th century, will be treated favourably provided that such are visually subservient to the original and employ materials which are inkeeping with the existing.
- The ACA should also be amended to incorporate a wider area including the lands along Adelaide Road and Station Road.
- The submission welcomes the inclusion of Marlborough Road ACA in the Development Plan, save for this caveat.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Appendix 4

**DLR Submission No:** B0349  
**Person:** Siobhan Dorman  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 3

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Propose a skate park in the vicinity of the harbour

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Appendix 8

**DLR Submission No:** B0350  
**Person:** Marian O’Shea  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 2,3

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
The submission is broken into four main items, which relate to Map 3 as follows:
- Monkstown Heronry – Heron’s roost and nest in several trees in the Monkstown. The heronry is an important part of Monkstown’s natural heritage and it forms a link with the Dublin Bay Natura 2000. The submission requests that all these trees should be preserved by a Tree Preservation Order, and the herons should be protected from adverse impacts during construction and operation.
- Stradbrook Stream – The Stradbrook stream flows through Monkstown and provides a continuous biodiversity corridor discharging to the Dublin Bay SACs. Protection of this natural biodiversity corridor is important as development in Monkstown may result in a risk of increased culverting. To preserve the Stradbrook Stream Wildlife Corridor, the submission suggests that the following lands adjoining the stream should be zoned for Open Space:
  - North side of Dalguise estate.
  - North side of former Cheshire Home grounds.
  - South Side of Glensilva grounds.
  - Both banks of the stream at Alma Place.
- Submission request that the northeast corner of Carrickbrennan Lawn should be zoned for Open Space.
- Light Pollution –To reduce light pollution, lighting which accompanies any development should be appropriately designed, with the light source shielded or cowed, and the fixture directed straight downwards. Conditions could be attached at the planning approval stage on the type of lighting, and guidelines could be issued to developers and applicants. The Council should also be mindful of correctly lighting its own properties. Guidelines on best practice for the installation of outdoor lighting should be either incorporated into the Development Plan or published as a separate document and referred to in the Development Plan.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Chapter 9, Chapter 12, Map 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0351</th>
<th>Person: Paul Murphy</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0352</th>
<th>Person: Helen Griffin</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerns about the safety of the current East Coast Cycle route through Corbawn and the potential effects on our community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Welcomes DLR's commitment to carry out a feasibility study to re-route the East Coast Cycle path by the coast at Corbawn, and incorporate this into the coastal protection works as coastal erosion is an ongoing issue and the alternative cycle route is superior in terms of cycling and coastal protection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0353</th>
<th>Person: Frances</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerned about the safety and congestion issues of the current plan of the East Coast cycle route going through Corbawn Drive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0354</th>
<th>Person: Malcolm Argyle</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission states that the property owners do not consent to having Overton, Kilmacud Road Upper (RPS No. 2126) listed on the RPS and request that it is removed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerns raised in relation to financial implications due to maintenance, insurance and devaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes grant constraints, further controls, legal obligations, invasion of privacy associated with the protection of the property.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0355</th>
<th>Person: Ita Robinson</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission considers that connecting the luas from Dundrum down to 46A and/or the DART at Booterstown via bus route/light rail would give a lot more options for people to use public transport into the city centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Goatstown/Clonskeagh needs more development as a village/community focal point. Goatstown Cross and Bird Ave are currently too limited and congested with traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0356</th>
<th>Person: Grainne Byrden</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Welcomes DLR's commitment for a feasibility study to re-route the East Coast Cycle Trail by the coast &amp; incorporate coastal protection works between Corbawn Lane &amp; the new Woodbrook station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chief Executive's Report on Draft Plan Consultation

Volume II – Summary of Submissions Received

- Concerned about coastal erosion at Corbawn. The alternative cycle trail will provide a better solution for cycling and coastal erosion.
- Concerned about the safety & congestion issues of the current East Coast Cycle Trail route through Corbawn & impact on the residents.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Chapter 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0357</td>
<td>Damian Loscher</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission re: addition of Coolgreen, Brennanstown Road (RPS No. 2050) to the RPS.
- Submission notes that planning history that would have allowed for the replacement of the property and that the property fell into disrepair resulting in many original features being lost.
- Submission queries the basis for adding the property to the RPS – it is noted that:
  - The property was the home of Sir Edward O'Farrell, a member of the British Establishment, but not a figure of historic or literary importance, and
  - There is no evidence that the property is an Orpen-designed home.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Appendix 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0358</td>
<td>Niall Tully</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2, 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Map 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0359</td>
<td>John Halligan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Supports East Coast Trail.
- Current Routing doesn’t work.
- Concerned about coast erosion.
- Welcomes DLR’s commitment for a feasibility study to re-route the East Coast Cycle trail by the coast at Corbawn and incorporate into coastal protection works between Corbawn Lane and the new Woodbrook Dart station.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Chapter 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0360</td>
<td>His Excellency, The Honourable Gary Gray AO Australian Ambassador to Ireland</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

**Background**

- Abbey Lea has been the residence of the Australian Ambassador since it was purchased by the Australian Government in 1964. Marino Avenue West is not within the title of Abbey Lea, but it is understood that it is owned privately and that various parties have rights of way over same. The ROW is of interest to the Australian Government given the Avenue’s proximity to Abbey Lea’s long southern boundary which runs nearly the entire length of Marino Avenue West, representing almost 50 per cent of the residential perimeter surrounding the Avenue.

**Nomination as ROW**
Further details as to how this proposal has come about, who nominated the Avenue for inclusion and why the notice has proceeded at this time would be appreciated, especially given no other nearby laneways nor Marino Avenue East have been included.

**Pedestrian Safety/Vehicular Movement**

- Since the Australian Government purchased Abbey Lea almost 60 years ago there has been considerable residential development in the area, resulting in increased foot traffic along Marino Avenue West as a shortcut to the Killiney DART station and the beach by nearby residents, effectively establishing Marino Avenue West as a right of way for pedestrian traffic, to which there is no objection.
- There is no footpath on Marino Avenue West and any increase in vehicular traffic would pose a safety risk to pedestrians. Consequently, the public ROW should only be open to pedestrian traffic and the submitter requests confirmation that the Council supports no increase in vehicular traffic. The residence frequently uses its side gate access onto Marino Avenue West; any increase in vehicles along the right of way will pose a safety risk to walkers and residents traversing the Avenue. Additional vehicles would also make it very difficult for bin collections and for emergency vehicles to access the Avenue, which is already a challenge.

**Annual Maintenance Plan**

- Request that in accordance with the provisions of the *Roads Act 1993* the Council puts in place an annual maintenance plan for Marino Avenue West to include the installation and upkeep of appropriate street lighting. DLRCC should engage with the residents to agree the provisions to maintain the safety of pedestrians and the residential neighbourhood.

**Traffic Calming Measures in the locality**

- Currently, there are no effective traffic calming measures in place at the junction of Killiney Hill Road and Marino Avenue West and there have been several near misses between pedestrians, vehicles, and cyclists at this location. Cyclists, who tend to come down Killiney Hill Road at speed, appear oblivious to the Abbey Lea driveway/the entrance to Marino Avenue West and are particularly difficult to see when departing Abbey Lea’s driveway on Killiney Hill Road or Marino Avenue West onto Killiney Hill Road in a vehicle, given the bends in the road, the weather and the need to use mirrors in order to safely turn.
- Making Marino Avenue West a pedestrian right of way will, over time, increase use by members of the public considering its proximity to Killiney and Ballybrack as well as the growth of nearby Cherrywood, for whom Killiney is the nearest beach and Killiney DART station the nearest station. However, there is no footpath on the eastern side of Killiney Hill Road and so pedestrians must cross Killiney Hill Road to access Marino Avenue West, which is a safety risk. As stated previously, the junction between Marino Avenue West and Killiney Hill Road is hazardous for all road users and given the Council’s intention to include the Avenue as a ROW, it is requested that the Council outlines what traffic calming measures are proposed so as to avoid a future accident.

**No objection subject to conditions**

- No objection in principle to the preservation of Marino Avenue West as a public right of way, on condition that the Council addresses the following:
  - The public ROW should be for pedestrian traffic only due to safety risks
  - Appropriate traffic calming measures and signage should be installed, including at the junction of Killiney Hill Road and Marino Avenue West;
  - Parking along Marino Avenue West should be prohibited to the public and available only for residents of the Avenue. perhaps through a permit system;
  - Appropriate signage should be put in place at the entrance to Marino Avenue West from Killiney Hill Road to indicate (1) a pedestrian only right of way and (2) a prohibition on public parking; and
  - An annual maintenance plan for Marino Avenue West should be established including the installation and upkeep of appropriate street lighting.

This request comes from a place of concern for the safety of pedestrians and the Ambassador does not wish for members of the public to suffer an injury while traversing this public ROW.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0361</td>
<td>Michael O’ Shea</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
• Concerned with the Falls Road and the absence of footpaths. Notes the volume of pedestrians and cyclists on the road and considers that it is dangerous without a footpath.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0362</th>
<th>Person: Nadia Jones</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• As a youth, more space and sports facilities are needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A skate park at the old marina would be a huge boost to facilities in Dún Laoghaire.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0363</th>
<th>Person: Sheila O'Malley</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requesting that a free skate park be opened in the area around the Ferry Terminal or the Carlyle Pier so that young people can enjoy an outdoor activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0364</th>
<th>Person: Karl Jones</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission objects to development on Clonkeen College site and supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0365</th>
<th>Person: Giles Fox</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2, 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that Mullen's Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0366</th>
<th>Person: Mary Kelly</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission request that Marlay needs to be declared an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additionally, to protect the historic heritage of Marlay, its wildlife and biodiversity, all concert activity needs to be removed away from the landscaped sections of this Demesne, which includes the woodlands, watercourses, the bankside, and the tree frame.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0367</th>
<th>Person: Stephanie Long</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0368</th>
<th>Person: Barbara Elliott</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0369</th>
<th>Person: Elaine Mooney</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0370</th>
<th>Person: Emily Kavanagh</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0371</th>
<th>Person: Mags Dalton</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission suggests it is an essential part of green infrastructure and provides feeding areas for protected species including Brent geese, snipe, bats and badgers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0372</th>
<th>Person: Martina Doyle</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission suggests it is an essential part of green infrastructure and provides feeding areas for protected species including Brent geese, snipe, bats and badgers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0373</th>
<th>Person: Caroline Fox</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0374</th>
<th>Person: Eoin McDonnell</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission suggests it is an essential part of green infrastructure and provides feeding areas for protected species including Brent geese, snipe, bats and badgers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLR Submission No:</td>
<td>Person:</td>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Map Nos:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0375</td>
<td>Ray Mooney</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0376</td>
<td>Michael Bird</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0377</td>
<td>Anthony G. Keane</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0378</td>
<td>Paul Mac Aree</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0379</td>
<td>Nicholas Headley</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A critical review of the process and outcomes in enforcement proceeding should be undertaken.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CDP should state the measures that will be taken to strengthen the enforcement function and include an undertaking to publish relevant statistics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0380</td>
<td>Rory O'Hagan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This summary should be read in conjunction with DLR Submission No. B0425.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The submission welcomes the inclusion of Marlborough Road ACA in the Draft County Development Plan (CDP).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• However, there is a concern that the boundaries of the proposed ACA have been too restrictive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The large houses on Adelaide Road are of considerable heritage value and they constitute the link between the developments of Silchester Road and Marlborough Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The inclusion of the properties along Adelaide Road in the Marlborough Road and Adelaide cACA represented a logical continuum of the established Silchester Road ACA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- The submission, therefore, considers that the approach to adopt the ACA now proposed is likely to fragment the unity of the original legacy of the 19th century town planning and may lead to significant adverse impacts on the architectural heritage of the area.
- The submission, therefore, requests that the Council amend the Marlborough Road ACA to incorporate a wider area including the lands along Adelaide Road and Station.
- It would also accord with the advice in the Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities, at par 3.2.5 that “The boundaries of a candidate ACA should make physical, visual and planning-control sense”.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0381</th>
<th>Person: Rachel Freedman</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission notes that the children at Dun Laoghaire Educate Together National School have limited outdoor space and requests that the council facilitates the use of Dunedin park for some of their outdoor activities.
- Submission notes that green space improves health, wellbeing and the livability of our local areas particularly for children.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0382</th>
<th>Person: Sadbh Ghiollain</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0383</th>
<th>Person: David Cunningham</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0384</th>
<th>Person: Margaret Cunningham</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0385</th>
<th>Person: Amhaoin Mallon</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.
- Submission supports the zoning of the land at Stradbrook rugby club to objective F.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 3, Map 7
### DLR Submission No: B0386
Person: Kate Sugrue  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0387
Person: Mr and Mrs P. L Lawler of Capilano Construction Ltd  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 5

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests the re-zoning of lands at Capilano, Ticknock Cross, Dublin 18, D18 W2K3 from Objective G - ‘To protect and improve high amenity areas’ to Objective A – ‘To provide residential development and/or protect and improve residential amenity’. The submission comprises a cover letter and a supporting report with map identifying the site.
- Makes the case that the re-zoning of the lands to Objective ‘A’ presents an opportunity for the delivery of residential development to meet housing demand envisaged by the Regional Planning Guidelines (sic) and will assist in rebalancing the quantum and location of ‘residential’ zoned lands currently along the Blackglen Road, extending the geographic residential development from the East of the Blackglen Road towards the West/tail end of the road.
- Submits that the re-zoning is justified in the context of meeting the medium and long term growth of the area to 2028 and beyond and notes that the re-zoning would match the zoning objective of lands within the vicinity of the subject site.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Map 5

### DLR Submission No: B0388
Person: Ray & Laura Mangan  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 2,6

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Map 2

### DLR Submission No: B0389
Person: Claire Carroll  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 2,6

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Map 2

### DLR Submission No: B0390
Person: Lorna Birrare  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 2,6

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Map 2

### DLR Submission No: B0391
Person: Anthony and Mary Collins  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 1

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
• The Dublin Eastern Bypass (DEBP) reservation should be omitted from the Plan. The move to more sustainable modes of transport is reflected in national and regional policy. The DEBP is contrary to these policies. The DEBP has been a planning blight for more than 40 years on the lands outlined in the submission at Drummartin Lodge to the East Drummartin Road and for other sites. The removal would increase the supply of zoned residential lands which could help meet the demand for housing. There is insufficient detail on the DEBP in the Draft Plan and it will not “protect and enhance amenities of the area”.
• Policy in the National Planning Framework 2040 is set out including National Policy Objectives and National Strategic Outcomes along with the National Development Plan. Regional Policy Objectives from the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy – Eastern and Midlands Regional Assembly. Key Targets, policies and objectives relevant to the concerns raised are also referred to from Smarter Travel the Development Plan Guidelines and the current County Development Plan. Submission refers to policy objectives from the Draft which support sustainable travel, avoid shift improve approach and the DEBP. The submission also refers to shifting focus towards the pedestrian, cyclist and public transport user in ‘Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area (GDA), 2016-2035’, the ‘Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets’ and the ‘National Cycling Manual’. In addition, the Dublin Eastern Bypass Corridor Protection Study is referred to shows that at the subject site is to be in tunnel, this detail is not shown on the Draft Plan.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0392</td>
<td>David Cunningham</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0393</td>
<td>Ian Murray</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0394</td>
<td>Rachel Joyce</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.
• Submission considers residential on the lands at Clonkeen College will have an adverse impact on residents of Meadow Vale. - traffic is already a significant problem in the estate
• Submission notes development would negatively impact the school community (current and future) by denying them the full benefits of the existing playing pitches at the school.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4, Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0395</td>
<td>John White</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission requests that the field at Silchester Park is rezoned from A to F.
• Submission notes that there is a long lease on the field, is maintained by the resident’s association, has been used by residents for recreation and is accessed by a key via a narrow lane way.
Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0396</th>
<th>Person: Mabel Fitzpatrick</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Strongly object to the opening of the emergency gate on to what is a private lane (Stable Lane) and not taken in charge by the Council. It will bring additional pedestrian traffic through an area which has already reached capacity.
- In addition to the residents of Connaught Place, Crofton Terrace and the houses on both sides of Stable Lane, residents also have to deal with numerous other vehicles parking in the lane.
- The lane is currently used as a turning point for many vehicles when they realise it is a cul de sac. This presents a real danger to the residents, as some of these vehicles drive at speed up the lane and then realise they have to turn.
- Submitter’s husband is elderly, with numerous health issues and uses the lane for exercise. It is already dangerous, but would be impossible if it was turned into what would, essentially, be a freeway for additional pedestrians, bicycles, scooters etc.
- To make this small residential laneway a Pedestrian Link would severely impact on the quality of life of all residents. There would also be a negative impact on the value of homes.
- There are already numerous links from the town to the seafront. i.e. Clarence Street, Kelly’s Avenue, Crofton Avenue, Charlemont Avenue and Marine Road. Cannot see any benefit to adding yet another one, which will benefit few and cause extreme disruption and stress to existing residents.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0397</th>
<th>Person: Karen Beare</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0398</th>
<th>Person: Michelle Hegarty</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0399</th>
<th>Person: Barry McDonald</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0400</th>
<th>Person: Gerard Kelly</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
### Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0401</td>
<td>Patrick Kelly</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

#### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0402</td>
<td>Deirdre Aherne</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.
- Submission considers there has been enough residential development in Cabinteely area and there is not sufficient infrastructure to cope with further development.
- Submission supports Zoning on the playing pitches in Stradbrook (Blackrock RFC) to objective F.

#### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0403</td>
<td>Mr Roderick Aherne</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission welcomes the zoning of Blackrock RFC, backing on to Wynberg Park, as Objective F and requests that this designation is maintained as it is important for local residents and their children.

#### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0404</td>
<td>Ruairi O’ Donnell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space.

#### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0405</td>
<td>Sally Anne Sloane</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Concerns about East Coast Cycle Trail going through a quiet residential area (Corbawn).
- Supports the alternative plan which incorporates the urgently needed Coastal Protection Plan.

#### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0406</td>
<td>Clara Clark</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary of Submission and Observation:
Broadly welcomes the goals, objectives and proposals of the plan. The submission quotes and raises issues with regard to specific pages and chapters of the Draft.

**Chapter 3**
- Concern that active travel is missing from the chapter.
- More emphasis on climate mitigation measures throughout the plan.
Chapter 4
- p. 71 -10 minute neighbourhood will require pre-planned cycling infrastructure, age friendly public spaces and reduced speed limits to 30 km/h for co-benefits of emission reductions and health.
- p.82 - All new homes should have solar panels, heat pumps and water harvesters as standard and accessible surface visitor parking for all housing complexes and apartments.

Chapter 5
- Welcomes the approach of the chapter. Safer routes to school should be included in policy for all schools, along with reduction of speeds to 30 km/hr around schools and residential areas and removal of barriers/kissing gates.
- 5.4.1 - speed limits must be reduced, with priority at junctions and traffic lights to pedestrians and cyclists.
- ‘Smarter Travel: A Sustainable Transport Future 2009-2020’ - Has this been revised and updated?
- 5.5.1
- User Hierarchy: 1. Pedestrians. 2. Cyclists. 3. Public transport. 4 Cars. – needs to be planned, implemented and then policed.
- P.109 Car Parking - more cycle parking at shops and shopping centres and services. Replace one car parking spaces with 10 bike spaces (= 5 Sheffield stands); include one disability/cargo bike parking space.
- 5.7.6 School Traffic zones – need clear policy and enforcement. Safer Routes to Schools needed to for all schools with segregated space.
- Policy Objective T30 - include dished footpaths at all junctions, removal of metal barriers, and priority traffic lights given to pedestrians and cyclists of all ages and abilities.
- Policy Objective T31 -
- Recommends improved directional signage from Clonkeen to Kilboggett Park, need to remove car signage from cycle lane on Leopardstown Road and segregated cycling lanes, with priority cycle traffic lights are required on the N11/Leopardstown Road junction.

Chapter 6:
- P.119: Cherrywood, Ballyogan/Carrickmines and Sandyford – need for cycle parking, segregated cycle lanes, permeability links to join up these areas and link to LUAS.
- 6.4.1 Business Districts need to be linked by segregated, connected cycle and walk ways with sufficient covered bike parking at each work hub. Showers, dry rooms should be supplied by employers.
- 6.4.2.8 Smart Dublin needs a smart, people-centred, climate conscious active travel plan. Reducing speed limits and creating more cycle-only streets to cater for all ages and abilities, including cargo bikes, disabled cyclists, and children. People living in apartments and terraced houses need secure cycle parking.
- 6.4.2.12 public venues must be accessible for all ages and abilities by bicycle and walking, with covered cycle parking.
- 6.4.2.15 S2S needs to be completed as per previous Development Plans.

Chapter 7
- Improvements such as the Covid-19 ones in Blackrock and Dundrum are examples of what we need. Places which are accessible safe and useable by all ages and abilities by active travel along with place making are required.

Chapter 8
- GI and biodiversity should be integrated into all plans for development new builds and retrofits and including private developments.

Chapter 9
- Sets out views of the purpose of parks, greenways and open space. Open spaces should be considered destinations along the general cycle network. Space for biodiversity, travel, relaxation and play is important.
- Greenway networks are welcomed; important to remove all barriers and kissing gates that preclude access. Linkages are very important.
- Regional parks - it is important to remove all barriers and kissing gates that precludes access, linkages and signage is essential along with seating, cycle parking, litter bins, off leash dog areas.
- District Parks – need lots of local amenities including cycle parking, litter bins, skate parks etc for older teenagers.
• Blackrock Park – Upgraded surfaces are welcomed, the Deepwell tunnel is still a problem and the pinch point along the Dart line for passing bicycles, buggies of all types, CPO is needed to address this.
• Local Parks – In addition to playgrounds there is a need for seating, litter bins, trees etc. Local parks should be available for schools for outdoor activities and nature learning.
• Amenity Open Spaces need to be more practical with picnic tables, seating, trees and bushes and landscaping for nature base play.
• Civic Spaces – welcomes additions to Blackrock, Dundrum and Glasthule. All public spaces should be age friendly and welcoming.

9.4.1.1 – include Sheffield bike stands at all sports grounds and play areas.

Chapter 10
Policy Objective EI15 air and noise pollution can be reduced by more active travel and less car use, reducing speed limits to 30 km/h in all built up areas and around all schools. Additional air monitors on main roads are needed.

Chapter 12
Ecological Impact Assessment: Can a case be made to reduce car traffic in areas deemed to impact the environment (eg Seapoint, Sandycove, Vico Road, and similar locations should not allow any car parking, other than disabled spaces)?

12.3.1.1 Design Criteria Accessibility focus on active travel for all ages and abilities.

12.3.2.1 part quoted with an example.

12.3.2.5 Recommends adding further detail with regard to signage, traffic management and 30km/h speed limits.

12.3.4 Recommends cycle parking at ground level for visitors and residents.

12.4.1 requests priority lights for pedestrians and cyclists at all traffic-light junctions.

12.4.3: Travel Plans – requests that measures for cycling, walking and cycle parking are made mandatory.

12.4.5 – 12.4.6 requests more emphasis on cycle parking and queries where are the cycle parking standards (including cargo bike)?

12.8.1 requests that picknick tables, benches and litter bins, dog paddocks cycle parking are added to the hard landscaping list.

Chapter 14
Coastal defence along Dart incorporating this into the S2S would benefit both the Dart and the delivery of the S2S.

Blackrock Park - welcomes work to date on paths. Calls for wide pedestrian and cycle links to Dart Station and Blackrock village.

Stillorgan – Welcomes new cycle facilities from the shopping centres to Lr Kilmacud Road but there is no safe cycling up or down to N11 and N11 from Brewery Road to Stillorgan Road is substandard.

Monkstown/Dún Laoghaire – SLO 29 – Deansgrange LAP should include a segregated cycle lane on the Deansgrange Road.

Sandyford/Foxrock - segregated cycling lanes, with priority cycle traffic lights are required on the N11/Leopardstown Road junction

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 3,4,5,8,10,12, 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0407</td>
<td>Ian Whitehouse</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0408</td>
<td>Gene Feighery</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission welcomes and supports the addition of Dun Leary House (RPS No. 2131) to the RPS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Submission notes the location of the property on a landmark site between Dún Laoghaire and Monkstown.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0409</td>
<td>Conor Murphy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0410</td>
<td>Gene Feighery</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• The submission requests that the ‘Pay to Play’ intervention on the public open space at Monkstown Leisure Centre on Monkstown Road through the introduction of enclosed football fields is removed and returned to fully accessible open space for the community.
• The Pandemic has highlighted the value and necessity for accessible open space for the public and the submission states that the open space at Monkstown Leisure Centre is inaccessible to the public in its current form.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0411</td>
<td>Peter Sloan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Welcomes DLR’s commitment for a feasibility study to re-route the East Coast Cycle Trail by the coast & incorporate coastal protection works between Corbawn Lane & the new Woodbrook station.
• Notes there has been coastal erosion and coastal protection promised in Shankill/Killiney and the cycle route will provide the coastal protection required.
• Concerned about the safety & congestion issues of the current East Coast Cycle Trail route through Corbawn & impact on the residents.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0412</td>
<td>Ó Gráda and Associates, Planning Consultants</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• The submission relates to the proposed objective SLO 10 relating to the area of Dún Laoghaire that includes Library Road, Rosary Gardens East and West, and Cross Avenue, which reads “To retain, improve and encourage the provision of sustainable neighbourhood infrastructure facilities.”
• The submission also notes objective SLO 152 of the current 2016-2022 County Development Plan, in particular the heritage value of that area includes homes being built for families of Dún Laoghaire’s veterans of World War One.
• The submission requests retention of Objective SLO 152 unchanged.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0413</td>
<td>Gene Feighery</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:
• The submission requests that as part of Tree Planting Objective, that a number of trees are planted on the extended footpath on Tivoli Road.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0414</th>
<th>Person: Jim Harding</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes concern over proposal to develop Clonkeen College and impact it would have on residents of Meadowvale.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Such a development will more than double the traffic at the entrance to Meadowvale. There is only one road entrance to Meadowvale.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes how previous developments have affected Meadow Vale residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4, Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0415</th>
<th>Person: Peadar McGing</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4, Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0416</th>
<th>Person: Adam Roche</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4, Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0417</th>
<th>Person: Liam Dodd</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission considers development on the school lands will increase traffic in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission states the need for green spaces for a good quality of life/wildlife.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4, Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0418</th>
<th>Person: Anne McGrath</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context: Person lives near Pottery Road in Dun Laoghaire.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agreement that no new apartments should be permitted in the area until (post) 2028 as too many apartments are currently being built.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
### DLR Submission No: B0419
Person: Morgan O'Connell  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 5, 8, 9

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission notes that the mountain area between Three Rock and Barnacullia/Woodside is an important area in respect of scenic amenity and wildlife (including the endangered Red Grouse) and is easily accessible to walkers from a large population area. It should be protected and the “Leave no trace” approach implemented.
- Mountain Biking and Hiking do not mix well, however, the Dublin mountains are big enough to accommodate both but both pursuits need separation.
- The area with views over Dublin Bay should be protected for walkers with perhaps one carefully chosen access biking route from Barnacullia and one from near Lamb Doyles to join the existing Coillte biking trails and hopefully future, sensitively developed, bike tracks around Three Rock.
- Ideally, these two suggested new access routes should not join or cross walking routes and should be camouflaged from views over the Bay. The relevant authorities can work with landowners to find solutions before irreparable changes have occurred.
- The submission includes some photographs of the on-going tree loss, tree damage, and damage to trails as a result of mountain biking, and a recent article from Pamorama with respect to the Dublin Mountains.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 9 and Chapter 8

---

### DLR Submission No: B0420
Person: Sarah McGuinness  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI  
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Map 7

---

### DLR Submission No: B0421
Person: Trish Morrison - Paul Morrison  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 3, 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- This submission is a revision to submission no. B0239 and has raised the same issues with respect to the Marlborough Road ACA.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Appendix 4

---

### DLR Submission No: B0422
Person: Olivia Donnelly  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI  
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Map 7

---

### DLR Submission No: B0423
Person: Ljiljana Adamovic  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 1, 2, 5

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests that SLOs are added for Clonskeagh / Dundrum and Booterstown / Blackrock / Stillorgan to facilitate, support and enhance the development of local schools, namely Goatstown Educate Together Secondary School, Ballinteer ETS and a sports hall at St Tiernans.
• Submission states that a lack of co-operation and coordination between dlr and DES results in students spending time in facilities that do not meet minimum standards.
• Submission states that money is wasted on temporary accommodation and there is a lack of will to address issues.
• Submission sets out how long each of the above schools have campaigned for improved facilities.
• Submission includes an extract from the Dublin Gazette in relation to the granting of permission for the Ballineteer ETS which includes an indoor sports hall for St Tiernans.
• Submission notes that the Goatstown ETS will remain on the Notre Dame site for the next year as an application for a new school has been withdrawn.
• Submission notes safety concerns raised by DES in relation to pedestrian links during the construction of the new school and an inability to engage with dlr while the application was on appeal.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4

DLR Submission No: B0424
Person: Christy Hughes
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 6

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Concerned with the use of Stillorgan reservoir for a public park. Privacy will be negatively impacted upon due to overlooking of house and garden. Considers visual and audio intrusion would become a permanent feature should a park development go ahead.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 14

DLR Submission No: B0425
Person: Rory O’Hagan
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 3, 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• This summary should be read in conjunction with DLR Submission No. B0425.
• The submission welcomes the inclusion of Marlborough Road ACA in the Draft County Development Plan (CDP).
• However, there is a concern that the boundaries of the proposed ACA have been too restrictive.
• The large houses on Adelaide Road are of considerable heritage value and they constitute the link between the developments of Silchester Road and Marlborough Road.
• The submission, therefore, requests that the Council amend the Marlborough Road ACA to incorporate a wider area including the lands along Adelaide Road and Station.
• It would also accord with the advice in the Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities, at par 3.2.5 that “The boundaries of a candidate ACA should make physical, visual and planning-control sense”.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

DLR Submission No: B0426
Person: Danielle Byrne
Organisation: Bullock Harbour Preservation Association
Map Nos: 4

Summary of Submission and Observation:
General Summary:
• W zoning (to include flooding section) for Bullock needs to be amended to exclude all residential uses.
• Amend SLO28 to state: “Any development shall have regard to the special nature of the area in terms of the height, scale, architecture and density of built form and shall comprise commercial marine-based activity and public water-based recreational uses, and shall only comprise uses that are compatible with the flooding (including wave over-topping) to which the site is subject”.
• Why is the Masterplan (July 2020), commissioned under Policy OCR15 of the 2016-2022 CDP, not referenced in the draft CDP?
• Section 10 Next Steps of the Masterplan should be incorporated into the draft CDP.
• BHPA not anti all development at Bullock Harbour. However the area behind the blue cottage, Castleview, and to the rear of the Western Marine site is unsuitable for residences. It would be an ideal site for harbour and marine related uses.

Chapter 6:
• Policy Objective E17: Maritime Economy – broadly based – would benefit from better understanding of the physical infrastructure required to support the maritime economy Maritime use of the site adjacent to Bullock harbour needs to be sustained as it is the only commercial/industrial structure located beside a slipway on the east coast between Wicklow town and the northside of Dublin.

Chapter 8:
• Policy Objective GIB3: Seascape: Welcome policy objective to carry out a Seascape Assessment as the seascape over Bullock is important as is has exceptional public accessibility which is rare in that area.
• Policy Objective GIB8: Coastline parks and harbours: CDP needs to reference Bullock Harbour specifically as a coastline public amenity – one of few places in area which has public accessibility to sea.
• Policy Objective GIB10: Dublin Bay Biosphere: Bullock Harbour offers access for recreational potential to be studied due to the abundant marine and bird life in the area.

Chapter 9:
• Policy Objective OSR11: Water-Based Sports: Bullock is important as it provides public access and a slipway for kayaking, rowing, fishing and sailing. Water based sports would benefit from access to changing and toilet facilities, boat storage, vehicle access, facilities to support training and supervision. These points were raised in the Masterplan.

Chapter 10:
• Flooding occurs at Bullock Harbour due to wave over topping during bad weather conditions. This makes the site unsuitable for residences. (numerous photos of flooding and over topping provided). Also, the unpredictable nature of the volumes of water that can occur from overtopping is stated. Climate change has led to a significant increase in flooding and wave over-topping with accompanying health and safety risk conditions.

Chapter 11:
• The Heritage chapter of the CDP focusses on the piers as Protected Structures, however, an understanding of the historic, natural and industrial heritage of Bullock Harbour would be beneficial for developers to have a context for their proposals. A history of the harbour is provided, and reference to the Masterplan is made which suggested that the harbour’s heritage and history should be emphasised more and that there is scope for a Heritage Centre at the harbour.

Chapter 13:
• Zoning Objective W: Residential use is ‘open for consideration’. A note should be added to the zoning objective stating that all residential uses in the W zoning should not be open for consideration at Bullock Harbour and be limited for consideration in Dun Laoghaire only.

Chapter 14:
• Specific Local Objective 28:
  Request that the SLO is reworded to state: “that any development shall have regard to the special nature of the area in terms of the height, scale, architecture and density of built form and shall comprise commercial marine-based activity and public water-based recreational uses, and shall only comprise uses that are compatible with the flooding to which the site is subject.”

Appendix 15 Green Infrastructure Strategy:
• This appendix refers to Bullock only in terms of boat rental and not in terms of access to coastline / pedestrian / visual amenity value.

Appendix 16 Flooding: Refer to comments on Chapter 10 above.
• Submissions includes excerpts from the DLRCC Bullock and Sandycove Harbours Masterplan July 2020 including a SWOT analysis, vision statement, concept proposals and next steps.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapters 6, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, Appendices 15 and 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0427</td>
<td>Colm Fallon</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
Objects to development of a public park in reservoir, has experienced constant noise and dust destroying our houses and cars. Concerned that the residents will have their privacy and the security of their properties compromised.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14

DLR Submission No: B0428  Person: Tony O'Connor  Organisation: N/A  Map Nos: 5

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission states that a triangular strip of land at Wesley Estate was gifted to the council as amenity space and should not be zoned A.
- Submission raises concern in relation to the subtle, but significant change to the wording of the A objective that includes ‘To provide residential development’.
- Submission refers to confirmation from the council that the strip of land in question was dedicated public open space for the residents of Wesley Estate to be left in perpetuity.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 13, Map 5

DLR Submission No: B0429  Person: Jerry Haughey  Organisation: N/A  Map Nos: 3, 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission welcomes the inclusion of Marlborough Road ACA in the Draft County Development Plan (CDP).
- The submission, requests that the Council amend the Marlborough Road ACA to incorporate a wider area including the lands along Adelaide Road and Station.
- It would also accord with the advice in the Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities, at par 3.2.5 that “The boundaries of a candidate ACA should make physical, visual and planning-control sense”.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

DLR Submission No: B0430  Person: Eoin Costello  Organisation: DigitalHQ clg  Map Nos: 3

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission on behalf of Digital HQ clg, which is a social enterprise located in Dún Laoghaire that converts empty space in listed buildings into remote working hubs to attract digital businesses and jobs. These facilities are referred to as Digital Growth Hubs.
- DigitalHQ currently operates on the upper floors of Bank of Ireland, 101 George’s Street. Thanks to the support of Bank of Ireland they operate a 10-office community enterprise centre at 101 George’s Street. The submission provides a range of material on the organisation’s background, personnel, experience and mission.
- Submission notes that the draft County Development plan acknowledges that the role of town centres is changing with a move towards multifunctionality and what is called “experiential retail”.
- Predict that within the next 10 years up to 50% of currently unoccupied retail space and buildings in town centres will become remote working hubs, but only if towns can provide a suitable environment for digital and creative talent.
- The National Remote Working Employee Survey has found 94% of workers would like to work remotely some or all of the time when the Covid-19 crisis ends. However, research has also identified the negative health effects of working from home and a decrease in innovation.
- Coworking spaces can address the issues associated with commuting as they are located in a person’s locality whilst also helping to address some of the negative issues associated with working from home on a continual basis.
- There is insufficient high-quality office space available in Dún Laoghaire to attract innovation driven enterprises. Equally there is significant footfall on the seafront town but this has a very low capture rate for the businesses on the main street.
Supports the proportionate conversion of empty space above shops into residential but believe that larger scale conversion to residential is harmful to the town’s long term viability and a critical mass of businesses as an attraction of footfall and expenditure.

Notes that the submitter has, since 2017, had discussions with officials in DLR CoCo outlining that DigitalHQ clg seeks a permanent base in the town to support the scaling up of activities.

Proposals for Digital Growth Hubs in Dún Laoghaire

Submission comments on investment in Dun Laoghaire and also the amount required to sensitively repurpose the vacant buildings identified.

Submission supports the Draft Dún Laoghaire Interim Urban Framework Plan’s objectives for placemaking and creating vitality including the distinct ‘Quarters’ approach. Submission suggests that each quarter could contain a coworking space. The submission identifies four unoccupied, listed buildings in Council/State ownership which would benefit from refurbishment, conservation and repair as follows:

Old Town Quarter - No. 9 Georges Place and No. 3 Kellys Avenue, Dún Laoghaire (Formerly Offices and Stores for the Council Depot)

‘Dunlaoire Enterprise Centre’ opened approximately 20 years ago in the former fire station which is located beside No 9. It provided 17 individual units of office space and closed in 2019. A further loss of enterprise space in the Old Town Quarter occurred in 2020 when the Harbour Business Centre closed with the loss of 8 offices for small businesses.

In terms of the planning context for these two adjoining buildings in George’s Place “the Plan supports the adaptation and reuse of the existing buildings on the site including the sensitive redevelopment of the Protected Structures.” Specific Local Objective - 31 To seek the redevelopment of the obsolete area at the Fire Station in accordance with the objectives of the Interim Dún Laoghaire Urban Framework Plan and the forthcoming Dún Laoghaire and Environs Local Area Plan.

DigitalHQ have submitted a detailed proposal for how the two adjoining empty properties in George’s Place could be sensitively repurposed as a vibrant enterprise campus which would cater for a mix of small businesses, social enterprises and digital/creatives.

Old Town Quarter – Former Carnegie Library Building – corner of Library Road & Lower Georges Street

Town Centre Quarter - Former Senior College Dun Laoghaire building, Eblana Avenue Quarter

Park End Quarter – Park House, 66 Georges Street, Dún Laoghaire (on the corner with Park Road).

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Appendix 8

DLR Submission No: B0431
Person: Adam Shanley
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 2,6

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 2

DLR Submission No: B0432
Person: Karen Donovan
Organisation: Office of Public Works (OPW)
Map Nos: Flood Zone maps 1, 9, 10, 14,

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission;
  • welcomes various policy objectives contained in the Draft Plan
  • highlights opportunities for the Draft Plan to address.
  • Considers flood zone images are small and difficult to read
  • Recommends that flood zone maps are referenced in the SFRA appendix
  • Notes reference to Annex A in Dundrum which is then not included
  • Notes reference to www.floodmaps which is no longer used for historic flood events, www.floodino.ie is the new website

Climate Change
Submission welcomes discussion on climate change but considers that it has not been considered in the plan making stage and is only considered in development design.

Green Infrastructure
Submission welcomes appendix 15. GI Strategy but notes that updates are required particularly in relation to National CFRAM and PFRA references.

- Submission requests that consideration be given to inclusion of the following in the Draft Plan

Objective to state that all applications for development must be accompanied by an SFRA (this is stated in the SFRA).

Objective on wave overtopping and impact of climate change on sea levels

**Justification Tests**
Submission considers that the SFRA is not clear that some areas have failed the Plan Making Justification Test as the text does not stand out.

**Dundrum**
The Council should consider including certain objectives as part of zonings for the areas that have failed the Justification test. The Council should liaise with gym owners to put in place an emergency plan.

**Rathmichael**
Submission notes that flood extents are greater than the CFRAM extents but also notes that areas that fail have not been rezoned. Consideration should be given to inclusion of a policy objective.

**Old Connaught**
Submission recommends that consideration be given to rezoning undeveloped land in flood zone A and B from objective A1 to a water compatible rezoning or attach policy objectives to zonings so that the sequential approach is applied.

The A1 zoning overlaps with the potential future scenarios flood extent maps prepared under the National CFRAM programme. Climate adaptation objectives should be considered for this site.

**Crinken Stream**
Submission queries whether development is proposed in at risk locations.

**Deansgrange Stream**
Submission contends that there are at-risk locations zoned as “existing residential” which have not been addressed in the Justification test. Submission suggests attaching an objective to address this issue.

**Shanganagh River**
Submission suggests attaching objectives to address issue of areas at risk of flooding. Submission agrees with assessment for Mill Lane area which assumes flood defences are not in place.

**Carrickmines.**
Submission includes comments on Cherrywood area.

Submission suggests attaching objectives to address issue of areas at risk of flooding at Carrickmines

Submission recommends that residual flood risk needs to be considered

The A1 zoning overlaps with the potential future scenarios flood extent maps prepared under the National CFRAM programme. Climate adaptation objectives should be considered for these areas.

**Dundrum Slang**
Submission suggest attaching objectives to zoning of area that have not passed Plan Making Justification test.

**River Dodder**
Submission raises a query in relation to the flood map extents in the SFRA, the flood maps (map 1) and National CFRAM maps.

**Little Darlege**
Submission comments on the ESB substation, which is a water compatible use at Dodder Park.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Appendix 15, Appendix 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person: Niall Mullally</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0434</td>
<td>Pat Sweetman</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0435</td>
<td>A. Timoney</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Submission suggests the Plan prioritise cycling and pedestrian infrastructure (particularly Cornelscourt/Cabinteely)
- Submission calls for the use of more Zebra pedestrian crossings over traffic lights to improve the flow of pedestrians and traffic.
- Submission requests delivery and maintenance of a high standard of accommodation for Travellers.
- Submission calls for maintenance and enhancement of parks and public spaces to suit different users as well as greatly enhanced public toilet facilities throughout the county.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0436</td>
<td>HSE</td>
<td>HSE (St. Columcilles)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission notes that the land owner generally supports the Council’s vision and hopes to safeguard the existing function St. Columcille’s, hospital, to provide vital patient services.
- Submission notes that this is a long established hospital and provides a range of public health care services and notes that this is one of 2 public hospitals in the County.
- The submission considers that the draft development plan continues to recognise the role of the hospital and provides flexibility to support future expansions at the site. The submission requests that the draft plan supports and protects the existing level of services through the inclusion of appropriate, planning policies and objectives.
- Submission sets out the site location and a description of the site including the built form and functions.
- Submission notes that the main hospital building was originally part of the Rathdown Union Workhouse.
- A map outlining the site boundary is included as part of the submission.
- The submission sets out planning history for the site.
- The submission includes a review of land use zoning objectives and policy objectives relative to the site. It is noted that the zoning objective in the current 2016 plan is ‘MH’ which supports the use of the site.
- Submission refers to policy SIC 10 in the current 2016 plan which the HSE favours and requests that a similar policy is retained in the forthcoming plan. It is recommended that specific reference is made to St. Columcille’s Hospital and that the importance of this particular facility to the community be made clear in the draft plan.
- Submission acknowledges the positive benefits of future infrastructure works that would increase accessibility to the hospital, namely the luas extension, upgrades to Loughlinstown roundabout and footpaths/cycleways at Loughlinstown linear park. The submission requests that these future proposals are discussed with the HSE to ensure that they do not undermine any potential future development or impact the operation of the hospital.
- Submission notes the change of land use zoning in the draft plan to SNI and the uses permitted within this zoning. It is considered that the new zoning would continue to support the existing and future use of the site.
- Submission notes the requirements of community infrastructure relative to population and details the development management requirements for development on SNI lands, highlighting relevant points. Having regard to the requirements, the HSE has no objection to the proposed new zoning objective for
the site as that the existing / future use of the site would not be impacted upon. It is noted that the permitted uses are supportive of hospital, medical and health provision services.

- The submission requests that any alterations to access or linkages via the site are agreed with the HSE.
- Submission raises no objection to the removal of the INST objective from the site.
- Submission notes other objectives in the draft plan that are relevant to the site.
- Submission states that the HSE seek to continue the established hospital operation at this site, therefore the proposed SNI zoning objective is welcomed and supported as it will provide sufficient policy support to support the continued operation of the hospital campus in the future.
- Submission notes the role of health service provision in the future of our communities and refers to the NPF with regard to healthcare provision being identified as one of the 10 NSO’s. Submission further notes the asset based approach in the RSES and considers that the hospital is an important community asset.
- Submission states that “the Draft Development Plan delivers a positive framework to ensure that community healthcare services, such as St. Columcille’s Hospital, will be protected and supported over the lifetime of the Plan, and into the future.”

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4, Chapter 5, Appendix 4, Map 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0437</th>
<th>Person: Denis Rice</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 1,5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

### Pedestrians and Cyclists
- Congratulate the Council on the initiatives undertaken on behalf of pedestrians/cyclists over the past 6 months, however, there is still no sense that the village is pedestrianised. Ultimately, the village needs to be pedestrianised.
- Despite being well served by public transport, the car has priority in Dundrum. If it is to become a village that belongs to the people, then the car must be removed.
- Great work has gone into improving the environs of Dundrum, but the various Pedestrianised/cycle paths should be linked together.
- The completion of a pedestrianised/cycle Link joining Meadowbrook, Ballawley Park, the Town Centre, the Village Centre, Finsbury Park/ Weston, Super Valu Churchtown, and Nutgrove would be beneficial.

### Transport
- Travel to Dundrum Village or Town Centre should be by foot, cycle or public transport. Travel by car should be a last resort and should be financially penalised.

### Parking
- No parking should be allowed in the village. In neighbouring estates, there should be no parking between 11.30 am and 1.00 pm and 2.00pm and 3.30 pm (or similar), to reduce all day parking in residential areas.

### Luas Bridge/ Taney Junction
- The Luas Bridge is unsightly and the undercroft area is not pedestrian friendly. The bridge divides lower Dundrum from the village. A possible solution is to create a walkway cum cycle route from the site of the current Central Mental Hospital, through Taney Green and Crescent with a pedestrian crossing to Taney Drive and an enlarged, upgraded, and very well-lit underpass of the Luas, linking the Luas station walkway to the Village.

### Arrival in the village by Luas
- The first stop for many visitors to Dundrum will be the Luas Stations. Both have issues as follows:
  - Dundrum Station – dangerous steps lead down to a very steep and unpleasant laneway, between the two banks. With Ulster Bank going, could Bank of Ireland move into present Ulster Bank and demolish the Bof I building, enabling a proper walkway to the Village and to the Council offices to be created, similar to the one at Dublin Airport with photos depicting the history of Dundrum?
  - Balally Station is worse, people wouldn’t use it even in the middle of the day. Getting to the Town Centre is a nightmare with traffic.
Dundrum Village/Old Shopping Centre

- Dundrum village is on life support. Whilst retaining some of its original character, it has more recently lost its way with hotchpotch development, e.g. the Credit Union which is situated at an angle and is not in keeping with the Village.
- The Village needs to be remodelled in the form of a landscaped park and primarily a place where people live.
- Any development of the village should minimise hard landscaping, as far as is possible. The street surface needs to have a finish that is pleasant to walk on.
- Major developers tend to ignore certain demographics when it comes to retail, particularly the older shopper.
- Whatever development emerges in the village, it is critical that the same excellent level of management is in place to that of the Town Centre.

Proposed Village Walkways

- The village requires walkways from the Kiosk entrance to the town Centre, through the Crossroads (with pedestrian right of way) past the Church down to the Luas Station.
- Where the current entrance is to the Car park [old shopping centre], there needs to be another walkway of about 20 feet in width, heading west towards where Matt Britton’s is at present, and then turning left or heading south to a walkway at the back of the Church.
- The area to the city side of the new walkway could have a three/four storey building, hotel or the like with an overpass to the island where the buses turn, with its own underground parking.
- The walkways should be very comfortable to walk on with plenty of seating, with planting and green areas.
- Lighting as used in the carpark in the Grange Golf Club or that used between the two banks as you get off the Dundrum Luas, would add to the character of Dundrum.
- The most comfortable type of walkway is probably the monastic cloister style(modern version of Stillorgan with character).
- Another alternative is the laneways in Brighton.
- The scale of Kildare Village is easy on the eye (not sure about the choice of outlets, but again no issues with traffic).

Areas for Public Entertainment

- Areas could be designed to cater for entertainers that would give the village a reputation for quality street music. Links with the art council and performing arts colleges could be integral to the success of the project.

Retail

- The link between the Town Centre and the village needs to be seamless yet it is vital that we do not end up with a little Town Centre, as retail looks like it will continue to struggle.
- Artisan shops and homegrown single traders, is what the people want and will support, provided their produce is realistically priced. The likes of the English Food Market in Cork is a good example, where local businesses seem to survive and flourish.
- Rents in the Village will determine the success or otherwise of the area, they must be affordable to homegrown single traders.
- The upwards only rent Act has to be scrapped.
- The 2 years prior to 2020 showed that if the likes of House of Frazer, Coast, etc. can collapse because of astronomical rents then it is only a short time before Dundrum will die a death and the local residents are left to pick up the pieces.

Proposed Community Building

- Design - High ceilings and large glass windows seem to dominate Architect’s thinking. They may be aesthetically pleasing, and win awards, but they are not comfortable, and waste internal space. Use of light is about clever positioning and sizing of windows highlighting a tree/a view, etc. E.g. Taney Parish Centre meeting room 1, upstairs).
- ½ Day / Day Courses: the building should be used as a centre for fun learning for all ages.
- Food - Kitchens could be accommodated where people could buy, and/or bring their food and learn to cook healthy food under the guidance of cooks. A place where you can go to pick up practical tips on all aspects of food/storage/wastage/costing etc., even get meals supplied for those needing help with this area. Every effort needs to be made to address obesity.
- Performing arts: A full storey of the building should be given over to the performing arts.
Dundrum CFE could move into the building and resite the B of I branch on the present CFE site beside other banks if Ulster bank is not a solution.

The library should be linked to the Community building by a covered walkway. Alternatively, look at resiting the library in the Community Building.

Civic Square - Please avoid the call for a big open Civic Square in the development, as whatever benefit they have for odd events, they are for the most part a massive invitation to unruly behaviour, are invariably awful in bad weather, and will in no time lead to “a no go area”.

Civic outdoor space

The area to the back of the church has great potential to be used as a civic outdoor space. Tiered seating could be installed on a permanent basis with temporary cover as needed for events. There could be a walkway around the perimeter from Ballinteer Road, The Bypass sloping down to the village streetscape.

Central Mental Hospital site

14 stories, not appropriate. This would be totally at odds with probably 95% of those living in the Dundrum area. Heights should be four stories maximum.

Signage

Dundrum Luas Station makes a fabulous starting point for the Wicklow way, and should be well signposted.

Love 30

Love 30 is great for built up areas, but housing estates should be the priority.

Pilot Pedestrian programme

A pilot programmed to give the estate back to the pedestrian, should be undertaken and could consist of the following:

- A speed limit of 30 km per hour for all vehicles (enforced by community / Traffic Gardai)
- Footpaths for pedestrians only (enforced by community / Traffic Gardai)
- Pedestrians and cyclists would have right of way in the estates.
- A competition could be held to devise a new sign indicating that you are entering a pedestrianised zone.
- Possible trial locations include Larchfield, Mount Carmel, Rosemount, Farmhill, Taney, Holywell, Dromartin, Ardglass, Parkvale, Dun Emer, Balally, Woodpark, Broadford, Ludford, Hillview, Meadowbrook, Ailesbury, Sweetmount, Mountainview, Weston, Finsbury, Woodlawn, Landscape, Frankfurt, Annville, Somerville.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

- Chapter 5, 7
- Appendix 5

DLR Submission No: B0438
Person: Aidan Masterson
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 3, 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The submission welcomes the inclusion of Marlborough Road ACA in the Draft County Development Plan (CDP).
- The submission, requests that the Council amend the Marlborough Road ACA to incorporate a wider area including the lands along Adelaide Road and Station.
- It would also accord with the advice in the Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities, at par 3.2.5 that “The boundaries of a candidate ACA should make physical, visual and planning-control sense”.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

- Appendix 4

DLR Submission No: B0439
Person: Brian Gallagher
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

- Map 7
### DLR Submission No: B0440
**Person:** Lynda Kouidri  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 3

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Object to opening of the Emergency gates at Stable Lane as it would mean loss of privacy for homes as well as concerns regarding antisocial behaviour, as access is currently only for residents and visitors.
- Opening the gate would change what is a residential laneway and affect the peace and quiet of the six houses on the lane.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):** Appendix 8

### DLR Submission No: B0441
**Person:** Mary Dunphy  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):** Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0442
**Person:** Mary Slattery  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):** Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0443
**Person:** Mary Dunphy  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):** Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0444
**Person:** Moss Simington  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 3

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Propose a new skate park in Dún Laoghaire near the ferry terminal, preferably free to use
- Skating is now an Olympic sport.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):** Appendix 8

### DLR Submission No: B0445
**Person:** Harry Cooney  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):** Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0446
**Person:** Sallyanne Godson  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 10

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission notes prosed upgrade to Cherrywood Road and suggested widening.
• Notes traffic already exceed the speed limit and speed reducing measures have been introduced and suggests straightening the road will negate this measure.
• Noted the dotted line suggests the road is to be widened at the base of the Brides Glen viaduct, a protected structure and where there is a difference in height of 2 metres between the roadway and ground running under the adjacent arch.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0447</td>
<td>Geraldine McNamara</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0448</td>
<td>Anne Fitzgerald</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0449</td>
<td>Amy Fitzgerald</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0450</td>
<td>Pat O’Loughlin</td>
<td>Old Connaught House Management Company</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
Comments below are in relation to Old Connaught area only:
• Roads, water and foul drainage systems should be developed first to support the additional population arising from the new residential units.
• The existing northbound slip road from the N11 is a sub optimal arrangement and the four local roads that serve the Old Connaught area are substandard.
• Due to traffic congestion on the N11 the local roads are often used as a “rat-run” and the situation will become more difficult and dangerous if the population in the area is increased before the roads infrastructure is dramatically improved.
• Local roads need to be upgraded but should be done in a manner to preserve their unique rural characteristics.
• Any improvements to roads would have to include the provision of footpaths for pedestrians.
• A vehicular bridge connection across the County Brook and an additional motorway crossing point north of the LAP lands would be welcomed.
• Concerns that the Local Network Reinforcement Project, that will be an interim project to facilitate foul drainage prior to the completion of the Drainage Area Plan in the area, will serve new residential development, whereas existing residences, that are currently operating on private sewerage plants, should link into the public system first.
• With regard to residential development, the existing sense of local identity can be retained though sympathetic development and the area should be developed in a manner that will tie in with and enhance, not diminish, the current character. A preference for bungalow or 2-storey dwellings built in
short curving closes branching out from feeder roads, is stated, and not high-rise apartment blocks or straight streets.
- There is, and increasingly will be a need for access to open green spaces. Festina Lente (Protected Structure) could serve as a focal point for a surrounding parkland to serve the area.
- Welcome any proposals to bring bus and Luas to the area.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5, 9, 10, Miscellaneous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0451</th>
<th>Person: Deirdre Moran</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0452</th>
<th>Person: Shane Horan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0453</th>
<th>Person: Ayse Doga Butler</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0454</th>
<th>Person: Deirdre O'Beirne</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Submission objects to 11 Avoca Avenue, Blackrock (RPS No. 425) being added to the RPS and seeks its removal as the property has been completely refurbished and there is little of the original structure remaining.
- Submission states that the property was proposed to be included on the RPS in April 2020 – the owner objected to this and notes that there was no inspection of the property and the reasons for its protection have not been provided.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0455</th>
<th>Person: Sheila Vaughan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Welcomes DLR's commitment for a feasibility study to re-route the East Coast Cycle Trail by the coast & incorporate coastal protection works between Corbawn Lane & the new Woodbrook station.
- Concerned about coastal erosion at Corbawn. The alternative cycle trail will provide a better solution for cycling and coastal erosion.
- Concerned about the safety & congestion issues of the current East Coast Cycle Trail route through Corbawn & impact on the residents.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0456</th>
<th>Person: Helen Concannon</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0457</th>
<th>Person: Delia Clune</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0458</th>
<th>Person: Fiadhnait O’ Keeffe</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0459</th>
<th>Person: Sorcha Ni Choncheanainn</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0460</th>
<th>Person: Colm Ryder</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0461</th>
<th>Person: Liam ó Riain</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7**

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission notes the support for the original Sutton to Sandycove (S2S) proposed coastal greenway and considers both the S2S on the seafront and commuter cycleway on existing roads are needed (noting 2004-2010 Development Plan Policy T7)
- Submission notes the 2010-2016 Development Plan strengthened this commitment to the S2S in Policy T12: while the Draft 2022-2028 Development Plan the policy makes no mention of the S2S.
- Submission questions the inclusion of a fully coastal greenway in 5.5.4 Policy Objective T13.
- Submission notes the need for coastal protection of the railway and notes the construction of a new sea wall to protect the railway could include a fully coastal S2S.
- Submission calls to reinstate the Policy to construct a coastal greenway which also protects the railway infrastructure.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5**

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0462</td>
<td>Jean Dempsey</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0463</td>
<td>Fiona Murray</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0464</td>
<td>Helen Cahill</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0465</td>
<td>John Whitty</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0466</td>
<td>Tony Hopkins</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0467</td>
<td>Maire O’Brien</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More accessible, safe, clean toilets needed in public areas, with an emphasis on safety and hygiene.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DLRCC needs to budget for these and consider locations such as DART/Luas car parks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Design an app for location of public toilets and publish a map on DLRCoCo’s website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0468</td>
<td>Martha Donlon</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Welcomes DLR’s commitment for a feasibility study to re-route the East Coast Cycle Trail by the coast &amp; incorporate coastal protection works between Corbawn Lane &amp; the new Woodbrook station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerned about coastal erosion at Corbawn. The alternative cycle trail will provide a better solution for cycling and coastal erosion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Concerned about the safety & congestion issues of the current East Coast Cycle Trail route through Corbawn & impact on the residents.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Chapter 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0469</th>
<th>Person: John Tracey</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Suggest a skate park in Dún Laoghaire, preferably free to use and near the ferry terminal or use the Carlisle pier.
- Skateboarding is a new Olympic sport, and this is the opportunity to put Dun Laoghaire at centre stage in Ireland for developing the sport.
- This would also bring additional business to an area that has been underutilised.
- There are not enough sports facilities for young people and this could open up great sporting opportunities especially for the disadvantaged.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Appendix 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0470</th>
<th>Person: Barbara O’Connell &amp; Neil O’Donovan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3, 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission welcomes the inclusion of Marlborough Road ACA in the Draft County Development Plan (CDP).
- The submission requests that the Council amend the Marlborough Road ACA to incorporate a wider area including the lands along Adelaide Road and Station.
- It would also accord with the advice in the Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities, at par 3.2.5 that “The boundaries of a candidate ACA should make physical, visual and planning-control sense”.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Appendix 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0471</th>
<th>Person: Donal Quinlan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Between Shrewsbury Road and Castle Farm in Shankill these is a woodland belt that requires maintenance and needs to be preserved as an attractive amenity to both estates.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Chapter 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0472</th>
<th>Person: Hilary &amp; Gilbert Carr</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2, 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Map 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0473</th>
<th>Person: Anne Lehane</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Map 7**
Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Suggest a new skate park, preferably free to use.
- It offers a healthy sporting opportunity to young people and is also a new Olympic sport.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 8

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission notes that Kilternan /Glenamuck has sufficient land rezoned to cope with the medium-term future needs of the area. However, there is a need for public green space.
- Submission objects to the designation of sportsgrounds, which are not accessible for recreational pursuits by the public, as public green space.
- Boundary walls should be of local granite, in keeping with the character and heritage of the area.
- Development in Kiltiernan village must resist any attempt at strip mall construction.
- Courtyard development with wide streetscape is more suitable in this upland area.
- Submission request protection of the following:
  - The wildflower meadows with a variety of orchids at Ballycorus Roadstone area.
  - Dingle Glen
- The land west of the Enniskerry must not be further rezoned and this should be a protected view.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 4, Chapter 8 and Chapter 9, Map 9

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Concerned with SLO85 re: Stillorgan Reservoir.
- Construction works have been endured.
- Irish water assured residents that there would never be a public park.
- Concerned about overlooking, security, public safety.
- Plan amended without consulting residents

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission notes the draft plan has excluded the S2S cycleway, included in previous plans.
- Submission welcomes recent commuter infrastructure improvements and notes need for coastal route which would be a Greenway.
- Submission suggests the S2S would offer benefits such as making the coastline accessible, offering a safe and environmentally friendly amenity for the public, act as a tourism attraction and provide business opportunities, allow the public to appreciate Dublin Bay Conservation area and act as a barrier to further erosion.
- Submission notes opportunity to develop a cycle and walkway similar to other Cities.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission notes that Marlborough Road was developed from the 1870s onwards, in three phases, the last of which entailed the construction of 17 houses in the years 1928-1932.
- The 20th century dwellings, are generally smaller than those of the 19th century and of a simpler finish, and thereby contributes to the architectural heritage of the area by virtue of its location, site layout and boundary, its design and finishes.
- The submission expresses concern that the proposed ACA designation may prove restrictive when upgrade works are required to the house.
- The Council are requested to append a statement to the Character Appraisal for the proposed ACA stating that proposals for alterations to the houses within the ACA, particularly those of the 20th century, will be treated favourably if such are visually subservient to the original and employ materials which are in keeping with existing.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0479</th>
<th>Person: Nicole Tracey</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A free skate park near the old ferry terminal or Carlisle pier would be a fantastic addition to the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0480</th>
<th>Person: Johnny Kelly</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0481</th>
<th>Person: Eamon Kelly</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0482</th>
<th>Person: Angela Kelly</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0483</th>
<th>Person: Lorna Hempenstall</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission objects to proposed cycle route, concern about safety risks with an increase of cyclists.
- Notes the benefits of environmentally friendly initiatives but does not consider it to be in the right location.
- Notes his wife was previously injured by a cyclist.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission requests that the Council progress and expand the work begun with the 2020 Masterplan for Sandycove and Bulloch Harbours to mitigate the dangers of traffic impacts and public health initiatives which are required to mitigate public health risks, protect water quality, and reduce public order offences.
- A Specific Local Objective should be included to pursue traffic control and public health initiatives in the area between Sandycove Park and Sandycove Avenue East in response to the increasing popularity of Sandycove Beach/Forty Foot bathing place.
- The proposed SLO is in light of the following:
  - Health and safety, in particular efficient access for emergency services.
Road safety.
- The designation of additional parking for disabled/vulnerable users would be a welcome safety initiative and would support inclusivity.
- Noise nuisance to residents, due to increased numbers and parking patterns. This could be abated through traffic control measure.
- Adequate provision of public toilets is a pressing public health requirement in the area.
- Council has a role to manage the public amenity and heritage of the area.
- Quality of the environment due to impacts on residents by air and noise pollution.
- Account needs to be taken of residents’ reasonable parking needs.
- Sandycove is readily accessible by public transport, and access has been so improved by the Council’s provision of safe direct pedestrian and cycling routes, there is no justification for the ongoing interference with property rights.
- Additionally, if Sandycove is to be the southern terminus of the S2S cycleway and/or a component part of the National East Coast Trail cycle route, there is a reasonable level of certainty that this will bring even more pressure to bear on the area.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5, Chapter 8 and Chapter 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0490</th>
<th>Person: David McGonigle</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes volume of traffic has increased in Sandycove and calls for traffic and road layouts to be reconsidered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes emergency services unable to access the 40ft due to cars at the side of the road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes access to residents’ properties is restricted, which is affecting quality of life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes footpath are inaccessible due to cars parking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes an increase in waste, litter and dog waste in the area and suggests more bag and bin drops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission suggests a local access only road should be implemented with use of an electric bollard to avoid a serious accident.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0491</th>
<th>Person: Cynthia O’ Mahony</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Welcomes the plan and in particular the Policy Objective T10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refers to evidence and contents of the NTA BikeLife report and the National Cycling Policy Framework (NCPF). Recommends that a modal shift target of 25% by bike be implemented in DLR and that a monitoring programme utilising citizen science data such as WeCount or traffic Totem counters be used along main routes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concern that the S2S is not mentioned in the plan. Both the coastal and inland route are needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Climate Action chapter should deal with active travel due to transport being responsible for most emissions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SLO 10 Blackrock Park - welcomes work to date on paths. Calls for wide pedestrian and cycle links to Dart Station and Blackrock village.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SLO 29 – Deansgrange LAP needs to priorities active travel and the ‘Park to Park’ route needs to be an SLO with a one-way system on Deansgrange Road, along with the provision of a dedicated two-way cycle lane.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapters 3, 5, 15,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0492</th>
<th>Person: Barry McGonigle</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Regarding the Sandy Cove area, the parking facilities, increase in littering and lack of cleanliness around the temporary portaloo are a disgrace and detracts from the natural beauty of the area. Photos attached to submission.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Chapter 5, 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0493</td>
<td>Gerard Stearn</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0494</td>
<td>Marie McGarvey</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2, 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0495</td>
<td>Gerard Stern</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0496</td>
<td>Maura Walsh</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Concerned with the use of Stillorgan reservoir for a public park. Privacy will be negatively impacted upon due to overlooking of house and garden.
- Considers there would be disruption due to noise should a park development go ahead.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0497</td>
<td>Paul Kohlmann</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0498</td>
<td>Claire Kerr</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0499</td>
<td>Marian Shanley</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
The submission welcomes the inclusion of Marlborough Road ACA in the Draft County Development Plan (CDP).

The submission requests that the Council amend the Marlborough Road ACA to incorporate a wider area including the lands along Adelaide Road and Station.

It would also accord with the advice in the Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities, at par 3.2.5 that “The boundaries of a candidate ACA should make physical, visual and planning-control sense”.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

### DLR Submission No: B0500
Person: Brian O'Connell
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 3, 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission welcomes the inclusion of Marlborough Road ACA in the Draft County Development Plan (CDP).
- The submission requests that the Council amend the Marlborough Road ACA to incorporate a wider area including the lands along Adelaide Road and Station.
- It would also accord with the advice in the Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities, at par 3.2.5 that “The boundaries of a candidate ACA should make physical, visual and planning-control sense”.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

### DLR Submission No: B0501
Person: D McGovern
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: N/A

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the land use zoning for the benefit of social and community activity.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 13.

### DLR Submission No: B0502
Person: A & S Casey
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 3, 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- This summary should be read in conjunction with DLR Submission No. B0425.
- The submission welcomes the inclusion of Marlborough Road ACA in the Draft County Development Plan (CDP).
- However, there is a concern that the boundaries of the proposed ACA have been too restrictive.
- The large houses on Adelaide Road are of considerable heritage value and they constitute the link between the developments of Silchester Road and Marlborough Road.
- The submission, therefore, requests that the Council amend the Marlborough Road ACA to incorporate a wider area including the lands along Adelaide Road and Station.
- It would also accord with the advice in the Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities, at par 3.2.5 that “The boundaries of a candidate ACA should make physical, visual and planning-control sense”.
- The ACA also includes all the back gardens of the houses on Marlborough Road. However, the Character Assessment makes no reference to any features or character attaching to the rear gardens, or justify this significant departure.
- The inclusion of the rear gardens is completely unnecessary.
- The disproportionate nature of this is heightened by the fact that the Character Assessment said our house retained little original character and by the fact that our rear garden is not in any way visible from the roadway.
- These boundaries therefore do not make “physical, visual and planning-control sense” as advised by the Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0503</td>
<td>Susanne Mahon</td>
<td>Local Business</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Intangible cultural heritage refers to the practices, expressions, knowledge, and skills that communities and groups recognise as part of their cultural heritage.
- Intangible cultural heritage is omitted from draft Plan. This goes against the Department of Tourism, Culture, Arts Gaeltacht, Sports and Media and Ireland’s support of UNESCO Convention for safeguarding the Intangible Cultural Heritage.
- Local crafts are no longer supported by the draft Plan and instead "Local Crafts" appears to be replaced by "Local Enterprise". This change in planning has negative connotations for traditional crafts and is contradiction to the Irish Government’s commitment to UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage and the creation of our National Inventory in 2019.
- The policy makers should rethink the wording of the “G” zoning objective and to include local crafts once again and to review the chapter on Heritage and refer to Intangible Cultural Heritage.
- DLR is fortunate to have such a rich history rooted in the traditional craftsmanship of stonework.
- New developments are neglecting to use traditional granite stone in keeping with the area: e.g. new development Kilternan beside Golden Ball using non-native black slate cladding.
- It would be best practise to make it mandatory for all new developments to use only traditional granite cladding in keeping with the area if incorporating stone finishes.

*Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 11 and Table 13.1.5*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0504</td>
<td>Feargal Geoghegan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission request that dlr keep the public Rights of Way intact. ROW are needed for future generations for educational and health reasons.
- Believe that ROWs are under threat from private property owners.

*Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 12*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0505</td>
<td>Mary O’Connell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The submission welcomes the inclusion of Marlborough Road ACA in the Draft County Development Plan (CDP).
- The submission requests that the Council amend the Marlborough Road ACA to incorporate a wider area including the lands along Adelaide Road and Station.
- It would also accord with the advice in the Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities, at par 3.2.5 that “The boundaries of a candidate ACA should make physical, visual and planning-control sense”.

*Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0506</td>
<td>Robert Byrne</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Request a skate park in Dún Laoghaire by the ferry terminal. Good healthy sport for youths.

*Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 8*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0507</td>
<td>JP Flynn</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission fully agrees and supports the attached submission document and comments made by the residents at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace, Sandycove, Co. Dublin for the 2022-2028 Development Plan.
- The Council should reset the parameters on the off-street parking at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace.
- Amend the Development Plan as necessary to allow Nos. 10 – 15 Breffni Terrace to building off-street parking.
- Adopt a commensurate higher level of tolerance for future planning applications for off-street parking at Nos. 10 - 15 Breffni Terrace as a result.
- A copy of the submission to amend the Plan is included with the submission which notes the planning history for the Terrace, the case for off-street parking at Breffni Terrace, including the positive interventions of same and requested that the Plan is amended to reset the parameters on off-street parking at this location, to sensitively incorporate off-street parking and to adopt a commensurate higher level of tolerance for future planning applications for off-street parking at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0508</td>
<td>Claire Maher</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0509</td>
<td>Owen Kelly</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0510</td>
<td>Paul Price</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission strongly objects to the replacement of SLO 152 by the proposed weakening in SLO 10.
  With concerning proposals relating to development in Rosary Gardens East, this SLO offers at least some degree of additional protection to the historically valuable heritage of the houses within this area, particularly the architecturally valuable streetscapes and Arts and Crafts cottage designs of the Rosary Gardens East and West cul-de-sacs, built by the Irish Soldiers and Sailors Land Trust for the families of Dun Laoghaire war veterans.
- Therefore, SLO 152 should be retained and reworded to incorporate SLO 10.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0511</td>
<td>Pola Finegan</td>
<td>Corbawn Area Residents’ Association</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission welcomes east coast cycleway/ coastal protection works at Corbawn Lane and Woodbrook DART Station.
- Submission details erosion that has taken place in Corbawn since 1986.
- Submission considers while the cycleway is important for future mobility, it is not safe or suitable in a residential estate and the residents would like to help develop a solution.
- Submission notes residents would lose amenity area to future coastal protection and a cycleway but support the DLR initiative to investigate the cycleway proposal.
- Submission notes from Clontra’s 2020 planning appeal to ABP that they have land that is also earmarked “along a disused railway to the East of the site” for a coastal cycle route.
- Submission notes amenity area is being lost to erosion every year with a lot of money being spent on short term measure, welcomes investigation of a permanent solution.
- Submission notes concern re: indication of flooding risk in Corbawn and ask for removal of this alert from the Draft Plan.
- Submission welcomes greenbelt status between Corbawn and Shanganagh Park and retention of lane/walkway between Rathsaillagh/Corbawn.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Chapter 5, Appendix 16.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0512</th>
<th>Person: Reuben Whelan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Please prioritise preservation of public Rights of Way, which are underappreciated but important to localities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recent cycling infrastructure has brought a lot to Dún Laoghaire and will continue to do so. More development of this nature should be considered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Appendix 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0513</th>
<th>Person: Liam Farrelly</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Map 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0514</th>
<th>Person: Fiona Bowman</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission states the area is in need of community development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Map 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0515</th>
<th>Person: Ian Chandler</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The 2021 EPA Wastewater Code of Practice eliminates the need for this SLO as it provides up to date guidance on how to deal with all sorts of wastewater and ground water situations, including those present in Rathmichael. This SLO and its information is dated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Council should be supportive of delivering new housing to the area (Rathmichael).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Chapter 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0516</th>
<th>Person: Claire Cunningham</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission on behalf of Blackrock Clinic in relation to the zoning of Seafort Lodge.
- Submission sets out the details and history of the clinic.
- Submission notes that the MH zoning objective in the current 2016 plan was welcomed by the clinic and hospital.
- Submission notes that Blackrock Clinic are in the process of developing a masterplan for their lands to guide its future development in a coordinated manner. As part of its continued development, the clinic fully acquired Seafort Lodge on Castledawson Avenue in September 2020 – a map showing this property has been submitted.
- It is noted that Seafort Lodge, currently zoned A, has not been in residential use for over 35 years.
- Submission notes the rezoning of Blackrock Clinic to SNI citing that this will allow the continued development of the hospital and clinic. Seafort Lodge remains zoned A – it is requested that this zoning is changed to SNI in order to provide hospital and medical uses and facilities the further expansion of the clinic and hospital.
- A solicitors letter confirming that Seafort Lodge is owned by Blackrock Clinic is attached with the submission.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

- Map 2

---

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission queries core strategy figures.
- Since Clause 2.3.7.1 of the Plan identifies significant existing lands already zoned for residential development, Dún Laoghaire- Rathdown County Council must limit unnecessary and unsympathetic over densifications within existing established communities.
- The wording in the Draft Plan effectively restates the wording of the existing Development Plan except for the footnote 1. This must be removed from the final Plan.
- The Draft Plan further excludes local residents to any input from Construction activities which impact upon them and their environment.
- This is unacceptable and highly undemocratic particularly since the Council currently does not set out standards for actual permissible maximum levels of noise, dust, vibration, odour etc. impacts that local residents must live with over periods of years for major projects.
- This approach is in contrast to the aspirations of the Draft Plan.
- The submission includes a letter to the Chief Executive of DLR with respect to Construction Management Plans and the impacts on local residents, and also a letter to the Planning Department with respect to compliance with the County Development Plan which currently does not facilitate any input from residents to the relevant Construction Management Plans.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

- Chapter 2 and Chapter 12

---

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.
Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0520</td>
<td>Michael Buckley</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission notes there is an increase in traffic at the Forty Foot in summertime and suggests closing the road during the summer months.
- Submission notes there is a difficulty for ambulances accessing injured parties at the Forty Foot and considers unless something radical is done to limit traffic congestion, lives may be lost.
- Submission suggests a diversion of traffic to allow local access only during summer months and eventually permanently.
- Submission notes the area is unique and requires unique solutions.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0521</td>
<td>Mary Haughton</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Notes that an area of open space has been used daily for dog walking and as a short cut to the luas.
- Notes that the space has been a lifeline, is a valued social space for residents.
- Refers to a planning application having been made.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
No specific issues have been raised and the area in question is not identified – importance of open space is noted in Chapter 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0522</td>
<td>Owen Cullen</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The Council is not giving any planning application the option to adequately address the issues concerning SLO93.
- This is inappropriate and damaging to the community.
- The Council has not taken 2021 EPA Code of Practice into account which gives methodologies for dealing with this type of soil/location.
- These new technological advances need to be investigated by the planners.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0523</td>
<td>Mary Haughton</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0524</td>
<td>Justin Tuite</td>
<td>Clarinda Park Residents Association</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The submission requests that the Plan enhance, restore and protect (NPO 17) the three Victorian Residential Garden Squares in Dún Laoghaire i.e. Clarinda Park, Crosthwaite Park, Royal Terrace ACAs in the Development Plan.
- The Plan should consider a Clarinda Park Restoration plan as a special local objective (SLO) to include the following:
- The removal of all off-road municipal surface car parking from the square.
• The reinstatement of original decorative wrought iron perimeter railings with granite plinths.
• Intensive planting/landscaping plan.
• The removal of all overhead electrical/telecom cables.
• The removal of all carpark signs, meters, sodium lighting etc.
• Traffic calming to create low traffic neighbourhood (LTN).
• High amenity lighting around and in the square.
• The Plan should retain the zoning on Tivoli Terrace South for public green open space.
• The Plan should develop a town strategy for dramatic increase of public electric car charging points for residents without off street parking and pedestrianisation and enhancement of Georges Street.
• The submission includes a Clarinda presentation and traffic survey.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14 Appendix 4 and Map 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0525</th>
<th>Person: Paul O’Connor</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission notes traffic congestion issues in the areas of Sandycove Avenues East, West and North and Sandycove Point.
• Submission notes these issues have affected the quality of life for residents.
• Submission notes traffic volumes are having an impact on health and safety for residents. Issues include noise pollution, access by both emergency and utility vehicles, danger to pedestrians and access for residents to their homes.
• Submission requests the County Development Plan include a traffic management plan which would resolve these health and safety issues.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0526</th>
<th>Person: Brian McBryan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Welcome the preservation of Marino Ave West as a pedestrian-only right-of-way and have already supported the response to this consultation in the submission by Richard Kean, SC [B0082]. However, there are additional points regarding public safety which should be considered and mitigated by the Council before the ROW is endorsed in the forthcoming CDP.

Safety Concerns
• Submission considers that the junction between Marino Ave West and Killiney Hill Road is particularly dangerous for all users. Details are set out.

Traffic Lights
• Suggest that traffic lights, incorporating a pedestrian crossing, are required at the Marino Ave West and Killiney Hill Road junction and at the junction of Military Rd and Killiney Hill Rd would also be a help for public safety in the area.

One-Way System
• An alternative to traffic lights would be to make a section of Killiney Hill Road one-way (up-hill-only), Converting the section from Military Road to Killiney Ave, or Strathmore Road to one-way would probably be sufficient to eliminate this risk.

Parking
• There is no footpath on Marino Avenue West and pedestrians share the narrow Avenue with vehicles. For this reason, it is critical that parking is strictly limited to essential residents use only, to avoid narrowing the Avenue further, and to ensure access for Emergency vehicles, bin lorries etc.
• There is a tendency for the Avenue to attract cars who are trying to avoid the “pay-and-display” parking near Killiney Dart station

Signage
• Appropriate signage should be put in place at the entrance to Marino Avenue West from Killiney Hill Road to indicate that it is a pedestrian-only right-of-way, and “No-Parking” signs are required along the Avenue, indicating that any parking is for residents-use only.

Ownership & Maintenance
The Avenue has never been formally “taken-in-charge”.

- Nobody appears to know who owns the Avenue. As a result, the Avenue does not meet the standards of safety that pedestrians might expect elsewhere in the County. If the Avenue is not maintained, potholes and trip-hazards will be a particular risk.

- Similar safety and public-health issues also occur on the existing pedestrian rights-of-way between Marino Ave West and Station Rd and between Marino Ave West by the ancient funeral path at the side of Abbey Lea, leading to Killiney Hill Rd. Likewise problems appear to occur elsewhere in the County, such as the right-of-way between Knock-na-cree Road and Knoc-na-cree Park in Dalkey, and the rights-of-way on Roches Hill near the golf course.

- If Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Council is serious about endorsing public pedestrian ROWs and enhancing “Green-way” access for pedestrians and cyclists, merely publishing a list of routes in the Development Plan is insufficient. Instead, the Council needs to proactively provide additional services to keep these routes safe and tidy, or alternatively, take the routes fully in charge.

**Indemnity**

- Request an indemnity from the Council in respect of any future third-party claims arising from the formalisation of a public right-of-way on the Avenue.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

- Chapters 5, Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0527</th>
<th>Person: Glen Powley</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0528</th>
<th>Person: Michael Donlon</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0529</th>
<th>Person: Una O’Shea</th>
<th>Organisation: Roebuck Residents’ Association</th>
<th>Map Nos: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

**Zoning:**

- Submission requests that a green area at the end of Friarsland Road and another at the end of Belfield Downs be rezoned from A to F. A map showing each area is included.
- Submission welcomes the new SNI zoning, retention of the INST objective and F zoning at Our Ladys Grove.
- Submission requests that the SNI zoning extends to include the access road at OLG.
- Submission welcomes the retention of F zoning on the Irish Glass Bottle Site and notes addition of an ED objective – it is requested that the site be used for education and associated recreation that is accessible for use by the local community.
- Submission requests that INST is recognised as a standalone zoning objective in Table 13.1.1.

**Transportation:**

- Submission requests that the Bus Priority Route on Goatstown Road is removed as the road is not suited to frequent bus traffic and the Bus Connects plans indicate a reduction in frequency of service along this route.
- Submission notes that 3 services will use the Dundrum Road, however, a Bus priority Route is not indicated along this road.
| Submission requests that pedestrian and cyclist permeability is provided through the IGB site. A withdrawn application provides a link to Farmhill / Mount Carmel to the north, however, links to the south should also be provided. |
| Submission requests that the Mount Annville Allotments site is uses to accommodate a pedestrian / cyclist link to improve permeability. |
| Submission agrees that the eastern bypass corridor should be preserved, however, SLO 4 should be updated to include pedestrian / cyclist permeability to adjoining area. |
| Submission highlights the possibility of improving pedestrian permeability under the Dundrum Luas bridge. |
| Submission requests that a sentence relating to additional vehicular links in Policy Objective RET4, Chapter 7, is omitted as there is no requirement to add additional vehicular links to the CMH site. |
| Trees: |
| Submission queries the removal of the tree symbol form the south west part of Our Ladys Grove and request that it is reinstated. |
| Submission requests that a tree symbol is added on the northern boundary of the Irish Glass bottles site to protect a number of mature ash trees. |
| Submission requests that tree symbols are applied to the Central Mental Hospital, in particular to the northwest of the walls garden and along a field boundary to the west of the walled garden. |
| Goatstown LAP: |
| Submission notes that the NC zoning and SLO 2 (re: accordance with the LAP) remains around the Goat Pub. The LAP places an emphasis on the lack of a village/neighbourhood centre noting the crossroads as an obvious location for this. It is considered that the Development plan should drill down more into the concept of neighbourhood to give meaning at each designation ensuring that future planning applications more definitively apply this concept and ideally provide for mixed use development. |
| The submission refers to the current SHD application at the Goat and notes limitations on input on a number of sites in the LAP area. |
| Submission requests that OLG is included within the boundary for the LAP. |
| Submission notes that very few objectives in the LAP have been achieved including improvements to public realm, street function and provision of a MUGA – it is requested that these objectives are progressed, particularly those in relation to traffic issues. |
| Dundrum / CMH Lands: |
| Submission notes that while there is a specific area of Dundrum zoned as MTC, there are a number of references to Dundrum as a major town centre that could lead to confusion in terms of the wider area being considered a major town centre. A definition of the Dundrum MTC is therefore requested and clarify in chapter 7 that the CMH is not defined or zoned MTC. |
| Submission requests that a SLO is applied to the CMH sites specifying that purpose built elderly accommodation is included in the development of the site. The ‘Housing for Our Ageing Population’ Government policy states is referenced in this regard, specifically in relation to ageing in place. The submission considers that such a SLO would accord with the policy objectives on the draft plan with regard to housing for older persons. |
| Submission refers to the biodiversity of the CMH given that it is an undeveloped site – a list of confirmed bird species is set out in Appendix 1 of the submission including species of high/medium conservation concern. It is requested that pesticides are not used in the clearing of the site and that as many wild areas are left as possible. A SLO recognising the natural environment of the site is requested. |
| Submission notes that there is limited reference to the CMH site in the draft plan. Given the scale of the plans for the site and the lack of a Dundrum LAP, it is requested that guidance for development within the site should be provided in the draft plan including under Section 4.2.1.2 to ensure appropriate sustainable neighbourhood infrastructure on the site. |
| Submission requests that section 4.3.1.1 is updated to refer to the CMH site in order to ensure that a balance between protecting existing residential amenities and the development of the site. |
| Submission requests that chapter 7 is updated to reflect to actual ownership of the CMH site. |
| Submission requests that the CMH site is specifically mentioned with regard to district heating in Section 12.2.5. |
| Open Space: |
| Submission requests that the population based equivalent open space requirement is reinstated with regard to high density development. |
• Submission seeks clarity in relation to the use of the terms ‘open space’ and ‘public open space’ throughout the plan as these are used interchangeably.
• Submission requests that the open space requirement for INST is corrected to 25% in Chapter 12.

Height:
• Submission refers to potential for landmarks buildings set out in Appendix 5 and requests that the developer of any such proposal demonstrates meaningful engagement with local communities at early design stage.
• Submission raises concern in relation to the height guidelines resulting in unsustainable apartment building in the local community.
• Submission requests that verifiable environmental impacts of building height is taken into consideration.
• Submission requests that the unaffordability of higher buildings for many people is taken into consideration.

Density:
• Submission requests that density for student accommodation is clearly set out in the plan.

The submission incorporates 2no. Appendices:
• Appendix 1 lists the bird species of confirmed sighting on the CMH lands from 1975-2020, noting those that are of medium or high conservation concern.
• Appendix 2 is a copy of a letter from the Residents’ Association to An Taoiseach in relation to the development approach on the CMH lands in February 2021. This letter raises a number of concerns in relation to the development of the lands including:
  o Height of 14 storeys in a suburban setting is inappropriate
  o Density / scale of development not feasible without significant infrastructure.
  o Increased traffic and access.
  o Demands on existing infrastructure including roads, public transport / capacity of Luas, schools, GP’s etc.
  o A map of the residents association are is included.
  o A letter from the residents association to the LDA is included which sets out concerns in relation to excessive density, heights of 14 storeys, protection of existing residential amenity, pressures on transport infrastructure – a full transport infrastructure assessment is requested with reference to the Dundrum ABTA, access issues / permeability, downsizing opportunities, respect for the development plan. Open space and community gain elements are welcomed.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 2, Chapter 4, Chapter 5, Chapter 7, Chapter 8, Chapter 9, Chapter 12, Chapter 13, Chapter 14, Appendix 5, Map1

DLR Submission No: B0530 Person: Joe McGill Organisation: N/A Map Nos: 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

DLR Submission No: B0531 Person: Garett Murtagh Organisation: N/A Map Nos: 10

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission in favour of greenway similar to the Waterford Greenway with fencing on both sides.
• Submission requests greenway is constructed away from houses and requests remedial works are carried out on cliffs.
• Submission suggests a cycle lane on the roadways in the estate (Corbawn) would be unsafe and suggests designers walk the route to identify problems.
• Notes there is a cycle lane on the main road from Shankill to Greystones.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0532</td>
<td>Clodagh Donlon</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0533</td>
<td>Carmel Hanley</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The submission relates to the Woodland / Linear Park between Shrewsbury Road (nos. 18 to 48) and Castle Farm, Shankill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The submission sets out a number of items that are required in order to protect / preserve the woodland including clearing ivy, thinning out of trees, planting of replacement trees, clearance of rubbish, work on the stream, protection of rear of houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some of the householders own a very small section of land behind their houses - they need additional protection from intruders because the pathway is so close to their houses. This should be provided by the Council because they laid down the pathway, thus causing problems of anti-social behaviour for residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In doing this work the Council accepted that they have a responsibility for the preservation of the wood, and this should be addressed in the Plan in consultation with the Residents of Nos. 18 to 48 Shrewsbury Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter 9, Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0534</td>
<td>Elizabeth Donlon</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0535</td>
<td>Donal O’Doherty</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0536</td>
<td>Catherine Leeney</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission states that this space was owned by the Redesdale Residents Association from the when the estate was built in the 1950’s until they transferred ownership to the council in the 1980’s. It was transferred on the understanding it would remain a green open space for the use and benefit of the wider community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0537</td>
<td>Paddy Shanahan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chief Executive’s Report on Draft Plan Consultation

Volume II – Summary of Submissions Received

- Submission notes the increase in swimmers over the last two years in Sandycove has had a negative impact on residents.
- Submission notes Sandycove cannot accommodate the volume of traffic which is causing air and noise pollution.
- Emergency services cannot access the area due to the traffic situation.
- Submission does not consider paid parking will solve the issue.
- Submission suggests a plan is developed as part of the Development Plan for the Sandycove area to address these issues.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

DLR Submission No: B0538
Person: David Robinson
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 5

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission refers to a strip of land adjacent to Ballawley Park, bordering Wesley Estate, that was given to the council for the benefit of the residents in perpetuity.
- Submission considers the zoning objective A for this strip of land is now incorrect as the zoning objective wording has changed. It is stated that this land is not for residential development.
- Submission notes disappointment in the council for not defending its current plan in relation to applications lodged to An Bord Pleanála under the SHD legislation.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 13, Miscellaneous and Map 5

DLR Submission No: B0539
Person: Fiona O’Reilly
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: N/A

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission notes that the Plan has not include proposals for mitigation of urban tree pollen levels via a commitment to plant balanced number of female trees in order to mop up excess pollen.
- The Plan should:
  - Preserve and reinstate Green corridors for fauna & wildlife biodiversity and include periodic audits of areas of interest.
  - Include a commitment to green parks with seating & planting (elderly friendly) within 1-2km of all residents in suburban/built up areas.
  - Include a commitment to Swimming pools for people who do not live within 2 or 5km of the sea, and who cannot avail of easy public transport access.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 8 and Chapter 9

DLR Submission No: B0540
Person: Alison Kay
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 3

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Ferry terminal building or part of it would make an excellent exhibition space.
- Rates on George’s St should be kept low as an incentive for start-up businesses.
- There should be a mixture of residential and retail on George’s St., bringing life and variety to the area especially in the evening time.
- Tax property owners who leave premises vacant give a depressed look to the Main Street.
- The band stand on the east pier could be put into use.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 8

DLR Submission No: B0541
Person: Niamh McDonald
Organisation: Irish Water
Map Nos: N/A

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Irish Water (IW) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Draft County Development Plan for the period 2022-2028.
• IW note, and welcome, the inclusion of many objectives in Chapter 10 of the Draft CDP that will support the delivery IW plans, programmes and policies. IW consider that these policy objectives E1-01 to E1-11, will also ensure the sustainable management of water and waste water in line with national and regional objectives as stated in the National Planning Framework and the Regional Economic Spatial Strategy for the East and Midlands Region. Confirm that projects are as set out in appendix 1 of the Draft Plan.

National and Regional Policy
References section 10 of the RSES which provides general policy direction in relation to water.

General Updates on IW Plans and Programmes
Update given on Irish Water Investment Plan (Revenue Control Period 3) 2020 to 2024, The National Water Resources Plan (NWRP),

Proposed Core Strategy & Availability of Water Services
• Dun Laoghaire / Rathdown falls within the Water Supply Zone for the Greater Dublin Area and supply in the area is currently constrained. As stated above, the NWRP will address these issues.
• The Water Supply Project (WSP) remains the project identified to deliver a ‘new source’ water supply for the Eastern and Midlands area. Abstraction Legislation is expected to be enacted later this year, after which planning permission will be sought from An Bord Pleanála for the Strategic Infrastructure Project
• The County is served by two main treatment plants at Shanganagh and Ringsend. Both plants have good capacity (Ringsend planned upgrades) however, these plants also serve other areas outside of the County. In the longer term, the Greater Dublin Area (GDA) will be dependent on Greater Dublin Drainage Project to free up capacity at the Ringsend plant. Confirm that projects are as set out in appendix 1 of the Draft Plan.
• Ringsend Waste Water Treatment Works upgrade will be complete by 2025
• The Greater Dublin Drainage project involves the development of a new regional waste water treatment facility and associated infrastructure including pipelines to serve the Greater Dublin Area and parts of the surrounding counties of Kildare and Meath. The GDD project is acknowledged as a critical piece of national infrastructure and has been identified in the National Planning Framework (NPF) as a National Strategic Outcome of the National 4 Uisce Éireann Irish Water Development Plan. The project will have the capacity to provide waste water treatment for the equivalent of half a million people to support the needs of a growing population and economy in Dublin and the surrounding counties, whilst also contributing to system resilience and flexibility. An Bord Pleanála granted a Strategic Infrastructure Development permission for GDD in 2019, but that decision was quashed (in November 2020) following legal challenge.
• Welcomes policies on SUDs in chapter 10
• IW will keep the Council updated on progress with the Drainage Area Plans (as listed in our submission at Issues Paper stage and in Appendix 1 of the Draft CDP) as the development plan process progresses. Where there are constraints in the sewer network and no project is identified on the IW Investment Plan, then infrastructure will be developer driven.

Other Policies
• Irish Water are preparing a strategy which will respond to global and national climate change legislative and policy frameworks for climate change action and fulfils the requirements of Irish Water’s Water Services Strategic Plan, The Water Services Policy Statement 2018 – 2025 and most recently the Climate Change Sectoral Adaptation Plan for Water Quality and Water Services Infrastructure 2019.
• IW supports policies in chapter 10 on River Basin Management Plan.

General Comments
• 10.2.1.2 To note that the Water Services Strategic Plan review was completed in 2020.
• Appendix 1 Table 1 – As stated, the cost estimates listed are from the NDP. These are subject to change.

See also submission no.B0904, a further submission from Irish Water

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0542</th>
<th>Person: John Cross</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10,14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
Chief Executive's Report on Draft Plan Consultation

Volume II – Summary of Submissions Received

- Concerned with the overall development of Shankhill, Shanganagh, Rathmichael and Old Conna areas wishes to retain green belt, sylvan low rise character and retain Shankill at the centre.
- In terms of transport there is concern with BusConnects proposals and alternatives are suggested. Supports new cycle facilities being constructed between the settlements.
- In terms of biodiversity favours developments should retain existing trees and hedgerows and incorporate biodiversity friendly elements and using native species.
- Protecting and enhancing streams, rivers, railways and existing roads is also important to act as wildlife corridors and act as stepping stones.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 2, Chapter 5 and Chapter 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0543</td>
<td>Mary O’Brien</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission welcomes the SNI zoning at Clonkeen College noting that there has been too much residential development and proposed residential development on school grounds in the county.
- Submission notes that further residential development on school grounds that have served sporting needs of local communities would be a retrograde step.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0544</td>
<td>Paul Sreenan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission asks the Council to ensure that the high amenity zoning attached to the high ground to the west of the Enniskerry Road, along Killegar Road and in Glencullen be maintained. Notes these areas have been recognised in successive Development Plans as areas of outstanding natural beauty.
- Submission refers to a re-zoning request received from Nijinsky Property Company Limited as part of the Comer Group Ireland. Highlights concerns that the proposal in the submission seeks to bring development into the higher ground adjacent to Kilternan Road and Ballybetagh Wood – in areas of outstanding natural beauty. Notes the absence of infrastructure in this area and considers that any development in the area would set a precedent for the whole area to be widely developed for residential use. Furthermore, considers that this would fail to discriminate between higher ground of outstanding natural beauty and low flat ground in the vicinity of Carrickmines/Kilternan that might be suitable for residential use.
- Requests the owners/developers of the Kilternan Sports Hotel be required to demolish the incomplete hotel and apartment complex and restore the land to its original condition.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0545</td>
<td>Niamh Moirarty</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0546</td>
<td>Paul Quinn</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 2
DLR Submission No: B0547
Person: Mike Higgins
Organisation: Cosgrave Property Group
Map Nos: 2

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission relates to SLO 4 on Map 2 of the Draft regarding St Helen’s Hotel, a protected structure. It refers to the planning history of the site, the context and background of the issues, the requirements of national, regional and local policy documents relating to the DEBP, and the extent of development on site including the presence of a basement area of the hotel within the alignment being a constraint on the future development of the DEBP route and corridor.
- The alignment of the DEBP reservation corridor and guidance included within the Dublin Eastern Bypass Corridor Protection Study Booterstown to Sandyford 2011 and Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2012 are hindering development which is necessary to enhance the facilities of the hotel which have no potential for conflict with any future road scheme or any other future transport based alternative within this corridor.
- Preventing renewal or refurbishment of the hotel will compromise a Protected Structure (St Helen’s). Development should be permitted over the existing basement which is within the corridor as this can not be used for the route/alignment. An SLO should be provided to cover this set of circumstances to St. Helen’s.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

DLR Submission No: B0548
Person: Tom Fennessy
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

DLR Submission No: B0549
Person: Karen Graham
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 9

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Reopen and maintain all existing rights of way, many of which are currently inaccessible.
- Many national monuments are also on private land e.g. Dolmens in Brennanstown and also Kilternan. Provide access with appropriate preservation.
- Maintain as many green spaces as possible, the purchase and maintenance of Fernhill is to be highly commended, but more is needed if population is to continue to grow.
- Ensure safe access by car, bike and foot for all school children within DLR. Some roads are extremely dangerous and school traffic wardens have been removed as it is too dangerous, yet children are expected to cross roads by themselves e.g. Kilternan Church of Ireland National School. As roads become busier this needs to be prioritised and not just in a sample school population but all in DLR remit.
- Ensure housing is supported by road, transport and recreational services. Services are not keeping up with development.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 12

DLR Submission No: B0550
Person: Veronica Daniels
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 2,6

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 2
### DLR Submission No: B0551
**Person:** Judy Durnin  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0552
**Person:** Vivienne Fitzpatrick  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 3

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission refers to Section 8.5.6, Appendix 12, *George’s Place*. Seeks the deletion of the first four sentences, which refer to a pedestrian/cyclist connection from the Council’s former Depot at George’s Place through Stable Lane to the seafront.
- Notes that Stable Lane is a private lane and the plan is to facilitate public access. Opening up the gate would change what is a private (not taken in charge) residential laneway/cul de sac to a public thoroughfare where none has existed before. There is no public right of way through the gateway, nor has there been. It was used as an emergency exit only.
- The change would mean loss of privacy and security for homes which have no surrounding garden or protective railings.
- Many of the residents are either 1) elderly and will not be able to cope with bikes prohibiting easy access to their own parked cars or 2) young children who have nowhere else to play.
- There have been a number of near miss incidents with bicycles in the area.
- Routes already exist to link the coastal road of Crofton Road via Kelly’s Avenue to George’s Lane, and Clarence Street. These routes are roads with footpaths, not small (private) narrow lanes.
- A letter from Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council is attached to the submission, confirming that the laneway has not been taken in charge.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Appendix 8

### DLR Submission No: B0553
**Person:** Ciarán Maher  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0554
**Person:** Pat McCoy  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 4, 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission refers to the ownership and zoning of lands at Ardbrugh Road, Dalkey. Two no. attachments have been submitted, one of which was previously submitted and has been summarised in full under B0057.
- The second attachment to the submission notes that the original correspondence was not intended to be a submission to the plan, however, this has been accepted as being a submission. It is noted that queries raised within the original submission have not be addressed. The original submission is recapped and expanded upon to include the following:
  - When developing Dalkey Rock in the late 1990’s, the boundary for the area was incorrect – an application was made to correct this boundary.
  - It is noted that the boundary in the development plan at that time was incorrect.
  - There is no reason to accept that the area to the rear of Dalkey Rock is zoned or mapped correctly as the original boundary was incorrect.
  - The designation of this area assumed that the lands were in council ownership and not private.
Submission notes that a similar situation occurs to the rear of Redan House where the residential boundary is incorrect. An application was made to correct the boundary to include the entire garden.

Submission notes that a Rangers dealing with the applications noted inaccuracies which demonstrates confusion in relation to boundaries.

There is no reason to accept that zoning in the draft plan is accurate.

Submission notes that access to the floor of the quarry under control of DLR is publicly accessible – rock climbers use this to gain access to the quarry.

The submission noted however, that the rock face to the rear of Redan House is in private ownership and there are potential liability issues as no arrangement has been made with the council in relation to access.

Submission requests is that access to the rock face is cordoned off to stop rock climbers accessing private property.

Submission notes that the lands were surveyed for a period of 9 months and an opinion was formed that development of the lands would not have any significant impact on the flora or fauna of the area.

The lands should be zoned residential to allow for further development.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Map 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0555</td>
<td>Michael Brennan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Welcome and support the retention of SLO 118 “The lands to facilitate and form any future extension of Shanganagh Park.”
- SLO 118 was enabled by landowners on these lands entering into covenants with DLR which should be preserved. Eg. 4.6 acres of land to the west of the Dublin Road opposite St. James’ Church and the new Woodbrook Development are subject to a covenant with the Council to retain the lands free from building development and to preserve all existing trees and to replant.
- Strategic Land Reserve designation on lands to the west of the M11 represents a clear danger to the Green Belt status of the area and should be removed.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Chapters 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0556</td>
<td>Helmut Holfeld</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The submission objects to the SLO for the greater Rathmichael area due to the restrictions for family members to build in the area.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Chapter 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0557</td>
<td>Conor White</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission is in favour of the East Coast Cycle Trail and would welcome early consultation and further details of the proposed route.
- Submission appreciative of dlr policy on Climate Change.
- Submission believes trail will add to amenity value of the area and provide a safe cycle route.
- Submission notes danger posed by speeding cars in Corbawn Estate but is optimistic that the proposed East Coast Cycle Trail may reduce this risk to the community.
- Submission welcomes dlrs commitment to consider providing associated coastal protection between Corbawn Lane and the new Woodbrook Dart station.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Chapter 3 and Chapter 5
### DLR Submission No: B0558
Person: Rory White
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 10

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission is in favour of the East Coast Cycle Trail and would welcome early consultation and further details of the proposed route.
- Submission appreciative of dlr policy on Climate Change.
- Submission believes trail will add to amenity value of the area and provide a safe cycle route.
- Submission notes danger posed by speeding cars in Corbawn Estate but is optimistic that the proposed East Coast Cycle Trail may reduce this risk to the community.
- Submission welcomes dlr's commitment to consider providing associated coastal protection between Corbawn Lane and the new Woodbrook Dart station.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 3 and Chapter 5

### DLR Submission No: B0559
Person: Tara White
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 10

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission is in favour of the East Coast Cycle Trail and would welcome early consultation and further details of the proposed route.
- Submission believes trail will add to amenity value of the area and provide a safe cycle route.
- Submission notes danger posed by speeding cars in Corbawn Estate but is optimistic that the proposed East Coast Cycle Trail may reduce this risk to the community.
- Submission welcomes dlr's commitment to consider providing associated coastal protection between Corbawn Lane and the new Woodbrook Dart station.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 5

### DLR Submission No: B0560
Person: Raymond O'Malley on behalf of East Coast Property BVI Ltd.
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission seeks the rezoning of part of ‘One Vico’, Vico Road from F to A and modify the line of the 0/0 objective to include the additional residentially zoned land.
- Submission notes that the site comprising one single private property currently contains two land use zones – A (0.53Ha) and F (0.32Ha).
- Submission references planning history for the site.
- Submission notes that the zoning objective does not appear to align with any internal boundary or other physical demarcation within the property and is considered inappropriate.
- The zoning does not reflect the use of the property as a single private dwelling and there is no apparent justification for the zoning.
- A map showing the property location and zoning is included.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0561
Person: John Redmill on behalf of Mr and Mrs Steve Pattison
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 2

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests that Bella Vista, Deans Grange Road (RPS No. 2037) be removed from the RPS.
- Submission sets out the legislative background, includes references to the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011) and the NIAH Handbook Edition March 2021, with regard to determining the special interest of a structure, its rating and adding structures to the RPS.
- Submission notes that a copy of the recommendations made by the Minister to the Planning Authority does not appear to be available online.
Submission notes that an ACA is another, less onerous, way of offering legal protection to buildings – it is noted that Bella Vista is not within an ACA.

Submission notes shortcomings of the legislation in terms of not distinguishing between different levels of architectural merit.

Submission notes that the RPS does not reflect the NIAH rating of a structure – this can result in over protection of structures.

Submission sets out a description of the property and provides detail of its NIAH entry – it notes that interiors are not referenced, and it comments upon practices employed by NIAH during their surveys of structures.

Inaccuracies of NIAH descriptions are noted and it is requested that 'vistas of Dublin Bay in the near distance' is removed from record as there are no such views.

It is not known if Edward Spencer, Gentleman, or Samwell Boswell, solicitor, were of any note or significance.

Submission states that the structure has no elements or features that are ‘special’ or of any particular significance.

Submission questions the definition and application of the NIAH ‘regional’ rating and considers that Bella Vista does not make any significant contribution to the heritage of Leinster or Greater Dublin and should not be includes on the RPS.

The Minister should be informed that the property is not to be listed on the RPS until such time that the Local Authority have made their own assessment of the property.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Appendix 4

### Summary of Submission and Observation:  

- Submission seeks the rezoning of lands at Brookfield Avenue, Blackrock from Objective E - ‘to provide for economic development and employment’ to Objective A - ‘to provide residential development and/or protect and improve residential amenity’, in order to facilitate the redevelopment of the lands to the more efficient and sustainable use as residential development.

- A comprehensive overview of the location, description, context and accessibility of the subject lands is provided. Considers the site to be ideally located for residential zoning having regard to its location within the existing built environment, on the outskirts of Blackrock village, a District Centre, and with a wide range of existing services and amenities and high frequency public transport connections (both existing and planned) nearby.

- An overview of the current planning policy pertaining to the site is set out. It is considered that rezoning the subject lands would actively encourage the development of a residential scheme which would achieve the key aims of both national and regional policy, namely the consolidation and re-intensification of infill/brownfield sites to provide high density and people intensive uses within existing built-up areas. Furthermore, the subject lands would adhere to the 10 minute settlement concept, due to its location in close proximity to the services and amenities at Blackrock Village.

- Notes that the former use of the site as a factory is no longer in occupation and suggests the existing businesses could very easily relocate to allow the true potential of the site to be realised.

- Highlights the urgent need for additional housing and states the provision of an infill residential development at the site would contribute towards addressing the current housing shortage and significant housing demand.

- Suggests the existing commercial units at the site represent an unattractive eyesore that doesn’t interact well with the surrounding streetscape and provides little or no passive surveillance. The redevelopment of the site for a high quality residential scheme could significantly improve the aesthetic of the site in the local environment.

- An overview of the urban design benefits of redeveloping the site is provided. It is considered that rezoning the lands would facilitate regeneration and provide a use which is more compatible (both physically and from a land use perspective) with the receiving environment. Submits that the existing use is not compatible with the predominantly residential surrounding context and suggests that redevelopment could significantly enhance the public realm through the provision of a more appropriate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0562</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Cocora Holdings Limited</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
relationship with the surrounding streetscape and the passive surveillance of the surrounding public footpaths.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Map 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0563</th>
<th>Person: Aoife McCarthy</th>
<th>Organisation: Coillte CGA</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The submission welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Draft Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan.
- A summary of the Coillte group is provided.
- It is noted that within Coillte, Land Solutions and Renewable Energy are providing innovative commercial solutions to allow the attainment of key national policy objectives particularly those that are prescribed by the National Planning Framework (2018). Additionally, in 2019 Coillte established a new not-for-profit entity, Coillte Nature, which is dedicated to the restoration, regeneration, and rehabilitation of nature across Ireland.
- The submission states that Coillte has a strong tradition of working with communities and stakeholders, including local authorities, and commits to working closely with Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council to:
  - Deliver on local and wider needs in a manner which aligns with the overall vision for the county.
  - Facilitate the development of a wide range of accessible recreational, community and sporting facilities.
- Coillte along with DLRCC are two of the founding members of the Dublin Mountains Partnership (DMP) which was formed in 2008. The DMP has influenced the development of the Dublin Mountains Makeover Project and is looking forward to achieving much more via its new Strategic Plan 2021-2025. The four themes of the DMP’s new Strategic Plan are; Protect the Resource, Provide for Recreation, Partner for Success and Promote the Benefits, will work well with the DLR’s ambitions as set out in the draft Development Plan.
- This aims to put people and nature first in the Dublin Mountains by transforming nine Coillte forests away from the clearfell and replanting commercial forestry model towards a different model. Which will maintain their green canopy on a permanent basis.
- Work on the Dublin Mountains Makeover started in 2020 and will continue for many years. Coillte manages 795 hectares of land (a mix of commercial forestry, heathland, biodiversity management and recreation provision) in Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown and 617ha of these falls within Dublin Mountains Makeover area.
- The submission welcomes the inclusion of policies in draft Plan, which seek to “promote, protect and enhance sustainable and appropriate access to the natural heritage of the County”, protecting the natural heritage assets of the county (Pol. GIB12); as well as promoting the “development of regional and local networks of hiking and walking routes / trails” (Pol. GIB17).
- Coillte is committed to protecting and enhancing recreation routes developed with the Dublin Mountain Partnership, including the Dublin Mountains Way, walking trails in Carrickgollogan, Barnaslingan, Tibradden, Kilmashogue and Ticknock, permanent orienteering courses and mountain biking trails at Ticknock.
- Coillte supports the development of green infrastructure as referenced in the draft CDP (Appendix 15).
- The submission requests that the Council consider the provision of planning policies as appropriate, to support the provision of development on Coillte lands where suitable; to provide, for example, tourism/recreation, commercial, community and/or other uses which would support and enable national, regional and local policy objectives.
- The submission requests that Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council promote the use of sustainable timber products in the in the forthcoming Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028.
- Coillte’s forest in the Dublin Mountains are increasingly used by people in the Greater Dublin Area for outdoor recreation and in 2020 Coillte Nature (and Dublin Mountains Partnership programme) embarked on a process of converting these forests from timber production to forests with a prime recreation and biodiversity function.
- As a result, Coillte is exploring opportunities to improve accessibility to the Dublin Mountains, for both local users and tourists. Access is these forests is currently exclusively by private cars which presents
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Challenges in terms of road congestion and adequate parking space. Cable car systems are increasingly being deployed in urban environments and Coillte is currently investigating the possibility of using a cable car system linked to public transport as a sustainable transport solution. In this regard, Coillte would welcome the inclusion of appropriate policy support in the County Development Plan, to explore the provision of cable car infrastructure to the Dublin Mountains as a recreation resource within the Coillte estate, in consultation with a range of stakeholders in the long term.

- In preparing the County Development Plan, the submission requests that the Council:
  - Continue to support sustainable rural based enterprises such as tourism/recreation and forestry in the county and make adequate provisions and objectives to facilitate their delivery.
  - Ensure the zoning of sufficient lands with associated objectives for recreational, commercial, tourism and community uses.
  - Support the provision of accessible recreational, community and sporting facilities in the county.
  - Support the provision of tourism infrastructure and visitor services at appropriate locations in the Coillte estate.
  - Promote the use of sustainable timber products in the Development Plan policies and objectives.
  - Support the enhancement and protection of the biodiversity in the forests and other habitats within the Dublin Mountains.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 6, Chapter 8, Appendix 15, Miscellaneous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0564</td>
<td>Geraldine Rafferty</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0565</td>
<td>Patricia O’ Farrell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Refers to SLO 57 and to previous submission in c 2011 that the proposed park is removed from any likely demand for public open space and therefore it is an inappropriate location.
- Refers to planning history of adjoining site on Corrig Road under register ref D201/0356 and that the land has been effectively sterilised and DLR has not acquired the site despite the designation.
- DLR have their own property on the corner of Corrig Road and Blackthorn Road and should use this instead for the district civic park
- Requests that the lands are rezoned and that the approved commercial use rights are reinstated

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0566</td>
<td>Joan Deegan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0567</td>
<td>Susie Cox</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Object to the proposed opening of the gate at Stable Lane/George’s Place, which provides a guarantee of privacy for residents.
While the Council owned the "yard" (depot) the stipulation has always been that the emergency gate that leads onto Stable lane and onward to the coast road was for emergency access only. This was confirmed recently with the development of the housing.

Also object to the proposed height of the new school development.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0568</td>
<td>Conor Sheehan, Sheehan Planning on behalf of Ms Rose Ivory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission refers to a recommendation in the pre-draft CE report with regard to reviewing the 0/0 objective in the Killiney area.
- Submission states that there appears to be no corresponding change to policy text relating to the 0/0 objective between section 13.3.3.8 in the Draft plan and chapter 8 of the current plan.
- Submission requests that proposed text at paragraph 12.3.8.8 and in chapter 4 (and any other relevant section of the plan) relative to the 0/0 objective to permit development on all 0/0 and where development would not detract from the character of the area regardless of its proximity to public transport.
- Submission requests that a definition of the ‘special amenity’ to be protected would be helpful.
- Submission states that it is unclear if a suitable site is one that should be located within ‘close proximity’ or if this extends to all sites within the 0/0 designation.
- Submission states that it should not be a precondition for small scale infill development to be within a 10-minute walk of a DART station.
- Submission notes the National and Regional imperatives of compact growth and infill development and states that ‘Notable Character Area Exclusions’ of the Draft Plan do not necessarily appear to reflect these imperatives.
- Submission requests that the 0/0 designation at Pine Hill, Vico Road be considered for removal.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4, Map 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0569</td>
<td>Brian Reddy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission requests the re-zoning of lands at Brewery Road, Stillorgan, Co. Dublin from Objective F to Objective A. A map is included which identifies the relevant site.
- The submission notes that the general public doesn’t have access to the land and there is ample land zoned open space for public use in the immediate area.
- Notes that the site is currently annexed for development in relation to the adjoining office development, in the same ownership, and that they would be keen to explore options to develop the site.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0570</td>
<td>Brendan Carberry</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission notes there have been incidences of anti-social behaviour prior to the current works at the reservoir. Concern the development of a park would increase this behaviour.
- Objects to a walkway at the site due to concerns of overlooking into house and garden.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0571</th>
<th>Person: Mary Brady</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td>Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td>Map 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0572</th>
<th>Person: Noreen Walsh</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Summary of Submission and Observation:** | Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space.  
- The Stillorgan/Sandyford area is already overdeveloped with large apartment blocks with no green areas. |
| **Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):** | Map 2 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0573</th>
<th>Person: Robert Simmons</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 1, 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td>Strongly support all the details of the submission made by the Roebuck Residents Association on the subject of the ongoing work on the County Development Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td>No issues have been raised to include in Volume I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0574</th>
<th>Person: Frank Kane</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Summary of Submission and Observation:** | Submission notes recent increase in volume of cars in Sandycove Avenue.  
- Submission notes there are a limited number of parking spaces and cars are parking on the footpath, double yellow lines and blocking entrances to dwellings.  
- Submission suggests the use of a UK solution of having red markings for no-stopping/parking zones, with heavier penalties might dissuade some.  
- Submission suggests tighter parking restrictions could act as a deterrent. |
| **Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):** | Chapter 5 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0575</th>
<th>Person: Shane Twomey</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td>Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td>Map 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0576</th>
<th>Person: Peter Dudley</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td>Welcomes Policy Objective T22: Roads and Streets and requests that Falls Road is included in Table 5.3 6 Year Road Objectives and shown on Map no 10 as there is presently no footpath and lighting is inadequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0577</th>
<th>Person: The Marianists of Ireland</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission requests that the A zoning and removal of the INST of the eastern parcel of lands is maintained at Saint Laurence College, Wyattville Rd. A map identifying the land parcel in question is included.
- Submission welcomes the SNI zoning for the remainder of the site.
- Submission states that insufficient rationale for the rezoning of the entirety of the site is provided particularly when regard is had to an impending SHD application on the lands.
- Submission considers that the SNI zoning will have a detrimental impact on the school as the sale of lands for residential use is required to support the requirements of the school.
- Submission sets out a site description, location and context noting that the site area is c. 5.8ha and is Irelands only Marianist school that has operated in the area for c. 53yrs.
- Submission considers the site to be an ideal location for residential development given its location proximate to a number of transportation links and range of services, facilities and open space.
- Imagery has been submitted with the submission illustrating its location and context.
- Submission notes that the rezoning of the land would impede the provision of residential development and prevent its sale.
- Submission sets out the National policy context noting specific National Policy Objectives from the NPF and references from the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas, Guidelines (2009).
- Submission sets out a comparison between the current, 2016 plan, land use zoning objectives and policies relative to the site and those proposed in the draft plan. It is noted that ‘residential’ is currently permitted in principle, however, under the draft which zones the site ‘SNI’, residential is ‘open for consideration’.
- Submission considers that the SNI results in a more restricted development potential and the draft plan does not provide sufficient information as to the circumstances required for residential development to be considered.
- Submission sets out policy objectives for development on lands zoned SNI in the draft plan.
- Submission agrees with Council’s view regarding the importance of providing new sustainable neighbourhood infrastructure within communities and safeguarding existing facilities, however, it is the proposed SNI zoning on the entirely of the site is counteractive as it will prevent the long-term growth of Saint Laurence College.
- Submission notes that a SHD application will be submitted during the life of the current, 2016 plan which demonstrates an interest in providing residential units on the site.
- The inability to sell the land and generate income of the protection and improvement of the existing school is considered to be a contravention of the SNI zoning objective.
- Submission notes that the SHD application will provide for residential units and ancillary uses which may be used by the local community and income received would be used to improve school facilities.
- Submission requests that the draft development plan would include some consideration of the inclusion of residential development on ‘SNI’ zoned lands.
- Submission notes the provisions of chapter 4 in the draft plan and submits that rezoning a portion of the site would allow for housing closer to a village centre and has potential to help achieve a number of objectives set out in the chapter and housing targets set out in the draft plan.
- Submission refers to rural clustering.
- A letter from the Marianists of Ireland is set out in Appendix A of the submission noting that they are the owners of the land and that it is their intention to dispose of a minor section of the lands for residential development.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4, Map 10

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The Right of way from the Dublin Mountain way accessing the lands beside the ski club and going through the Fairy Village and forest, exiting out on the Killegar Road must be retained for the benefit of public use.
- The Change of Use of the whole property of Nijinsky holdings is in appropriate where the lands are currently used for sporting and agricultural use.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Map Nos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0579</td>
<td>Geoffrey Corry</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Map Nos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0580</td>
<td>Martha Vard</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Map Nos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0581</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>On Behalf of Kennedy Wilson</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission provides an introduction and provides an outline of and update on the development that Kennedy Wilson are involved in within dlr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission welcomes the additional 25% headroom applied to the population figures up to 2026 and notes that housing targets set since 2008 have not been met with undeveloped allocation being brought forward, rather than remaining with additional provision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Built to Rent**
- Submission considers that restrictions on built to rent (B2R) are not appropriate and that the requirement for B2R developments to meet all standards set out in section 12.3.6 of the Draft Plan conflicts with SPPR 8 in respect of 50% requirement in relation to dual aspect, separation distances and storage.
- Submission requests that section 4.3.2 be amended to remove restrictions on Built to Rent.
- Submission requests that section 12.3.5 be amended to remove restrictions on Built to Rent.
- Build to Rent should be omitted as a separate use class as its inclusion is not allowed for under the Planning and Development Act. If retained Build to Rent should be permitted in principle under “NC”, A, A1 and A2 zoning.

**Density**
- Designation of the County as an “intermediate location” conflicts with SPPR 4 of the Design Standards for New Apartments. County should be designated as “central and/or accessible urban location.”
- PHP18 should be amended to incorporate Section 28 Guiding Height Guidelines and relationship to density and should also address the 2018 Section 28 Apartment Guidelines. A suggested wording in given.

**Unit Mix**
- Submission contends that use of the Interim HNDA to justify a departure from SPPR 1 on mix is inappropriate in the absence of guidelines on HNDA.
- It is unclear if mix requirements apply to BTR but it is considered that they should not apply.
- It is unclear as to why older people would require to down size to a 4 bed apartment.
- Falling household size should create demand for more 1 and 2 beds.

**HNDA**
Submission
• Provides an overview of the HNDA and considers that it is not clear if the HNDA has been carried out with coordination assistance from the Regional Assembly.
• Considers that sweeping restrictions on mix are inappropriate although submission agrees it is important to promote a mix within a scheme.
• Requests that table 12.1 be omitted and that the Draft Plan and Strategy be revised to align with the Design Standards for new Apartments.

Dual Aspect
• Requirement for 50% of apartments to be dual aspect should be omitted and sites that are in central/accessible locations should be allowed to justify a lower dual aspect ratio.

Building Height
• Additional Criteria set out in table 5.1 of the Building Height Strategy should be omitted as they are in conflict with the Section 28 Guidelines.
• Draft Plan should be amended to ensure where proposals meet section 3.2 of the Section 28 Guidelines, the planning authority can grant permission even where specific objectives may indicate otherwise.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 2, Chapter 4, Chapter 12, Appendix 2, Appendix 5

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission refers to lands at Dundela Avenue, Sandycove and the roadway at the Dundela Avenue extension requesting proof that the roadway has been taken in charge. In the absence of proof that the roadway has been taken in charge requests that the roadway be described as a private road in the Plan.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission notes increase in traffic between Seapoint and Dalkey following the introduction of cycle lane.
- Submission notes decrease quality of life for residents as there is increased pollution, increased commute times and lack of access for emergency vehicles in the Sandycove area.
- Submission welcomes Cycle lanes and sea swimming but request some planning measures.
- Submission notes residential parking has been reduced, cars queue for parking spaces and newly installed bike racks stand empty.
- Submission notes that a paid parking system will not solve the issue.
- Submission requests a mix of residential parking only with a few paid parking spaces.
- Submission notes that the Sandycove Loop requires a its own SLO within the County Development plan.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- EirGrid notes and welcomes reference and emphasis placed on electricity transmission in the Draft Development Plan, particularly Section 10.5 which details Energy Policies.
- EirGrid understands the principle underlying objective Policy EI20 in Section 10.5.2 and will always examine the feasibility for same. However, it is not always possible for high voltage transmission infrastructure to be located underground for a variety of reasons - technical, economic and environmental. EirGrid would ask the council to review and exclude transmission infrastructure under this objective.
EirGrid carefully plans its routes and sites for new transmission grid infrastructure based on a careful consideration of a wide range of issues. The final route for any line is a carefully considered balance of technical, economic, planning, environmental considerations. EirGrid will always explain this as part of its substantive reasons for the route design.

EirGrid welcomes the promotion of measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the draft plan and support for the development of offshore renewable energy generation, set out under Objective CA11 in Section 3.4.2.2. This policy should be expanding to include the support for related onshore grid connections and reinforcements, consistent with RPO 10.24 of the Eastern and Midland Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy: “RPO 10.24: Support the sustainable development of Ireland’s offshore renewable energy resources in accordance with the Department of Communications, Energy and Natural Resources ‘Offshore Renewable Energy Development Plan’ and any successor thereof including any associated domestic and international grid connection enhancements.”

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 3, Chapter 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person: Dudley Dolan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission has expressed concern with respect to the protection of the area around Ticknock, Woodside, Blackglen, and in particular, Fitzsimons Wood.
- The 2016-2022 Plan emphasises the important role of wildlife corridors to the fauna and flora diversity throughout the County and highlights the legislative backing for the protection of wildlife corridors as set out in the Habitats Directive 1992 (92/43/EEC).
- The submission notes that the Council has created an excellent Biodiversity Education Programme relating to Fitzsimons Wood.
- The submission therefore requests that the following be included in the Draft Plan:
  (i) A clear map showing the Wildlife Corridor from Three Rock Mountain to Fitzsimons Wood
  (ii) Clarification as to how Deer will be able to cross the widened Blackglen Road
  (iii) Confirmation that the widened Blackglen Road will allow Badgers to cross via a tunnel or culvert.
  (iv) Confirmation that any planning permissions for development along Blackglen Road will make provision for the proposed Wildlife Corridor.
  (v) Fitzsimons Wood designated a Natural Heritage Area (NHA).

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person: Shane Moriarty</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- An overall traffic management plan is needed for the Goatstown area to accommodate the increase in population arising from both permitted development and schemes under construction.
- Recommends a new approach such as the removal of traffic lanes for pedestrians and cyclists and speeding up the upgrade of the Luas and extension of a new line from Rathfarnham to Booterstown.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person: Zoe Thorp</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
Chapter 2:
- An unfinished building block (photo submitted) in Sandyford Business Park should be addressed in the Plan - should be used for housing and retail units. Currently it is an eyesore.

Chapter 3:
- Fantastic chapter, especially urban greening and 10-minute settlement approach.
- Promotion of renewable energy, especially micro wind and solar, and infrastructure for electric cars is great.
- New builds should include charging stations for electric cars.
- Supportive of the Glencullen LAP- keeping some places rural is fantastic.

**Chapter 4:**
- Fully support Section 4.3.2.2 – a mix promotes a community better

**Chapter 5:**
- Support the delivery of the metro extension to Bray. The increase in tram size and frequency is also welcome.
- Section 5.6.5 Control of On-Street Parking – this should go further by developing more multi-storey preferably underground car parks, especially in areas such as Sandy Cove and Seapoint. Parking removal is not a good response as it encourages dangerous parking.

**Chapter 7:**
- Table 7.2 shows fantastic promise and the development of these district centres will be invaluable.
- DLRCC should also make sure there are spaces designated for local markets.

**Chapter 8:**
- Positive regarding the chapter, in particular the prospects to be preserved (Section 8.1).
- Regarding 8.5.3. submission considers that there should be specific concentrations on how to keep those areas usable for all, particularly with regard to litter.
- Section 8.6.3 Rights of Way is fantastic, fully support it and signposting of ROWs, and all ROW must be actively fought for.
- ROWs are an amenity and supports biodiversity and promotes outdoor activities.
- Hope that ROWs are recorded and put on maps.
- Proper link between Enniskerry and Kilternan required and DLRCoCo and WCC should discuss this.
- Section 7.1.1 is a great policy and if carried out as described will greatly benefit the environment and natural heritage of the county.

**Chapter 9:**
- Move towards nature-based play is a great idea.

**Chapter 10:**
- In support of chapter 10 however there should be a stronger policy for 10.2.2.10 and 10.4.3 due to sewage overflow and the impact on swimming.
- In support of the development of a wide network of multi-material recycling centres.

**Chapter 11:**
- In support of chapter 11 and any plan that increases or maintains public access to heritage areas.

**Chapter 13:**
- In agreement with Section 13.1.8 that Sandyford has been developed in a piecemeal fashion and needs to be corrected and utilised.
- An underground multi-storey car park should be built in UCD, next to the new residential units built in the last year.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapters 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9,10, 11, 12, Miscellaneous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0588</th>
<th>Person: Marie O'Riordan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oppose pedestrianisation of area between Patrick Street to St Michael's Hospital due to impact on traffic. A lot of traffic is already diverted due to new cycle lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests the re-zoning of lands at Glenamuck Road from zoning Objective ‘F’ to zoning Objective ‘A’. The lands comprise a playing pitch, car parking area and ancillary changing room buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• States the lands are privately owned and not publicly accessible. An overview of the land’s usage is set out. Notes that Bective Rugby Football Club use the pitch on a very infrequent basis but now have no further need for the land. The Club has other more suitable modern facilities available elsewhere.
• An overview of the location of the lands, surrounding context, and planning history of sites in the vicinity is provided. It is highlighted that the general area has and is undergoing significant change, as evidenced by a large number of planning applications for, inter alia, high-density residential development.
• Submits the lands are well served by amenities, services and existing and planned transport infrastructure making them eminently suitable for residential development. Highlights that road improvements in the Kiltiernan/Glenamuck area will significantly improve traffic movements and unlock further lands for residential development, including the subject lands.
• An overview of national and regional policy and guidance is set out. Submits the proposed re-zoning would be in accordance and consistent with the National Development Plan, NPF, RSES, and the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2009).
• An overview of the existing and Draft CDP is provided. Notes that under the Draft CDP, the majority of the subject site continues to be zoned Objective ‘F’, with the access road zoned Objective ‘A’. Submits the lands cannot be defined or categorised under the public open space types listed in the Draft CDP’s Hierarchy of Public Open Spaces (Table 9.1) as they are privately owned and are not, and will not be, available for public amenity or recreation use.
• Considers that although the greenfield / playing field characteristics of the site lend it to being described as open / recreational green space, the Objective ‘F’ zoning is not appropriate having regard to the private nature of the lands, coupled with the infrequency of their use. Submits the occasional use of the lands does not represent a sustainable use for the site and contravenes national policy to provide additional housing on infill sites that are serviced.
• Submits the Objective ‘F’ zoning does not represent the efficient use of serviced lands given their proximity and available links to Dublin City and South County Dublin employment centres, and to established social and community services in the immediate vicinity.
• Highlights the site is not zoned Objective ‘B’ (Rural Amenity), Objective ‘G’ (High Amenity), or Objective ‘GB’ (Green Belt) and does not contain any sites of conservation interest. Considers this infers the site is not of specific amenity, visual or environmental value, that could render it less suitable for future residential development.
• Submits the lands do not suffer from any significant physical limitations that may prevent their development. Notes a small pocket of the site is located within Flood Zone A.
• An overview of relevant extracts from the Kiltiernan-Glenamuck LAP is set out. Highlights the lands that immediately bound the subject site are identified for medium to high density residential development as well as commercial development.
• Submits the lands comprise an infill site between other zoned lands and their re-zoning would further provide serviced, strategically located lands for residential development, delivering much need residential units to the area whilst also consolidating the built form.
• Highlights the rezoning of the lands would not result in the loss of public open space as the lands are currently not accessible to the public. Notes there are a number of other publicly available amenities available in the area such as public parks, the recreation facilities at Samuel Beckett Civic Centre and also the planned Jamestown Park. Submits the proposed re-zoning would afford an opportunity to link the site with the future Jamestown Park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person: Hughes Planning and Development Consultants on behalf of the Roe Family</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission requests the rezoning of c. 2.16ha of land located to the west of the Enniskerry Road in Kiltiernan from Objective ‘G’ – High Amenity to Objective ‘A’ – Residential.
Submission sets out context with regards the location of the subject lands including proximate lands uses and transportation. An overview of planning history pertaining to the surrounding area is set out.

Reference is made to the Glenamuck District Distributor Road Scheme and it is suggested that there is scope to facilitate additional residential development within Kiltiernan such as at the subject lands.

Policies from the NPF are set out and it is suggested that the proposed rezoning would accord with the vision of the National Planning Framework. Reference is made to the identification of Kiltiernan in the RSES. Submission sets out a number of policy objectives from the Draft CDP and also the Kiltiernan / Glenamuck LAP 2013 and suggests that the rezoning of the lands to residential would help to achieve these objectives.

States that current development and expansion in the County along transport routes does not correlate with the CDP’s objectives for creating sustainable urban villages. Suggests that rezoning the subject lands from High Amenity to Residential would support the concentration of development near the heart of Kiltiernan Village, serving to strengthen its core. This would reduce the need for private cars and promote more sustainable transport methods such as walking and cycling. The rezoning of the lands would also help to achieve the housing target for the County and accommodate the growing population.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 9

Summary of Submission and Observation:

Submission on behalf of Wind Energy Ireland (formerly the Irish Wind Energy Association). The submission outlines the submitter’s role as well as the background to the wind industry in Ireland, the technology’s role in electricity generation and impact on carbon emissions. It also compares Ireland to various European countries in term of their wind resource and turbine densities and outlines Ireland’s offshore wind resource and potential for additional wind generation.

Local Authorities should be cautious when considering the designation of areas so as not to constrain renewable energy potential, particularly for wind generation.

The County’s densely populated urban nature means that traditional onshore wind farms cannot be developed so the submission focuses on the possibilities of offshore infrastructure and its integration into the onshore electricity transmission network.

The submission outlines Ireland’s policy ambitions as set out in the National Climate Action Plan 2019 as well as Section 28 Guidelines for Planning Authorities and the relevant requirements thereunder.

Policy changes in recent years have now put planning permission as the critical first stage of any renewable energy projects, prior to an application for a grid connection and route to market. Therefore, clear and supportive planning policies are required to ensure that Ireland meets the challenges of addressing climate change and decarbonising the Irish economy.

It is unclear how the Draft Plan has demonstrated how its implementation will contribute to realising overall national targets on renewable energy and climate change. DLRCC should ensure that the finalised development plan ensures the economic and carbon reduction potential of offshore wind is reflected in all future policy decisions and procedures.

Apart from one Policy Objective (CA11) there appears to be no other reference to onshore [offshore?] wind or renewables in the Wind Energy Strategy, which is focused more on onshore wind farm development.

Recommend that DLRCC considers updating its Wind Energy Strategy to recognise the potential for the Irish Sea to accommodate offshore renewable energy development.

It is also vitally important that the onshore development associated with offshore wind should also be referenced. This would allow for a more expansive Wind Energy Strategy which is cognisant of Ireland’s Offshore Renewable Energy Development Plan (OREDP) and the forthcoming Marine Area Planning Bill.

Urge that DLRCC’s finalised plan update its policy objectives to ensure that the onshore grid infrastructure necessary to facilitate offshore renewable energy development is referenced and supported. This is particularly important in the Council’s coastal areas and in the Carrickmines area, where it is proposed that electricity from future offshore wind farms will land onshore and connect into existing electrical transmission system infrastructure at the existing 220 kV Carrickmines Substation.
The submission goes on to outline necessary onshore infrastructural requirements to support offshore wind energy generation and recommends that land-use planning policies recognise the importance of this critical infrastructure ensuring that there are no conflicting policies preventing future investment, expansion and connections to Carrickmines substation.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Chapter 3, Appendix 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0592</td>
<td>John Spain</td>
<td>On behalf of Westbrown (Sandyford properties) limited</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission relates to 26 Corrig Avenue, Sandyford.
- Request rezoning of lands at 26 Corrig Avenue from objective F to objective A2, Zone 5. Considers zoning is inconsistent with the long established commercial use of the site and results in the site being blighted. No progress has been made in relation to progression of the Civic Park.
- Site is suitable for residential development and a site to the south is in the same ownership.
- Relevant planning history for the site and surrounding sites is set out including a recent refusal on the site.
- National and Regional Policy context is set out – NPF and RSES and Greater Dublin Area Transport Strategy.
- Development Plan guidelines, Building Heights Guidelines and Apartment Guidelines are set out and it is requested that the Draft Plan does not inhibit development potential on the site.
- Local Planning policy is set out along with argument for why sites is suitable for residential development.
- An appendix is included with relevant planning history.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Appendix 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0593</td>
<td>Roslyn Nicholson</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7, 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- It is noted that submission B0593 and submission B0619 were combined and resubmitted as B0630.
- See B0630 for a complete summary of the combined submissions.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Refer to issues raised under B0630.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0594</td>
<td>Keep Ireland Open</td>
<td>Keep Ireland Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The submission indicates support for several policies with the Draft Plan.
- This submission includes references from County Development Plans throughout the Country which have been used to form the basis of the suggested policy objective text for the Draft Plan.
- The submission highlights that the Draft Plan must indicate that it has regard to plans in adjoining counties and co-ordinates the objectives with those in adjoining Counties.
- It must conform to the RSES for the Eastern and Midland Region, strive to secure the financial resources to implement the policies and objects of the Plan and shall ensure that the development plan is consistent with the strategy of the NTA.
- It is presumed that the Council will be monitoring the provisions in the Draft Plan which has commenced/or is imminent and that you will liaise with their planners to ensure that the plans are compatible, where appropriate.
- The submission is concerned that many of the excellent provisions in the 2016 Plan have not been carried forward to the Draft without any apparent reason. Therefore, it requests that these are reviewed to be included.
The submission recommends a number of suggestions with respect to the format of the Plan such as sub-sections, an index, and Development Management relevant policies should be dealt with at the end of each chapter, or cross referenced to make the document more user friendly.

The layout could also be improved by sub-numbering or sub-lettering lists of points and paragraphs. The present layout creates difficulties when referring to particular points. Also, Chapter numbers should be placed on each page.

The submission indicates that the Draft fails to comply with, have regard to the Planning & Development Act, plans in adjoining counties (including Draft), DoECLG Guidelines, Heritage Act 1995, National Heritage Plan, Eastern and Midland RSES and the Development Plan Guidelines.

**With respect to Chapter 3:**

- **Policy Objective CA13: Solar Energy,** last paragraph should be replaced by:
  “Development must safeguard and protect the natural heritage and must have no significant adverse/negative impact on the surrounding area natural, environmental quality/value or on the visual character of the landscape and amenities. There is a presumption against their being located in sensitive areas such as Natura 2000 sites. Development must have regard to its effect on scenic routes, its possible cumulative effect and the potential for mitigation through screening with hedges.”

- The following policy objectives should be included:
  - That the Council make representations to the appropriate government department to make Planning Guidelines for ground mounted solar farms.
  - A Renewable Energy policy to produce a Renewable Energy Strategy within the lifetime of the Plan. And to provide guidance with respect to the location and the impact of the development including any ancillary facilities or buildings in terms of their impacts on the amenities of the area and shall not create a hazard or impact on the visual amenity.

**With respect to Chapter 5:**

- The submission requests a reworded policy objective for Policy Objective T10: Walking and Cycling. Several additional policy objectives are drafted for inclusion in this regard.
- The submission requests additional policy objectives for Policy Objective T12: Cycle Routes, Policy Objective T13: Coastal Cycling Infrastructure Objective.
- Submission suggests detailed and lengthy additional policy objectives with respect to cycling, waking and cycling combined.

**With respect to Chapter 6:**

The submission welcomes Policy Objective E18 Rural Development.

**With respect to Chapter 7:**

- Submission requests that an additional Sub Section: Tourist-based developments is included to Chapter 7 and have a suggested policy objective for same.

**With respect to Chapter 8:**

- The submission expresses support with respect to the following:
  - Green Infrastructure.
  - Policy Objective BIB3: Seascapes.
  - Policy Objective GIB4: High Amenity Zones.
  - Policy Objective: GIB 5: Historic Landscape Areas.
  - Policy Objective GIB6: Views and Prospects.
  - Policy Objective GIB 8: Coastline Parks and Harbours.
  - Policy Objective GIB 9: Beaches.
  - Policy Objective GIB10: Dublin Bay Biosphere.
  - Policy Objective GI28: Invasive Species.
  - Policy Objective GIB 29: Nature Based Solutions.
  - Policy Objective GIB 30: Promoting Biodiversity by avoiding Widespread Use of Herbicides and Pesticides.

- The submission suggests replacement wording for Policy Objective GIB 2: Landscape Character Areas which is based on numerous County Development Plans. Several additional policy objectives are drafted for inclusion in this regard.
- The submission suggests the inclusion of additional policy objectives with respect to Policy Objective GIB 11: Coastal Area Feasibility Study.
• The submission suggests that the first phrase of Policy Objective GIB18: Protection of Natural Heritage and the Environment should be repositioned in Chapter 11 Heritage and Conservation and merged with proposed additional policy objective.
• The submission suggests that Policy Objective GIB16: National Park should be prefix with policy objective Wicklow Mountains, and should include to promote, add and enhance.
• Several policy objectives are also suggested for inclusion, including a proposed policy objective with respect to National Parks.
• The submission suggests that Policy Objective GIB17: Trails, Hiking and Walking Routes, should be repositioned in Chapter 5: Transport & Mobility in Section 5.5 by Promoting active Travel: Cycling and Walking as an additional policy objective. Paragraph three should also be positioned in Chapter 5 as an additional policy objective.
• Additionally, the first paragraph should be repositioned in Chapter 11 Heritage and Conservation as an additional subsection: G County Heritage Plan Policy Objective.
• The submission suggests that the first paragraph, first point of Policy Objective GIB18: Protection of Natural Heritage and the Environment should be positioned in proposed additional subsection: Amenity Forestry and merged with proposed additional policy objective.
• The submission suggests that the fifth point of Policy Objective GIB18: Protection of Natural Heritage and the Environment should be deleted as it better dealt with in 8.7.1.9 Policy Objectives GIB26: Geological Sites.
• The submission suggests that the sixth point of Policy Objective GIB18: Protection of Natural Heritage and the Environment should be deleted as it better dealt with in 8.3.1.4 Policy Objective GIB21: Designated Sites.
• The submission suggests that the seventh point of Policy Objective GIB18: Protection of Natural Heritage and the Environment should be proposed as an additional subsection in Chapter 11 Heritage and Conservation: D Wetlands.
• The submission suggests that the eight point of Policy Objective GIB18: Protection of Natural Heritage and the Environment should be repositioned as in 8.7.1.1 above and merged with a suggested policy objective.
• The last paragraph should be repositioned in a proposed additional subsection in Chapter 11: C Peatlands.
• The submission suggests that the first sentence of Policy Objective: GIB21 Designated Sites should be reworded with suggested policy wording. The submission also requests that the second sentence should be replaced with several suggested additional policy objectives.
• The submission suggests additional policy with respect to Natura Sites, NHAs, Ramsar Sites, Statutory Nature Reserves, Biogenetic Reserves, and Wildfowl Sanctuaries.
• The submission suggests new wording for Policy Objective GIB24: Rivers and Waterways. It also suggests that the first paragraph and first sentence should be merged with the policy objective.
• The policy objective should also include a Table of Existing or potential riverside walks/cycle routes – similar to Kildare County Development Plan.
• Several additional policy objectives are drafted for inclusion in this regard.
• Specifically with respect to the Dodder and The Slade Valley and to co-operate with adjoining Councils in developing a strategy and in the preparation of an Environmental Development Plan.
• The submission suggests that the first phrase of Policy Objective: GIB26 Geological Sites should be replaced with suggested policy wording. Several additional policy objectives are drafted for inclusion in this regard.
• The last paragraph should be merged with proposed additional policy objective.

With respect to Chapter 9:
• The submission suggests that Policy Objective OSR7: Trees, Woodland and Forestry should be repositioned in Chapter 11 E Amenity Woodlands.
• Also, Policy Objective OSR8: Greenways and Blueways Network should be repositioned in Chapter 5 Transport and Mobility in 5.5 Promoting Active Travel: Cycling and Walking as additional provisions.
• Additional policy objectives are suggested with respect to access and recreational amenities in both urban and countryside locations, their protection and preservation. That gold course development does not impinge on rights of ways and permission is not permitted for noise generating sports.
• The submission suggests that Policy Objective OSR11: Water Based Sports should be repositioned in Chapter 8 Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity in 8.6 The Coast as an additional Policy Objective.
With respect to Chapter 10:
- The submission requests a reworded policy objective for Policy Objective EI 20: Overhead Cables. Several additional policy objectives are drafted for inclusion in this regard.
- The submission requests that an additional policy objective be included with respect to telecommunications and public rights of way.

With respect to Chapter 11:
- The submission suggests that a number of subsections be included to Chapter 11 i.e. Heritage, Mass Rocks and Holy Wells, Peatlands, Wetlands, Amenity Woodlands, Special Amenity Areas, World Heritage Sites, and has suggested policy objectives for each proposed new subsection for Chapter 11.
- The submission requests a reworded policy objective for Policy Objective HER1: Protection of Archaeological Heritage. Several additional policy objectives are drafted for inclusion in this regard.
- The submission requests a reworded policy objective for Policy Objective HER2: Protection of Archaeological Material in Situ. Several additional policy objectives are drafted for inclusion in this regard.
- The submission requests a reworded policy objective for Policy Objective HERS: Historic Burial Grounds. Several additional policy objectives are drafted for inclusion in this regard.
- The submission requests that an additional chapter titled Rural Economy is included with respect to Agriculture, specifically commonage and recreational and amenity resources, commercial developments in the Countryside, extractive, and commercial forestry. Policy Objectives are suggested for each of the suggested subsections, in this regard for example the recognise and support farmers, to promote the adoption of a land use strategy and to protect and conserve rural amenities etc.

With respect to Chapter 12:
- The submission expresses support with respect to the following Sections of this chapter:
  - 12.2 Climate Action.
  - 12.2.3 Wind Energy – first paragraph.
  - 12.7 Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity.
  - 12.7.1 Green Infrastructure.
  - 12.7.2 Biodiversity.
  - 12.7.3 Sensitive Landscapes and Site Features.
  - 12.7.4 Amenity Landscapes, Views and Prospects.
  - 12.9 Environmental Infrastructure.
- With respect to Section 12.2.4 Solar the submission suggests that an additional provision be included with respect to ‘Hydro Power’, as follows: “In assessing hydro energy schemes proposals the Council will take into account the impact on public rights of way and walking routes”.
- With respect to Section 12.7.4 Fencing of Hitherto Open Landscape, the submission suggests that the wording be replaced with suggested wording which references the Planning and Development Regulations with respect to fencing or enclosure of land open to or used by the public.
  In addition, the submission requests that the first paragraph should be deleted as this provision conflicts with the remainder of this of this Policy in that the criteria of what constitutes best agricultural practice approaches i.e. the requirements of different farmers and the interests of recreational users and the visual pollution of landscape caused by this fencing. There has been a large increase in the amount of fencing in upland areas. Barbed wire has been used in most of this fencing, which, in the absence of stiles or gates, makes access for recreational users almost impossible and also could have serious consequences in the event of a serious accident or illness. The submission states that no other County plan includes a provision of this nature.
  Several additional policy objectives with suggested wording are proposed for inclusion with respect to the type of fencing to be used.
- With respect to Section 12.9.8 Telecommunications, the submission suggested that the fourth point should include the term “routes”.
- With respect to Section 12.10 Drainage and Water Supply, the submission suggests that the title does not reflect the provisions therein and another title should be considered.
- With respect to Section 12.10.2 Coastal Issues - Erosion/Flooding/Recreation, the submission requests that an additional subsection should be included (taken from other County Development Plans in the Country): Tourism and Recreational Development as follows:
  - “Tourism and recreational development shall be assessed against the nature and scale appropriate to the character of the area and shall be located to be visually sympathetic to its surroundings”.
• With respect to Section 12.11 Heritage the submission requests that an additional subsection be included as follows:
  - “In assessing applications for new quarries or extension to existing quarries the council will have regard to the visual impact on the environment, landscape, archaeology including proposed mitigation measures. (Taken from Louth Draft).
  - In assessing individual development proposals, the following criteria will be taken into account: The impact on landscape and public rights of way and walking routes, mitigation features where impacts are inevitable, protection of NHAs, SPAs, areas of scenic importance and national monuments including the cumulative impact of the proposal. (Taken from Meath Draft)”.

**With respect to the Appendices the submission notes:**
The Wind Energy Strategy, regard had to all National and Regional Planning Policy and Ministerial Planning Guidelines.

• Section 11.3 Analysis of Suitable Areas for Wind Energy the following should be considered and included:
• Prepare Maps showing the degree of acceptability from prohibition to preferred including areas in adjoining counties considered unsuitable (taken from Cork Council). Public Rights of Way/Access Routes the Plan should include additional provisions as follows:
• Identify existing public rights of way and established walking routes and maintain and preserve them free from development. (Taken from Cavan 4.73 PIO 117.8).
• All applicants should include a LIA dealing with possible impacts on any existing rights of way or established walking routes. (Taken from Kilkenny 10.5.3 Landscape Impact Assessment).
• Ensure that the assessment of wind energy development proposals will have regard to the impacts on public rights of way and walking routes. (Taken from Kildare 8.5).

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 1, Chapter 3, Chapter 5, Chapter 7, Chapter 8, Chapter 9, Chapter 10, Chapter 11, Chapter 12, and Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0595</th>
<th>Person: David Mulcahy Planning Consultant Ltd</th>
<th>Organisation: On behalf of David Morris</th>
<th>Map Nos: 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
• Submission requests the rezoning of c. 5ha of land at ‘Annalands’, Ferndale Road from Objective ‘GB’ - Green Belt to Objective ‘A’ – Residential.
• There is a severe shortage of housing and serious pent-up demand due to an undersupply in recent times which is now exacerbated by Covid-19.
• Submission sets out details with regards to the site location, context and planning history of the lands and surrounding area. States that the site is free from any constraints in respect of flooding, built heritage, natural heritage, archaeology etc. Highlights that the lands benefit from close proximity to a range of community infrastructure and both existing and planned public transport options.
• Sets out a range of relevant and supportive national, regional and local policy provision and guidance. Suggests the rezoning of the subject lands would accord with the objectives of the NPF and RSES which seek to deliver compact urban settlements.
• Considers the site to be underutilised and within an established urban footprint which reads as an anomaly in terms of zoning. Suggests that re-zoning the site would reflect the existing residential zoning that is in place to the north, east and west and comprise a sequential increase of the existing residential zoning in the area.
• Suggests DLR has limited opportunities for new development and that rezoning the subject lands for residential development would serve to increase housing supply in the County.
• Suggests the rezoning would not materially compromise the strategic Green Belt and that sufficient Green Belt would remain in situ in order to ensure there would be no coalescence of Rathmichael and Old Conna.
• Notes that the ground water issue in the general area pertains to both Residential and Green Belt zoned lands and suggests it should not be an impediment to rezoning. Suggests that it could be reasonably expected that the groundwater issue would be resolved within the lifetime of the Plan and that houses could be delivered.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Welcomes the retention of a residential zoning objective (A2) on the site.
- Sets out the locational attributes of the site in the SUFP area in terms of Sandyford’s employment opportunities and high capacity, high frequency existing and proposed transport links (Luas, core bus corridors and M50) and therefore considers it to be a ‘central and/or accessible urban location’.
- States that the adjoining lands zoned for open space to the north of the subject site are in a related ownership. A submission has been made on behalf of the owners of the adjoining lands to the north to zone them for residential uses.
- Sets out the relevant planning history, national and regional policy and plans, Section 28 Guidelines including SPPRs, Greater Dublin Area Transport Strategy 2016 -2035, MetroLink Project, Bus Connects and also relevant parts of the Draft Plan, existing SUFP and Draft SUFP policy for the area.

Build to Rent Development
- Submission considers that Build to Rent is not a separate use from residential. Subject lands would be considered Tier 1 lands in the Council’s Tiered Approach to Land Zoning given the significant infrastructure existing around the site. Essential that Build-to-Rent developments be considered permitted in principle on residential zoned lands if the Council is to reach its housing target.
- Requests that Build-to-Rent residential developments are not considered a separate use class and are classed under the ‘Residential’ use class.

Housing Mix
- Submission considers that the mix requirements in relation to 3+ bed units is in conflict with SPPR1 of the Apartment Guidelines.
- Interim HNDA does not provide the evidence required to propose the mix requirements.
- Mix requirement will inhibit the provision of apartment schemes in the County and will impact negatively on lifestyle choice to downsize.
- Around 70% of the residential zoned lands as set out in table 2.8 are on green field sites where apartment development is anticipated to be a minority type.
- Subject site is located on brownfield lands where older people will not choose to downsize, instead the location should be targeted at ‘young professionals’ who work in the SUFP area, this is most sustainable in terms of transport emissions as they will be close to work and not need to use a private car.
- Request that the minimum requirement for 3+bed units set out in Table 12.1 is removed from the Draft County Development Plan.

Density
- The provisions of the ‘Design Standards for New Apartments’ Guidelines 2020 should be acknowledged by the Sandyford Urban Framework Plan in order to fully align with them - the Draft SUFP places a serious restriction on the potential residential yield of the subject lands which meet the criteria as a ‘central and/or accessible urban location’ and therefore can accommodate higher density apartment development.
- Remove the residential density limits set out in Map 2 of the Draft Sandyford Urban Framework Plan.

Height
- Draft indicates a numerical limitation on height stating a benchmark height of 3-5 storeys across the site. Considers that this conflicts with SPPR 1 of the Guidelines which states that: ‘... to support increased building height and density in locations with good public transport accessibility, particularly town/ city cores, planning authorities shall explicitly identify, through their statutory plans, areas where increased building height ... and shall not provide for blanket numerical limitations on building height.’
- Remove the building height limits set out in Map 3 of the Draft Sandyford Urban Framework Plan.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 12, Appendix 17
Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0598</th>
<th>Person: Karen &amp; Max Stolberg</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3, 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The submission requests that the Council amend the Marlborough Road cACA to incorporate suitable redevelopment of the 20th century buildings to satisfy modern living with energy efficient structures that address Ireland’s commitment to 2050 legally binding climate change commitment.
- Consideration should also be given to maintain the overall visual impression of Marlborough Road. Development of sufficient architectural design that compliments the area should be considered.
- The Council should clarify that extensions of any properties on Marlborough Road is not restricted by any cACA requirement. This can be done by maintaining the cACA boundary along the front of the properties or by stating that extensions are not of material concern for the ACA.
- The submission requests that the Council amend the Marlborough Road ACA to incorporate a wider area including the lands along Adelaide Road and Station to restore the integrity of designation of the land between Marlborough Road and Silchester Road. A justification is set out and a map is included.
- The extension of the ACA also accords with the advice in the Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities, at par 3.2.5 that “The boundaries of a candidate ACA should make physical, visual and planning-control sense”.
- The submission has expressed concerns that the proposed ACA designation will prove unduly restrictive when upgrading dwellings in the ACA. The Council should append a statement to the Character Appraisal for the proposed ACA stating that proposals for extensions and alterations to the houses within the ACA, particularly those of the 20th century, will be treated favourably provided that such are visually subservient to the original and employ materials which are in keeping with existing.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------|

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Raises concerns that this plan is being launched in draft form at a time when due to Covid-19 one cannot meet to review / discuss the plan.

Neighbourhood, People, Homes and Place:

- Concerned that neighbourhood (Watson’s Kiliney) is becoming increasingly unsustainable with development that is planned. The existing infrastructure at Watson is not being modernised which will result in serious and ongoing health and safety issues for our residents.
- 4.3.1.3 Policy Objective PHP20: Protection of Existing Residential Amenity.
- This policy objective does not apply to Watson’s residents due to the proposals for new developments in our surrounding area and impact negatively on the residential amenity, in terms of traffic, and overlooking by apartment developments.

Transport and Mobility: 5.7.7 Policy Objective T28 Traffic Management

- The submission highlights concerns with respect to planning applications for future development that plans to connect into Watson’s estate and access roads.
- 5.7.6 Policy Objective T27: Road Safety.
- The submission notes that all traffic for future developments in the area will be explicitly funnelled into Watson estate, and will result in public, road user and child safety issues.

Development Management: 12.3 Neighbourhood - People, Homes and Place.

- The submission is concerned that future development on land near Watson’s Estate will result in overlooking, sunlight and daylight issues and will be out of keeping with existing area.
12.3.2.1 Development within Sustainable Neighbourhood Infrastructure Lands "Shall be well designed having regard to the site context, landscape features, heritage within or adjoining the site." The submission considers that this does not apply to future developments near Watsons.

12.3.11.8 Vehicular Entrances: The submission considers that planning applications for development on the Kylemore SHD will apply to Watson’s site as the planned vehicular entrance / exits have not taken the existing estate into consideration.

12.4.5 Car Parking Standards: the submission has concerns about the plan to “limiting car parking supply” on new development sites. It is contrary to the age demographic and will result in proposed development not having enough parking and leading to overflow clogging our roads.

This point also appears to be contrary to 12.4.5.6 Residential Parking, which states that "car ownership levels in the County are high and therefore car storage for residential development is an issue".

12.3.1.1 Design Criteria: "Utilising existing site features, tree coverage and an appropriate landscape structure". The submission is concerned as to how this will be managed, as sites adjacent to Watsons have been cleared of all existing and protected trees and vegetation on the sites.

The Development Management Draft Plan is not sufficient in addressing the issue of developers taking a drip by drip approach to planning applications for sites in the borough. There is a track record of developers submitting multiple planning application for sites in the area, increasing / changing density with each one.

SLO’s:

• Existing Specific Local Objective 160 should be included verbatim in the proposed County Development plan 2022-2028. The roundabout is essential to the road networks and traffic management in our local community. Existing communities to not want these roundabouts to be removed and replaced with any other form of junction / traffic management infrastructure.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14, Miscellaneous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0600</th>
<th>Person: Codling wind Park Ltd</th>
<th>Organisation: Codling wind Park Ltd</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

• Encourage the Council to ensure that the Draft provides a clear and supportive policy framework to take account of offshore wind farm development and its facilitating onshore infrastructure – relevant locations for this are the Council’s coastal areas (landing onshore of electricity) and in the Carrickmines area to connect into existing electrical transmission system infrastructure at the existing 220 kV Carrickmines Substation.

• At the Codling wind park up to 140 wind turbines are proposed with c. 1.5 million tonnes of carbon emissions savings per annum.

• Onshore infrastructure would include works to get the cable onshore, under and over ground cable infrastructure, substations, operation and maintenance structures, parking, marine works and temporary construction compound etc.

Requests the following amendments to policy objectives:

To ensure that the onshore grid infrastructure necessary to facilitate offshore renewable energy development is referenced (CA11).

EI19 should recognise that other statutory agencies outside of EirGrid and ESB also have responsibility for development of electricity transmission infrastructure.

Consider updating Wind Energy Strategy to include off-shore wind to include reference to the on-shore developments associated with the off-shore wind.

GIB6 amend part which states ‘or otherwise interfere with Views and/or Prospects’ as it is open to a very broad interpretation. Any development has, in theory, the potential to interfere with a view or prospect.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 3, 8, 10, Appendix 11

| DLR Submission No: B0601 | Person: Michael Collins | Organisation: S2S - Sutton to Sandycove Promenade and Cycleway | Map Nos: 2,3 |
Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Outlines the problems with regard to lack of co-ordination in the delivery of transport project close to the seafront between Merrion Gates and Dun Laoghaire.
• Raises the issue of the delivery of the S2S project on the seafront with coastal protection works is being hampered by concerns relating to SAC and SPA. All the various projects at the coast need to be looked at in combination as per the NPWS Appropriate Assessment Guidance.
• Covid mobility measures have overtaken all of the debate and cycle facilities are mostly on-road – Draft Plan is putting this forward as the same thing as the coastal route.
• Loss of habitat and disturbance to birds is overstated. Description of topography and access is included. Coastal protection works of the DART, Bus Connects and S2S should be combined, Merrion gates overpass should be re-examined.
• Puts forward a holistic solution having regard to the assessment set out in the submission.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0602</th>
<th>Person: Marcus Crowe</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10, 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The submission considers that SLO 93 is hindering the possibility of increasing supply of affordable and sustainable newly built homes in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• With the ongoing escalation of housing prices (especially in Dublin, specifically DLR), the focus should be on increasing the supply of housing where possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Young people who have been brought up in this area are finding it difficult to afford to remain in the area as adults.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapters 10 and 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0603</th>
<th>Person: Brenda Richardson</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0604</th>
<th>Person: Catherine O’ Kelly</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Objects to development of a public amenity at reservoir site due to concerns that the residents will have their privacy and the security of their properties compromised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resident has had issues with anti-social behaviour at the site and considers a public area would provide disruption to residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0605</th>
<th>Person: Paddy Boyd</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The submission states that none of the SLOs relating to the Dún Laoghaire area refer to the role that Dún Laoghaire has played in the historical development of recreational water sports.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The building of the harbour established a sheltered facility close to a major city that encouraged the construction of purpose-built yacht clubs, the promotion of small boat sailing and rowing craft and the codification of a set of rules for yacht racing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• It should be an aspiration of the Development Plan to provide a facility (either stand alone or incorporated into the centres suggested in other SLOS) that recognises Dún Laoghaire's significant role as the birthplace of specifically amateur watersports.
• An additional SLO should be included to reflect this.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 14

DLR Submission No: B0606
Person: Justin O’ Halloran
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 2,6

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 2

DLR Submission No: B0607
Person: Deirdre Fitzgerald
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

DLR Submission No: B0608
Person: Lynn Mckee
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 3

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• The submission requests the draft proposal for Dun Leary House to be retained as a Protected Structure be approved.
• The house is surrounded by apartment blocks and is sitting in the middle of an ACA as well as close to the West Pier and Old Dun Leary.
• It has a role in our local history, the retention of this building as part of the Strategic Local Objectives is critical and will give future generations a taste of our industrial and marine harbour heritage. Later additions of the steel lobby are poor and distracts from the fine structure and fabric of this building however it has been lived in on and off for many years, it could provide needed housing and even be incorporated into a suitable development of the site.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

DLR Submission No: B0609
Person: Elaine Egan
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

DLR Submission No: B0610
Person: Robert Cook
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 2,6

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 2

DLR Submission No: B0611
Person: David Lee
Organisation: TPA on Behalf of Homeland Estates B Ltd.
Map Nos: 2
Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission on behalf of the property owner to demonstrate that there is no architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, social or technical reason why Árd na Glaise, Stillorgan (RPS No. 2099) should be included on the RPS.

- Submission notes that the property has been subject to 2 separate conservation assessments (included with the submission) and an An Bord Pleanála opinion, that the property was a poor example of a Victorian/Edwardian arts and craft style home – the best examples of these are already on the RPS.

- Submission notes that no detailed assessment of the property has been carried out to justify the addition of the property onto the RPS.

- Submission details the site history with regard to planning permissions on the site – D19A/0313/ ABP PL06D.304966 and D20A/0222/ ABP PL06D.307679.

- It is noted that dlr included refusal reasons in both instances with regard to heritage interest and value of the property. An Bord Pleanála did not accept that the property was worthy of retention in their opinion nor include a similar reason for refusal under D19A/0313/ ABP PL06D.304966. The second application is currently under appeal with ABP.

- Submission notes that the dlr conservation officer does not provide specific detail in the second application with regard to what aspects of the property are worthy of retention.

- Submission states that the RPS listing is not based on any scientific or objective assessment of the property and that professional evidence noted that the property is not worthy of retention never mind listing on the RPS.

- Submission states that the dlr conservation officer appears to have ignored the conclusions of 2 conservation reports submitted with planning applications.

- No detailed justification as to which 'one or more' categories of special interest were considered in relation to adding the structure to the RPS has been provided by dlr.

- Submission refers to a response to a submission (A0027) in the pre-draft CE Report re: NIAH recommendations and notes that the property has not been recommended by any NIAH survey or relevant Minister for inclusion in the RPS.

- Submission contains commentary in relation to submission A0027 from the pre-draft stage of the development plan process noting that the submission was not from trained professionals, contained factual inaccuracies and used images from the conservation assessment submitted as part of a planning application.

- Submission notes that the fact that Maurice Walsh resided in Árd na Glaise does not in its own right merit the inclusion of the property on the RPS – a plaque on the site would be more appropriate.

- Submission noted that the property is screened from the public road and therefore does not contribute to the architectural heritage of the wider area.

- The conservation reports included as appendices to the submission are summarised in the main body of the submission with sections of each report being highlighted as follows:
  - The property is a less significant Arts & Crafts building. The submission states that the house was most likely a poorly designed replica of an Arts & Crafts house.
  - Its decorative elements are out of scale with spaces which serves to emphasise a lack of coherence with the room.
  - The property is modest house and was probably not architect-designed.
  - That the property as seen from the road may be regarded as having heritage value, however this is surface decoration.

- The submission cites sections of the Architectural Heritage Protection, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2011, including Section 2.3.3 relating to structures that should be included on a RPS and the stages of the process to follow and 2.4.5 that recommends that planning authorities follow procedure developed by the NIAH.

- The submission sets out each stage of the evaluation process as per section 2.5 of the guidelines and provides an assessment of the property under each of the 8 criteria in section 2.5.4 of the guidelines - Architectural, Historical, Archaeological, Artistic, Cultural, Scientific, Technical and Social.

- The submission considers that the property does not possess any relevant criteria under architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, scientific, technical or social interest. The assessment considers that while the property was home to Maurice Walsh, there is no record of this association relating to specific aspects of the physical fabric of the dwelling and therefore concludes that the property does not possess any literary or cinematic associations to merit its protection under the ‘cultural’ criteria.
Submission refers to Section 2.6 of the Guidelines with regard to a notice to the owner and occupier of a structure to be included on the RPS – notice was issued to the owner, however, no justification for adding the property was provided.

It is stated that the property "has not been given sufficient consideration, nor has it been subject to an assessment by the Council under the criteria set out in the Planning and Development Act, 2000."

Submission notes the importance of the RPS, however, for the reasons set out within the submission, does not consider Árd na Glaise as warranting inclusion on same.

Summary of Appendix 1 of Submission – Conservation Assessment by Historic Building Consultants:

• Appendix 1 of the submission is a conservation assessment report.
• The report sets out the history of the property and provides a detailed description of the structure.
• It is noted that the structure an Arts and Crafts building, built c.1900.
• The report includes a number of photographs of the property.
• Report states that the structure is modest and was probably not architect-designed.
• The assessment concludes that the house lacks the decorative style and coherence that might be expected in a good example of an Arts and Crafts house. It is noted that there are better examples of this house style within the County.

Summary of Appendix 2 of Submission – Description of Ard na Glaise by ARC:

• Appendix 2 sets out a detailed description of the property.
• The report notes that the house first appearance on the 25 inch Ordnance map of 1908, where the house is named Lucerne. Historical maps are included in the report.
• The report sets out details of the external and internal features of the house. A photographic survey is included in the report.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Appendix 4

Summary of Submission and Observation:

• Encourage the Council to ensure that the Draft provides a clear and supportive policy framework to take account of offshore wind farm development and its facilitating onshore infrastructure – relevant locations for this are the Council’s coastal areas (landing onshore of electricity) and in the Carrickmines area to connect into existing electrical transmission system infrastructure at the existing 220 kV Carrickmines Substation.
• Sets out the policy and legislative context for offshore wind – Off-shore wind is a key enabler to meet Ireland’s Renewable energy target and transition to a low carbon society. Welcomes Policy Objective CA11.
• Onshore infrastructure for off-shore wind would include works to get the cable onshore, under and over ground cable infrastructure, substations, operation and maintenance structures, parking, marine works and temporary construction compound etc.
• Requests the following amendments to policy objectives:
• To ensure that the onshore grid infrastructure necessary to facilitate offshore renewable energy development is referenced (CA11).
• EI19 should recognise that other statutory agencies outside of EirGrid and ESB also have responsibility for development of electricity transmission infrastructure.
• Consider updating Wind Energy Strategy to include off-shore wind to include reference to the on-shore developments associated with the off-shore wind.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Chapter 3, 10, Appendix 11.
• The submission notes that it is the wish of the De Vesci OMC to request DLR to retain Dun Leary House, as a protected structure as proposed in the Draft Plan.
• Dun Leary House continues to be a building in use, now residential on a regular basis and this transition from commercial to residential proves that it has a valid role as a building with the possibility of providing accommodation or commercial premises. It is in good condition and has been on this site for over 100 years.
• It is a building of history and style, that reminds us of our history, the Old Dun Leary which is nearly gone, and the immense importance of the harbour in the past.
• This building should not be demolished for redevelopment as it is in the middle of an ACA and will add a value to the neighbourhood by way of history and style.
• The building should be retained as a SLO as contained in the draft Plan.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0614</th>
<th>Person: Rebecca Egan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0615</th>
<th>Person: Barry Egan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0616</th>
<th>Person: Bronwyn Salmon</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The submission refers to Section 8.5.6, Appendix 12, George's Place and seeks the deletion of the first four sentences (as far as “sense of place”). This section refers to a pedestrian/cyclist connection from the Council’s former Depot at George’s Place through Stable Lane to the seafront.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The gate from George's Place onto Stable Lane has remained closed and locked for over 20 years. It served only as an emergency exit for The Fire Station. Stable Lane is a private lane for the use of residents of Stable Lane and Connaught Mews only and has not been taken in charge by the Council (the submitter included a letter from Council to this effect).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stable Lane is the front garden for the residents including 6 young children that play there. The houses themselves have no front gardens. Opening the gate will inevitably increase footfall and impact on the safety of our children playing here. Elderly residents also use the lane for exercise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The impact of cyclists using the lane will compromise the safety of residents and could lead to collisions and accidents. There is also a blind spot on the lane, accidents will be inevitable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gardai are aware of an increase in anti-social behaviour in the area. Opening a link will increase this activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The opening of Scrumdiddly’s on the corner of Kelly's Avenue and Crofton Road led to an increase in the dumping of rubbish in the area. This would increase in Stable Lane with a pedestrian connection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parking is inadequate to serve the needs of residents. (the submitter attached photos of parking in Stable Lane). The opening of the gate would further negatively impact the already congested nature of Stable Lane.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are multiple alternative routes from George’s Street to the waterfront, Kelly’s Ave, York Road, Crofton Ave, Marine Road, Charlemont Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B0617</strong></td>
<td>Barry Egan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B0618</strong></td>
<td>Jacqueline McGowan-Smyth</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B0619</strong></td>
<td>Roslyn Nicholson</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B0620</strong></td>
<td>Jocelyn Espey</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B0621</strong></td>
<td>David Espey</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Map 7

- It is noted that submission **B0593** and submission **B0619** were combined and resubmitted as **B0630**.
- See **B0630** for a full summary of these combined submissions.

- Refer to issues raised under B0630.
- It would also accord with the advice in the Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities, at par 3.2.5 that “The boundaries of a candidate ACA should make physical, visual and planning-control sense”.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0622</th>
<th>Person: Fergus Joyce</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submissions note there was no public consultation re: SLO85.
- Ongoing works at the site have resulted in dust and noise in gardens and have directly impacted residents being able to study and work.
- Notes a commitment by Irish Water that a park would not be built at this site.
- Notes there is a public park very nearby which services the same catchment area.
- Objects to the use of Stillorgan reservoir for a public park. Quality of life and security will be negatively impacted upon due to overlooking of house and garden.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0623</th>
<th>Person: Patricia Stewart</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission refers to Section 8.5.6, Appendix 12, *George’s Place* and seeks the deletion of the first four sentences (as far as “sense of place”). This section refers to a pedestrian/cyclist connection from the Council’s former Depot at George’s Place through Stable Lane to the seafront.
- No public right of way has ever been established. The site was previously used as a fire station and then Council depot. In 1993, Edmund Kenny of Crofton Terrace obtained an injunction against the local authority, preventing it from using the gate as anything other than an emergency exit.
- Ownership of Stable Lane has not been established, nor permission sought or obtained from an owner for it to be used as a public through way.
- Ownership of the wall in which the gate is inserted has not been established. The wall predates local authority ownership.
- Stable Lane has not been legally taken in charge, the installation of tarmac, road markings and traffic bays in 2004 notwithstanding. The submitter attached a letter from the Council dated 1st August 2017 stating that it has not been taken in charge.
- Providing a public pedestrian throughway will result in substantial and irremediable loss of privacy for residents. Homes in the area have no front gardens or buffer to what would become the public realm.
- There are multiple alternative routes linking the coastal road and George’s Street (a) via Kelly’s Avenue a few metres to the eastern side of Stable Lane/George’s Lane, and (b) via Clarence St a few more metres to the west.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0624</th>
<th>Person: Caroline Byrne</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Seeking a Dundrum that has been rethought and oriented around pedestrians, alternative modes of transport (cycles and scooters) and in which Dundrum village acts as a beacon in planning for climate change.
- The Council should consider the completion of sites already half built and abandoned, e.g. Sandyford Industrial Estate, Dundrum Road for housing and schools before building on new sites.
- The height of new apartment buildings in the area is having a negative impact on residents in existing housing estates.
- Sunlight travels from the town centre to the Library over the course of the day. This creates the perfect opportunity for open community space within the old shopping centre parking lot. Due to the
orientation of the main street, buildings on the west side should consider sunlight on the street. Creating a sun corridor as part of the redevelopment plan would draw people and support a thriving community.

- Community spaces are key to the success of any community and should offer facilities for all age groups. It is proposed that the area currently occupied by surface car parking be redesigned to accommodate a thriving community space. Dynamic park design facilitates valuable visible teenage recreation, concerts/theatre in the park, farmers market. A space surrounded by commercial interests would become the focal point of a village community, attracting people far and wide. The submission provides examples of interactive free flowing open spaces both in Ireland and internationally.

- Business success is linked to quantity and frequency of customers. A multi-purpose space focused on the human factor will support local businesses and gain support from residents.

- The new Dundrum development should support and promote locally owned business, in contrast to the town centre development which is focused on international operators.

- Changing Main Street to single lane traffic with bicycle lanes has already increased footfall and built community spirit, as well as reducing emissions. Continuing the single lane traffic from the Luas bridge all the way down to the Milltown bridge along the lower Dundrum Road would further reduce emissions and would also improve safety as the road is too narrow to accommodate current levels of traffic. For example, the road along Seapoint in Dún Laoghaire has improved the quality of life for pedestrians, cyclists, drivers and residents in the area.

- A 30kph zone should be considered for all of Dundrum. Within these limitations noise pollution will be significantly reduced.

- A balance needs to be made between residential and commercial interests within the redevelopment of Dundrum village.

- Airfield could support the creation of a community working garden in the centre of the village, which reflects the essence of the old village which was once farming land. This would provide valuable open space for all the new apartments in the area.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5, Chapter 7, Miscellaneous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0625</td>
<td>Dylan Salmon</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission refers to Section 8.5.6, Appendix 12, George's Place and seeks the deletion of the first four sentences (as far as “sense of place”). This section refers to a pedestrian/cyclist connection from the Council’s former Depot at George’s Place through Stable Lane to the seafront. Reasons for objecting to the proposed connection are as follows:
  - Health & Safety & Antisocial behaviour - Since 2017 when the wall was removed to prepare for the housing development on Kelly's Ave, the houses on the lane became visible resulting in attempted break-ins, cars thefts, etc. of which the Gardai are aware.
  - Opening the gate will increase activity resulting in greater visibility and affecting safety of children who play on the lane and the elderly folk that use it.
  - Cyclists speed in the area and have lots of alternative routes, as do pedestrians, to access the waterfront.
  - Parking - Stable Lane is a private lane and residents and their visitors from Crofton Terrace, Connaught Terrace, Albert Terrace, Connaught Mews and Stable Lane park here because they have no designated parking spaces.
  - Parking is currently inadequate for residents, which is clearly demonstrated by cars parked on double lines when all spaces are occupied. The result of this is that cars are parked on both sides of Stable Lane, making entry and exit from the lane difficult.
  - The submission also attaches a letter confirming that Stable Lane has not been taken in charge by the Council.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0626</td>
<td>Noel Dillon</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0627</th>
<th>Person: Lisa Maguire</th>
<th>Organisation: Health Service Executive</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The Environmental Health Service (EHS) has reviewed the draft plan and support and agree with the many comprehensive objectives outlined within. This development plan will have the effect of improving the health and wellbeing of the population of DLR if its objectives are implemented in full.

**Policy Objective CA4: Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Council Climate Change Action Plan 2019-2024** “It is a Policy Objective to implement the DúnLaoghaire Rathdown County Council Climate Change Action Plan 2019 - 2024 and to transition to a climate resilient low carbon County”
- To facilitate policy objective CA4 it is recommended to carry out a carbon emissions baseline study for the area, outline specific actions that seek to combat, reduce or eliminate the emissions of greenhouse gases in the area, and outline key indicators for the monitoring of progress on climate action.
- DLRCC should act in an educational capacity on climate issues for the public and maybe introduce initiatives such as implementing energy audits in businesses, partner and collaborate on climate action initiatives, implement education strategies for the public and build innovative initiatives for local citizen engagement.
- Education Strategy for Dublin Bay Biosphere in Policy Objective GIB10 is an excellent example.

**Policy Objective T11 and Policy Objective T12**
- Welcomes the proposed use of ABTAs in Section 5.3.
- An audit of existing pedestrian and cycle facilities should be carried out and a programme of works for improvements required, with funding set aside.
- Recommendations given for increasing the uptake of active and sustainable transport.
- Implementation of measures which improve customer experience (after public consultation) of public transport (examples given) including landscaping of pedestrian/cycle routes.

**Policy Objective GIB1: Green Infrastructure Strategy** “It is a Policy Objective to continue to implement, and update, the DLR Green Infrastructure (GI) Strategy, to protect existing green infrastructure and encourage and facilitate, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, the development, design and management of high quality natural and semi-natural areas”.
- Importance of green infrastructure and green recreational space is well recognised in Plan.
- Green spaces should be co-designed with communities and reflect local needs.
- Lack of green space in Sandyford Business District – needs improvement.
- Use of green infrastructure as mitigation for air and noise pollution and rewilding initiatives.

**Policy Objective E10: Office Development** “It is a Policy Objective to facilitate significant additional office development in employment and commercial centres. The appropriate locations for office development would generally be in employment zoned areas, Major Town Centres and District Centres”.
- Secure bike parking and shower facilities should be provided for staff on large-scale employment sites.
- Landscaping and quality design of large-scale employment sites/industrial estates needs to be taken into consideration.

**Policy Objective E15: Home Working / E-Working** “It is a Policy Objective to permit home-based economic activities where, by virtue of their nature and scale, they can be accommodated without detriment to the amenities of residential areas”.
- Support and facilitate the establishment of co-working/remote working hubs and creative hubs.

**Food**
- DLRCC should take a proactive stance on the regulation and control of unhealthy food establishments. An assessment of food outlets in the area should be carried out and control measures implemented.
- DLRCC should support community--based initiatives that develop programmes that support healthy lifestyles.
- DLRCC should implement a strategy to look at food poverty within the county to ensure that affordable healthy food choices are available to all.
- DLRCC should consider the provision of public drinking water facilities throughout the county.
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Policy Objective EI13 ‘Waste Management Infrastructure, Prevention, Reduction, Reuse and Recycling Objectives’
- No reference to food waste in the Plan. Measures recommended to tackle food waste which should be implemented by DLRCC.

Policy Objective PHP13: Equality, Social Inclusion and Participation “It is a Policy Objective to promote equality and progressively reduce all forms of social exclusion that can be experienced because of gender, gender identity, marital status, family status, age, race, religion, disability, sexual orientation, nationality, homelessness and membership of the Traveller Community”
- The provision of a social inclusion unit within the council is a welcome initiative.
- Recommendations given for measures to improve social inclusion including promoting access to a wide range of opportunities, active citizenship, alcohol-free venues, community shared services, measures to tackle isolation

Section 15.5 Implementation and Monitoring Framework
- The EHS wish to acknowledge the progressive nature of this proposed performance management framework and commends DLRCC for its efforts in this regard.
- The proposals to prepare ‘progress reports’ from various data sources to monitor how progress on the policy objectives outlined in the Development Plan is achieved is welcome.
- Criteria for ‘measuring progress’ should be outlined for individual policy objectives (where applicable). Highlight and promote areas where progress is being made and also examine areas where less was achieved and investigate the reasons why. Any barriers to the implementation of the policy objectives should be identified.
- The public should be involved in the monitoring process and data should be made public.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 15, Miscellaneous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0628</td>
<td>Eamonn Molloy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Concerned with proposed use of reservoir as a public park – Irish Water gave undertakings that it would not be used as a public park.
- Disamenity would arise from park due to overlooking and security concerns
- Have endured ongoing disruption from construction.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0629</td>
<td>Éilis McDonnell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission strongly objects to the replacement of SLO 152 by the proposed weakening in SLO 10. With concerning proposals relating to development in Rosary Gardens East, this SLO offers at least some degree of additional protection to the historically valuable heritage of the houses within this area, particularly the architecturally valuable streetscapes and Arts and Crafts cottage designs of the Rosary Gardens East and West cul-de-sacs, built by the Irish Soldiers and Sailors Land Trust for the families of Dun Laoghaire war veterans.
- Therefore, SLO 152 should be retained and reworded to incorporate SLO 10.
- The submission would strongly support the development of a participatory arts centre, and requests the development of a DLR coastal swimming policy.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 9, Chapter 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0630</td>
<td>Roslyn Nicholson</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- It is noted this submission is a combination of submission B0593 and submission B0619.
- The submission refers to the Coastal amenity area that lies to the east of Bayview Estate, Killiney Hill Road, with public access via the Bayview railway underpass to the shoreline – and relates to Map 10.
The amenity area (Zoned F) to the east of the railway embankment encompasses many habitats and there is considerable biodiversity. The Shanganagh River is now included in the “Dublin Urban River Enhancement Project” which should bring restorative benefits.

- The area was included in the CFRAM programme.
- The public amenity space lacks a formal designation for biodiversity and protection, it is an important wildlife corridor and 'buffer zone' and merits particular protection.
- The space provides access to the rugged natural shoreline of Killiney Bay, which has a special coastal character.
- The old Victorian granite railway bridge at the mouth the Shanganagh River is one of the earliest railway bridges in Europe.
- The original pre 1914 railway line embankment provides the popular raised walkway and also serves as an added layer of protection as a berm bank.
- These structures should be included in the list for protection and conservation.
- To the south of the Shanganagh River at the cliff top at Shanganagh Cliffs, there is an avenue of small trees and hedgerow that marks the original access road to the ruined Battery (No 5 South), which could be added to Map 10.
- The submission welcomes the inclusion of 'View Prospects' in the Shanganagh Cliff area.
- Another viewpoint should be included on the raised embankment.
- Local communities have had considerable input into this space in terms of clean-ups and monitoring. The acclaimed shoreline Rock Art Trail initiated by a local resident during the first pandemic provided a welcome bonus to beach users.
- The pNHA designation for the soft sedimentary cliffs south of the Shanganagh River as far as the County Boundary with Wicklow has been removed in this Draft Plan, with no explanation.
- The coastline is showing the impacts of erosion it has been particularly accelerated in the early spring of 2021, along the stretch from the Shanganagh River southwards to Corbawn Lane.
- The Dublin Array Windfarm company is surveying Killiney Bay with a view to the development of wind turbines along sandbanks.
- One of the possible 'landfall sites' for a cable link is 'Shanganagh Cliffs', possibly on the shoreline below the Bray Shanganagh Waste Water Treatment Plant.
- There has been accelerated erosion at that location in 2021 and along the soft cliff southwards.
- The submission has concerns that any heavy engineering works may cause cliff collapse, or other impacts in the immediate vicinity. It is also directly south of the Shanganagh River channel. The river mouth changes course and would require a buffer zone to protect it.
- The impact of Land/Sea interface needs careful management here to mitigate cumulative pressure on the inshore marine area, local geology, and biodiversity. It is also a residential area with playing fields, a MUGA (Multi Use Games Area) pitch and community allotments which took some time to be developed.
- The Codling Windfarm development may also be seeking a landfall site for a cable along this stretch of coast.
- The Landfall of cable links may prove challenging to a number of the policies in the Draft County Plan especially as the Renewable Energy programme will most likely be 'exempt' from standard expected planning procedures, tendering process and public consultation periods.
- The submission expresses concern that large wind turbines on sandbanks within 10 km of shore may prove to be very intrusive on the horizon.
- With respect to offshore wind energy developments, it is noted that surveys for windfarms are underway in Killiney Bay, while several important pieces of national legislation are still in a transitional phase just now.
- These include an update of the 1933 Foreshore Act, Marine Spatial Planning, unfinished consultations on Marine Protected Areas, a review of the NPWS and new marine and coastal planning structures for coastal zone management under the Marine Planning and Management Bill.
- There is limited data available on the biodiversity of the Kish and Codling sandbanks, which are fish nurseries. Along with possible threats to the integrity of the seabed, interference with sediment cycle patterns, seismic and noise impacts on wildlife, among other issues, there are many questions to be resolved.
- An independent assessment is required with particular regard to sustainable eco-systems.
- Residents of DLR need regular reliable updates with information on Windfarm Developments along with accurate maps and public participation during the forthcoming process which seeks to develop large windfarms close to our coast.
- The Draft Plan supports the development offshore wind development when it is in an 'environmentally acceptable manner' however this is questionable.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 8, Chapter 10, Appendix 4, Appendix 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0631</td>
<td>Alan Roche</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0632</td>
<td>Alison Polley</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0633</td>
<td>Mary O'Beirne</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Draft has omitted the Woodbrook Strategic Park and Ride although this is one of the recommendations of the Bray and Environ Transport Study (BETS). The Woodbrook Dart station now has planning permission with a view to it being operational by 2023. According to the BETS the strategic park and ride is to be delivered in Phase A 2019-2027. The Plan should be more transparent in terms of where this project is at in terms of location, scale and delivery.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0634</td>
<td>Michael O’ Connor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Opposes SLO 57 – proposal to develop a civic park at the proposed location. Site is removed from the demand for a park and traffic is heavily trafficked. The Council own property on the corner of Corrig and Blackthorn Roads – the park should be developed there instead.
- Owns Corrig House on Corrig Road the property has become non-conforming use and if permission is sought it will be refused. Permission has been refused on the adjoining site.
- Council has sterilised the land and is collecting contributions from developers but has not pursued the public park.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14 and Appendix 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0635</td>
<td>Christopher Raythorn</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0636</td>
<td>Sandra Russell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLR Submission No:</td>
<td>Person:</td>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Map Nos:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0637</td>
<td>Helen Shenton</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Considers that section 2, <em>Understanding Building Heights</em> of Appendix 5 makes a compelling case which is endorsed in terms of the argument against higher buildings in conservation areas. Detail is set out in relation to impact of height on historic fabric.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 2.3.4, and section 3.3 of the Building Height Strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Duplicate of 637 above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLR Submission No:</td>
<td>Person:</td>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Map Nos:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0638</td>
<td>Helen Shenton</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Considers that section 2, <em>Understanding Building Heights</em> of Appendix 5 makes a compelling case which is endorsed in terms of the argument against higher buildings in conservation areas. Detail is set out in relation to impact of height on historic fabric.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 2.3.4, and section 3.3 of the Building Height Strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLR Submission No:</td>
<td>Person:</td>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Map Nos:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0639</td>
<td>Brian Moore</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLR Submission No:</td>
<td>Person:</td>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Map Nos:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0640</td>
<td>Sinead McCarthy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLR Submission No:</td>
<td>Person:</td>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Map Nos:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0641</td>
<td>Rita O’ Reilly</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLR Submission No:</td>
<td>Person:</td>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Map Nos:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0642</td>
<td>Debra McCurrie</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

#### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0643</td>
<td>Jacobs Engineering Ltd</td>
<td>Amgen Technology (Ireland) UC</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission states that the overall development plan is a progressive and inspiring document.
- Submission notes the use and history of the Amgen site on Pottery Rd citing the integration of industry with housing and institutional activities.
- Submission considers the rezoning of land to SNI is a direct contravention to Amgen’s existing planning permission under reg. ref. D19A/0904. A map outlining the area in question is included.
- Submission states that the Amgen site is currently constrained restricting its potential to expand.
- Submission states that the site is currently zoned ‘industrial’ which has attracted employment over its 30yr history. It is stated that the retention of this zoning would allow for the natural expansion of the Amgen site.
- Submission notes that the plan outlines a shortage of additional employment lands and the retention of the existing zoning would demonstrate a commitment to sustainable industrial growth.

#### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0644</td>
<td>Geraldine Bransfield</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2, 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space.
- Submission notes the field is used by citizens and is a safe area for kids and elderly alike.

#### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0645</td>
<td>Owen Duffy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2, 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space.

#### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0646</td>
<td>Niamh Flynn</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Concerned with the use of Stillorgan reservoir for a public park.
- Submission notes privacy and security concerns should the area be open to the public, due to overlooking of house and garden.
- Should a large fence be erected along the boundary, there would be issues with lack of light.
- Submission notes the current works have caused disruption in terms of noise disruption.
- Notes the area is well served by parks and open space.

#### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0647</td>
<td>Patrick Jackson</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Submission highlights and details ‘Picker Pals’, a litter-picking programme for primary school children and their families.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): No issues have been raised to include in Volume I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0648</td>
<td>Alan Downer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0649</td>
<td>Annemarie Conneely</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0650</td>
<td>Joan Conneely</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0651</td>
<td>Aiveen Byrne</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0652</td>
<td>David Timoney</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Map 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Map 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Map 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission notes that lands on both sides of the planned distributor road between Glenamuck Road and Ballycorus Road have been rezoned residential but that lands south of Ballycorus Road on the eastern side have not been rezoned. Submission asks can this be addressed.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Map 9

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Shift to active travel can address Climate emergency, traffic congestion and increased sedentary lives. This needs to be done by installing a connected segregated cycle network. Reallocation of road spaces to walking/cycling needs to be done.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Chapter 5.

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Do not remove the Ballybetagh right of way and the Dingle right of way, which are of natural and historical significance.
• Kilternan is becoming more heavily residential so preserving these areas is even more important to maintain the balance between residential development and the natural environment and outdoor space.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 12

DLR Submission No: B0654  
Person: Ciara O’Connell  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 13

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Protect the Ballybetagh and Dingle rights of way, which are of natural and historical significance.
• All right of ways should be preserved to protect those who ramble the countryside.
• ROWs should not be forfeited for development.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 12

DLR Submission No: B0655  
Person: Leanne Hill  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 13

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Protect the ballybetagh and dingle paths/rights of way.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 12

DLR Submission No: B0656  
Person: Niamh Scott  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 13

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Protect the Ballybetagh right of way and the Dingle right of way as they are of natural and historical significance.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 12

DLR Submission No: B0657  
Person: Oisín Kelly  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 2,6

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space
• The development plan should ensure there are adequate number of areas such as this one. There is a need to invest more in this particular green space, for instance engage with local residents on what flowers, trees and facilities to be in this space and how it can be improved further.
• There is a need for public investment in Council built homes.
• The housing crisis should not put pressure on green spaces.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4, Map 2

DLR Submission No: B0658  
Person: John & Linda Leenane  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 6

Summary of Submission and Observation:
Submission notes the following:
• Objects to the use of Stillorgan reservoir for a public park.
• Residents were assured the site could never be open to the public.
• The current works have caused noise disruption and further works would bring privacy concerns.
• Safety and security concern as well as possible illegal dumping behind homes.
• The current parking issues in Stillorgan heath would be exacerbated should a development take place.
• States there is a public park in the area which causes car parking and speeding/safety issues.
• The area is in need of more public amenities and a swimming pool which is fundamental to health and well being of residents.
- The loss of the leisureplex and Glenalbyn pool does not serve the interests of residents.
- The introduction of a park at this site would be a waste of resources.
- Notes that an ecofriendly wildflower meadow at this location could help save the bees.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0659</th>
<th>Person: Jennifer Pekaar</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - No comment entered in text box
  - No document attached

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0660</th>
<th>Person: David O Keeffe</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - Oppose the removal of the Ballybetagh right of way and the Dingle right of way, which are of natural and historical significance and a valuable amenity for access to the uplands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0661</th>
<th>Person: Fiona McCann</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - Object to the removal of the Dingle Way and Ballybetagh Way paths which are full of mature trees and of historical and natural significance to the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0662</th>
<th>Person: Michala Kinska</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - Object to the removal of the Ballybetagh right of way and the Dingle right of way.
  - Need more places and walks like that, not fences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0663</th>
<th>Person: Ursula Cloonan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - Retain the Ballybetagh and Dingle rights of way, which are of natural and historical significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0664</th>
<th>Person: Clodagh Dunne</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0665</th>
<th>Person: Cliona O'Reilly</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission notes need for a solution to the increase in traffic and visitors into the greater Sandycove and Dalkey area as a result of their being designated of cultural and architectural and recreational interest.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Chapter 5

### DLR Submission No: B0666
- **Person:** Sally-ann Mitchell
- **Organisation:** N/A
- **Map Nos:** 13

### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Oppose the removal of right of ways at Dingle Way and Ballybetagh way

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Appendix 12

### DLR Submission No: B0667
- **Person:** Alan
- **Organisation:** N/A
- **Map Nos:** 2,6

### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Map 2

### DLR Submission No: B0668
- **Person:** Joyce Richardson
- **Organisation:** N/A
- **Map Nos:** 4

### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission requests that a Specific Local Objective (SLO) is placed on the lands bounded by N11/M1, Dublin Road, N11/M11 slip road and Aughmore Lane/St. Joseph’s, Crinken Lane and designated “to facilitate and form any future extension of Shanganagh Park”. This is due to the level of high-density developments in the Shankill area namely Shanganagh Castle, Woodbrook, Abington, Rathmichael and Old Conna.
- These high-density developments exclude Cherrywood which has capacity for 30,000, and the submission suggests that there sufficient lands are already zoned for residential use.
- The submission requests the Council to remove the SLR from the Green Belt, and the land outlined as Green Belt should be free from development.
- The submission requests that the lands at the Aske and Christian Brothers’, are reserved for playing pitches and other sporting and recreational facilities and not changed from Green Belt to Objective MOC.
- The submission requests that the Green Belt be retained.
- The lands along both sides of Allies River Road provide a green corridor of agriculture land in the County and a unique opportunity exists to extend Shanganagh Park to form a green cycle way to Woodbrook and the Carrickgollogan Mountain.
- Within the existing Green Belt, there is a significant existing mature woodland, which must be protected and extended to aid carbon sequestration.
- The Crinken Stream runs through the Green Belt and the Council must ensure no development takes place within any river stream or watercourse. The area is also prone to frequent flooding. The
Submission states that planners have a duty of care to all the new residents who will live in this part of the County, to provide housing and the retention of the Green Belt as it appears on Map No. 14.

- The submission states that the objectives as stated in the Draft Plan such as, to protect and conserve the environment, to provide a countywide green infrastructure network, and the Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan (MAPS) which refers to a metropolitan green belt around built-up areas are achievable by the retention of the Green Belt and to keep it free from development.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 2, Chapter 14, Chapter 8, Chapter 9, Chapter 12, Map 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0670</th>
<th>Person: Emma Moran</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9,13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Retain the Ballybetagh right of way and the Dingle right of way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• These are beautiful natural and historical landmarks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0671</th>
<th>Person: Sara Leonard</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9,13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Retain the Dingle Way of Ballycorus Road/ the Ballybetagh Way between Enniskerry and Ballybetagh.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• These are historical walks with natural significance and should remain in place for everyone to enjoy and use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0672</th>
<th>Person: Leah Coleman</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No comment entered in text box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No document attached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0673</th>
<th>Person: Sarah O’Loughlin</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0674</th>
<th>Person: M Munro</th>
<th>Organisation: Monkstown Village and Longford Terrace Resident Association</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• contends that Chapter 12 Development Management is inadequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• states that residents in Monkstown Village are suffering from noise nuisance, odour nuisance and an unacceptable level of visual intrusion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• provides detail of a meeting held with the then CE of dlr in January 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• provides details of a resident’s deputation held on 11th September 2019 and states that a senior planning official confirmed that many residents in the area were suffering aforementioned issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Submission then provides a very detailed background to the issues experienced in Monkstown Village. A summary is as follows:
  - Noise is caused by whirring fans and odours are caused by extraction plants which in some cases are unfiltered. In some instances, these are located in close proximity to homes. There is also a visual impact.
  - Issues arising for residents include inability to use their gardens, inability to hang out clothes and difficulties sleeping.

**Expert Group**
- Submission provides information in relation to an expert group that was formed in late 2017. The expert group examined 16 planning assessments in Monkstown Village prepared by dlr and found that none of the applications;
  - identified that the proposed development may have a negative noise impact on adjacent homes.
  - considered where any extraction fans should be located.
  - Identified that possibility that development might have a negative impact from the expulsion of odours, smoke, grease, gasses and other particles
- They also advised that statements made by dlr in relation to exempted development were incorrect.
- The expert group provided legal opinions which addressed issues including constitutional rights
- The submission then provides details of a review of assessment of planning applications for restaurant, bars and cafes in the Blackrock electoral area. This review found flaws with the 32 applications examined. Reviews of the Dundrum, Dun Laoghaire, Killiney Shankhill, Stillorgan and Glencullen Electoral Wards are either imminently due or are pending and will be forwarded to the CE and the 40 elected members of the Council once completed.

**Meetings held with dlr**
- The submission then sets out details of meetings held with dlr management from November 2017 to May 2019 as follows;
  - Meeting with member of senior management team in November 2017. At this meeting issue and finding s of professional team in respect of Monkstown Village were outlined and solutions presented.
  - A number of meetings were held in 2018 and at each meeting dlr were evasive and deflective.
  - Details of a phone conversation with the head of planning on 24th June 2019 are set out.
- Submission states that a FOI request in relation to notes and records was submitted in the summer of 2019 and considers that the response to this FOI request was poor. The submission sets out 5 point of detail with regard to the FOI response.
- The submission then has a detailed section entitled “The 2019 Local Elections and a Deputations Meeting 11th September 2019”.
- Some details in relation to individuals who were elected in the 2019 local elections are set out along with details of various councillors that the residents group met with prior to the deputations meeting.
- Details of the deputations meeting are provided as follows;
  - 4 residents set out the impact of noise and odours in their homes, including impact on resale. One resident outlined the details of the visit of the EHO to her home.
  - Two elected members set out their experiences and views
  - EHO stated that cooking odours were not classed as pollutants under the Air Pollution Act.
  - Details are provided in relation to the discussions held at the deputations around the issue of exempt development, taking action under the EPA Act 1992, the keeping of noise logs, discussion of condition 5 in a planning permission granted, EPA Guidelines, an acoustic consultant’s report prepared by a consultant on behalf of the residents and impact of noise on property values.
  - A number of bullet points are set out which deal with the fact that a bone speaker was brought to the deputation and used to demonstrate the noise levels being experienced.
  - Submission states that the conversation held at the deputations meeting demonstrate that dlr are incapable of setting adequate noise control conditions with reasonable skill and that the residents association therefore object to the current draft Plan which leaves it open to allow dlr set noise control conditions.
  - Submission expresses concern in relation to the requirement now contained in the Draft Plan which allows Planning Authority ask for an acoustic assessment. Concern relates to the
scenario where a developer refuses to do so and consider that the Plan does not address any refusal.

- The submission consider that it is dangerous and questionable to rely on any acoustic assessment carried out by a developer and consider that dlr should provide the assessment. The submission sets out concerns in relation to any legal challenges.
- Submission discusses the EPA guidelines on Noise.
- Submission consider that the Draft Plan should make it clear that the legal onus to prevent noise nuisance rests with the Local Authority.
- Submission raises concerns around the record of the deputations meeting and sets out details of subsequent correspondence between the resident’s association and the Council in relation to the minutes.
- Submission then provides details of a meeting held with the then CE of dlr in January 2020. Matters raised included suggestions around noise conditions, investigation of the issues, use of powers under EPA Act and an invitation to the CE to visit properties in Monkstown.
- The submission sets out an update in terms of correspondence with the Council since January 2020 and states that they intend to submit another FOI request.
- Submission requests that the Draft Plan is amended to direct that dlr is obligated to attach conditions when dealing with food and beverage uses adjacent to family homes. The submission suggests that the condition used by DCC is appropriate. This conditions states that “Noise and vibration from the development must be inaudible and imperceptible at the nearest sensitive premises”. Another suggested wording is also given.
- Submission requests that in addition to amendments to the Draft County Development Plan they also request that issues highlighted in the submission be investigated.
- Submission requests that the Draft Plan be very prescriptive. A suggested condition is provided as follows “Noise and vibration from a commercial development seeking to locate beside existing family homes must not be granted permissions unless the noise it will make will in inaudible and imperceptible at the nearest sensitive premises”.
- The submission then comments on both the executive’s response to motions received on the Chief Executive’s Draft Plan and also comments made by the executive at Special Council meetings held in December 2020 at which the Chief Executive’s Draft Plan was discussed.
- Submission goes through comments made by the executive at the Council meeting on 17th December 2020.
  - While the Planning and Development Act does not use the term “Noise Nuisance”, the submission considers that the language used in the PDA is taken from the EPA Act 1992 definition of noise nuisance. Submission considers that the response to the motion on noise and the views expressed at the special council meeting are contrary to how the Oireachtas Drafted the EPA Act and the PDA.
  - Submission contends that for the planning office to resist dealing with noise nuisance with conditions is untenable.
  - The Draft Plan should state that is a planning goal to prevent development from breaching Section 108 of the EPA Act and creating a noise nuisance for residents.
  - Submission states that the statement in response to motion on noise “It is not possible to prevent noise nuisance” by applying planning conditions is contrary to dlr’s obligations under Section 34 of the PDA.
  - Submission contends that the comment by the executive that there are many sources of noise such as roads, dogs barking etc. is yet again another argument that noise is too difficult a topic to deal with and that this argument is unsustainable. Submission states that no one expects planning department to deal with dogs barking as there is a noise complaints unit to deal with such matters.
  - Submission provides commentary in relation to article 40.3.2 of the Constitution and the common good and disputes comments made by the executive at the meeting held on the 17th December 2021.
- Submission concludes by asking the incoming CEO to set out their views and their responses to the issues raised and to also state that they will accept the amendments proposed in the submission.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 12 Development Management.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0675</th>
<th>Person: Cara Byrne</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9,13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do not remove the Ballybetagh right of way and the Dingle right of way as they are of natural and historical significance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0676</th>
<th>Person: Eric and Christelle Purmessur</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission made by tenants of Ardmeen House, Newtownpark Avenue (RPS No. 2058) who are responsible for its maintenance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission states that the property is not suitable for inclusion on the RPS and should be removed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0677</th>
<th>Person: Maria-Jose Gonzalez</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There appears to be major elements of the Aqua Geo Services reports missing. Submission queries why this report is not publicly available?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recommendations of the Aqua Geo Services reports were made to the Council – has the Council implemented all of these recommendations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not enough information is available to justify the Council having a housing ban (in the Rathmichael area?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SLO93 should be removed or toned down due to the EPA Wastewater Code of Practice (2021) providing solutions to the issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter 14 (Map 14), Chapter 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0678</th>
<th>Person: Niamh Mangan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission claims that if the field were to be developed in any way, there would be a further dangerous increase in traffic with a heightened risk of injury, especially to children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0679</th>
<th>Person: Liam &amp; Jacinta Kenny</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0680</th>
<th>Person: Margaret &amp; John Byrne</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0681</th>
<th>Person: Kevin Kheffache</th>
<th>Organisation: Marina House Hostel Ltd</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission objects to the proposed addition of 7 Old Dun Leary Road to the RPS.
- Submission cites the use of the property as a tourist hostel, the impact of covid-19 on the tourism trade and financial implications as reasons to reconsider the inclusion of the property onto the RPS.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0682</th>
<th>Person: Aaron Moore</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 5, 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- **Transport and Mobility** - A network of connected segregated cycle routes is essential to make cycling safe for all regardless of ability or age. Of particular interest are the roads around Dun Laoghaire town—they are too car dominated – safe wide paths and bike lanes are needed.
- **Open space, Parks and Recreation** – Wide difference in the level of care put into different parks. Some parks don’t have litter bins.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapters 5, 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0683</th>
<th>Person: Breda Blatchford</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- SLO93 contributes as a reason for the high property prices in the area, and this SLO should be reassessed.
- Hydrologist report is dated and the full report is not publicly available.
- The status of water in the areas appears to be moderate and the main issue appears to be coming from agriculture and other land uses. Why are new homes that could apply the 2021 Wastewater Code of Practice being targeted?

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 14 (Map 14), Chapter 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0684</th>
<th>Person: Andrew Orr</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Challenge SLO 93 as 2021 EPA Wastewater Code of Practice should address groundwater concerns.
- For over 10 years SLO93 has prohibited new dwellings in the area, on the basis that the groundwater issues are not adequately addressed. DLRCC has implied that these issues would be ameliorated or improved however there has been no movement on the issue, and little public information on tests that have been carried out.
- DLRCC should be supportive of delivering new housing to the area.
- The 2021 EPA Wastewater Code of Practice eliminates the need for the SLO as it provides up-to-date guidance on how to deal with wastewater and ground water situations. Each planning application should be allowed address the concerns related to groundwater using the 2021 EPA Wastewater Code of Practice and these should be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 14 (Map 14), Chapter 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0685</th>
<th>Person: Helena Cullen</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission notes they are happy with the planned improvements of the area, but not with the rapid roll out of changes without consideration.
• Submission notes previous work carried out at Otranto park could have included the ‘emergency’ bicycle lane.
• Submission notes the coast road has been narrowed and impacted on the health and safety of the area, access for Emergency services has been compromised.
• Submission notes there is a lack of toilets in the Sandycove area. Access to public toilets in Otranto park could be given to the public.
• Submission included photos of the area (available to view online) and a short video clip of traffic which has been redacted.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0686</th>
<th>Person: Aine Doohan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9,13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Please do not remove the Ballybetagh right of way and the Dingle right of way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0687</th>
<th>Person: Alex O’Connor</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission considers no attempt has been made to address the traffic situation in the Sandycove area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes provision needs to be made for the well being of the residents in Sandycove to be able to have access to their homes for parking, emergency vehicles, for utility services and amenity in an area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0688</th>
<th>Person: David Roe</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests the rezoning of a 0.68ha plot of land located in the townland of Kiltiernan from Objective B – ‘To protect and improve rural amenity and to provide for the development of agriculture’ to Objective A – ‘To provide residential development and/or protect and improve residential amenity’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission describes the location of the lands and includes a map identifying the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seeks to have the lands re-zoned on the basis of the current shortage in housing supply and the growing population of Dublin. Submits that rezoning the lands would assist the Local Authority in reaching its housing target and objective to accommodate for an expanding population, and furthermore, would be in keeping with the strategies and missions identified in the Draft DLR CDP and the Kiltiernan LAP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• States that the site is in close proximity to neighbouring Objective A zoned land and just outside the boundary of the Kiltiernan LAP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0689</th>
<th>Person: Jean Andrews</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The submission requests that the three large mature Sycamore trees in the fenced field between St. Joseph’s School and Fairway Drive, Cualanor be added for a protection/preservation objective in Map 3 of the Draft County Development Plan (2022-28).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • These trees are a valuable local amenity providing ecosystem services for residents, provide for green space and natural landscapes. The trees also provide nesting sites for local birds, in an area where there
are not many mature trees. The trees are located directly beside St Joseph's school, also providing a valuable amenity for the children in the school.

- The submission also requests the provision of safe cycling and walking facilities to be provided on Tivoli/Corrig/Eden road in Dún Laoghaire. Currently there is no cycle lane or road markings of any sort along this route. The road and footpaths are extremely narrow with a high volume of traffic at peak times, with traffic often travelling at high speed.

- The Plan should make this road safer for children and better support active travel in the area by means of a one-way system with a two-way cycle lane created to accommodate the hundreds of school children travelling to school along this road daily during school term time. However, if this is not possible there are other solutions such as: speed limits; ramps; safer crossings at junctions; footpath barriers; and markings indicating shared road space for bicycles and cars - that could be employed.

- The Plan should develop the safe segregated cycleway that was provided for planning the Cualanor development several years ago. This has still not been created.

- The Plan should reinstate the commitment to a combined walkway/cycleway on the seafront known as the Sutton to Sandycove walkway and cycleway (S2S). This would be a valuable local amenity and would have huge benefits for public health, air quality and emissions.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 9 and Map 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0690</th>
<th>Person: Jennifer O Dwyer</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission requests that the three large mature Sycamore trees in the fenced field between St. Joseph's School and Fairway Drive, Cualanor be added for a protection/preservation objective in Map 3 of the Draft County Development Plan (2022-28).
- These trees are a valuable local amenity providing ecosystem services for residents, provide for green space and natural landscapes. The trees also provide nesting sites for local birds, in an area where there are not many mature trees. The trees are located directly beside St Joseph's school, also providing a valuable amenity for the children in the school.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 9 and Map 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0691</th>
<th>Person: Duncan Kelly Lyth</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
The submission notes the following:
- That the mature sycamore trees in the fenced field beside St Joseph’s school’s playground, off Tivoli Road in Dún Laoghaire, which following inspection by the Council’s Parks and Landscapes Services, have been passed as meeting the criteria for inclusion in the protection/preservation objective, should accordingly be added to Map 3 of the County Development Plan 2022-2028.
- These trees are located within the grounds of a Protected Structure (Durham Place), are locally visible, contribute greatly to the quality of the local urban environment, provide habitat for birds, insects, wildlife, pollinator benefits as well as carbon capture.
- That the Royal Terrace Architectural Conservation Area be extended to include the houses on Carlisle Terrace (Tivoli Road), Dún Laoghaire. These houses which were built at a similar time to the houses on Royal Terrace (1860s), connect to Royal Terrace by way of the piers to which they are adjoined, indicating that the houses were originally viewed as one continuous development. On the map of 1843 the entire area which now comprises Royal Terrace /Carlisle Terrace was one continuous field, bordering Durham Place. By 1866 this same area was fully developed for residential dwelling. Given the inclusion of the Cottage Home complex in the Royal Terrace Architectural Conservation Area, it would be natural to complete this tableau with the inclusion of Carlisle Terrace to form a single rectangular block of significant historical interest.
- That extensive provision be made for Electric Vehicle charging points for those with no off-street car parking who will need to charge their cars in public spaces.
- That the extensive green field (sports grounds) at Tivoli Terrace South be retained as a public amenity and should not be rezoned for residential development, but rather for the enjoyment of the community.
- That Clarinda Park be restored to its original historic form as a park. This would involve removing all car parking spaces from within the park, reinstalling the railings and rewilding the park, with the result that green space within the town would be increased.
- That Tivoli Road and Corrig Road should be reconfigured to provide for one way traffic and cycle route. This road given its narrow nature, is not suitable for high volume traffic as is the situation today.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4 and Map 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0692</th>
<th>Person: Claire Golden</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9,13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oppose the closure of the Ballybetagh and Dingle right of way walks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is a pity to remove people’s right to enjoy this natural beauty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0693</th>
<th>Person: Liz Lawrence</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes concern over volume and speed of traffic through the Sandycove Loop.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes the slip road up to the 40ft is subsiding, it is hazardous for pedestrians, cyclists and dog walkers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The embankment is fragile and collapsing, partly due to storm damage, and partly due to the impact from road traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0694</th>
<th>Person: Dave</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10, 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerns with the submission by Eastern and Midlands Regional Assembly (EMRA) in relation to the Luas Green Line Extension to Bray; queries why are they commenting on the Luas extension when it is the role of the NTA to comment on the NTA/TII or other relevant Government Departments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Neither the RSES nor the NTA’s Transport Strategy for the Great Dublin area provide any definitive guidance or imperatives in relation to preferred routing - other than the nebulous schematics in, respectively, Fig. 5.4 (RSES) and Fig. 5.3 (NTA Strategy).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Green Line alignment shown on Draft Plan Maps 10 and 14 was triggered by the inclusion of same in the NTA’s Bray and Environs Transport Study (BETS) in 2019.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The final Material Amendments phase of the Draft CDP goes out for public consultation around October 2021. There is no prospect of the NTA Strategy Review being advanced enough, or in any position to inform, the final adopted 2022-2028 CDP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Considers that it is better to have something tangible on Maps 10 and 14 rather than a complete vacuum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0695</th>
<th>Person: Mags Keddy</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9,13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Retain the Dingle way off Ballycorus rd that leads to the protected Dingle nature reserve and the Ballybetagh way between Enniskerry rd and Ballybetagh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Submissions Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0696</td>
<td>Stephen Roe</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0697</td>
<td>Ian Sutton</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0698</td>
<td>Craig Galligan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0699</td>
<td>Marie-Therese Walker</td>
<td>MTW Jewellery</td>
<td>9,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0700</td>
<td>Scarlett Hughes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0701</td>
<td>Shaunna Galligan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- **B0696**
  - Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
  - Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

- **B0697**
  - Do not remove the right of way at ballybetagh (Enniskerry rd to ballybetagh) and the Dingle Right of way (off ballycorus).
  - Note that the submitter’s son uses the Ballybetagh pathway for access to the Bus route on Enniskerry Road.

- **B0698**
  - Submission opposes plan for an east coast trail through Corbawn Drive, Shankill.
  - Concerned the trail will have a negative impact of residents and safety in the area.
  - Considers a cycle way through Shankill Village would be more appropriate.

- **B0699**
  - Please do not remove the Ballybetagh right of way and the Dingle right of way, which are of natural and historical significance.

- **B0700**
  - Please do not remove the right of way at Dingle Way, Ballycorus road and Ballybetagh, Kilternan, which are both of historical significance and of great importance to locals.
  - The ROWs should be preserved as part of any building works.

- **B0701**
  - Submission opposes plan for an East Coast Trail through Corbawn Drive, Shankill.
  - Concerned the trail will have a negative impact of residents and safety in the area.
  - Considers a cycle way through Shankill Village would be more appropriate.
### Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0702</td>
<td>Brid Meehan</td>
<td>Old Connaught and District Community Association</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0703</td>
<td>Luke Walsh</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0704</td>
<td>Susan Watchorn</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0705</td>
<td>Linda Kenny</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0706</td>
<td>Kim Evans</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9,13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- **DLR Submission No: B0702**  
  Person: Brid Meehan  
  Organisation: Old Connaught and District Community Association  
  Map Nos: N/A  
  
  **Summary of Submission and Observation:**  
  - Submission states that there are sufficient lands zoned for future development in the Shankill area. Refers to a number of housing projects and new development areas including: Abington; Shanganagh Castle; Woodbrook; Old Conna; and, Rathmichael.  
  - Requests the ‘Strategic Land Reserve’ be omitted and that lands in the Green Belt be retained and free from development. Outlines the environmental and human benefits of retaining the Green Belt and considers it to be a definite physical divide between Shankill and Bray, linking the mountains to the sea. Refers to a number of Council objectives and suggests the Council should take in charge the Green Belt.  
  - Refers to the Aske and Christian Brothers land and states that it had been their understanding that the land was reserved for recreational and sporting activities. Notes that there is now a change of use from Green Belt to Objective MOC.  
  - Supports the retention of SLO 118.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 2 and Map 14.

- **DLR Submission No: B0703**  
  Person: Luke Walsh  
  Organisation: N/A  
  Map Nos: 13  
  
  **Summary of Submission and Observation:**  
  - Submission welcomes the opportunity to have a voice.  
  - Submission does not support the rezoning of the sports hotel or lands adjoining it stating that infrastructure should be developed prior to consideration of rezoning and notes impacts on biodiversity.  
  - Submission notes unfinished or out of date planning permissions in the area.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Map 13.

- **DLR Submission No: B0704**  
  Person: Susan Watchorn  
  Organisation: N/A  
  Map Nos: 2,6  
  
  **Summary of Submission and Observation:**  
  - Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Map 2.

- **DLR Submission No: B0705**  
  Person: Linda Kenny  
  Organisation: N/A  
  Map Nos: 9,13  
  
  **Summary of Submission and Observation:**  
  - Do not remove the Ballybetagh right of way and the Dingle right of way, which are of both natural and historical significance, being 900 years old.  
  - The ROWs add to people’s quality of life through social and recreational amenity and improve wellbeing. They are outdoor playgrounds for both young and old as well as being an outdoor education facility.  
  - Greater density development planned for the near future mean that more families will benefit from these rights of ways being upheld.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Appendix 12.

- **DLR Submission No: B0706**  
  Person: Kim Evans  
  Organisation: N/A  
  Map Nos: 9,13  
  
  **Summary of Submission and Observation:**
• Do not remove the Ballybetagh right of way and the Dingle right of way, which are of natural and historical significance and should be preserved for future generations.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0707</td>
<td>Nicola McEntee</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9,13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Do not remove the Ballybetagh right of way and the Dingle right of way, which are of natural and historical significance as well as being enjoyable walking trails.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0708</td>
<td>Liz Lawrence</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• The submission objects to the temporary solutions to the ongoing need for public toilets for visitors year-round and for lifeguards during the summer months and spoil the beauty and ambience of the area for the entire summer.
• The site by The Billows is too visible and too far away from the beach for the people who need it.
• The blue shipping containers beside the beach were unspeakably ugly.
• The Council’s landscape gardeners should be deployed with planters to soften the effect.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0709</td>
<td>Andrew Marshall</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• The submission notes that Sandycove is a place of international cultural significance as well as being a place of high recreational amenity and is a popular destination for thousands of visitors. The intensification of use in recent times requires a dramatic rethinking of how the area is organized to accommodate all users safely.
• The County Development Plan should include the following Specific Local Objective: “To develop and implement proposals that will ensure that the Sandycove loop (including the avenues, lanes and point) is a safe and healthy place for visitors and local residents alike, and an amenity that can be enjoyed by a wide range of users”.
• The following issues will need to be considered:
  • Safety of pedestrians.
  • Access for emergency vehicles.
  • Restriction of motorised vehicular traffic into the area.
  • Safety of cyclists and protection of pedestrians from cyclists.
  • Safety and access for less able-bodied users.
  • Identify the wide range of users and interests both cultural and recreational, and their needs.
  • A hierarchy that gives priority to pedestrians whilst maintaining essential vehicular access only.
  • The provision of toilet facilities commensurate with visitor numbers.
  • The re-location of casual trading pitches.
  • Safe access for residents to their homes.
  • On street provision of e-car charging points to facilitate residents with no curtilage parking.
  • A unique, sensitive, and sustainable solution will be needed for this unique set of problems.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0710</td>
<td>Gerard Ryan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission requests drain infrastructure is maintained and developed and that new developments take account of past flooding to prevent future flooding.
• Submission details erosion that has taken place in Corbawn since 1986 and notes there is an urgent issue in relation to coastal erosion in the estate, requests works to be prioritised.
• Submission notes residents would lose amenity area to future coastal protection and a cycleway but support the DLR initiative to investigate the cycleway proposal.
• Submission notes from Clontra’s 2020 planning appeal to ABP that they have land that is also earmarked “along a disused railway to the East of the site” for a coastal cycle route.
• Submission notes amenity area is being lost to erosion every year with a lot of money being spent on short term measure, welcomes investigation of a permanent solution.
• Submission considers while the cycleway is important or future mobility, it is not safe or suitable in a residential estate and the residents would like to help develop a solution.
• Submission welcomes greenbelt status between Corbawn and Shanganagh Park and retention of lane/walkway between Rathsallagh/Corbawn.
• Submission requests large developments not be allowed along the rural Quinns Road.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Mapping, Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0711</th>
<th>Person: Mary Priestman</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td>The submission requests that the Plan should provide more walking recreation places around the apartments and houses on the Glenamuck Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0712</th>
<th>Person: John Thompson</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Summary of Submission and Observation:** | Retain the hill walkers right of way across woodland areas.  
Development can take place while retaining our natural environment. |

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0713</th>
<th>Person: Antoinette Pim</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Summary of Submission and Observation:** | All rights of way should be retained and kept open. 
If landowners are being disturbed, then suggest choosing the first weekend every month for ROWs to be open as a compromise. |

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0714</th>
<th>Person: Rebecca Wright</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Summary of Submission and Observation:** | SLO 93 makes it very difficult to buy a home in the area, particularly a new home. It appears to keep house prices astronomically high. 
We would love to see more starter homes being built in Rathmichael. This is something the Council should be working towards. 
The SLO should be toned down significantly so that people could adequately address the Council’s concerns around water by using the current EPA Wastewater Code of Practice. |

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14 (Map 14), Chapter 10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0715</td>
<td>Rob Asher</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The experience with the pandemic has meant a lot more people have come to enjoy the lovely scenery outdoors in Dun Laoghaire and surrounding areas.
- Understand that several public Rights of Way are at risk of being removed due to pressure from land developers and ask that they be preserved for future generations.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0716</td>
<td>Bernie Dwyer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Disheartened by the way DLR and An Board Pleanála are destroying the Glenamuck area.
- Access to Dingle Glen, Kilmacanogue, etc. should be retained.
- DLR heritage has done some wonderful work over the years and yet we have no access to The Brennanstown Dolmen and the one on Bishop’s Lane Kilternan.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0717</td>
<td>JJ McCarthy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Protect our public right of ways to local historical and sites of interest.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0718</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9,13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The rights of ways (2no.) for access to the Dingle at the bottom of Wayside pitches and the Ballybetagh road, which leads old oak small Forrest, are well used and should be retained.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0719</td>
<td>Suzanne Thompson</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9,13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Retain the right of way paths off Ballycorus road and Ballybetagh road.
- New housing should accommodate the access paths.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Appendix 1, 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0720</td>
<td>Peter Graham</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Appropriate cycle and running facilities through estates and in public footpaths are needed.
- Roads and Luas are at capacity; more development should only be allowed with the implementation of improved transport.
- Green spaces must be maintained and enhanced where appropriate

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0721</td>
<td>Liz Lawrence</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes that new parking bays on Sandy cove Ave North are contributing to traffic congestion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Notes difficulty for cars to drive through onto S.A. Nth as well as larger vehicles such as bin lorries, ambulance and the fire brigade.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0722</td>
<td>Aoife</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Object to the closure of the right of way paths in Kilternan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Closure of right of way paths are detrimental to the history of Kilternan village.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0723</td>
<td>Elizabeth Hickey</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue the roll out of segregated cycle track and protected junctions suitable for all connected to neighbouring Local authority areas as well as the Dodder greenway and East Coast trail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved swim facilities are needed and a tidal pool would be good to see.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter 5, 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0724</td>
<td>Abigail Henderick</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The submission requests that the Plan includes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More green space for recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More facilities for teenagers to prevent antisocial behaviour and perhaps links with community Gardai.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preservation of established forest, woodland, and natural beauty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enforcement of dog ownership laws, dogs on leads in onlead parks and clean up after dog.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protection of existing village feel of places like Cabinteely, Blackrock, Monkstown without being overdeveloped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Any new housing development should include replacement of trees and green spaces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developments of sheltered housing schemes for older adults.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter 9 and Chapter 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0725</td>
<td>Eoin Edwards</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The submission suggests that the green areas and facilities need to take a higher priority in the Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jamestown park, for example, was planned back in 2006 and is still not open to the public.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a Greenway running through Clay Farm, Elm Field, however this is closed off by fences, etc. and would be good to open to public.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stepaside village could use the space beside the retail space (old pitch and putt) as a square with benches and flowers for pedestrians and cyclists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLR Submission No:</td>
<td>Person:</td>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Map Nos:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0726</td>
<td>Lauren Doherty</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0727</td>
<td>Neasa Murphy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0728</td>
<td>Sarah Byrnes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0729</td>
<td>Finbarr Curtin</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0730</td>
<td>K. Ó Cearbhaill</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0731</td>
<td>Stephen Igoe</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- **DLR Submission No: B0726**
  - Person: Lauren Doherty
  - Organisation: N/A
  - Map Nos: N/A
  - Summary of Submission and Observation:
    - Submission raises concerns in relation to town planning in Kilternan. States that there is a lack of infrastructure to serve new residential development and that outdoor amenities, history, wildlife and culture in the area needs to be protected. Recommends the area is kept green and sense of community maintained.
  - Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 2

- **DLR Submission No: B0727**
  - Person: Neasa Murphy
  - Organisation: N/A
  - Map Nos: 9,13
  - Summary of Submission and Observation:
    - Do not remove the Ballybetagh right of way and the Dingle right of way, which are ancient and beautiful walkways that should be preserved for future generations.
  - Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 12

- **DLR Submission No: B0728**
  - Person: Sarah Byrnes
  - Organisation: N/A
  - Map Nos: 10
  - Summary of Submission and Observation:
    - DLRCC should reconsider SLO93.
    - This objective is making it very hard to build further houses in the Shankill area and more resource need to be employed into investigating why the issue can’t be ruled on a case by case basis especially if stringent plans are in place to take into account the new 2021 EPA Wastewater Code of Practice that is equipped to deal with these issues via up to date wastewater strategies and systems.
    - There is a lack of housing in the Shankill/Rathmichael area and the Council should be looking at all avenues to increase supply in this area.
  - Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14 (Map 14), Chapter 10

- **DLR Submission No: B0729**
  - Person: Finbarr Curtin
  - Organisation: N/A
  - Map Nos: N/A
  - Summary of Submission and Observation:
    - The submission requests that the Plan projects the areas of nature outstanding beauty and the historical sites in the County.
  - Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 8

- **DLR Submission No: B0730**
  - Person: K. Ó Cearbhaill
  - Organisation: N/A
  - Map Nos: 7
  - Summary of Submission and Observation:
    - Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
    - Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.
    - Submission considered there has been a decline in Dún Laoghaire town centre commercially, and overdevelopment has resulted in an increase in traffic congestion and reduced air quality.
    - Submission notes that green areas should be preserved and maintained for future generations and should not be overdeveloped.
  - Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 9, Map 7, Appendix 8

- **DLR Submission No: B0731**
  - Person: Stephen Igoe
  - Organisation: N/A
  - Map Nos: 7
  - Summary of Submission and Observation:
    - Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
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- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Map 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0732</th>
<th>Person: Ruth Igoe</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Map 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0733</th>
<th>Person: Stephen Kestell</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7, 9, 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Protect public rights of way e.g. the Mullins Hill right of way across Killiney golf course.
- There should be right of ways to important historical sites such as Brennannstown and Kilternan dolmens as well as Dingle Glen.
- The increased urbanisation of Carrickmines and Lehaunstown is alarming. There should be no further urban construction in the upland areas.
- Trees and hedgerows need to be protected.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Chapters 2 and 9, Appendix 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0734</th>
<th>Person: Marco Kraus</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2, 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Map 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0735</th>
<th>Person: Dave Egan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission notes that few areas of natural beauty remain in the area and parks do not substitute for this.
- The Council should not allow developers destroy the little things that make the area the way it is.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Chapter 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0736</th>
<th>Person: Tom Daly</th>
<th>Organisation: Redesdale Residents Assoc.</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2, 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space.
- Under the Green Infrastructure provisions of the current Development Plan, supporting native plant and animal species and providing ecological corridors for their movement, sections of this large open green park have been designated by the Council as a Nature Wildlife Area. It is vital to maintain these ecological corridors in line with the current Plan.
- Submission notes the importance of green space and infrastructure, and states it is vital to maintain ecological corridors in line with the current Plan.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Map 2**
Summary of Submission and Observation:
• People should have right to access any historical amenities in the local area.
• Do not agree with high rise buildings – there is no need for any housing to be more than 2/3 levels high. Anything higher than this will infringe and be detrimental to the natural beauty of the area.
• Adequate leisure and green space should be available for public mental and health well-being. This should include multiple large parks and woodland walks, including ponds. Adequate seating at dedicated view points should be provided too.
• Protected spaces for children and dogs (off lead) should be provided.
• Local flora and fauna including hedgerows and trees should be protected as without them there can be no wildlife including insects, birds and mammals and thus in the grander scheme - no us.
• Any new builds should have significant architectural planning to prevent flooding at lower levels caused by the removal of hedgerows, trees and installation of tarmac, and wind evaluations for safety.
• Road infrastructure and widening along with installation of bike lanes and pedestrian footpaths should be provided, eg. Glenamuck Road.
• Any green spaces should be adequately supported by the council for anti-social behaviour, and litter bins provided and emptied regularly, or encourage the movement of dog waste to the undergrowth as a natural fertilizer.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Chapters 5, 8, 9, 10, 11
- Appendix 5

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission requests that the field at Silchester Park which is currently zoned A be rezoned to F as this area is used for recreational purposes.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Map 3

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Section 8.6.3 of the Development Plan must seek to protect and secure all public rights of way into the future using a combination of signposting, path clearance and enforcement against any attempts by landowners and developers to block such rights of way.
• The public amenities around the Seapoint, Sandycove and 40 foot bathing areas need significant investment including regular cleaning and maintenance, improved facilities. The provision of full-time DLRCC staff at these locations should be considered.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Appendix 12

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Provide more greenspaces and play areas for kids.
• Protect historic public rights of way. It's frustrating that right on our doorstep are the country’s two finest 4000-year dolmen at Brennanstown and Kilternan and we are unable to visit them, or other areas such as the proposed national heritage area at Dingle Glen or Kilmashogue Hill.
• Enhanced protection for local trees and hedgerows.
• No further urban sprawl up into high amenity upland areas.
• More mountain bike trails.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Chapter 9, Appendix 12
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0741</td>
<td>Rory O’Connell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Object to the closing of the Rights of Way, given its popularity to local walkers and importance as a local amenity.
- Access should not be removed in the name of development.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 9, Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0742</td>
<td>Stewart Duffy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space.
- Access to Mullen’s field is off narrow roads in housing estates and these roads are already being overused as short cuts. Concern is expressed regarding potential traffic issues should there be further development in the area.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0743</td>
<td>Kerry McLaverty</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Retain current Right of Way in Kilternan - particularly the Ballybetagh ROW.
- Ballycorus Road - The plan states for “traffic management/active travel upgrades.” It is unclear what is planned in this regard due to the vague nature of the zoning descriptor. While it is understood and necessary that any essential road upkeep works or indeed pathway improvement should be conducted expeditiously, prior commitments to avoid road widening were made and should be honoured so as to maintain the culture and heritage of the road.
- Note that chapter 4 of the plan refers to “high density” residential development near public transport, but excludes areas of Dalkey and Kiliney on the basis of “notable character”. Propose that Kilternan and the surrounding areas of Ballycorus/Rathmichael and Glencullen should also be considered as areas of notable character, given the many landmark heritage sites, nature trails, protected structures and sites of historical interest.
- The rapid development of the Glenamuck Road and Carrickmines area demonstrates little regard for maintaining the character of the area and is of huge concern. The architectural design of any future residential development(s) should be sensitive to the historical character of the area.
- The rezoning of lands in the Kilternan area on the Enniskerry Road to “A” residential is particularly worrying, as “high density” developments of multi-storey modernistic design would ruin the integrity of one of the last ruralesque retreats in South Dublin.
- Maintaining green areas and natural preservation of the Ballycorus and Kilternan areas is of paramount importance.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapters 4 & 11, Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0744</td>
<td>Dr Darren O’Beirne</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8, 9, 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

**Rights of Way**
- The county is fortunate to have many natural and historic sites dating back over millennia and landowners have facilitated the passage of fellow members of the community via defined trails across their property. However, this is under severe and accelerating threat from the current custodians. The Council should protect all existing ROW. The submission sets out several established right of ways and recommends that they be included in the county’s record.
- Lehaunstown, Tully Cross - There is an established right of way that covers the short distance between Lehaunstown Lane and the ancient cross. A few months back fences totally blocking all access, along
with threatening signs, were erected by developers (photo submitted). Safe passage to the cross should be accommodated during the forthcoming building activity. The restrictive measures mark a blatant infringement of the public right of way.

- **Glendruid** – There is an established trail through the woods along the Carrickmines Stream which has been blocked in recent years by development near the Brennansstown Luas stop and a bricked-up access gateway on Lehaunstown Lane. Request that a formal ROW is established to access the site, which is on a trail clearly used by locals for a very long period.

- **Kilmashogue** – Kilmashogue mountain is a national asset and reaching the top of scenic Kilmashogue mountain remains relatively achievable. However, the specific tracks of the ROW have a number of challenges due to maturing trees and intimidating signs. Consequently, alternative routes that join the ROW from Coilte land in the Ticknock valley appear to have become established. The ROW should be clearly accommodated.

- **Barnacullia** – There are well used access points to Three Rock mountain from Barnacullia that are not currently marked on the ROW map. It is recommended that these be formally recorded as ROWs. The submission includes a figure showing three routes as follows:
  - Path heading northwest of Murphystone quarry
  - From the top of the lane just south of the Blue Light pub, the trail heading west towards the nearby radio antennae
  - The laneway above Flanagan & Co. connecting to the forest trail above

- The proliferation of mountain bikes has increased the danger to pedestrians on these trails. In particular, the Murphystone trail would benefit from cycle-calming railings and warning / priority signs on the popular routes.

- **Dingle Glen** – A right of way exists which allows the public to visit this natural native regenerating woodland. The official ROW which passes through a farmyard on Dixon Lane, currently requires a slight variation due to hedgerow growth. It is noted that locals often use another variation of this route. Protecting this ROW is critical so that access to view this important natural habitat is maintained.

- **Ballybetagh** – This ROW appears to have been blocked, but is clearly an old path, as evidenced by the stunning trees that line both sides of this beautiful trail. Walkers still use this route, but have to contend with significant obstructions, such as multiple barbed wire fences, security fences, a horse track and knocked or obstructed stone stiles as well as threatening and intimidating signs. The submission includes a series of photos of the route showing obstructions. Request that the council actively protect the ROW.

- **Rathmichael** – The route that connects the Dublin Mountains Way, passing by ancient Rathmichael cemetery, is easily accessed. The trail which extends this ROW from Rathmichael Rd to Brides Glen Rd has become overgrown and requires clearing.

- **Kilternan** – Kilternan Dolmen is a significant historic monument in the local area. ROWs to visit this site were removed in recent times. These should be immediately reinstated, or at the very least new routes established to replace them. In the interests of balancing concerns of all parties, perhaps a new shorter ROW could be established from either the new Bishops Gate or Glebe Rd developments.

- The county is fortunate to contain two very significant Dolmens at Glendruid and Kilternan. Formal public right of ways should be established for these two sites. It is a national shame that the second largest dolmen in our country, previously accessible, now sits inaccessible behind security fences. Other megaliths remain inaccessible to the public such as those at Larch Hill and Brehon’s Chair. Right of ways, or a mechanism by which these can accessed, should be established.

**Proposed Kilgobbin Road ACA**

- Kilgobbin Road Kilgobbin Road, on the winding stretch between Violet Hill and Kilgobbin Heights, should be assessed as an area of architectural conservation. This road possesses both a sylvan character and a significant number of historic buildings and sites. Kilgobbin Road’s historic landmarks include Kilgobbin Church and cemetery, Kilgobbin Castle, Kilgobbin Cross, the Pale ditch, an original milestone, Oldtown House (1690s), as well as other notable houses from the 1700 and 1800s. Any development in this small area should be controlled and managed so that it is in keeping with the character of the environment.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Chapter 9, Chapter 11, Appendix 12
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0745</th>
<th>Person: Emer McGillion</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More green spaces and play areas for kids are needed in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There needs to be enhanced protection for local trees and hedgerows.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are two ancient heritage sites in the area that cannot be accessed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased building, particularly high rise will, along with dense traffic, lack of amenities will continue to ruin the beautiful area &amp; landscape.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 8 and Chapter 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0746</th>
<th>Person: Simon Dobbyn</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission objects to the use of Stillorgan reservoir for a public amenity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residents were assured the site could never be open to the public.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes privacy and security concerns should the area be open to the public, due to access, and overlooking of house and garden.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes a public space would affect the value of their home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Notes there is no need for a public amenity as there is a public park beside it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0747</th>
<th>Person: N Quinn</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is an urgent need for safe infrastructure on Tivoli Road to protect children who are walking, cycling and scooting. Traffic has increased on Tivoli Road since the CMR went in. Concern in particular for families and young children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tivoli Road should be a priority if DLRCC are promoting safe travel to school on a congested road with 3 schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seeks a one way road with with protected lanes for cycling and scooting are urgently needed to avoid injury to children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0748</th>
<th>Person: Ann Ronan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests the removal of SLO 85 from the Plan and ensure the lads are reserved for reservoir.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Notes that residents were assured the site could never be open to the public due to safety, security and privacy concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Notes that no notice was given to residents re SLO85.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0749</th>
<th>Person: Daragh Moore</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This is a detailed plan with many good points in it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More effort needs to be made to make the plan more accessible as it is quite complex and uses legal wording.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appendix 1 not attached to Plan – therefore difficult to follow what the plan is proposing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Strategic County Outcomes include mention of “softer modes of walking and cycling” in the target of “a Compact and Connected County” and “…approach centred on the core principle of sustainability…” however the evidence of planning for the changes needed to support this vision in the Plan are not seen.
- Chapter 3 – no mention of cycling infrastructure or walking. These are mentioned in Chapter 5 but also need to be in Chapter 3 as they are important in terms of the climate action response.
- Chapter 5 - Figure 5.3 shows a prioritisation of users in terms of transport provision. The plan does not state that this prioritisation of users is the policy of the council and from this plan I would say that this is clearly not the council’s priority order.
- Private car is the priority of the Council – walking to get to the shops, work or other facilities does not appear to be properly considered. For example, dishing footpaths for vehicles is a policy which is not for pedestrians.
- Chapter 15 – nothing about sustainable transport in Section 15.5.4 but these measures should be prioritised.
- No target date for the preparation of a Biodiversity Action Plan under Section 15.5.8. Clear targets with dates should be added.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapters 1, 3, 5, 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0750</td>
<td>Colette Butler</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Ann Ronan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0752</td>
<td>Seamus Smyth</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0753</td>
<td>Fionnuala Hayes</td>
<td>Sandycove Avenues &amp; Lanes North East &amp; West(SAL NEW)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Do not remove the Ballybetagh right of way and the Dingle right of way, which are of natural and historical significance, dating back 900 years.
- The submission notes Specific Local Objective 21.
- The submission requests that the Council include the provision of a swimming pool leisure facility and library within the Stillorgan area.
- It would be very important to ensure that the swimming pool was suitable for both leisure and competitive swimming.
- More segregated cycle facilities that can be used by young and old similar to the Dutch.
- More pedestrianised streets would also be great!
- Integrate land use planning and transport more i.e. high rise near train stations.
- Sandycove is of international cultural significance and also of high recreational amenity.
- Traffic problems in the area set out.
- Map and photos of the Sandycove area are attached to the submission.
• Recommend a new SLO as follows:
  “To devise and implement measures that will ensure that the Sandycove loop (being Sandycove Avenues North, East and West, adjacent lanes and Sandycove Point) is a safe and healthy place for visitors and local residents alike, and an amenity that can be enjoyed by a wide range of users.”
• Need to address a range of issues relating to pedestrian and cyclist safety, access for emergency vehicles, e-charging, toilets, restricting cars but allowing essential access only, issues around casual trading etc.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 3, Chapter 5 and Chapter 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0754</th>
<th>Person: Clare Hilton</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Apartment living is not conducive to the Irish way of life and is not the answer for the housing situation in the area. Apartments in Ireland are used to promote transient living, are badly designed to properly serve modern living and constitute a subtle social divide that is growing in Ireland.
• Apartments lack storage and laundry facilities.
• The building of apartments should not be promoted, and a more innovative, socially acceptable alternative should be sought in the area to promote community, social cohesion and better standard of living.
• Safe and secure green spaces for all to enjoy, including community gardens, outdoor gyms, picnic facilities and safe seating.
• Better access and historic public rights of way protected eg. Brennanstown and Kiltearn.
• Enhanced protection for local trees and hedgerows – important to maintain for a healthy and better quality of life for all.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapters 8, 9, 12, Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0755</th>
<th>Person: Tom Merriman</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 1,5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• In the absence of an LAP for Dundrum, additional/revised Specific Local Objectives should be included in the CDP as follows:
• Amend SLO 9 as follows: ‘To ensure that any future redevelopment in Dundrum Village, including on the old shopping centre lands, takes cognisance of the character and streetscape of the Old Main Street, and maintain where appropriate, and possible existing buildings and/or facades. Buildings heights alongside Main Street must be in keeping with the original relatively low-rise streetscape, in keeping with its character, scale and Candidate Architectural Conservation Area status.
• New SLO Map 1: That the Dundrum Luas Station will be significantly upgraded and that the detailed design proposals are incorporated into the Local Area Plan for Dundrum.
• New SLO Map 1: Permeability through all major developments on the east side of Main Street should ensure pedestrian/cycle links between Main Street and the Dundrum Bypass.
• New SLO Map 1: In the context of any redevelopment of the Old Shopping Centre, that power lines on Main Street will be under grounded.
• New SLO Map 1: All new developments on Main Street will facilitate the provision of a pedestrian-friendly and traffic-calmed environment along Dundrum Main Street, with particular care being paid to paving materials, modern public lighting, hard and soft landscaping and street art. There is a particular need for improved soft landscaping along the Main Street.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0756</th>
<th>Person: Johan Keating</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9,13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Do not remove the Ballybetagh right of way and the Dingle right of way, which are of natural and historical significance.
- New Road infrastructure should be organised and built before any more houses or apartment blocks get the go ahead.
- Keeping green space in the local area for children to play safely.
- The new park on glenamuck Road should not be allowed to proceed as its close proximity to overhead power lines.
- New local schools, primary and secondary level should be built.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0757</th>
<th>Person: Paddy &amp; Margaret McCormack</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Opposed to the use of the reservoir as a park. Plan was amended without consulting residents
- Assured that reservoir would not be used as a park.
- Have endured disruption from construction since 2017.
- Concerned with overlooking, security of property due to elevation of a park over their dwelling and garden.
- Consider that there is no need for a park at this location there is already a park, instead swimming and other leisure facilities are needed in the area.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0758</th>
<th>Person: Brian Cooney</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission requests that the Plan consider the following:
  (i) Given the substantial increase in use of our coastal villages, the Council should engage cleaners (for the weekends) to clean the villages at 6am in the mornings (Blackrock/ Monkstown/ Dún Laoghaire/ Glasthule/Dalkey).
  (ii) The Council should upgrade and expand the access points for swimming along the coast by introducing new ladders to access the water at areas from Monkstown through to Coliemore Harbour.
  (iii) The site at Georges Place/ Old fire station is tailor made for a 'creative arts & cultural lab space'. There is currently an application for a primary school, but it is not considered that the site can accommodate this development.
  (iv) Specific policies should be included to substantially increase CCTV surveillance and enhance speed control on roads approaching villages in the County - for example Monkstown Rd approaching the village.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0759</th>
<th>Person: Doyle Kent</th>
<th>Organisation: Doyle Kent Ltd on behalf of Mr. S. Mannix</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Concern with lack of progress on the R118 project. Request the following changes to the Draft Plan:
  - Include an objective to the draft Development Plan that the layout of the R118 will make appropriate provision for access to serve the zoned residential lands (former Beechwood Nursery) at the Graduate roundabout and a preliminary design proposal for the new layout at the Graduate roundabout be published within six months of the adoption of the new Plan and that the application to An Bord Pleanála in respect of the project is brought forward at an early stage in the lifetime of the Plan.
  - Submission includes a planning history and background context material in terms of the road project, national, regional and local planning policy.
**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Chapter 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0760</th>
<th>Person: Bernie Crean</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9,13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Do not remove the Ballybetagh right of way and the Dingle right of way.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Appendix 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0761</th>
<th>Person: Kate O’Carroll</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission makes a number of recommendations in relation to the Kilternan area.
  - Suggests Kilternan needs a real village centre, with associated amenities, to improve the area for all residents. States that development to date has comprised only housing with no amenities.
  - Green space should be a priority and greater protection given to existing trees. More parks and areas for safe recreation should be provided. Existing rights of way should be preserved and historic places in the area need to be preserved and made more accessible.
  - School places for both primary and secondary are an existing issue and schools need to be able to cope with the extra demand.
  - Suggests that no more land around Kilternan should be rezoned unless the above issues are resolved. Adds that due to the steep topography of the area, development can have an effect on views from a very large area and that this is not always properly considered.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Chapter 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0762</th>
<th>Person: Patricia McSparrsn</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission requests that a Specific local Objective (SLO) is included in the Development in respect of Sandycove Avenue East, North, West, Sandycove Point and adjoining avenues to reverse the high volumes of motorised traffic and the problems resulting from lack of effective traffic management.
- The SLO should also take into account the detrimental impact on health and safety resulting from the high toxic emissions, the high levels of noise, the impeded access for emergency vehicles and residents in the interests of protecting the environment, the health and safety welfare and amenity of the local residents and visitors.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Chapter 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0763</th>
<th>Person: Paul O’Connor</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission notes congestion around Sandycove Point.
- Submission notes lack of adequate traffic and parking infrastructure and increasing volumes of visitors.
- Submission notes health and safety hazards and difficulty for emergency services accessing area due to congestion.
- Submission notes anti-social behaviour, noise and air pollution in the area.
- Submission notes the above issues are distressing for residents.
- Submission notes importance of implementing a strategy and addressing the above issues.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Chapter 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0764</th>
<th>Person: Helga Ryan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: Map 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Section 12.9.8 Telecommunications states that a communications mast ‘shall not have a significant negative visual impact’. This states that a negative impact is therefore acceptable, the degree of which is totally subjective.
- Continuous noise and negative visual impact means that a communications mast should never be sited in a residential area.
- Person lives in a Protected Structure and the Council has made a commitment to retain the sylvan, rural nature of the area, and yet a communications mast is being considered in the area (Kilgobbin Road). Application was withdrawn by Eirgrid but DLRCC are in talks with Eirgrid about it.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0765</th>
<th>Person: Ciaran O’ Connor</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td>Build more housing.</td>
<td>Requests more curb-segregated bike lanes county-wide.</td>
<td>Get the S2S done. Supports more Place making and making the CMR permanent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make it easy for people to cycle to school and college.</td>
<td>Requests curb-segregated bike lanes at the following locations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eden Rd-&gt;Corrig Road-&gt;Tivoli-&gt;Monkstown Ave-&gt;Rowanbryn and onward joins Dalkey with Dundrum in an orbital route.</td>
<td>Carrickbrennan Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kill Ave from Foxrock Church-&gt;Deansgrange-&gt;Bakers Corner-&gt;Kill Lane-&gt;Mounttown Roundabout-&gt;York Rd-&gt;Crofton Road.</td>
<td>Cross Avenue and Booterstown Avenue - make Booterstown Avenue lower one way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Churchview Road in Killiney/Ballybrack to Wyattville Road.</td>
<td>Johnstown Road from Pottery Rd to Rochestown Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sallynoggin</td>
<td>Rochestown Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Join the contraflow bike lane at Maretimo Terrace/Idrone Terrace in Blackrock with that on the Main Street.</td>
<td>Trial a one-way route and bike lanes on Deansgrange Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build the Blackrock Skatepark and pump track at Williamstown.</td>
<td>Install more outdoor gym/calisthenics bars like what’s in Hudson in all parks across the county.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 2, 5, 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0766</th>
<th>Person: Doyle Kent Ltd on behalf of Mr and Mrs M Kearns</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td>Submission requests that the private residential property at 12 Pine Lawn, Blackrock, is rezoned from F to A.</td>
<td>Submission notes that the land appears to have been zoned for residential use at the time of granting permission for the house in 1988.</td>
<td>Submission sets out a detailed site description incorporating imagery of the property and a location map. The context of the site / surrounding area is also set out with regard to proximity of infrastructure and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submission notes the current zoning objective of the property, that being ‘F’ - ‘To preserve and provide for open space with ancillary active recreational amenities’ and notes that this has been carried over to the draft plan.</td>
<td>Submission notes that there is a limited range of development in the F zone – residential is not permitted which conflicts with the reality on site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Submission notes planning history for the site and understands that the F zoning was first applied in the 1993 Dublin County Development Plan – the site had been developed at that time.

Submission incorporates a comprehensive planning and development history of the area from 1964 including details in relation to the subject site and conditions attached to permissions granted.

Submission notes the National and Regional policy objectives with regard to infill/brownfield development and compact growth and details the policy objectives for same set out in the draft plan.

Submission notes policy objectives of the draft plan with regard to densifying existing built up areas and encouraging additional dwellings within existing communities.

Submission states that the site is ‘0.2415 hectare which is equivalent to approximately four houses per hectare’ and that the existing density represents poor use of serviced land.

Submission considers that the current zoning is contrary to national and regional policy, is inconsistent with the overall policies of the draft plan and discriminates against the owners of the property.

Submission notes that there is no prospect of the site being used for any of the purposes set out under the F land use zoning objective.

Submission notes that there is no justification for retaining the F zone on the site.

Appendix 1 of the submission contains a map of the site and area requested for rezoning.

Appendix 2 of the submission includes a detailed planning history, including planning documentation extracts, for the site. It is noted that there are gaps in detail due to the time that has elapsed.

Appendix 2 notes a lack of evidence with regard to agreements between the land owner and Dublin City Council with regard to open space lands. Details with regard to various correspondence in respect of the open space lands is set out and includes a reproduced map showing lands for open space as per correspondence dating from 1985.

Land ownership history is set out in Appendix 2.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Map 6

DLR Submission No: B0767
Person: Vincent Colgan
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: N/A

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Requests an increase in joined up safe cycling infrastructure.
- Children are growing up without independence due to car dominance.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Chapter 5

DLR Submission No: B0768
Person: Peter Fry
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: N/A

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Cycle routes should be off road as when on road they lead to congestion and this is increasing our carbon footprint. The cycle network be be elevated above footpaths – this should be trialled somewhere in the country.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Chapter 5.

DLR Submission No: B0769
Person: Kate
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 9

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Need more green areas
- Need some food stores (Dunnes etc) at the top of Glenmacuck road

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Chapter 9

DLR Submission No: B0770
Person: Caroline Falkner
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Map 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0771</th>
<th>Person: Simon Falker</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Chapter 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0772</th>
<th>Person: Jackie O’ Shea</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Chapter 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0773</th>
<th>Person: Karen Meagan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Increased development is impacting negatively on the landscape, vista, wildlife, heritage and ecosystem.
- Not enough infrastructure to cope with continued building of apartments & housing estates. Lack of secondary schools, shops, amenities & recreational areas.
- Very few bus routes.
- Thousands of apartments currently being built. With people working from home there will be a need for more infrastructure than perhaps pre covid.
- Increased crime rates related to lack of facilities for youth.
- The area is stretched to bursting & continued building will negatively blight the beauty & ecosystem of this area.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Miscellaneous**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0774</th>
<th>Person: Jill Marshall</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission notes poor traffic situation in Sandy cove Avenue North, as well as parking on double yellow lines and on the pavement.
- Submission notes emergency vehicles cannot pass through to gain access to either local houses or the sea.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Chapter 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0775</th>
<th>Person: Mathieu Boucher</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: Maps 5, 9, 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- No more developments in Glencullen, Stepaside, Sandyford area. Too many cars. Too many buildings, too many people in the Luas. We need space.
- Lisieux Hall permission needs to be reviewed – it is a strategic location for the area and another project for the community could be made here, instead of profit.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Miscellaneous**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0776</th>
<th>Person: Marguerite MacMahon</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Request the deletion of the following text from Section 8.5.6, Appendix 8:
  
  > 'The ongoing redevelopment of the site offers an opportunity to provide a mixed-use redevelopment that includes educational uses and the Plan supports the adaptation and reuse of the existing buildings on the site including the sensitive redevelopment of the Protected Structures. The first phase of the development has anticipated a new pedestrian/cycle link between George’s Place and Crofton Road and the completion of this route across Stable Lane to further strengthen the connectivity between Georges Street and the Waterfront is a strategic objective of this Plan Any redevelopment will include upgrades to the public realm along Georges Place to include traffic calming, extensive tree planting, pollinator planting schemes, creative water connectivity attenuation, wider paving, improved surfaces and new public lighting to create a stronger sense of place…’

  - No public right of way of Stable Lane has been established: Stable Lane is a private lane.
  - Ownership of the wall in which the emergency gate was inserted, has not been established. The wall predates local authority ownership of the site.
  - A public pedestrian/cycleway link from Georges Place to Crofton Road serves no purpose as there are other alternative routes available.
  - The DLR County Development Plan 2016-2022 objectives for the area were not realised. The provision of planting and public spaces (Appendix 12, Section 2.7) without a reduction in parking spaces was not a feasible objective and has been superseded by social housing on George’s Place. No engagement has taken place with the residents of Stable Lane or George’s Place regarding the draft 2022-2028 CDP and the impact on their residential area and there has been no request or support from the residents for this ‘anticipated’ new pedestrian/cycle link.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0777</th>
<th>Person: Ken Regan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission acknowledges the cycle lanes along the seafront and notes improvement to traffic flow specifically in the Sandycove Avenue West area.
- Submission notes traffic flow around the general area is improving as this system beds in.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0778</th>
<th>Person: John Wiles</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Object to the intention to create a pedestrian/cycle link between George’s Place and Crofton Road via Stable Lane.
- The proposed route passes through a private lane where there is no public right of way and uses a gate that has remained closed since 1993 when Edmund Kenny of 7 Stable Lane obtained an injunction against the local authority preventing its use for anything other than an emergency exit.
- The development of this area as outlined in the 2016-2022 CDP has been abandoned and superseded by residential development at George’s Place.
- There are ample alternative routes in close proximity, e.g. Kelly’s Lane.
- Section 8.5.6 isn’t a plan but a series of vague aspirational statements that mean absolutely nothing and which seem to be based solely on the premise of increased permeability for no apparent purpose.
- There aren’t any ideas for the area. The existing Development Plan (2016-2022) had a diagram ‘Ideas for Georges Place’ it is obvious that there is no intention of implementing what is shown there. This diagram has been removed with no new ideas inserted in its place.
Over the last 5 years the council has made little effort at all to develop protected structures in the vicinity and in fact has done the opposite, develop around them thus restricting the potential for use of these protected structures.

Section 8.5.6 in its current form removes the statement that the plans would implemented ‘without the reduction of parking’, a vital resource for the residents of the area.

Effort should be put into connecting with the local residents and producing a plan with consultation with the residents of the area that the council purports to support and improve their ‘sense of place’.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0779</td>
<td>Hanna Isseyegh</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The submission notes that limited outdoor space available to serve the Dún Laoghaire Educate Together National School and share the Red Door School site in Monkstown Grove.
- The submission is requesting that the large green space between Tivoli Terrace South and North to be developed for use for school children of all ages for sports days and other outdoor events and could help achieve a number of the Strategic County Outcomes i.e. the creation of a compact and connected community, the creation of a network of liveable towns and cities and most significantly and the creation of an inclusive and healthy county, and would all benefit from the Tivoli green space being developed for better use for our children and broader community.
- Dunedin park could be used for some outdoor activities and the Council should facilitate this as soon as possible.
- There is a much smaller green space on Harbour road beside Irish Lights that would also benefit children in the area particularly the Dún Laoghaire Educate Together national school this site should be developed in a way to make this use possible.
- The submission notes that green space improves health, wellbeing, and the liveability of our local areas particularly for children and living in a post covid world our outdoor spaces become more important than ever. The Council should be doing everything possible to facilitate better use of what we have in our County.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0780</td>
<td>Éilis Kavanagh</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Too many car parking spaces are being permitted for each house/apartment – need to reduce so as to encourage use of public transport, cycling and walking.
- More bike racks need to be installed in apartment blocks and housing complexes.
- All housing complexes should be permeable and fence free.
- Council should prioritise, upgrade and create more ROWs, including mapping them, due to an increase in people walking. Honeypark is a good example of this.
- Swimming policy required to ensure maintenance of swimming spots, including Dillon’s Park and Coliemore Harbour.
- Arts building where organised art based/craft classes are held should be considered by the Council.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 12, Appendix 12 (submission refers to ROW but actually means permeability in estates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0781</td>
<td>Annette Martin</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0782</td>
<td>Nicholas Koumarianos</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests implementation of the Sandycove to Sutton Walkway and Cycleway along the shoreline.
- Submission notes that the proposal to bring it onto the main road is not welcomed.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0783</td>
<td>Magda Stelmaszek</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Fully support maintaining Right of Way to all natural and historical landmarks in the area, which should be preserved and incorporated into any proposed development plan.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0784</td>
<td>Niall O'Riordan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission notes concern about the traffic congestion around Sandycove, in particular the junction of Sandycove Avenues West and North plus Sandycove Avenue East.
- Submission notes high levels of pollution and noise in the area and asks for the issue to be addressed by the Council.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0785</td>
<td>Tom Phillips + Associates on behalf of Durkan Estates Clonskeagh Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission relates to lands at Our Lady’s Grove, Goatstown. Requests the site retains its Objective ‘A’ zoning and the INST Objective be omitted from the lands. The submission also opposes the introduction of the term ‘public open space’ to the INST Objective policy.
- Submits that the proposed rezoning of this site contravenes national planning policy which supports the sequential development of infill urban lands and the delivery of residential units to meet the ongoing urgent need for housing. Notes the site is serviced by all necessary physical and community infrastructure; is located c. 5km from the city centre; and is ready for immediate development, unlike many other sites zoned for residential development in the Draft CDP.
- An overview of the history pertaining to the site and wider Grove lands is set out. Notes that improvements to the existing educational and convent facilities are a direct result of the sale of lands for residential development. A summary of the benefits arising from ongoing development at Our Lady’s Grove is provided.
- States the adjoining secondary school has confirmed there is no intention to extend the school. Notwithstanding, it is noted that an expansion area has been identified within the school site should this be required.
- Highlights the subject lands are now in private ownership and largely enclosed by a fence. Submits the lands comprise a backland site and never comprised public open space in the locality.
- Submission provides an overview of the process which resulted in the proposed rezoning of the subject site from a residential zoning – Objective ‘A’ - to a combination of open space - Objective ‘F’, sustainable neighbourhood infrastructure - Objective ‘SNI’, and residential - Objective ‘A’. Submits the proposal put forward by the Executive as part of the Chief Executive’s Draft Plan provided a more appropriate response to the planning context of the subject site than the published Draft CDP.
• An overview of Motions considered at the December 2020 Council Meetings in respect of the Chief Executive’s Draft Plan is provided. Reference is made to Motion no. 124 which introduced the Objective ‘F’ open space zoning. Submits the site is wholly unsuitable for the provision of open space in the absence of new residential designed to passively overlook the space. Reference is also made to Motion’s 122 and 123. Submits the INST Objective should be removed as it is no longer needed and the SNI zoning objective secures the retained educational facilities and their amenities. Furthermore, any future residential development at the site would provide public and private open spaces as required by both national and CDP policy.

• Submits the proposed changes to the site’s zoning Objective is a politically led proposal and contrary to the advice of the Council’s Executive, national policy and good planning practice.

• Suggests the base mapping used for the Draft Plan may have led to confusion in terms of the location of the boundary between the school grounds and the subject site. Submits the ‘SNI’ zoning Objective should align with the landownership boundaries and should not extend into the subject site.

• Commentary on the ‘INST’ objective is provided. Submits that school facilities at Our Lady’s Grove would be secured through the ‘SNI’ Objective in the new CDP and that the development of the remainder of the site does not reduce the amenities or facilities available to the local community.

• Notes the material alteration in the ‘INST’ Objective to provide a percentage of ‘public open space’ under the Draft CDP, which replaces a reference to ‘open space’ in the current CDP. Submits the text should refer to ‘open space’ and not ‘public open space’ as this places an additional burden on the development of ‘INST’ lands, particularly in cases where community facilities are retained. Furthermore, it discounts the contribution that the amenities associated with community facilities make to the setting and character of an area. Highlights the proposed re-zoning would result in an unused serviced accessible urban site, which is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. Highlights the lands would remain in private ownership and there are no means for the Council to compel the landowner to open the lands to the public. Submits the proposed re-zoning is not consistent with national housing policy and it will not result in any benefits to the local community.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Map 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0786</td>
<td>Niall O’Riordan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

• Submission notes traffic through the avenues around Sandy Cove has reached capacity.

• Submission notes illegal parking on foot paths and across resident’s driveways and blocked roads resulting in traffic jams. Noting concern for emergency services needing access.

• Submission requests appropriate action to avoid a potential catastrophe.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0787</td>
<td>John Spain Associates on behalf of</td>
<td>Park Developments and Castletown Construction</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

• Submission requests the re-zoning of lands at Stepaside Village, on a site known as Mountain View, from Objective ‘F’ to Objective ‘A’. Alternatively, and without prejudice to the primary rezoning request, it is requested the site be re-zoned to Objective ‘SNI’, rather than the existing Objective ‘F’ with site specific objective - SLO 87.

• An outline architectural masterplan for the lands is included which, it is submitted, demonstrates the suitability of the lands for a mixed scheme of assisted living / retirement village, community centre, residential use and village car parking. The provision of a village car park, village square public open space, and community centre are highlighted as potential planning gains for Stepaside Village.

• Submits the lands are centrally located adjacent to the core of Stepaside Village and accessible via public transport. Considers the area to be well served by existing and planned infrastructure, local services and facilities.
• A summary of the Draft CDP zoning and Specific Local Objective (SLO 87) pertaining to the site is detailed. Notes that the previously proposed road objective to the south of Stepaside Village has been removed in the Draft CDP and submits that this precipitates the site coming forward for development.

• Submits that in sequential planning terms the lands comprise an optimal location for residential development and a retirement village, and ancillary community uses, given their proximity to the core of Stepaside Village, associated services and public transport facilities.

• Contends there is an underprovision of residential zoned land in the Draft CDP. Submits the Core Strategy should be re-assessed, and a number of suggestions are made in this regard, including, inter alia: factoring in the latest CSO population growth figures; the application of ‘headroom’ beyond 2026; addressing pent-up demand and ongoing supply constraints; assumptions relating to timeframes for the development of land; and, additional off-setting of lands with significant infrastructural and phasing requirements.

• Suggests that such a re-assessment would support the zoning of additional residential lands and, in this regard, requests the Council give consideration to the re-zoning of the subject lands.

• Submits that the delivery of additional housing, assisted living, and supporting facilities at Stepaside Village, which already provides for a range of facilities and amenities, would represent an appropriate approach to delivering housing choice and age-friendly development.

• Submits that the zoning of the lands Objective ‘SNI’ would also allow for supporting and complementary land uses, including inter alia assisted living accommodation / retirement village type development. States that under any rezoning to Objective ‘SNI’, the planning gains including a village car park and village square type public open space could also be realised.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 2 and Map 9.

DLR Submission No: B0788
Person: Orla Wood
Organisation: Dimensional Fund Advisors Limited
Map Nos: 3, 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:

• Commentary is set out in relation to the history of Marlborough Road

• Many of these smaller houses have not to-date been extended or upgraded to take account of today’s building standards or requirements for space.

• Submission sets out details in relation to a planning application for an extension to a house on Marlborough Road

• The submission requests that the Marlborough Road ACA clearly states how these smaller 20th century properties can be extended and upgraded in a manner that is sympathetic to the character of the Marlborough Road ACA while meeting the requirements of the planning authority.

• Submission requests that the Council clearly state that any rear extensions will not be restricted by ACA development requirements and only by existing planning permission requirements.

• Submission queries the exclusion of the Adelaide Road section that forms a block with Marlborough Road from the proposed ACA.

• The submission welcomes in principle, the inclusion of Marlborough Road as an ACA, and hope that this will result in the Council undertaking various upgrades to footpaths

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

DLR Submission No: B0789
Person: Kate O’ Riodan
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 3

Summary of Submission and Observation:

• Submission notes that while they choose eco-friendly modes of transport, the level of traffic from both cars and bikes in Sandycove is a hazard.

• Submission requests the Council examine options to rectify these issues before serious harm occurs.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5
**Chief Executive’s Report on Draft Plan Consultation**

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission relates to the Airfield Estate and seeks to ensure that the appropriate local planning framework is in place to further support, enhance and promote Airfield as an educational, social and cultural amenity for the County, ensuring its long-term viability.
- Submission primarily comprises three requests: the amendment of SLO 3; the incorporation of a new Objective; and the re-zoning of lands associated with ‘Eden Farm’ from Objective ‘F’ to Objective ‘A’.
- An overview of the Airfield Estate is provided including its history, purpose, activities, and recent upgrade works.
- Welcomes the inclusion of SLO 3 in the Draft CDP which seeks ‘to encourage the retention and development of the Airfield Estate for educational, recreational, and cultural uses’ but requests the SLO be expanded to acknowledge and support the importance of Airfield as a significant tourism and community asset, and to appropriately provide for its ongoing operation, renewal and development. The specific wording requested is as follows:

  ‘To support the ongoing operation and development of Airfield Estate as a major educational, recreational, tourism, cultural and community asset, and as an exemplar of sustainable environmental and climate action initiatives. The Council will support and facilitate: temporary and occasional uses that are ancillary and complementary to the established use including events, markets, pop-ups; festivals, a cycle and pedestrian connection from Dun Laoghaire to Dundrum to integrate Airfield Estate and the provision of directional signage on the surrounding road network. The Council will support initiatives presented by Airfield Estate that are integral to its ongoing sustainability and its endeavours to have a positive impact on and contribution to the local and national community. The Council will also proactively support and maximise the potential contribution of the Estate to the County’s green infrastructure, biodiversity and wildlife network to enhance the Parks Master Plan Program.’

- Submits that Airfield needs to continue to expand and adapt its offer and operations to ensure continued visitor support for the sustainable future of the Estate. Requests a wider range of temporary and occasional uses, that are ancillary and complementary to the established use, including events, markets and pop-ups, be facilitated. Submits that such uses would be consistent with Airfield’s current ethos and would facilitate the provision of active learning activities and events with significant public benefit.
- Notes that Airfield Estate aims to promote climate change awareness through the development of sustainable energy initiatives including appropriately scaled renewable energy infrastructure.
- Submits that cycle and pedestrian connections to Dundrum Town and LUAS should be appropriately connected to Airfield Estate to facilitate visitors utilising sustainable travel modes and undertaking linked trips.
- Given the significance of Airfield Estate as a tourist attraction of regional importance, it is submitted that appropriate directional signage should be facilitated on the surrounding road network. This would be consistent with Policy Objective T31.
- Requests the Council proactively supports and maximises the potential contribution of the Estate to the County’s green infrastructure, biodiversity and wildlife network. Suggests that it would be appropriate, given the contribution of Airfield to biodiversity, climate change mitigation, leisure, education and amenity, that it is included in DLR’s Parks Master Plan Programme.
- Requests the inclusion of a new objective in the CDP as follows:

  ‘The Council will engage with all relevant stakeholders, including Fáilte Ireland, to establish and develop a Food Tourism Network in the County, maximising the County’s renowned food offering and integrate with hiking and walking routes and trails including coastal, sea based, and long-distance hiking trails in the Dublin Mountains, and cultural and historic sites and events. The Council will support the addition of small-scale alternative accommodation to support the wider tourism industry in the county.’

- Submits that the creation of a food tourism network within DLR would assist in creating a single unified message around the County’s food offering which would complement and enhance its natural, cultural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0790</th>
<th>Person: Declan Brassil &amp; Co. on behalf of</th>
<th>Organisation: Airfield Estate</th>
<th>Map Nos: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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and historic attractions. Such an approach would improve food tourism while supporting the local economy.

- Requests the re-zoning of lands associated with ‘Eden Farm’ from zoning Objective ‘F’ to zoning Objective ‘A’. Notes that the Eden Farm property is a residential dwelling. Submits that the current zoning does not reflect the historic and established use of the property and it is requested that the property be rezoned to appropriately reflect its established use. It is noted that the lands do not currently form part of the operational farm and are a separate and distinct land use.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Chapter 6

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission notes how residents of Sandy Cove have to deal with anti-social behaviour, litter and illegal parking.
- Notes that cars are being parked illegally across residents’ gates.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Chapter 5

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Welcomes DLR’s commitment for a feasibility study to re-route the East Coast Cycle Trail from existing roads to a new path along the coast & incorporate coastal protection works between Corbawn Lane & the new Woodbrook station.
- Concerned about coastal erosion at Corbawn. The alternative cycle trail will provide a better solution for cycling and coastal erosion.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Chapter 5

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Challenge SLO93 as 2021 EPA Wastewater Code of Practice should address groundwater concerns.
- For over 10 years SLO93 has prohibited new dwellings in the area, on the basis that the groundwater issues are not adequately addressed. DLRC has implied that these issues would be ameliorated or improved however there has been no movement on the issue, and little public information on tests that have been carried out.
- DLRC should be supportive of delivering new housing to the area.
- The 2021 EPA Wastewater Code of Practice eliminates the need for the SLO as it provides up-to-date guidance on how to deal with wastewater and ground water situations. Each planning application should be allowed address the concerns related to groundwater using the 2021 EPA Wastewater Code of Practice and these should be assessed on a case-by-case basis.
- SLO93 needs to be removed or rephrased.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Chapter 14 (Map 14), Chapter 10

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The submission stated that the new DLR County Development Plan (CDP) should represent a catalyst for positive change and facilitate the development of the county in a plan-led, sustainable manner. The CDP should strive to establish a coherent framework for coordinated sustainable economic, social, cultural, and environmental development in line with the UN Sustainable Development Goals.
- With respect to Sustainable Transport:
• The data presented in a 2020 Government review of sustainable mobility policy makes it clear that Ireland has failed to achieve the modal shift in transport that was envisioned in the Smarter Travel policy.

• The submission welcomes the policies in the Draft Plan that support the integration of land use and transport planning; the facilitation of sustainable transport initiatives; and the prioritisation of pedestrians, cyclists, and public transport users.

• The robust targeted and timelined plans are needed to ensure the efficient implementation of these policies. The submission recommends that the current modal split be further analysed and that specific modal shift targets for 2028 be set in line with the Smarter Travel objectives.

• Considering the Programme for Government mandate (2020), and the transport data, the submission highlights urgency with which the Council needs to address the current unsustainability of transport and the need to achieve meaningful progress toward a modal shift away from private car use. It is recommended that provision for the immediate review called for in the Programme for Government be included in the CDP.

• With respect to Biodiversity:
  • The submission welcomes the commitments to riparian biodiversity buffer zones in Section 8.7.1.7: i.e. dedicated minimum of 10 metres each side of the water’s edge, and up to 30 metres for areas where the ecosystem functioning of the catchment requires it, and also to ensure no development - including clearance and storage of materials – takes place within a minimum distance of 1 0 m measured from each top of bank of any river, stream, or watercourse, (where practical).
  • The submission welcomes the recognition of the importance of the Booterstown Marsh Nature Reserve as a wetland.
  • The submission recommends that an objective be included to address the ongoing sewage issue at Booterstown beach and in the Trimelstown and Elmpark Streams. This should be addressed jointly with Dublin City Council.
  • With regard to the proposed cycleway from Sutton, the Council should ensure that its development in the area of the Marsh is carried out in accordance with Habitats and Birds Directives principles and obligations.
  • The submission welcomes the inclusion of the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030 in the Draft Plan and in the forthcoming DLR County Biodiversity Action Plan 2021-2026. The submission recommends that the relevant objectives in the EU Strategy’s 14 points be incorporated into the Action Plan:
    1. Legally - binding EU nature restoration targets will be proposed in 2021, subject to an environmental impact assessment. By 2030, significant areas of degraded and carbon rich ecosystems are restored; habitats and species show no deterioration in conservation trends and status; and at least 30% reach favourable conservation status or at least show a positive trend.
    2. The decline in pollinators is reversed.
    3. The risk and use of chemical pesticides is reduced by 50% and the use of more hazardous pesticides is reduced by 50%.
    4. At least 10% of agricultural area is under high - diversity landscape features.
    5. At least 25% of agricultural land is under organic farming management, and the uptake of agro - ecological practices is significantly increased.
    6. Three billion new trees are planted in the EU, in full respect of ecological principles.
    7. Significant progress has been made in the remediation of contaminated soil sites.
    8. At least 25,000 km of free - flowing rivers are restored.
    9. There is a 50% reduction in the number of Red List species threatened by invasive alien species. 10. The losses of nutrients from fertilisers are reduced by 50%, resulting in the reduction of the use of fertilisers by at least 20%.
    11. Cities with at least 20,000 inhabitants have an ambitious Urban Greening Plan.
    12. No chemical pesticides are used in sensitive areas such as EU urban green areas.
    13. The negative impacts on sensitive species and habitats, including on the sea bed through fishing and extraction activities, are substantially reduced to achieve good environmental status.
    14. The by - catch of species is eliminated or reduced to a level that allows species recovery and conservation.

• With respect to Urban Greening:
  • The submission welcomes the numerous urban greening measures provided for in the Draft Plan. We would highlight Point 11 of the aforementioned EU Biodiversity Strategy that: “Cities with at least 20,000 inhabitants have an ambitious Urban Greening Plan.”
• With regard to greening urban and peri-urban areas, regard is had to Section 2.2.8 of the Biodiversity Strategy. The submission suggests that the new Development Plan should provide for the immediate development of an Urban Greening Plan, as well as specific timelined and targeted policies for achieving the objectives of the Urban Greening Plan during the Development Plan period.

• The submission highlights the following Area-Specific Considerations:
  - The submission welcomes that a significant number of buildings in the Dundrum area are proposed for addition to the Register of Protected Structures, and the proposed designation of certain delineated parts of Dundrum Main Street as a candidate Architectural Conservation Area (“cACA”).
  - The submission supports the related wording in SLO 9:
    - “Building Heights alongside Main Street must be sensitive to the original streetscape, in keeping with its character and Candidate Architectural Conservation Area status”.
  - The submission requests reconsideration of SLO9 to include:
    - “To ensure that any future redevelopment of the old shopping centre lands, takes cognisance of the character and streetscape of the Old Main Street, and maintain where appropriate, and possible existing buildings and/or facades”.
  - The submission notes that the wording of SLO 150 of the current CDP 2016-2022, applied to most of the western side of the Main Street, which was envisaged as being part of Phase 2 of the Dundrum Town Centre shopping complex development. The proposed new wording refers only to the “old shopping centre lands” at the northern end of the Village. It would remove the requirement that development along the remainder of the western side should take cognisance of the character and streetscape of the Old Main Street. The submission notes that the added reference to maintaining “existing buildings and/or facades” does not seem relevant to the old shopping centre lands where existing buildings are likely to be demolished, whereas it would be relevant to the remainder of the Main Street. It is suggested that SLO 9 should read:
    - “To ensure that any future redevelopment of the old shopping centre lands and the lands between there and the Holy Cross Church Parochial House takes cognisance of the character and streetscape of the Old Main Street, and maintain, where appropriate and possible, existing buildings and/or facades. Building Heights alongside Main Street must be sensitive to the original streetscape, in keeping with its character and Candidate Architectural Conservation Area status.”
  - The submission welcomes SLO 114:
    - “To support the provision of a Dundrum Community, Cultural and Civic Centre, which integrates into a civic square/plaza area, to be located at the northern end of Dundrum town”.
  - It suggests that this objective should be reflected in any development of the old shopping centre lands, and that sufficient resources be allocated so that the existing cACA area at Dundrum Village Crossroads and the new cACA for Dundrum Main Street can be assessed with a view to prompt re-designation as ACAs by Variation of the CDP.
  - The submission urges that preparation of the Local Area Plan for Dundrum should be advanced as quickly as possible. This will shape policy for Building Height, as indicated at section 4.2.5 of the Building Height Strategy in Appendix 5 to the draft CDP, and address the issues for Dundrum set out at section 7.5.2 of Chapter 7.
  - The submission welcomes that Marlay House is one of the houses and gardens listed under Policy Objective HER26, Section 11.5.2 of the draft CDP.
  - The following should be added to the Register of Protected Structures in accordance with the recommendations made after the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (“NIAH”) survey:
    - The House, Its Stable yard/Craft area [RPS No. 1518],
    - Laurelmere [RPS No. 1592],
    - No. 2033: House (Head Gardener)
    - No. 2034: Farmyard Complex
    - No. 2057: Gateway
    - No. 2082: Gateway
    - No. 2083: Gateway
    - No. 2084: Walled garden
  - The submission regrets the omission of the Gate Lodge adjacent to the Eastern Gateway (NIAH 60220021). The Gate Lodge was included in the NIAH survey under Reg. No. 60220020, as the adjacent gateway has been added to the RPS, the gate lodge should be included.
  - The submission also notes that omission of the following from the proposed RPS list:
    - Marlay Park Ha – Ha.
- Marlay Park Central Pond.
  • The submission welcomes the proposal to designate Marlay Park as a candidate Architectural Conservation Area. The Park is a place and area of special architectural, historical, and artistic value while and it contributes to the appreciation of the main Protected Structure, Marlay House (RPS No. 1518).
  • The cACA designation is important, the submission requests the demesne landscape at Marlay needs to be better recognised and protected. It is the most important demesne in public ownership in the County. When the written description for the ACA is being prepared, that attention should be directed to the submissions made on behalf of An Taisce and other conservation organisations in the consultation period for the Marlay Park Masterplan.
  • The submission suggests that Specific Local Objective 47 (Map 5) should be revised in the light of the proposed designation of the cACA to include a cross reference to the cACA in the Policy Objective. This could be included in a similar manner to that proposed for SLO 9 relating to Dundrum on Map 13.
  • A specific reference to conservation of the designed landscape and woodland should be inserted into the Objective, with a focus on the conservation of the heritage of Marlay Park and should read:
    “....with a focus on the conservation of the heritage of Marlay Park in keeping with its character, its Protected Structures and its Candidate Architectural Conservation Area status, the conservation of its designed landscape and woodland ...” This wording would accord with Policy Objective HER26 and the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines Section 3.12.1 and Section 3.11.2.
  • In line with Policy Objective HER8 at section 11.4.1.2 the submission requests that a Specific Local Objective referring to conservation of the designed landscape and woodland at Marlay would be in line with these Objectives.
  • With respect to Tree Protection the submission recommends that a tree restoration plan be drawn up for the protection of existing trees, replanting, and restoration of the designed woodland arboreal landscape.
  • The submission states that the three Gateways proposed for the RPS need to be distinguished in the List so that their locations can be identified. It is assumed that they correspond to NIAH entries 60220021, 60220017 and 60220019 but it is not clear which RPS number relates to which Gateway. They could be described as “eastern”, “north-eastern” and “north-western” respectively.
  • The submission notes that Map 5 in the draft CDP shows the eastern Gateway with an orange “Protected Structure” symbol but the other two Gateways do not appear to be shown on the Map. The north-eastern gateway (NIAH 60220017) may be obscured by an “Industrial Heritage” symbol for the adjacent post box (NIAH 60220018) but the north-western gateway (NIAH 60220019) these need to be visibly shown in accordance with section 11.4.1 of the draft CDP.
  • The submission requests that all six of the RPS additions are listed under the Name “Marlay House” which corresponds to the NIAH survey but would be clearer as “Marlay Park” or, like the existing entries for Marlay Park House (RPS No. 1518) and Laurelmere (RPS No. 1592), given their respective names with the Location as Marlay Park.
  • The submission also requests that the Central Pond and the Island Lake on Map 5 should be identified with the word “Lake” or “Pond” in a similar manner to the Lake at the Gort Mhuire Centre on Map 5 (RPS 1453) or the Pond at Dundrum Town Centre shopping complex on Map 1 ((RMP No. 022-10002).
  • The submission notes that Marlay Park as shown on Map 5 has a number of Tree symbols indicating the objective “To protect and preserve Trees and Woodlands” but more are needed in the central area of the woodland.
  • With respect to the use of Fernhill House the submission supports Policy Objective HER26 and notes SLO 75, however, it is considered that that the Objective “To ensure .... the conservation of Fernhill House” is not sufficient and would welcomes a specific objective for progressing suitable uses of Fernhill House. In the absence of a Part 8 proposal for Fernhill House the submission urges that SLO 75 be amended to state the Council’s intention with regard to use of the House for example a café use in the old drawing room, exhibitions in the old billiard room.
  • The submission notes that the Darley family, who owned Fernhill in the 19th Century, were noted stoncutters. Barnacullia, on the hillside immediately above the Fernhill estate, has had a long tradition of quarrying, masonry and stone cutting. A Stone Museum and possibly a stonemason’s workshop for educational/training purposes at Fernhill could find support among current businesses in the industry and members of families connected with quarrying in the past. This would accord with Policy Objective HER26 in ensuring that Fernhill House would have “a key role to play in education, research, interpretation and providing public access to our multi-layered heritage.”
• It is suggested that the garden squares in Monkstown and Dún Laoghaire be listed as ACAs.
• The submission it supportive of the extensive amendments proposed in Chapter 11 and Chapter 12 Section 12.11, as compared to the current CDP.
• The submission has expressed concerns with respect to Section 12.11.2.3 “Development within the Grounds of a Protected Structure”, while the first paragraph of section 12.11.2.3 reads “Any proposed development within the curtilage, attendant grounds, or in close proximity to a Protected Structure, has the potential to adversely affect its setting and amenity.” It is considered that, the use of the words “in close proximity” is correct and the heading is wrong. The submission also refers to the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines at Section 13.8 “Other Development Affecting the Setting of a Protected Structure or an Architectural Conservation Area”, including section 13.8.1: “When dealing with applications for works outside the curtilage and attendant grounds of a protected structure or outside an ACA which have the potential to impact upon their character, similar consideration should be given as for proposed development within the attendant grounds.”
• Therefore, the heading at page 298 should revert to the wording in the current CDP. Likewise, the sub-heading for the list of assessment criteria at page 299 reads: “Any proposal for development within the grounds of a Protected Structure will be assessed …..”[emphasis added]. This too is inconsistent with the Guidelines at section 13.8.1, and should read “Any proposal for development in close proximity to a Protected Structure will be assessed in terms of the following: …”
• The submission welcomes the new paragraph at the end of Section 12.11.4 New Development within an ACA and accords with the Architectural Protection Guidelines.
• “In some instances, development adjacent or immediately outside the boundary of an ACA may also have an impact of their setting and context. An assessment of the impact on the character and appearance of the area may be required.”
• It is considered that SLO 10 (on Map 3) in Chapter 14, “To retain, improve and encourage the provision of sustainable neighbourhood infra structure facilities”, is an inadequate replacement for the current SLO 152. The valuable heritage considerations in SLO 152 have been lost in the proposed new version. Therefore, SLO 10 should be revised to retain these objectives.
• The submission recommends the inclusion of an objective to provide information and resources to the owners of 18th and 19th Century buildings on thermal upgrades and energy efficiency improvements.
• The preparation of a draft Development Plan requires Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) under the SEA Directive by DLR County Council. The submission highlights Article 10, which sets out the provisions for the monitoring of a programme subject to SEA and the obligation for remedial action where unforeseen adverse effects arise. The Council has a legal obligation to ensure that the SEA process is robust, effective, and identifies all likely significant effects on the environment under the range of considerations set out in the Annexes to the SEA Directive. To ensure integration of environmental considerations into the plan, a general policy or land use zoning should not be maintained where likely significant effects on the environment are identified.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 2, Chapter 3, Chapter 9, Chapter 14, Chapter 15, Appendix 4

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• The submission has expressed concern with respect to the protection of the area around Ticknock, Woodside, Blackglen, and in particular, Fitzsimons Wood.
• The 2016-2022 Plan emphasises the important role of wildlife corridors to the fauna and flora diversity throughout the County and highlights the legislative backing for the protection of wildlife corridors as set out in the Habitats Directive 1992 (92/43/EEC).
• The submission notes that the Council has created an excellent Biodiversity Education Programme relating to Fitzsimons Wood.
• The submission therefore requests that the following be included in the Draft Plan:
  (i) A clear map showing the Wildlife Corridor from Three Rock Mountain to Fitzsimons Wood
  (ii) Clarification as to how Deer will be able to cross the widened Blackglen Road
  (iii) Confirmation that the widened Blackglen Road will allow Badgers to cross via a tunnel or culvert.
  (iv) Confirmation that any planning permissions for development along Blackglen Road will make provision for the proposed Wildlife Corridor.
(v) Fitzsimons Wood designated a Natural Heritage Area (NHA).

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0796</th>
<th>Person: Margaret Keogh</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Traffic calming and pedestrian lights at junctions are required through Stepaside village and Enniskerry Road along with footpaths and cycle tracks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• E-Car charging - roadside charging policy/scheme is needed for houses without driveways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More Green spaces needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public rights of way – frustrating that we can’t access Brennanstown and Kilternan Domens, Dingle Glen or enjoy the epic view onto of Kilmashogue Hill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0797</th>
<th>Person: Catherine Blay</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All new buildings should not exceed 4 storeys in height in order to preserve the sight of the natural landscape.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All ROW should be kept in place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More open spaces created.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stepaside, Kilternan and Glencullen areas to retain a rural environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All the above is in the interest of the mental and physical well being of people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapters 12 and 13, Appendix 5, Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0798</th>
<th>Person: Alex &amp; Caroline Fattacini</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0799</th>
<th>Person: Tony Byrne</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission request that consideration is given to the number of schools in the Kilternan / Glanmuck area, particularly secondary schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission queries the capacity of the Stepaside Educate Together in Ballyogan relative to proposed development in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes that Kilternan is outside the catchment area of this school and suggests that a secondary school more centrally located in the area may be required given potential population increase in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0800</th>
<th>Person: Linden Lee</th>
<th>Organisation: Bellevue, Glenageary and Rochestown Residents Association</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The submission which represents more than 1200 households in the locality, request that the Specific Local Objective (SLO) 160 which is contained in the County Development Plan 2016-2022 be reinstated into the new County Development Plan for 2022-2028.

The objective of SLO 160 specifically is to retain and protect the roundabouts - at Killiney Shopping Centre (Graduate Roundabout) and at Glenageary Shopping Centre (Glenageary Roundabout) - essential and vital elements of infrastructure that continue to serve our community by providing and ensuring safe and sustainable traffic management for the immediate locality.

Their removal or destruction would be totally contrary to the Council’s own Development Plan Vision statement which concludes with the words “to deliver this in a manner that enhances our environment for future generations”.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission is broadly supportive of the Draft Plan but wishes to make comments on various Development Management standards. Submission seeks the following amendments:
  
  **Residential Density**
  
  - Amend text in PHP18: Residential Density at section 4.3.1.1 to include reference to the Section 28 Guidelines on Building Heights and Apartments as they relate to higher density development.
  - Omit reference at section 12.3.5.1 which defines dlr as a suburban or intermediate location so as to align with apartment guidelines. Submission considers that the County includes lands that are central and/or accessible urban locations which can accommodate higher densities.

  **Build to Rent Development**
  
  - Submission considers that Build to Rent is not a separate use from residential
  - Amend text in Policy Objective PHP27 from ‘BTR accommodation must comply with all apartment standards set out in Section 4.3.5’ to read: ‘BTR accommodation must comply with all apartment standards set out in the ‘Design Standards for New Apartments’ Guidelines 2020’ in terms of Build to Rent development. This amendment is requested as it is submitted that a number of the standards in section 12.3.5 conflict with SPPR 8 of the Guidelines.
  - Submission considers that the requirement for on site car parking for Build to Rent is contrary to SPPR8 of the Apartment Guidelines.

  **Separation distances**
  
  - Submission notes that the apartment guidelines state that separation distances that may be specific in development plans should be replaced by performance criteria.

  **Housing Mix**
  
  - Submission considers that the mix requirements in relation to 3+ bed units is in conflict with SPPR1 of the Apartment Guidelines.
  - Interim HNDA does not provide the evidence required to propose the mix requirements.
  - Mix requirement will inhibit the provision of apartment schemes in the County and will impact negatively on lifestyle choice to down size.
  - Around 70% of the residential zoned lands as set out in table 2.8 are on green field sites where apartment development is anticipated to be a minority type.
  - Based on the above it is requested that ‘Table 12.1 Apartment Mix Requirements’ be amended to align with the provisions of Specific Planning Policy Requirement 1 of the ‘Design Standards for New Apartments’ Guidelines 2020 in terms of Apartment Unit Mix

  **Dual Aspect**
  
  - Submission requests the amendment of section ‘12.3.5.1 Dual Aspects in Apartments’ to align with Specific Planning Policy Requirement 4 of the ‘Design Standards for New Apartments’ Guidelines in respect to the fact that it is not considered that the County is an “intermediate” location. Significant parts of the County can be categorised as central or accessible.

  **Car parking**
  
  - Amend ‘Table 12.6 Car Parking Zones and Standards’ to include a row under ‘Land Use’ specifying ‘Build to Rent’ and note provision of car parking as ‘Default Minimum’ to align with Specific Planning Policy

- Standard carparking requirements should be omitted and replaced with assessment on a “case by case” basis.

**Open Space**

- Submission considers that there is no basis for the requirement for an additional 5% (15% versus 10%) public open space for residential development within the existing built up area.
- Based on the above it is requested that ‘Table 12.8 Public Open Space Requirements for residential developments’ is amended to align with the provisions of ‘Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas’ Guidelines 2009. (15% to 10% for existing built up area).

**Building Height Strategy**

- Performance based criteria set out in section 5 of the BHS includes additional criteria to those set out in SPPR3. It is therefore not consistent with SPPR 3.
- Amend Appendix 5 Building Height Strategy to accurately reflect the content of the ‘Urban Development & Building Height’ Guidelines 2018
- The submission notes that the Building Height Strategy states that subject to the implementation of performance based criteria for assessing height (at Section 5 of the Appendix), that ‘SPPR 3 (1) and (2) have been incorporated into DLR policy and includes the line “the planning authority may approve such development, even where specific objectives of the relevant development plan or local area plan may indicate otherwise” is defunct as policy is consistent with the SPPR’. Submission request that the above should be omitted from the Draft Plan.

**Land Use Zoning**

Submission supports the MTC zoning objective in the St Michael’s Hospital carpark site in Dun Laoghaire town.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

- Chapters 4, 12, 13, Appendix 5 Building Heights Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0802</th>
<th>Person: John Harrington</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) More greenspaces and play areas for kids.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Historic public rights of way protected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Enhanced protection for local trees and hedgerows.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) No further urban sprawl up into high amenity upland areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0803</th>
<th>Person: Paul McElroy</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0804</th>
<th>Person: Gillian Hunt</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The submission notes that limited outdoor space available to serve the Dún Laoghaire Educate Together National School and share the Red Door School site in Monkstown Grove.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The submission is requesting that the large green space between Tivoli Terrace South and North to be developed for use for school children of all ages for sports days and other outdoor events and could help achieve a number of the Strategic County Outcomes i.e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Dunedin park could be used for some outdoor activities and the Council should facilitate this as soon as possible.
• There is a much smaller green space on Harbour road beside Irish Lights that would also benefit children in the area.
• The submission notes that green space improves health and wellbeing.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 9

**DLR Submission No:** B0805  
**Person:** John Spain  
**Associates**  
**Organisation:** Cairn PLC  
**Map Nos:** 2

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission is on behalf of Cairn PLC with regard to their lands at Chesterfield, Cross Avenue, noting the ability of Cairn to help address the chronic housing shortage due to their strategic landbank and ability to deliver high quality homes.
- Submission sets out a site description, its location and context and includes a location map / site boundary.
- Submission supports the retention of the residential zoning of the site and notes the ability if infill sites to provide a sustainable residential model in line with National Planning Objectives.

**Density / Location:**
- Submission notes that location of the site within 1km walk distance of a DART Station, proximity to proposed Bus Connects corridor and a range of schools, local facilities and amenities.
- Submission requests the omission of commentary in the Draft CDP that DLR is a county ‘classified as a suburban or intermediate location’ as this category is misleading. It is considered that the subject site is a ‘Central and/or Accessible Urban Location’ and may comprise wholly of apartment development.
- It is considered that this classification would restrict densities and curtail the development yield of residentially zoned lands.
- Submission notes that there is no rationale for the ‘restrictive provision’ and it conflicts with S.28 Guidelines.
- Submission refers to Policy Objective PHP18: Residential Density and notes that “the Planning Authority are obligated to acknowledge the content of the Apartment Guidelines and the Building Height Guidelines which make specific provisions for increased densities at appropriate locations”.

**RPS:**
- With regard to Chesterfield House, the submission noted that the property was almost entirely demolished and rebuilt in the 1970’s. This incorporated the original drawing room (RPS No. 171) and some elements of original masonry.
- Submission notes that the original lands have been subdivided and altered resulting in a change of character of Cross Avenue.
- It is considered that the original drawing room has low architectural merit and it is requested that this be removed from the RPS.
- A ‘Statement of Significance’ by Howley Hayes is included as part of the submission – summarised under Appendix 1.
- Submission refers to commentary made by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government in their observations on a planning application reg. ref D04A/0950 with regard to heritage protection policy.

**Trees:**
- Submission supports commentary in Section 12.8.11 in relation to the tree symbol and Arboricultural Assessments.
- Submission notes that only 2no. category A trees were recorded in a trees survey of the site and therefore request that the Trees & Woodland objective is removed from the site.
- Submission notes that future development proposals for the site will seek to preserve, as far as possible, existing trees.

**Housing Mix:**
- Submission considers that the housing mix set out in section 12.3.3.1 will reduce the supply of apartments in the county, make apartments less viable and reduce investment in housing.
- It is considered that the interim HNDA does not provide an evidence base to propose such an onerous requirement that is inconsistent with the Apartment Guidelines.
- Submission notes a disconnect between household formation and house type in dlr based upon the 2016 census data.
- Submission considers that suitably sized apartments proximate to existing residential areas is part of the solution to issues highlighted in the interim HNDA, however the mix requirement would inhibit the ability of older people to ‘right size’.
- Submission considers there to be no justification for the minimum 3-bed requirement.
- Submission request the removal of Table 12.1 of the Draft Plan.
- The submission supports a broad mix of residential tenures and typologies and notes that objective of the Plan should be to provide a mix of residential typologies.

### Dual Aspect:
- Submission requests that the blanket requirement for 50% dual aspect for all proposed apartment developments is omitted in order to align with SPPR4 of the Apartment Guidelines 2020.

### BTR:
- Submission does not consider that a ‘build to rent’ use is a legally different or a distinct land use and seeks the omission of build to rent as a distinct land use from the adopted Plan.

### Building Height:
- Submission supports Policy Objective BHS1 – Increased Height.
- Submission requests that additional criteria (Table 5.1 of height strategy) is omitted as the range of development management criteria contained in Section 3.2 of the National Building Height Guidelines is considered sufficient.
- It is considered that the additional criteria conflicts with Section 28 National Guidelines.

### Open Space:
- Submission seeks the retention of the existing minimum 10% provision of Public Open and/or Communal open space for new developments.
- Submission considers the increase to 15% in Section 12.8.3.1 is inconsistent with National Planning Policy and would place an additional strain on the ability to deliver sustainable developments of an appropriate density.

### Car Parking:
- Submission requests that review of car parking zones and that parking standards be indicated as maximum for residential developments.

### Appendix 1 of Submission – Statement of Significance:
- Appendix 1 sets out the legal obligations of a Local Authority to create a RPS.
- The report sets out an assessment of the history and significance of the existing building on site and incorporates imagery of the property.
- It is noted that only a portion of the original structure (Drawing Room) remains and states “Had the house not been listed in 1991, it is unlikely that it would justify protection under the Architectural Heritage Guidelines published by the DOE in 2004.”
- Report sets out a site history and details features of the original drawing room / house and includes images of the interior.
- The ‘statement of significance’ within the report states “there is little of historic or architectural significance about the protected room”.
- The report concludes that “Neither the architectural merit, nor the state of preservation of the interior of the protected room and its radically altered setting, justify retention in the RPS”.

### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- SLO 51 to provide primary and post primary schools has been in place since 2011. It is restricting the development potential and value of the site owned by Oceanscape Ltd. former Atlantic Homecare site in the Stillorgan Business Estate.
- The Dublin City Valuer’s Office approached the owners of the site to acquire the property in 2017, no further approaches have been made since then.
Submission includes a legal opinion on this matter and sets out its opinion why its retention would represent material failures to comply with basic statutory obligations in terms of no evidence to justify choice of study area, need or site selection, lack of consultation with the Department of Education, several basic principles of administrative law and infringement of property rights.

The submission then requests an amendment and also puts forward an alternative amendment.

**Amendments requested**

- Request that the SLO 51 as identified on Map 6 is removed.
- Request that the text of SLO 51 is amended as follows: ‘To provide for primary and post primary education facilities at Legionaries of Christ lands’
- Request that Objective E2 is amended as follows: ‘It is an objective of the Council to retain a 2 no. core sites for the provision of a 2 No. primary schools (equivalent) and a 1 No. post primary school at Legionaries of Christ lands. The Council shall liaise with the Department of Education in the development of this site these site (SLO 51 Map 1)

**Alternative Amendment suggested**

- “To provide for primary and post primary education facilities at Legionaries of Christ lands, and at Stillorgan Industrial Estate/Benildus Avenue other appropriate lands in the Sandyford Urban Framework Plan area, if required.
- Or if a substantive evidence base is found for a need for schools then:
  - Alter the text of SLO 51 in Appendix 2 ‘Specific Local Objectives’,
  - Remove SLO 51 from the Holly Avenue lands in Map 1 ‘Land Use Zoning’, and apply the objective to the entire Stillorgans Business Estate area currently zoned Objective LIW
  - Replace the school and playing pitches in Drawing 11 ‘Design Principles & Character Areas’ with the existing buildings on Holly Avenue.

Arguments are put forward for the amendments as follows:

- The identification of new schools and specific sites should be supported by population and needs assessments and in accordance with specified criteria. These assessments have not been undertaken
- No evidence is provided in the Draft Plan that the Department had any involvement in identifying the site for the purpose of retaining the objective.
- The identified need for schools in the area for the period of the Draft Development Plan has been met as evidenced by recent announcements and acquisitions by the Department of Education.

The submission then goes on to set out the context and current development plan status for the site on Holly Avenue.

Submission considers that it is inappropriate, inequitable, and contrary to the planning legislation and national policy guidance to retain the objectives on the site for the following reasons:

- The planning authority is required to takes steps to achieve the objectives of the Plan: 15.—(1) It shall be the duty of a planning authority to take such steps within its powers as may be necessary for securing the objectives of the development plan.
- The Ministerial Guidelines on ‘The Provision of Schools and the Planning System: A Code of Practice for Planning Authorities’ (2008) states that the following information is required to identify the need for a primary school; • population projections for the area over the next nine years (as set out in the Development Plan) • the current school-going population based on school returns; • the increase in school-going population, assuming that an average of 12% of the population are expected to present for primary education; and • the number of classrooms required in total derived from the above.

The submission references an FOI request from 2017 regarding designation of the site for educational purposes and considers that the Council cannot rely on the Department to justify site selection. Conclude that the objective for a school must be removed in the absence of an evidence base.

**Provision of educational facilities in the Goatstown/Stillorgan area.**

- Submission states that the school for which this site was designated is being built on a site that the Department already owns. The submission sates that the Goatstown Stillorgan Educate Together National School is currently operating from Grafton House in the Sandyford Business Park, and its permanent location will likely be on the Former Irish Bottle Site on Taney Road. The submission goes on to state that
- the Department of Education announced the patronage of 32 new post primary schools to be operational between 2015 and 2021, including two Educate Together post-primary schools within 2 kilometres of the site. These two new schools comprise the Goatstown Educate Together Secondary School (capacity 800) and the Booterstown/ Blackrock/ Dún Laoghaire Educate Together (capacity
1,000). The Goatstown Educate Together Secondary School opened in August 2020 to serve the Goatstown/Stillorgan school planning area and is currently operating from a temporary location in the old Notre Dame site. This school will move to its permanent location at the former Glass Bottle Site on Taney Road, subject to planning.

- The submission provides additional commentary on various schools granted in the County since 2016 and commentary on other sites and concludes by stating that SLO 51 in their view is unnecessary.

**Supporting development and efficient land use of the site within the SUFP area**
The submission considers that the site is ideally suited for high intensity employment generating uses.

**Alternative amendment - strategic objective to facilitate future school site selection**
- In the event that it is deemed that there is a need for a school in the SUFP area SLO 51 should apply to the entire Stillorgan Business Estate area.
- Submission concludes by providing a summation of the above.
- A legal opinion is included which sets out legal deficiencies under the following headings; No evidence to justify choice of Study Area, No evidence to justify stated need; No evidence to justify site selection:
  - A quote is provided from the FOI request which relates to the Draft 2016 Plan. It is considered unlawful to carry through the SLO to the current Plan.
  - The legal option provides commentary on breach of statutory duty to consult with providers of education services and states that if SLO 51 is retained without consultation with Education providers the Development Plan would be similarly vulnerable to challenge.
  - Retention of the SLO also fails to vindicate client’s rights to property under Article 43 and 40.3.1 of the Constitution.

**Response and Recommendation to issues**
Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 14, Appendix 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0807</td>
<td>Mide Power</td>
<td>Not Here Not Anywhere</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Plan should ensure rapid phasing out of fossil fuels including gas and expansion of gas.
- Plan should ban fracked gas.
- Any new large scale fossil fuel infrastructure must be inline with Ireland's fair share of CO2.
- Data centres must onsite renewable energy and heat recovery should be use for district heating.
- Support community energy projects.
- Could should play a leadership role in Climate Action.

**Response and Recommendation to issues**
Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0808</td>
<td>Dorota Witkowska</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission requests the Council to:
  (i) Develops the large green space between Tivoli Terrace North and South for use for all local schools and early childhood learning centres.
  (ii) Develops the small green space on Harbour Road beside Irish Lights to allow children from the area to safely play there including schools in the area.
  (iii) Allow Dunedin park in Monkstown to be used by Dún Laoghaire Educate Together National School that has wholly insufficient space for the children to play in currently.

**Response and Recommendation to issues**
Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0809</td>
<td>Elaine Fitzgerald</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission notes that limited outdoor space available to serve the Dún Laoghaire Educate Together National School and share the Red Door School site in Monkstown Grove.
- The submission is requesting that the large green space between Tivoli Terrace South and North to be developed for use for school children of all ages for sports days and other outdoor events and could help achieve a number of the Strategic County Outcomes i.e.
- Dunedin park could be used for some outdoor activities and the Council should facilitate this as soon as possible.
- There is a much smaller green space on Harbour road beside Irish Lights that would also benefit children in the area.
- The submission notes that green space improves health and wellbeing.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Chapter 9**

---

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Encouraged to see commitment to Active Travel, Accessibility and Road Safety in the Draft, but to achieve this several large roundabouts which significant barriers to cyclists and pedestrian, especially those with reduced mobility, children and the elderly.
- The problematic roundabouts which need to be redesigned and listed in the plan are as follows:
  - Dalkey Roundabout
  - The Graduate Roundabout
  - The Glenageary
  - The Monkstown Roundabout
  - The T.E.K Roundabout (Stradbrook Road)

---

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission is on behalf of Cairn PLC with regard to their lands at Glenamuck Road, Kiltiernan, noting the ability of Cairn to help address the chronic housing shortage due to their strategic landbank and ability to deliver high quality homes.

**Site Specific Observations / Recommendations:**

- Submission sets out a site description, its location and context and includes a location map / site boundary.
- Submission supports the approach set out in the Core Strategy and notes the intention to prepare a new LAP for the area.
- Submission supports the retention of the residential zoning of the site and notes the ability if infill sites to provide a sustainable residential model in line with National Planning Objectives.

**Transport / Infrastructure**

- Submission supports the Bus Priority Route on Glenamuck Road and the 6 Year Road Objective for the delivery of the Kiltiernan / Glenamuck Distributor Road (GDR).
- Submission is broadly supportive of the approach set out in relation to the implementation of a new local road network, however, it highlights the importance of the rapid delivery of the Kiltiernan / Glenamuck Distributor Road, particularly the link between the R117 Enniskerry Road to the Glenamuck Road / Golf Lane.
- Submission notes that the subject site is not dependent upon the GDR and requests that the 700 unit cap is removed in Appendix 1 as the new distributor road is permitted and has drawn down funding.
- Submission considers that the subject site constitutes Tier 1: Serviced Zoned’ lands as it comprises lands that are able to connect to existing development services.

**Density / Location:**

- Submission requests the omission of commentary in the Draft CDP that DLR is a county ‘classified as a suburban or intermediate location’ as this category is misleading. It is considered that the subject site is a ‘Central and/ or Accessible Urban Location’.

---

**Housing Mix:**
• Submission considers that the housing mix set out in section 12.3.3.1 will reduce the supply of apartments in the county, make apartments less viable and reduce investment in housing.
• It is considered that the interim HNDA does not provide an evidence base to propose such an onerous requirement that is inconsistent with the Apartment Guidelines.
• Submission notes a disconnect between household formation and house type in dlr based upon the 2016 census data.
• Submission considers there to be no justification for the minimum 3-bed requirement and this conflicts with SPPR1 of the Apartment Guidelines and is not supported by dlr’s own analysis of the market and future trends.
• The mix would inhibit apartment development and would negatively impact downsizing opportunities.
• Submission request the removal of Table 12.1 of the Draft Plan.

Dual Aspect:
• Submission requests that the blanket requirement for 50% dual aspect for all proposed apartment developments is omitted in order to align with SPPR4 of the Apartment Guidelines 2020.

BTR:
• Submission does not consider that a ‘build to rent’ use is a legally different or a distinct land use and seeks the omission of build to rent as a distinct land use from the adopted Plan.

Building Height:
• Submission considers the subject site to be a suitable area for increased building height.
• Submission supports Policy Objective BHS1 and BHS 2.
• Submission requests that additional criteria (Table 5.1 of height strategy) is omitted as the range of development management criteria contained in Section 3.2 of the National Building Height Guidelines is considered sufficient.
• It is considered that the additional criteria conflicts with Section 28 National Guidelines.
• Submission requests that priority is given to the LAP review to reflect the Building Height Guidelines and NPO 13 and omit a blanket limitation on height.

Open Space:
• Submission seeks the retention of the existing minimum 10% provision of Public Open and/or Communal open space for new developments.
• Submission considers the increase to 15% in Section 12.8.3.1 is inconsistent with National Planning Policy and would place an additional strain on the ability to deliver sustainable developments of an appropriate density.

Car Parking:
• Submission requests that review of car parking zones and that parking standards be indicated as maximum for residential developments.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 2, Chapter 5, Chapter 12, Chapter 13, Appendix 1, Appendix 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0812</td>
<td>Sadhb O’ Connor</td>
<td>The Blackthorn Partnership</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission seeks the rezoning of lands adjacent to Blackthorn Park from ‘LIW’ to Objective SNI - to allow for the creation of a Sustainable Neighborhood that will provide an appropriate gateway to the Sandyford Business District, improving the public realm and commercial edge and creating enhanced linkages with surrounding communities.
• The submission includes: an overview of the Location; context and Accessibility of the lands; a justification for a request to rezone the lands; the criticisms’ of Sandyford as a sustainable urban quarter; the urban design benefits of redeveloping the subject lands and the potential future role of the subject site to the Sandyford Area if rezoned. Multiple photographs are included.
• Address the need to improve Sandyford as a place to live by providing a connected urban environment that includes opportunities to interact and enhance vibrancy and vitality during the evening and weekends, increase the availability of accommodation and support community infrastructure, green infrastructure and transform the area into a more permanent community.
- Submission considers that the subject site has the potential to provide an animated connection from the Beacon hospital and Blackthorn Drive areas to the playground via a series of interesting and connected plaza environments.
- Submission considers that the planned expansion of the Beacon Hospital into the Beacon Hotel site is a major change which provides a need to consider the requirements of staff, patients and their visitors having regard to services and facilities, short term accommodation, long term accommodation and a neighborhood for long term living.
- Submission provides narrative in relation to the provision of open space in the SUPF area and considers that developments with a focus on the delivery of substantial open spaces (such as Sustainable Neighborhood Infrastructure lands which are required to provide at least 20% public open space) can help to increase the public space amenity opportunities in the Business District area.
- Sandyford needs to function as an area with permanent homes and a strong sense of place, in addition to jobs. Subject sites can deliver on this requirement.
- Submission considers that the subject site presents an opportunity to identify the services and facilities needed to allow the Sandyford Urban Framework Plan area to properly function as a 10 minute settlement and allow a sense of community and sense of place to develop and allow permanent residents rather than a transient population to dominate.
- An architectural presentation is included including a site assessment and masterplan for the lands showing how the lands could be laid out in the event of a re-zoning to SNI. It details the development opportunities of the site including a gateway proposal to the SUFP lands, connections through the site and developing synergies of SNI in terms of adjoining Blackthorn Park, screening of industrial buildings and the provision of enhanced public realm.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 17, Map 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0813</td>
<td>Patrick Cassidy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission is from the part owner of Corrig House on Corrig Road.
- Objects to civic park. Unfair as the land can not be developed or sold and Council has not bought the land.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0814</td>
<td>Clare Burke</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10, 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
Requests (providing commentary and photos):
- Traffic calming measures on Ferndale Road to promote pedestrian safety (part of Dublin Mountain Way), but without changes to the trees that line the road.
- Enhance the pedestrian route between Shankill Village and Ballybride Road if legally possible through landscaping through a Section 8.6.3 of the Draft or as an SLO (part of Dublin Mountain Way).
- Protect the public views through Clontra, towards the sea and insert symbol to preserve views for the length of the field in which the house sits on Map no 10.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5, Chapter 8, Map 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0815</td>
<td>RW Nolan &amp; Associates on behalf of Eddie Fox, Ray Tilson and John Davey</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
Submission requests the re-zoning of c. 18.4 ha of land located to the south of Kilternan from Objective ‘G’ - ‘To protect and improve high amenity areas’, to Objective ‘A’ – ‘To provide residential development and/or protect and improve residential amenity’.

Relevant and supportive policy context from both the NPF and RSES. Particular reference is set out. Particular reference is made to NPO 1a and 2a of the NPF and it is highlighted that the subject lands are located within the boundary of Dublin City and Suburbs boundary as defined in the RSES.

Submission notes that the Draft CDP does not propose zoning any additional lands for new residential development. Suggests this will likely result in a shortage of development land during the plan period. Suggests serious consideration should be given to the inclusion of additional zoned lands within the Kilternan settlement.

Considers there will be a serious under provision of zoned land within the Eastern and Midlands Region as a consequence of the continued relative concentration of national population growth in the Region (85%) compared to the policy objective of a 50% maximum (NPO 1a of the NPF refers).

Submission highlights the general lack of development on zoned land in DLR during the last six years. Submits that if the lands zoned for residential development were not developed during the last six years then it is equally unlikely that they would be developed during the next six years. Suggests this will result in under provision of housing units, notwithstanding the zoning of lands.

Notes that a significant number of units were granted planning permission during 2020 and that these permissions reflect a ‘pent up demand’ from the period of the current CDP, significantly reducing the capacity of zoned land for housing demand over the next six year period.

Makes the case that the zoning of the subject lands for new residential development could achieve a logical and natural extension of development direction for Kilternan while providing the additional benefit of creating a direct road link across the subject lands to avoid the substandard road alignment of the existing Glencullen road.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Chapter 2, Map 9

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen Collage to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Chapter 9

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The submission states that our local children desperately need more green space and play areas.
- Therefore, the Council should:
  (i) Develop the large green space between Tivoli Terrace North and South for use for all local schools and early childhood learning centres.
  (ii) Develop the small green space on Harbour Road beside Irish Lights to allow children to safely play there.
  (iii) Allow Dunedin park in Monkstown to be used by Dún Laoghaire Educate Together National School that currently has insufficient space for the children to play.

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The submission requests that priority should be given to providing green spaces.
- There is a clear lack of open green space and this was highlighted during COVID as individuals were restricted to our local 5km.
- The field opposite the church in Kilternan was inaccessible for the second lockdown as development preparation of site began.
- A token green space within new SHDs is not adequate. The park in Glenamuck is welcome but is insufficient for all the proposed development to come.
- The preservation of the mountains, restricting development in high amenity areas, preservation of hedgerows should be at the forefront of the Plan.
- Public rights of way should be maintained and more trails and pathways to the natural woodland areas and to the local hills should be prioritised.
- The Kilternan area will be a major building site for the next 10 years + therefore the establishment of amenities for all of this intended development should be carried out ahead of the actual development commencement i.e. the provision of road networks, cycle ways, paths, open green spaces and parks.
- The infrastructure is currently not sufficient for the current population of the area and this needs to be addressed within the Development Plan.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 8 and Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0819</th>
<th>Person: Michael Parker</th>
<th>Organisation: Insight Consultants</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support the change in zoning away from medical as most of the land use is not medical and the present zoning is not appropriate - the only dedicated medical facilities are the Beacon Hospital and the Consultants Clinic. (Zoning has changed from MH to SNI at The Mall, Bracken Road/Blackthorn Road/Blackthorn Avenue, Sandyford)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Beacon Mall is largely populated by service and professional services companies accounting for some 33 of the 45 individual office buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- However, suggest that a mixed use zoning with specific objectives to provide for assisted living, step down facilities, social housing, a hotel and a swimming pool and/or other facilities for local workforce and community be included rather than the proposed SNI objective which is too restrictive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Need more affordable and social housing in the area to allow staff to live and work in the same area without the need for long commutes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Quality leisure and community facilities, hotel and pool are also badly needed (Beacon Hotel has closed permanently).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 13 and 14, Appendix 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0820</th>
<th>Person: Marie Collins</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0821</th>
<th>Person: Bridin Finn</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Submission requests that access to safe space in Dunedin Park is made available for children from Dun Laoghaire Educate Together National School.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Submission noted that there is inadequate outdoor space for children within the school, causing stress and difficulty for a child with autism and dyspraxia.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0822</th>
<th>Person: Brigid Pike</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Map 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0823</th>
<th>Person: John Spain</th>
<th>Organisation: On behalf of Ravensbrook Lts</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission is made on behalf of owners of units 31 and 31a Ravensrock Road, Sandyford. Submission contends that site is suited to increased height and a denser form of development.
- The following amendment are sought

**Location, Building Height and Density**
- Amend Section 4.3.1.1 (accompanying text to ‘Policy Objective PHP18: Residential Density’) to include reference to the provisions of the ‘Design Standards for New Apartments’ Guidelines 2020 and the ‘Urban Development & Building Height’ Guidelines 2018 as they relate to higher density apartment development;
- Remove reference at Section 12.3.5.1 of the draft Plan which defines ‘DLR as a County is classified as a suburban or intermediate location’ to align with the provisions of the ‘Design Standards for New Apartments’ Guidelines 2020;

**Building Height Strategy**
- Numerical limitations on heights as set out in the SUFP conflict with SPPR1.
- Request that the SUFP is reviewed and amended to reflect the content of the Height Guidelines.
- Omit BH1 SUFP and BH4 SUFP and Amend Maps 2 and 3 of the SUFP to provide for increased building height and density on the site;
- Omit specific height guidance to reflect ‘Urban Development & Building Height’ Guidelines 2018’;
- Amend Appendix 5 Building Height Strategy to fully reflect the ‘Urban Development & Building Height’ Guidelines 2018;
- BHS considered overly onerous as it states that subject to implementation of the performance based criteria that SPPR 3 (10 and (2) have been incorporated into dlr policy.

**Housing Mix**
- Requirement in relation to 3+ beds in in conflict with SPPR1 of the Apartment Guidelines
- Amend ‘Table 12.1 Apartment Mix Requirements’ to align with the provisions of Specific Planning Policy Requirement 1 of the ‘Design Standards for New Apartments’ Guidelines 2020 in terms of Apartment Unit Mix;

**Build to Rent**
- Submission requests that BTR should be removed as a separate use class and also requests that BTR should be moved from open for consideration to permitted in principle in Zone 5 in the SUFP
- Amend the following: ‘BTR accommodation must comply with all apartment standards set out in Chapter 4 under draft Policy Objective PHP27’;

**Phasing**
- Request removal P4 which states “P4 It is an objective of the Council, in co-operation with Irish Water, that within Sandyford Business Estate no additional development shall be permitted to commence construction until the new tank sewers in the Blackthorn Avenue environs commences construction.” As it is considered that works can be agreed with IW separately.

**Dual Aspect**

**Car parking**
- Amend ‘Table 12.6 Car Parking Zones and Standards’ to include ‘Build to Rent’ as ‘Default Minimum’ to align with Specific Planning Policy Requirement 8 of the ‘Design Standards for New Apartments’ Guidelines 2020;

**Open Space**
- Amend ‘Table 12.8 Public Open Space Requirements for residential developments’ to align with the provisions of ‘Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas’ Guidelines 2009;
Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 4, 12, Appendices 5, 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0824</th>
<th>Person: Alice Lawless</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission notes concern regarding the deteriorating coastal erosion in Corbawn.
- Submission concerned of what impact the proposed cycle route will have on Corbawn Drive in terms of safety and congestion.
- Submission suggests dlr incorporates the cycle way into the coastal protection works works between Corbawn Lane and the new Woodbrook Dart station.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0825</th>
<th>Person: Helen Smith</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission notes that limited outdoor space is available to serve the Dún Laoghaire Educate Together National School and share the Red Door School site in Monkstown Grove.
- The submission is requesting that the large green space between Tivoli Terrace South and North to be developed for use for school children of all ages for sports days and other outdoor events and could help achieve a number of the Strategic County Outcomes i.e Dunedin park could be used for some outdoor activities and the Council should facilitate this as soon as possible.
- There is a much smaller green space on Harbour road beside Irish Lights that would also benefit children in the area.
- The submission notes that green space improves health and wellbeing.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0826</th>
<th>Person: John Dowling</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission notes the grant of land for educational purposes by Royal Exchange where Clonkeen College now is.
- Also aware of the subsequent efforts to frustrate the intentions of the donor of the land.
- Submission supports the SNI designation.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0827</th>
<th>Person: Stephen &amp; Triona Pattison</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests that Bellavista, Deansgrange Road (RPS No. 2037) is removed from the RPS.
- An appraisal of the property prepared by John Redmill, conservation architect and historic buildings consultant, is attached to the submission. It is noted that this appraisal was submitted separately and summarised in full under submission reference B0561. (Please refer above for summary)
- The submission notes that this conservation assessment identified errors and inaccuracies in the NIAH survey record – it is noted that this record was then used by dlr in their assessment of the property.
- The submission states that dlr have not conducted their own conservation assessment of the property.
- A review of the NIAH rating for the property is sought.
- Submission recognises that Bellavista may be of interest and contribute to the heritage of the local area, however, it does not have any special interest.
• It is noted that there are other policies in the development plan that afford protection to older buildings of interest including AR8 (HER21), ARS (HER20) and RES4 (PHP19).
• The level of protection constitutes a prohibitively onerous set of requirements upon householders.
• The property was previously split into 3 units – the property has been renovated over the past 10 years in a sympathetic manner. Its inclusion on the RPS would add cost and complexity to any future works to the property.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0828</th>
<th>Person: John Spain Associates on behalf of Donal Courtney</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission requests the re-zoning of lands at Springton, Glenamuck Road, Carrickmines, from Objective ‘G’ – To protect and improve high amenity areas - to Objective ‘A2’ – To provide for the creation of sustainable residential neighbourhoods and preserve and protect residential amenity.
• Submission outlines the location and provides a description of the site. Notes that development in the vicinity of the site is relatively high density and suggests the lands do not have the characteristics to justify their ‘High Amenity’ designation.
• An overview of relevant national, regional and local planning policy and guidance which support the re-zoning request is provided. Suggests the provision of residential uses at the site would support the Council achieve national, regional and local policy objectives.
• Suggests the site is an appropriate location for residential development given its proximity to high-capacity public transport at the Carrickmines Luas stop (c. 800m), its location close to a significant employment area, and the availability of urban bus services. Reference is made to proposed upgrades to the existing LUAS Green line and Bus Connects which will further support development in the area.
• Highlights the identification of Carrickmines as a Strategic Employment Location in the Draft CDP and suggests that the re-zoning of the lands for residential uses would promote the opportunity for people to live and work within the same vicinity which would, in turn, encourage sustainable modes of transport and help reduce carbon emissions.
• Notes that significant areas of land identified in the Draft CDP will require the provision of supporting infrastructure, and that it is unlikely that the majority of lands zoned for residential uses will be developed over the lifetime of the Plan. Suggests this will result in a shortfall in housing delivery and exacerbate the housing shortage. States the subject lands would be considered Tier 1 lands as they are sufficiently serviced to accommodate residential development immediately.
• Requests the Planning Authority reconsiders the reduction in zoned land in the Core Strategy having regard to the current shortfall in housing completions and development of zoned land.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 9

|--------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------|------------|

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Request rezoning from ‘F’ to ‘E’ for their premises on 27 Corrig Ave, Sandyford and the 2 adjoining premises.
• Includes earlier submission prepared by Kiaran O’Malley & Co. Ltd, when this land was rezoned from ‘E’ to ‘F’ in 2011, objection has not changed and submission is still relevant. Reasons previously set out were:
  • Location was removed from any likely demand for public open space. More relevant today as Carmanhall Rd is open to through traffic.
  • An alternative location would be the Council property at the opposite end of Corrig Rd.
• There appears to be no intention to take steps to implement the plan leaves owners in an adverse position. This is unfair to the owners.
Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 17 Map 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0830</td>
<td>Brendan Ferres</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission would like to see some improvements for safer cycling along Deansgrange Road.
- Clonkeen Park could be further development with a playground or skatepark.
- The submission also notes that limited outdoor space available to serve the Dún Laoghaire Educate Together National School and share the Red Door School site in Monkstown Grove.
- Dunedin park could be used for some outdoor activities and the Council should facilitate this as soon as possible.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0831</td>
<td>John Spain</td>
<td>On behalf of Cairn PLC</td>
<td>7 &amp; 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission relates to lands at Brennanstown Road and it is requested that the submission should be read alongside other submissions from Cairn PLC. Detail in relation to Cairn and their delivery of new homes is set out. The submission expresses support for the zoning on their site on Brennanstown Road.
- Site on Brennanstown Road is considered to constitute a central or accessible urban location which is suitable for large scale apartment developments and higher density development.

Specific Local Objectives (SLO)
- It is considered that SLO 73 which was carried forward from the current Plan is no longer appropriate. In the absence of a Part 8 scheme to upgrade the road, recent grant of permission have demonstrated that improvements can be best delivered through planning applications. There should be no delay to future development on Brennanstown Road.
- A technical note from an engineering firm is included which puts forward a five section proposal for upgrade of Brennanstown road based on land ownership.
- Submission therefore requests omission of SLO 73.
- The submitter is willing to engage with the relevant transport authorities consistent with PO 22.

Objectives “To preserve and protect trees and woodlands”
- Submission requests removal of 3 objectives “To preserve and protect trees and Woodland” on lands on Brennanstown Road. It is considered that trees can be best retained in the context of a site specific tree survey.

Car parking and car parking supplementary map
- Request that the northern part of a site on Brennanstown Road be included in zone 2 in the parking zone maps. Commissioning of Brennanstown Luas stop may not have been taken into account.
- Request that the parking zones are reviewed and that the parking standards are indicated as maximum for residential development.

Housing Mix
- Considers that the unit mix proposed will inhibit the ability of older people to “right size at the right time”
- Considers that data analysis in the HNDA does not support housing mix requirements particularly those around 3+ bed and seeks removal of table 12.1 of the Draft Plan.

Build to Rent Development
- Submission considers that Build to Rent is not a separate use from residential

Dual Aspect
The categorisation of the entire County as an intermediate location conflicts with SPPR 4 of the apartment guidelines which makes provision for “a minimum of 33% of dual aspect units will be required in more central and accessible urban location”

Building Height
- Additional criteria in table 5.1 of BHS should be omitted and those in table 3.2 of the section 28 guidelines are sufficient.
- Supports Policy Objective BHS 1 – Increased Height

Open space
Seek retention of 10% open space in existing built up area as set out in current Plan.

Density and Central Accessible locations
- Omit reference at from chapter 12 which defines DLR as a suburban or intermediate location

County Wide ecological network
- Submission is supportive of the statement that locally important biodiversity sites (LIBS) have no formal designation

Submission sets out details of the client’s 2 sites on Brennanstown Road, along with commentary on how various elements of the Draft Plan would support particular development of these 2 sites.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapters 4, 8, 12, 14, Appendix 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0832</td>
<td>Tara Power</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen Collage to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0833</td>
<td>Ronald Barrington</td>
<td>Trustees of the Private Burial Ground, Brennanstown Road.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission noted that the private burial ground (RPS No. 2066) is held under a trust deed and can never change its use as private family burial ground and there is no need to have it listed on the RPS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a concern that a S.57 application would be required each time that a burial is required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td>Appendix 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0834</td>
<td>John Dowling</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission fully supports the proposed designation of SNI in this plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes that lands at Clonkeen were given for Educational Purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes awareness of subsequent legal developments to frustrate the donor’s intentions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0835</td>
<td>R Mulry</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen Collage to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0836</td>
<td>John Spain</td>
<td>On behalf of Cairn PLC</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission provides background and detail on the company and their role in delivery of new homes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission provides details on the Blakes and Esmonde Motors site and supports the retention of the DC land use zoning objective on the Blakes and Esmonde Motors site, Stillorgan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building Height Strategy
- Consider that the height parameters set out in the Stillorgan LAP are contrary to SPPR 1 of the Building heights Guidelines in that they set out blanket restrictions. Considers SPPRs 2 and 3 are still applicable.
- Requests review of Stillorgan LAP to be aligned with Building Height Guidelines.
- Recommend addition of an SLO for a Landmark Building on the Blakes and Esmonde Motors site.

Central and Accessible Location classification
- Support the omission of classification of the County as a suburban or intermediate location.

Housing Mix
- Considers that the unit mix proposed will inhibit the ability of older people to “right size at the right time”
- Considers that data analysis in the HNDA does not support housing mix requirements particularly those around 3+ bed and seeks removal of table 12.1 of the Draft Plan.

Build to Rent Development
- Submission considers that Build to Rent is not a separate use from residential

Building Height
- Additional criteria in table 5.1 of BHS should be omitted and those in table 3.2 of the section 28 guidelines are sufficient.

Open space
- Seek retention of 10% open space in existing built up area as set out in current Plan.

Flood Risk
- Policies in relation drainage and attenuation along with policies on flood risk require further consideration along with application of the DM flood risk Justification Test.

Car parking
- Request that the parking zones are reviewed and that the parking standards are indicated as maximum for residential development.

Development and Density in Dublin Study, March 2021
Submission includes a Draft of a study entitled “Development and Density in Dublin”. It is noted that the full study is not submitted.
Studies sets out the need for a more strategic approach to planning in Dublin and considers that the city lacks regional management to meet challenges. The study looks at mechanism that have been put in place in other cities at 3 different scales; entire city region scale, area of opportunity scale and individual development project scale. 8 key principles are derived from the examination of the approach in other cities. It is stated that these principles are then applied to 2 area in Dublin – Stillorgan and Clonburris. The 8 principles include:
- Most important joined up urban management is the linkage of transport and land use planning
- Planning takes time
- Strategic plan must address housing challenge
- Not all area require same planning attention,
- Importance of environmental considerations,
- Need to look at post covid city
- Strategic plans pay attention to compact growth
- City management only works at Metropolitan scale
Stillorgan Road is considered to be an appropriate location for intensification of development and increased building height. This should be supported in the Draft Plan.
Support for reference to N11 in the Building Height Strategy.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapters 4, 12, Appendices 5, 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0837</th>
<th>Person: Noreen O’ Gorman</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission objects to SLO85.
- Submission notes there are high pressure pipes and chemicals on site.
- Submission notes that one of the points of covering the reservoir was to offset the risk of a terrorist attack on public water supplies.
Submission notes there are security/privacy issues and risk of anti-social behaviour to neighbouring properties should access be given to the public.

Submission notes concern that there is a risk of death or injury should someone fall off the roof.

Submission notes that Irish Water have stated that the site is required for the future of Dublin’s water supply and no public use is possible.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0838</td>
<td>Cliona Corbett</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The submission states that the wildlife corridor must be correctly planned and thought out in the County.
- The submission expresses concern with respect to the protection of the area around Ticknock, Woodside, Blackglen, and in particular, Fitzsimons Wood.
- The 2016-2022 Plan emphasises the important role of wildlife corridors to the fauna and flora diversity throughout the County and highlights the legislative backing for the protection of wildlife corridors as set out in the Habitats Directive 1992 (92/43/EEC).
- The submission notes that the Council has created an excellent Biodiversity Education Programme relating to Fitzsimons Wood.
- The submission therefore requests that the following be included in the Draft Plan:
  1. A clear map showing the Wildlife Corridor from Three Rock Mountain to Fitzsimons Wood
  2. Clarification as to how Deer will be able to cross the widened Blackglen Road
  3. Confirmation that the widened Blackglen Road will allow Badgers to cross via a tunnel or culvert.
  4. Confirmation that any planning permissions for development along Blackglen Road will make provision for the proposed Wildlife Corridor.
  5. Fitzsimons Wood designated a Natural Heritage Area (NHA).

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0839</td>
<td>Derek Reilly</td>
<td>Dublin EV Owners Club</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Would welcome a hubs or number of EV charging hubs for those who live in apartments or have no off street parking, similar to Dundee City Council partially powered by solar panels (photo included).
- Request planning permission include that 50% of allocated parking in new developments have EV charging installed.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 3, 12.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0840</td>
<td>Gabby Mallon</td>
<td>DLR Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission notes the hierarchy of plans in relation to the development of the CDP and highlights the need for full information and consultation in relation to developments at national level which may have significant local impacts.
- Questions the sustainability of an adequate and ‘ethical’ water supply for the Dublin and Metropolitan area arising from the NPF target that half of future national population growth is to be focused in the existing five Cities and their suburbs.
- Submits that there is not enough focus in the CDP on the provision of affordable housing. Highlights that the delivery of affordable housing presents a significant challenge for the achievement of the Strategic County Outcomes ‘Creation of a Network of Liveable Towns and Villages’ and ‘Creation of a Vibrant Economic County’.
- Highlights the need for affordable housing to accommodate the future workforce and support the intensification of employment in identified strategic employment areas. Concerns are highlighted about
the ability to provide adequate affordable housing on public bus corridors. Reference is made to the Section 49 Development Contribution scheme in the Kilternan-Glenamuck area which, it is suggested, increases the cost of properties for citizens.

- Highlights the need to provide affordable rental accommodation to workers in hubs such as Sandyford and Cherrywood and also provide sustainable build to buy affordable housing to develop communities.
- Highlights the need for the CDP to reflect remote/home working in residential schemes through the provision of larger apartments, larger balconies, more communal areas, and the provision of housing with rear gardens. Submits that remote/home working will form a major part of the future work model and employees will require enhanced infrastructure, including sustainable ICT infrastructure. Suggests the household size used in the Core Strategy needs to be revised to reflect home/remote working requirements.
- Submission raises a number of potential impacts of the strategic residential and employment corridors identified in the Dublin MASP, including; a potential mismatch between public transport needs and the projected increase in population; inadequate recreational provision; inadequate hotel and restaurant provision; and, inadequate provision of affordable housing.
- Highlights concerns about the shortfall in housing stock in the County relative to the projected population increase. Submits that the impacts of the Covid pandemic will further limit the availability of housing stock. Suggests that the lack of delivery is also attributable to the failure of the SHD model.
- Submits that the emphasis in the Plan on the achievement of housing density and ensuring the best use of land, risks being incompatible with good quality housing and sustainable work life balance, building communities and place making. Suggests that the Build to Rent schemes also have implications on building sustainable communities.
- Highlights the importance of a transparent and fair process in relation to Sustainable Rural Housing and stresses the need for the Council to recognise and support ‘affordable housing’ applicants.
- Fully supports the enterprise and employment aims and objectives as set out in Chapter 6 of the Draft Plan. Recommends a skills audit be undertaken to establish what skills are in existence and what skills are required by employers in the County. Highlights the need to re-evaluate the promotion of Dublin as a global City Region due to the impact of Brexit and Covid 19.
- Highlights the need for the provision of enhanced public transport services; recreational amenities (for employees and residents); and, sustainable affordable housing for employees at the strategic employment locations. Highlights there is a need to avoid strategic employment locations becoming ‘dead zones’ after 6pm and recommends research is undertaken to identify ‘humane’ models of office development of scale, that remain safe and vibrant living spaces, 24/7.
- Highlights the need to ensure the supply of skills to meet the needs of the high tech sector. Raises concerns that the labour intensive sectors will be unable to attract and retain appropriately skilled staff.
- Supports the overall strategy for centres identified in the Retail Hierarchy in Chapter 7. Highlights the need to revitalise and grow Dun Laoghaire and Dundrum, as living towns and hubs for the County. Recommends a post Covid retail strategy.
- Highlights the need for balance in the provision of funding between commercial rates and property tax. Submits the upward trend of commercial rates cannot be sustained together with an increasing Local Property Tax.
- Submits that the Council must ensure that sufficient resources are put in place to ensure that a vibrant tourism and hospitality industry returns. Suggests a long term strategy is required. Submits the CDP must plan for tourism in the rural uplands of DLR and include objectives to reflect same, including the need for sensitive sustainable accommodation.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 2, 4, 6 and 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80841</td>
<td>Tim O’Broin</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Residents of 2 Sandycove Ave want to support and mirror submission of 10-15 Breffini Terrace to be allowed off-street carparking.
- 2 to 6 Sandycove Avenue West are protected structures. Previously permission has been refused for off-street car parking.
- Submission includes photos of recent examples of off-street car parking at Elton Park.
• There are currently traffic hazards in the area, especially for unloading vehicles. Drivers often drive on the footpath. There is traffic congestion and a lack of off-street parking, therefore electric cars cannot be charged.
• Seek to amend the Plan, as required, to allow for 2 to 6 Sandycove Avenue West to sensitively build off street parking.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5, 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0842</td>
<td>Brian Garvey</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• The submission notes that limited outdoor space available to serve the Dún Laoghaire Educate Together National School and share the Red Door School site in Monkstown Grove.
• The submission is requesting that the large green space between Tivoli Terrace South and North to be developed for use for school children of all ages for sports days and other outdoor events and could help achieve a number of the Strategic County Outcomes.
• Dunedin park could be used for some outdoor activities and the Council should facilitate this as soon as possible.
• There is a much smaller green space on Harbour road beside Irish Lights that would also benefit children in the area.
• The submission notes that green space improves health and wellbeing.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0843</td>
<td>John Spain</td>
<td>Leopardstown Park Hospital Trust</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission relates to Leopardstown Park Hospital and sets out background to the Trust, detail in relation to the site including context, site history, local planning context, national and regional planning context. The submission also includes 6 appendices.
• Request that Planning Authority amend the Draft Plan to provide for residential on lands at Leopardstown Park Hospital.
• Reasons are set out as to why the lands are suitable for residential development including the fact that the northern lands (93.9ha) are not required by the hospital in the future, lands are suitable for residential use due to close proximity to public transport, proposed residential zoning is consistent with national and regional planning policy and that lands can accommodate new pedestrian and cycle links. A Masterplan is included.
• It is considered the lands at Leopardstown Park Hospital could play a meaningful role in reducing the imbalance between employment growth and residential capacity during the lifetime of the SUFP.
• The following amendments are sought;
  Zoning
• That the northern parcel of lands of the overall Leopardstown Park Hospital lands, should be zoned Objective A2. This would necessitate the updating of the SUFP MAP 1, to indicate the lands as ‘Zone 5: Residential’. In addition, the rezoning would require the updating of Section 2.3.5 and 2.3.6 of the draft SUFP to list the lands as a new neighbourhood under Objective A2 Residential Zone 5’, and remove reference to the northern parcel of lands as ‘SNI’ Sustainable Neighbourhood Infrastructure.
  Specific Local Objectives
• Request that SLO 63 should be omitted from the northern parcel of land at Leopardstown Park Hospital, and instead applied to the southern parcel which will meet the requirements of the medical campus objective.
  Density and Height
• The density and building height limitations set out in the draft SUFP should be reviewed to reflect the content of the Urban Development & Building Height Guidelines 2018 and also the NPO 13 of the NPF.
• The 2-3 storey building height limit on the subject lands is omitted from the draft SUFP Map 3. The subject lands are appropriate for increased heights given its location directly adjoining the Luas Green Line.
Line Central Park Station, and adjacent to the residential development at Central Park with existing heights of generally 10 to 17 storeys;
• Request that the Building Height Strategy be reviewed, and the additional assessment criteria for building height beyond that set out in the Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines should be omitted;

**Build to Rent**
• References to Build to Rent development as a separate land use should be omitted from the draft Plan, with Built to Rent treated as falling within in ‘residential’ land use;
• Request that the draft Plan omits additional caveats introduced by the draft Plan in respect of BTR. In particular, Section 4.3.2.3 and 12.3.6 should be amended to remove restrictions on BTR.

**Residential Mix**
• Additional development management standards for apartments beyond that set out in the Apartment Guidelines, including the unit mix for lands within the SUFP, should be omitted from the draft Plan to ensure consistency with national guidelines, in particular the requirement for 40% of apartment units to be three bedroom;
• It is not clear why ‘Lands within the SUFP’ are separately identified in terms of residential mix requirements.
• The rationale of utilising the interim HNDA to justify a significant departure from Section 28 Guidelines as they relate to apartment type mix is inappropriate and should be omitted from the draft Plan.
• Unclear as to why older people who may be ‘downsizing’ would seek out 3 and 4 bedroom apartment units
• To restrict development on the basis of unit mix at a high level would restrict provision in terms of the land use matrix of permitted and open for consideration uses.

**Intermediate Urban Location**
• Reference to the entire County as an intermediate urban location should be omitted, having regard to the excellent existing public transport infrastructure, and instead allowing assessment of individual sites against the Apartment Guidelines Criteria.

**HSE proposals.**
• HSE are planning a new hospital on the southern portion of the lands in accordance with a Plan prepared in 2017. A letter is included from the HSE which confirms that the lands to the north are not required for hospital use in the future.
• The submitted masterplan shows how the lands could be developed for residential use along with a new park and the conservation of the former stables as a community use. In terms of transport and drainage reference is made to the submitted Engineering report. Any development would keep the road reservation free from development.

**Sandyford Business District and Rebalancing Existing Employment Uses**
• A report is appended which considers that whilst the SUFP district is evolving to a premier suburban office / employment location, the development of a meaningful quantum of residential accommodation for the area’s expanding working population has not materialized.
• Report finds that the working population of the district is likely to grow to 48,500 employees by the end of the draft Sandyford Urban Framework Plan (i.e. 2028), whereas the residential population only has capacity to grow to almost 12,000. This is based on the maximum capacity for the residential zoned lands which have potential to deliver a potential 2,582 units. Report considers that permitted schemes won’t be delivered and as a result the area could lose its competitive edge.
• Both the population projections, and the land allocation to accommodate the resulting projected population growth should be revisited and proposed amendments to the Draft Development Plan be proposed to address period of prolonged undersupply.

**Core Strategy**
• Population growth figures should take account of the latest population growth figures published by the Central Statistics Office
• 25% headroom should be applied beyond 2026 to 2028 owing to the anticipated continued population growth above the national average in Dun Laoghaire Rathdown

**Appendix 17 SUFP**
• Use of density and plot ratio in the SUFP places a serious restriction on the potential residential yield of lands.
• Building Height restrictions as set out in the SUFP are contrary to National policy.
• Request that Section 2.5 (Density) and Section 3.2 (Building Height) the Draft SUFP is reviewed to reflect national and regional policy. In particular the content of the Urban Development & Building Height Guidelines 2018 and also the NPO 13 of the NPF should be reflected in the draft SUFP, and numerical limitations on building height and density should be omitted from the draft SUFP Maps 2 and 3.

• Request that additional criteria (Table 5.1 of height strategy) is omitted from the Plan.

Appendix 1: Letter of Support from the HSE;
Appendix 2: Conservation Report prepared by Molloy & Associates; Detail similar but at a higher level to what would be submitted at planning application stage.
Appendix 3: Engineering Site Assessment prepared by DBFL Consulting Engineers again at a higher level but akin to detail which would be submitted at planning application stage. Report addresses water, flood risk and transport.
Appendix A – Contains details of Irish Water records
Appendix B – Detail of Greenfield Runoff Calculation
Appendix 4: Landscape Note Prepared by Dermot Foley Landscape Architects
Sets out details of proposed future landscaping.
Appendix 5: The Sandyford Business District – An Analysis of Residential Supply Issues prepared By Knight Frank;

• In summary this report puts forward an argument that there is a mis-match between working and living population (26,000 employees and 5,000 residents). It finds that this imbalance is likely to persist. The working population of the district is likely to grow to 48,500 whereas the residential population only has the capacity to grow to almost 12,000. Report considers that the residential is unlikely to happen as the ownership is fractured.

• The viability of development is faced with many challenges currently including the high costs of construction, narrow range and expensive sources of finance as well as planning and development risk. The report identifies a variety of sites that could play a meaningful role in reducing the imbalance between employment growth and residential capacity in the district during the lifetime of the next Sandyford Urban Framework Plan. A failure to consider other potential land for development would mean that the shortage of accommodation in the area will persist and the district could lose its competitive edge/attractiveness with other surrounding areas becoming more attractive for companies looking to create employment.

• The report notes that “there is very little industrial stock available in the Dublin market and this is unlikely to be alleviated anytime soon given the low levels of new industrial accommodation in the development pipeline.”

Appendix 6: Masterplan Document prepared by O’Mahony Pike Architects, with input from the client, Knight Frank, DBFL Consulting Engineers, Dermot Foley Landscape Architects, Molloy & Associates and John Spain Associates

• This masterplan as referenced above is an update of a 2017 plan which sets out a framework for development of lands at Leopardstown Park Hospital, and is submitted in support of the rezoning request.

• The Masterplan provides details of site history, current planning context, a site strategy, proposed services, details of different character areas and proposed uses, urban design, details on density, detail on parkland and a separate appendix with a strategic high-level masterplan.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 4, 13, 14, Appendices 5, 17

Summary of Submission and Observation:

• Propose that future permits for street vendors around the county (markets, 7 day permits for ice cream and coffee stands etc.) are only allowed to renew their permit when they can power their business via electricity and not a combustion engine/generator.

• Air quality is of huge importance and having an ice cream van running all day or a generator on our beautiful pier spewing out toxic gases to run a coffee stand, we really need to get our priorities in order.

• Appreciate that the local authority will need to install an electricity supply and some sort of metering for these.
Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0845</th>
<th>Person: Michalina Nyga</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission notes the limited outdoor space availability serving the Dun Laoghaire Educate Together National School.
- Submission requests that the green space between Tivoli Terrace South and North to be developed for use for school children for a range of outdoor events benefiting a large number of schools in the area.
- Submission notes that with investment, the development of the green area for use by children would help achieve a number of the Strategic County Outcomes.
- The green space within the harbour could also be developed to benefit children.
- Use of Dunedin Park for outdoor activity for children sharing the Red Door site should be facilitated as soon as possible.
- The benefits of green spaces within our local areas, particularly for children, is highlighted.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0846</th>
<th>Person: Al and Carmel Crowley</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission notes the addition of “to provide residential development” to the A zone objective.
- Submission refers to a strip of land, zoned A, in Wesley Estate that was left as an amenity space for residents.
- Submission notes that it has been confirmed over the years that this land is amenity space and includes an extract from correspondence from dlir noting that the land is dedicated open space as per a planning condition and to be left as such in perpetuity.
- Submission noted that the strip of land appears to be incorrectly zoned A and should continue to be an amenity for all residents.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0847</th>
<th>Person: Barbara Salsi</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Protect the ROWs around Kilternan, Glenamuck and Carrickmines.
- Carrickmines castle is an important historic site and must be protected.
- Inadequate green/public space in Kilternan Glenamuck.
- New playground is next to a pylon – not good enough – and pylon is not shown clearly on plans.
- Wayside Celtic is privately owned, and these lands shown on plans as public open space is misleading.
- Dingle Glen must be protected. No further rezoning or construction should be considered there.
- Kilternan and Glenamuck needs a village in keeping with its surroundings and character.
- Kilternan Glenamuck LAP needs to be adhered to as planners and ABP have granted permission where their neighbours have been refused – little consistency in the planning department.
- Kilternan Glenamuck need more schools and better public transport provision.
- Any further development including SHDs should be stopped until the new Distributor Road is built.
- Construction traffic has damaged the Glenamuck Road.
- Kilternan Glenamuck have constant problems with electricity and water outages – ESB lines cannot cope with the amount of new building.
- Hedgerows, wildlife, history and character of Kilternan Glenamuck are being destroyed by poor planning decisions.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapters 4, 5, 7, 8, 11 Appendix 12
Summary of Submission and Observation:
Development Plan should recognise opportunity for intensification along the N11 corridor including recognition of Stillorgan District Centre as an important location.

Core Strategy.
- Support for adoption of high growth scenario in the Plan.

Climate change
Cautions against overly prescriptive development standards relating to climate action

Central and Accessible Location classification
- Support the omission of classification of the County as a suburban or intermediate location.

Housing Mix
- Considers that the unit mix proposed will inhibit the development of apartments in the County and the ability of older people to “right size at the right time”
- Considers that data analysis in the HNDA does not support housing mix requirements particularly those around 3+ bed and seeks removal of table 12.1 of the Draft Plan.

Build to Rent Development
- Submission considers that Build to Rent is not a separate use from residential
- Plan should comply with SPPR8 of Apartment Guidelines and omit additional standards in relation to dual aspect, separation distances, unit storage and car parking as set out in section 12.3.5

Building Height
- Additional criteria in table 5.1of BHS should be omitted and those in table 3.2 of the section 28 guidelines are sufficient.
- Request priority be given to review of LAPs to reflect Height Guidelines, NPO 13 of the NPF and omit blanket restriction on height.

Open space
- Seek retention of 10% open space in existing built up area as set out in current Plan.

Flood Risk
- Policies in to relation drainage and attenuation along with policies on flood risk require further consideration along with application of the DM flood risk Justification Test

Car parking
- Request that the parking zones are reviewed and that the parking standards are indicated as maximum for residential development.

Building Height Strategy
- Considers that the height parameters set out in the Stillorgan LAP are contrary to SPPR 1 of the Building heights Guidelines in that they set out blanket restrictions. Considers SPPRs 2 and 3 are still applicable.
- Requests review of Stillorgan LAP to be aligned with Building Height Guidelines.
- Recommend addition of an SLO for a Landmark Building on the Blakes and Esmonde Motors site.

Development and Density in Dublin Study, March 2021
Submission includes a Draft of a study entitled “Development and Density in Dublin”. It is noted that the full study is not submitted.
Studies sets out the need for a more strategic approach to planning in Dublin and considers that the city lacks regional management to meet challenges. The study looks at mechanism that have been put in place in other cities at 3 different scales; entire city region scale, area of opportunity scale and individual development project scale. 8 key principles are derived from the examination of the approach in other cities. It is stated that these principles are then applied to 2 area in Dublin – Stillorgan and Clonburris. The 8 principles include;
- Most important joined up urban management is the linkage of transport and land use planning
- Planning takes time
- Strategic plan must address housing challenge
- Not all area require same planning attention,
- Importance of environmental considerations,
- Need to look at post covid city
- Strategic plans pay attention to compact growth
- City management only works at Metropolitan scale
Stillorgan Road is considered to be an appropriate location for intensification of development and increased building height. This should be supported in the Draft Plan.

Support for reference to N11 in the Building Height Strategy.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Chapters 2, 3, 4, 12, Appendices 2, 5, 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person: Downey Planning on behalf of</th>
<th>Organisation: Eoin Conway</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission requests the re-zoning of lands at Dublin Road, Shankill from Objective ‘GB’ – To protect and enhance the open nature of lands between urban areas, to Objective ‘A1’ - To provide for new residential communities and Sustainable Neighbourhood Infrastructure in accordance with approved local area plans. The lands comprise the Woodbrook Downs residential estate, two Protected Structures (Aske House and Beauchamp House) and a greenfield site in agricultural use.
- An overview is provided of: the surrounding context; existing policy provisions of the Draft CDP and the Woodbrook-Shanganagh LAP; planned developments in the area; existing and planned transport options; and planned upgrades of Shanganagh Park.
- Submits that re-zoning the lands would provide additional housing at a sustainable location within walking distance of essential everyday amenities. Highlights the lands would benefit from excellent access to Shanganagh Park.
- Considers a mid-density housing development at the site would be appropriate, when considered in the context of the directly opposite Woodbrook site. Suggests this would make best use of the lands and provide additional housing at a strategically-important part of the County.
- Submits that a residential scheme would be highly sustainable as the lands would be well-served by bus services and cycle lanes along Dublin Road, as part of the planned BusConnects scheme. Furthermore, future residents would have a choice of sustainable transport options including the future extension of the Green Luas Line to Bray, the new DART station at Woodbrook and the East Coast Cycle Route. Private car owners would also be well-served by the M11, M50 and N11.
- Highlights that easy access to the East Coast Cycle Route, S2S promenade and Greenway on the eastern side of the new DART Station, would provide residents with direct links to the Coastal Park Corridor, providing occupants with a high-quality living environment.
- Submits the current ‘GB’ zoning is ill-suited to the emerging context of the site and it couldn’t reasonably be considered that the lands serve ‘to protect and enhance the open nature of lands between urban areas’.
- Contends that there are insufficient lands zoned A1 within the Woodbrook-Shanganagh LAP area to meet the objective of providing 2000-2300 units, as set out in the LAP. submits the proposed re-zoning would provide additional land to meet the housing target.
- Submits that, having regard to the emerging development context of the area, the site is strategically located adjacent to forthcoming improvements in transport infrastructure, community facilities and open space. Submits the proposed ‘A1’ zoning would optimise the use of the lands and offer the opportunity to provide additional sustainable neighbourhood infrastructure. Furthermore, a higher-density residential scheme would support the Council’s policies and fully realise the development potential of the local area in providing high-quality housing at a sustainable location.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Chapter 13, 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person: Declan McSweeney</th>
<th>Organisation: Archdiocese of Dublin</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission notes that the Archdiocese of Dublin owns a large number of church and school properties in the county.
- Submission notes that there is a possible requirement to amalgamate parishes and closure of a number of churches.
- Submission notes that ‘residential’ has been excluded from the ‘permitted in principle’ zoning in the revised zoning for schools and churches.
- Submission states that this rezoning would result in restrictions on permitted uses and impact on property values.
- Submission noted that there is a shortage of housing and lands for residential development in the county and therefore request that either the sites are not rezoned or that ‘residential’ is ‘permitted in principle’.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 13**

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The submission states that existence of the wildlife corridor connecting the Three Rock Mountain area with Fitzsimons Wood (pNHA) via Woodside Road, and the Blackglen Road is well known. The presence of the corridor is clearly recognised with the Council’s ‘Deer Crossing’ signs on the Blackglen Road.
- The presence and importance of deer to the biodiversity of Fitzsimons Wood is well illustrated in the Council’s publication on the Biodiversity Education Programme relating to Fitzsimons Wood.
- Confirmation that the Council consider providing a tunnel or culvert for Badgers.
- The submission requests that the Council consider a proper wildlife corridor to contribute to reduction of biodiversity in the important pNHA.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 8**

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission requests 3 developments in dlr to benefit communities and children:
  - Develop the green space between Tivoli Terrace North and South as a joint amenity space for local schools and the community. A lack of outdoor space serving schools is noted.
  - Develop a similar amenity space on the green space at the Irish Lights within the harbour.
  - Develop Dunedin Park to benefit local residents and enable its use by children from Dún Laoghaire Educate Together school. It would also benefit children of the adjacent Holy Family School.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 4, Chapter 9**

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission objects to the removal of the S2S coastal walkway and cycleway from the Development Plan.
- Submission notes the S2S would provide world class walk/cycleway for residents and visitors.
- Submission notes how the pandemic has highlighted the importance of outdoor traffic free spaces.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5**

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The submission states that existence of the wildlife corridor connecting the Three Rock Mountain area with Fitzsimons Wood (pNHA) via Woodside Road, and the Blackglen Road is well known. The presence of the corridor is clearly recognised with the Council’s ‘Deer Crossing’ signs on the Blackglen Road.
- The presence and importance of deer to the biodiversity of Fitzsimons Wood is well illustrated in the Council’s publication on the Biodiversity Education Programme relating to Fitzsimons Wood.
- Confirmation that the Council consider providing a tunnel or culvert for Badgers.
- The submission requests that the Council consider a proper wildlife corridor to contribute to reduction of biodiversity in the important pNHA.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0855</td>
<td>Deirdre Kearney</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- It is important for the development of the County that attention is given to providing support for artists living and working within the Borough, which would add greatly to the perception of Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown and in particular the town of Dun Laoghaire itself as a destination for those interested in Arts and Culture.
- The submission attaches two proposals, the first for the Carnegie Creative and the second for the Bath House Art Centre.
- The documents set out the case for an arts strategy as the foundation of urban regeneration of Dún Laoghaire.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0856</td>
<td>Gerard Harrington</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Request the removal of the following text from Section 8.5.6, George’s Place: “The first phase of the development has anticipated a new pedestrian/cycle link between George’s Place and Crofton Road and the completion of this route across Stable Lane to further strengthen the connectivity between Georges Street and the Waterfront is a strategic objective of this Plan. Any redevelopment will include upgrades to the public realm along Georges Place to include traffic calming, extensive tree planting, pollinator planting schemes, creative water connectivity attenuation, wider paving, improved surfaces and new public lighting to create a stronger sense of place…”
- The connection will increase pedestrian traffic on Stable Lane and will result is loss of privacy & security.
- During the development of the houses on Kelly’s avenue, the original wall was removed and as a result there were a number of car break-ins and attempted home burglaries which has still left a sense of fear and insecurity.
- With Scrumdiddly’s, on the corner of Kelly’s avenue, there is daily parking and littering in Stable Lane. The pedestrian connection will make matters worse.
- There are already multiple routes to the waterfront, notably to the east and west of George's street, i.e. Kelly’s avenue & Clarence street.
- Stable lane has not been legally taken in charge (the submitter attached letter from DLRCOCO in this regard).
- No public right of way has been established.
- In 1993, Edmund Kenny of 7 Crofton Terrace obtained an injunction against the local authority, preventing it from using the gate as anything other than an emergency exit.
- Ownership of stable lane has not been established and permission has not been sought or obtained.
- Ownership of the wall (where the gates are) has not been established - it predates local authority ownership of the site behind stable lane.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0857</td>
<td>Elaine Redmonds</td>
<td>IDA Ireland</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission sets out the role of IDA Ireland and provides information in terms of Foreign Direct Investment including its importance at the national, regional and local level. Highlights that supporting
business activity and facilitating required expansion of existing FDI assets will maintain Ireland’s competitiveness and assist in economic recovery post the COVID-19 pandemic.

- Submission supports the request for re-zoning made by Amgen Technology (DLR Submission Nos B0643 and B1241 refers). Expresses disappointment with regard the proposed re-zoning of Zoning Objective E (Economic and Employment) land at Pottery Road to Zoning Objective SNI (Strategic Neighbourhood Infrastructure). Highlights that the original purpose of the ‘E’ zoning was, and should continue to be, to support industrial based activity such as that undertaken by Amgen Technology (Ireland).
- IDA Ireland wish to ensure that the level of FDI activity in the Pottery Road area is maintained and enhanced over the six years of the emerging CDP.
- Considers that there would still be more than sufficient land remaining as SNI in the area if the lands in question reverted back to Zoning Objective E. Suggests that the provision of adequate neighbourhood scaled facilities and the expansion of Amgen Technology could both be accommodated in the area, whilst at the same time providing Amgen with the zoning certainty they need under Zoning Objective E (Economic and Employment) for future expansion and flexibility.
- Highlights that planning permission has been granted at the lands in question under Planning Reference D19A/0904 for a car park to serve future expansion at Amgen Ireland.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission requests a proposed extension of the existing ‘off-leash’ area at Seapoint to include:
  1. The west-pier, either in its entirety, or the lower level path; together with
  2. Access from the car park at the pumping stations at Seapoint, and
  3. Relevant signage.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests that the tennis club is changed from A to F in order to preserve the space for recreation and amenity.
- A Monkstown Lawn Tennis image and aerial image identifying the club are attached to the submission.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission notes the limited outdoor space serving the Dún Laoghaire Educate Together School.
- Submission seeks the development of the green space between Tivoli Terrace South and North for use for school children noting that this would benefit a number of local schools and would help achieve a number of the Strategic County Outcomes.
- Submission requests that the green space in the Harbour beside Irish Lights could also be developed for the benefit of school children.
- Submission requests that Dunedin Park is used for some outdoor activities of the DETS.
- Submission notes the benefits of green space, particularly for children.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 4, Chapter 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission notes the benefits of green space, particularly for children.
Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Recommend updating to the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030 in the environmental reports from the strategy for 2020.
- Recommend formatting landscape pages to display as a landscape oriented page, the file required multiple edits to be comfortable to read.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): SEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0862</td>
<td>Orna Mulcahy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission notes traffic issues in the Sandycove area and pay and display may help, and traffic wardens are needed on a more regular basis.
- Submission requests a sign in the area asking swimmers to be respectful of the area and take home all their gear.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0863</td>
<td>Emma-Jane Morrissey</td>
<td>Irish Wheelchair Association</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The submission provides some background to the Irish Wheelchair Association (IWA), which has been providing services for 60 years, and indicates the vision of the IWA is to ensure people with disabilities enjoy equal rights, choices, and opportunities in how they live their lives.
- The IWA work with, and on behalf of, 20,000 members with physical disabilities to drive positive change through the influencing of public policy, the provision of quality services and enabling accessibility to all aspects of society.
- The submission highlights the wide range of services provide by the IWA.
- The need for ongoing meaningful consultation on a phase-by-phase basis is compulsory, understanding that a city that is accessible to a person with a disability is a city that is accessible to everyone and welcomes the opportunity to participate in this process.
- The ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) brought with it a legal basis for people with disabilities to have the right to live independently. Therefore, it is imperative that the Dún Laoghaire- Rathdown County Council implements the 2022-2028 Development Plan in a cross departmental structure if people with disabilities are to be really included in society with equal status to participate.
- The submission notes Article 28 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities (UNCRPD) on providing an Adequate Standard of Living and Social Protection states, "governments must ensure access by persons with disabilities to public housing programmes".
- The submission indicates that the experience of IWA members who are wheelchair users in accessing social housing has not been positive. Despite the ongoing implementation of the National Housing Strategy for People with a Disability there is still no strategically planned annual supply of fully wheelchair accessible properties.
- IWA recommends Dún Laoghaire- Rathdown County Council:
  - Design property to be sustainable over the lifetime of a person who is a wheelchair user as needs, use of mobility and exercise equipment and the requirement for personal assistance change.
  - Include IWA's Think Ahead, Think Housing campaign in their housing strategy, which encourages people with disabilities to apply to their local authority to secure their future housing needs.
  - Advertise the campaign
  - Commits that that all social housing projects supported by capital funding from the Department of Housing, Planning and Local Government to deliver 7% of integrated fully wheelchair accessible social housing units within choice locations that are accessible to community amenities and transport links.
  - Include a fully wheelchair accessible design should be incorporated into each social housing project planning.
  - Promote innovative housing design models for people with disabilities
- That all future housing meet or exceed energy requirements.
- Ensures that the expertise of people with the lived experience of disability is included in the development and roll out of the Housing Strategy for Disabled People.
- Creates a register of accessible housing available from the local authority and Approved Housing Bodies in the area.
- Review Part M of the Building Regulations (2010) to include mandatory provision for liveable wheelchair accessible housing.
- Develops a plan to make the approach and access to all housing complexes wheelchair accessible.
- Reviews the means testing of the Housing Adaptation Grant as it is out of touch with current building costs.
- Creates a database including the number of people on the housing list requiring supports to live independently to inform the HSE of this requirement, the number of people (requiring supports) in an offer zone, who have received the required supports within 6 months and who have not received the required supports within 6 months.

- With respect to Sustainable transport:
  - The submission states that shared space and shared surfaces as an urban design concept does not work for people with disabilities and is not recommended by IWA as a safe and inclusive design approach to the design of urban streetscapes. Several very specific elements of this design approach cause anxiety for people with disabilities and other vulnerable streetscape users, for example:
    - The removal of signal-controlled crossings
    - Courtesy crossings.
    - Sufficient time to cross the road or will have incorrectly understood the giving of permission from the motorist/cyclist to cross the road.
    - The removal of kerbs is particularly problematic for people who have a visual impairment as kerbs provide a way-finding function.
    - Pedestrian interaction with cyclists is of particular concern to vulnerable streetscape users, where cyclists are not required to dismount when passing through a shared area, or where cycle lanes with no kerb demarcation are routed through a shared space environment.
  - The submission indicates some UK reports and provides some images as examples.
  - Clearly, the inclusion of a ‘Shared Space, Shared Surfaces’ approach in an urban design project requires careful, collaborative and real consultation with people with disabilities and their representative organisations to ensure that the environment is safely and confidently usable by everyone.
  - The submission refers to ‘Bus Islands’, and stresses the concern poses by people with disabilities and the relationship with cyclists and people with visual impairment. The submission stresses that this is not a satisfactory or safe way for anyone to negotiate their way through the bus connects system. There is nothing in these designs that force cyclists to slow down/stop/dismount which leaves the pedestrian in a very vulnerable position. As pedestrians must cross a cycle lane.
  - The submission highlights the dangers of parking spaces alongside cycle lanes which are a danger to a passing cyclist and to a person with a disability entering or exiting their car. The council needs to ensure that an appropriate number of wheelchair accessible parking bays are safely positioned around the city for ease of access.
  - The submission request that all kerbs at pedestrian crossings should be flush with the roadway and have appropriate tactile paving in place.
  - At controlled crossings, the pedestrian signals must allow adequate time for all pedestrians to cross safely. The pedestrian signals should be both audible and pulsating and the push button should be located at a height of 900-1000mm. Road markings at crossings should prevent vehicles from blocking sight lines and from blocking dished kerbing.
• The submission requests that Public Transport Interface Bus and tram stops should be located on or adjacent to pavements and should be readily and easily accessible to transport users without the person having to cross cycle tracks. Kerb heights at bus and tram boarding points should be designed to negate or lessen any vehicle ramp gradient and to minimise vertical and horizontal stepping distance onto or off the bus/tram. The vehicle boarding area should have a minimum 2000 x 2000mm clear area, or as dictated by individual vehicle type requirements.

• The submission indicates where bus or tram shelters are provided, they should contrast against the surrounding background. The placement of shelters should not compromise the clear pavement width and any glazing on a glass-fronted enclosed shelter should incorporate manifestations on the glass between 850–1000mm and again between 1400–1600mm. There should be a clear view of approaching traffic and sufficient illumination so that timetables can be easily read, located with the mid-point of the sign at a height of 1400mm. There should be no obstacles with perch-style seating can be provided at heights between 460–900mm and arm rests should be incorporated into the seating. Fully enclosed shelters should incorporate an 1800mm turning circle, while open-type shelters should have a minimum depth of 1200mm.

• The submission requests that the Council support the work of the IWA.

• With respect to Green Infrastructure, Open Space, Recreation and Natural Heritage:
  • The submission references Article 30 of the UNCRPD focuses on the rights of people with a disability to participate in cultural, recreational and sporting activities, specifically Article 30 (5) of the CRPD describes how Governments and Service Providers should take appropriate measures to enable persons with disabilities to participate on an equal basis with others in recreational, leisure and sporting activities by encouraging and promoting participation, encouraging the provision of appropriate instruction, training and resources, as well as ensuring access to venues, activities and services.
  • Given the significant number of people with a disability there is an urgency to review the outdoor environment and to strategically plan how adaptations can be incorporated into nature’s design to accommodate people with disabilities and their right to exercise, socialise and enjoy the many benefits that being in the outdoors has to offer.
  • IWA Sport and Sport Ireland have developed an accessibility guide “The Great Outdoors” – this guide aims to provide organisations and land managers with relevant guidance and information relating to accessible design.
  • The guide can also act as a support for future service planning and should be considered by Dún Laoghaire- Rathdown County Council in designing and maintain the many parks and recreational zones of the county.
  • Other items:
    • The submission notes that many Irish Wheelchair Association members are excluded from participating in economic activity and social life through a lack of fully accessible toilet and changing facilities. Changing Places facilities should include both a hoist and a height-adjustable changing bench. Currently there are a limited amount of Changing Places facilities in the area. IWA strongly recommends the allocation of Changing Places facilities at strategic locations in public buildings that are open at weekends and evenings as well as office hours.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5, Chapter 9 and Chapter 10

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission notes the limited outdoor space serving the Dún Laoghaire Educate Together School.
• Submission seeks the development of the green space between Tivoli Terrace South and North for use for school children noting that this would benefit a number of local schools and would help achieve a number of the Strategic County Outcomes.
• Submission requests that the green space in the Harbour beside Irish Lights could also be developed for the benefit of school children.
• Submission requests that Dunedin Park is used for some outdoor activities of the DETS.
• Submission notes the benefits of green space, particularly for children.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0865</td>
<td>Daniel Plewman</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes there are issues surrounding parking, access and air pollution in Sandycove Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes while the cycle lane is a good idea, it is adding to the problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission details suggestions to alleviate the traffic issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0866</td>
<td>Pamela Brennan</td>
<td>Mountainside Preservation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The submission has expressed concern with respect to the protection of the area around Ticknock, Woodside, Blackglen, and in particular, Fitzsimons Wood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The 2016-2022 Plan emphasises the important role of wildlife corridors to the fauna and flora diversity throughout the County and highlights the legislative backing for the protection of wildlife corridors as set out in the Habitats Directive 1992 (92/43/EEC).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The submission notes that the Council has created an excellent Biodiversity Education Programme relating to Fitzsimons Wood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The submission therefore requests that the following be included in the Draft Plan:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) A clear map showing the Wildlife Corridor from Three Rock Mountain to Fitzsimons Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Clarification as to how Deer will be able to cross the widened Blackglen Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Confirmation that the widened Blackglen Road will allow Badgers to cross via a tunnel or culvert.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Confirmation that any planning permissions for development along Blackglen Road will make provision for the proposed Wildlife Corridor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Fitzsimons Wood designated a Natural Heritage Area (NHA).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0867</td>
<td>David Kerr</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes the limited outdoor space serving the Dún Laoghaire Educate Together School.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission seeks the development of the green space between Tivoli Terrace South and North for use for school children noting that this would benefit a number of local schools and would help achieve a number of the Strategic County Outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that the green space in the Harbour beside Irish Lights could also be developed for the benefit of school children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that Dunedin Park is used for some outdoor activities of the DETS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes the benefits of green space, particularly for children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4, Chapter 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0868</td>
<td>Sonya Nunan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do not remove the Ballybetagh right of way and the Dingle right of way, which are of natural and historical significance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Measures to deter walkers should be resisted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• These walkways and green areas were important physical and mental health assets during the pandemic and should be retained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Investigate restoration and preservation of Pucks Castle, Cromlech on Pucks Castle Lane/Murphys lane, St Kevin’s Church Ballyman Road/valley or purchase by council and public access to increase amenity value.
- Preservation of views off Murphys lane and Pucks Castle Lane.
- Investigate the use of cameras on Carric Golligan (Pucks Castle Lane, Quarry road, Murphys lane, Barnaslingan lane) to reduce dumping and cars racing/crashing regularly.
- Investigate the purchase or restoring access to the Old Mill Pond at the Roadstone site in Rathmichael and its potential refurbishment as an amenity.
- Floodlighting of Old Railway Bridge, Cherrywood Road to increase amenity value.
- Investigate water table levels beneath Dun Laoghaire Golf Course and the effect of pumping from the aquifer. Results to be publicly available.
- Insist as part of grant of planning for Dun Laoghaire golf course extension that fire department and forestry services have free access to proposed water storage tank on Pucks castle Lane/ Murphys lane for firefighting.
- Create walking/cycling trail from Bray to Enniskerry along the Dargle River.
- Create publicly accessible map of Rights of Way.
- Planting of trees in general.
- Plant fruit trees and specimen exotic trees on roadsides and in parks to allow for local harvesting, increase the bee population and enhance the beauty of the area.
- Plant a specimen tree in all roundabouts and especially the roundabout at Loughlinstown Hospital to add beauty.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 8, 9, 11
- Submission states that the SNI zoning would “prejudice sustainable residential development at a highly suitable location which is supported both by the national and regional planning policy context and by objectives and policies identified elsewhere within the Draft Development Plan.”
- Submission notes that the lands are infill in nature and appropriate for residential development due to their proximity to Deansgrange village, high capacity and frequent public transport and a range of other facilities and amenities.
- Submission notes that the rezoning at Clonkeen College does not “acknowledge that the land in question is no longer associated with the school, is not required to serve their existing or future needs.”
- Submission details the uses, ownership and intended development proposals for the subject lands. The site context is detailed and includes detail with regard to surrounding facilities and transportation links. It is noted that pre-planning meetings with regard to a SHD application has commenced.
- Submission notes that the existing secondary school would be retained along with its playing pitches and there would be sufficient space to expand the school in the future if required. It is noted that the lands owned by CCB are not required to cater for the existing or future needs of the school.
- Submission considers the lands to be well serviced and accessible in line with the Core Strategy.
- Submission notes that residential use is not permitted in principle under the SNI zoning objective
- Submission queries if the application of the SNI objective for the entire landholding is a drafting error – if so this should be revised back to A.
- Submission requests that the lands owned by the Congregation of Christian Brothers and subject to a current pre-application process for Strategic Housing Development retain the current residential zoning objective.
- Submission notes that a review was undertaken of other schools of similar or greater numbers, which are served by playing facilities of a similar scale to those envisaged for Clonkeen College, including Coláiste Eoin and Coláiste Iosagáin, which are collectively served by a recently constructed new sports pitch.
- Submission notes that CCB is proactively working with ERST and the local authority with regard to the delivery of appropriate playing facilities in various schools throughout the County.
- Submission refers to the Technical Guidance Document 027 (Identification and Suitability Assessment of Sites for Post Primary Schools) which provides worked examples for the calculation of the site area necessary to accommodate a school relative to Clonkeen College and notes the ability to reduce areas in urban areas.
- Submission concludes that the area retained for the school is adequate to accommodate its needs and notes the existence of a significant area of public open space to the north which accommodated space for sports and games.
- Submission notes that the delivery of the pitch for the school is dependent upon Clonkeen Investment DAC progressing with the development of the lands.
- Submission notes that policy support for development at National, Regional and local level at this location having regard to compact growth / infill.
- Submission considers that the application of SNI at this location is excessive and is unnecessary outside of school lands.
- Submission states that “it is incumbent on DLR to support and maximise housing delivery on well served sites such as this, and it is noted that if the SNI were applied to the lands in whole, as is currently proposed, it could prejudice the delivery of a significant quantum of housing at an appropriate location.”

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Map 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0872</td>
<td>Conor O'Toole</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission requests a proposed an extension of the existing ‘off-leash’ area at Seapoint to include:
  (i) The west-pier, either in its entirety, or the lower-level path; together with
  (ii) Access from the car park at the pumping stations at Seapoint, and
  (iii) Relevant signage.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0873</td>
<td>RPS Group</td>
<td>On behalf of Cosgrave Property Group</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- **Revise Tier Designation of lands at Old Connaught to Tier 1 and Tier 2 with associated revisions to Appendix 1:**

  Old Connaught lands are in Tier 2 (zoned land that is serviceable within the lifetime of the Plan). The lands should be designated as both Tier 1 and Tier 2, as the area is currently serviced by sufficient infrastructure to accommodate an initial phase of development on a portion of the zoned lands.

  Welcome the fact that the Draft Plan calls for an Implementation Plan and Phasing Programme to be prepared which would identify a phased pathway for delivery of development in parallel with phased delivery of infrastructure, however, there is scope for a proportion of development to be accommodated at Old Connaught in the immediate term in advance of the infrastructure identified in Appendix 1.

**Water Infrastructure:**

Table 11 of Appendix 1 identifies the Old Connaught-Woodbrook Water Supply Scheme (OCWWSS) as being necessary to facilitate development. In discussions between Atkins Consulting Engineers on behalf of CPG and IW, IW has indicated that CPG could install a temporary reservoir on site as an interim solution to allow an initial phase of development to progress until the Ballyman Reservoirs are delivered, as a 24” trunk main runs directly through CPG zoned lands. On this basis, request that the Water Infrastructure provisions of Table 11 of Appendix 1 be revised to state:

- **Include an interim solution of water supply from 24” main to local temporary onsite reservoir to accommodate initial phase of development, and**
- **Accordingly, revise the zoning tier from Tier 2 to ‘Tier 1/Tier 2 – existing infrastructure can accommodate interim design solution’**

**Transport Infrastructure:**

Table 11 of Appendix 1 of the Plan identifies the transport infrastructure necessary to facilitate development at Old Connaught. For the full development of the area Appendix 1 identifies the infrastructure projects identified in the Bray and Environs Transport Study (2019) (BETS) and the N11 / M11 Junction 4 to Junction 14 Improvement Scheme as necessary infrastructure. Partly, on this basis of these ‘delivery’ requirements of the BETS identified infrastructure, Appendix 1 designates the lands at Old Connaught as Tier 2. This blanket designation of all of the lands in this area as Tier 2 fails to acknowledge that the infrastructural projects listed are identified in BETS as being required to serve the “full build out” of the residentially zoned lands at Old Connaught. It does not acknowledge that initial phases of development at Old Connaught could potentially be accommodated without new physical infrastructural works being necessary. BETS and Appendix 1 note that an implementation plan and phasing programme should be set out which would set out the transport infrastructure and service requirements for each phase of development. Such a programme could reasonably make provision for initial phases of development at Old Connaught to be progressed in advance of the upgrade of Ferndale Rd, the link road from Ferndale Rd to Dublin Rd, and the Cherrywood to Rathmichael Link Rd.

Old Connaught is already well connected to the existing road and transport network in the area most notably via Old Connaught Avenue which provides direct access to the Dublin Road in Bray. The measures to upgrade Ferndale Road and to develop the Cherrywood to Rathmichael Link Road will be implemented to predominantly facilitate the development of Rathmichael. The development of a link road between Ferndale Road and Dublin Road at Shanganagh will facilitate the development of Old Connaught but only in the context of adding to connectivity across the N11 that is already provided along Old Connaught Avenue. An initial phase of development could be further facilitated, if necessary, by the development of public bus services via Old Connaught Avenue, which is designated as a bus corridor route in the existing and Draft Plan.

Initial phase of development equating to approx. 500 units. This scale of development could be advanced without recourse to the need for any general improvements to transport access to Old Connaught. N11/M11 Junction 4 to Junction 14 Improvement Scheme also listed in Table 11. Table 11 notes that the scheme includes the upgrade of the Wilford roundabout, located immediately to the east of the Old Connaught lands. In this regard, while it is acknowledged that the N11/M11 Junction 4 to Junction 14 Improvement Scheme will have benefits for development at Old Connaught, however the BETS does not identify that Scheme as being necessary for the full build out of the lands at Old Connaught. BETS was prepared in 2019 with the input and agreement of Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Council.
Request that the Transport Infrastructure provisions of Table 11 of Appendix 1 be revised to:

- Acknowledge that the transport infrastructure identified in BETS for Old Connaught is for the ‘full build out’ of Old Connaught and that initial phases of development could be accommodated within the existing transport network (albeit with increased bus services that will only be delivered on foot of / following permitted development),
- The extent of the initial phases to be accommodated within the existing transport network shall be be determined on foot of the implementation plan and phasing programme to be prepared and incorporated as part of the Local Area Plan,
- Remove the references to the N11/M11 Junction 4 to Junction 14 Improvement Scheme, and
- Accordingly, revise the zoning tier from Tier 2 to ‘Tier 1/Tier 2 – existing local transport network along with addition bus services will facilitate initial phases of development at Old Connaught.”

Amendment to the introduction to section 4.7 of Appendix 1 to state:

“The Old Connaught and Rathmichael are not currently sufficiently serviced for the full build out of all residential zoned lands. The full build out of these areas is contingent upon the timely delivery of supporting infrastructure. An initial phase of development however can be accommodated at Old Connaught based on existing infrastructure, interim design solutions and bus service provision to be delivered in parallel with development delivery. Implementation plans incorporating phasing programmes are to be prepared as part of the Local Area Plan making provision for an initial phase of development on the basis of existing infrastructure and future phases of development to be linked with the commensurate delivery of supporting infrastructure.”

Amendment to Table 2.8 of Draft County Development Plan be amended from ‘Tier 2’ to ‘Tier 1 and Tier 2’.

Specific Local Objectives

- Amendment of proposed SLO 107

SLO107 states:

“To co-operate with the National Transport Authority, Transport Infrastructure Ireland and Wicklow County Council in the establishment of a combined road across the County Brook Valley to provide connections between the proposed new development areas of Old Connaught and Fassaroe (Wicklow County). The Corridor and Route Selection Process outlined by Policy T24 should be followed”

More appropriate that SLO 107 make a broader provision for a combined ‘road and public transport bridge’ in line with the provisions of the 2019 Bray and Environs Transport Study (BETS). The BETS includes an objective for the provision of a “new Busway and Bridge over County Brook and Ballyman Glen”. The provision of a bus service within the lifetime of the plan is more likely to be achieved than Luas. The provision of a bus service on this combined bridge would not preclude its future conversion to a Luas crossing should Luas services be delivered to the area in the future.

Request that SLO 107 be modified as follows:

“To co-operate with the National Transport Authority, Transport Infrastructure Ireland and Wicklow County Council in the establishment of a combined road and public transport bridge across the County Brook Valley to provide connections between the proposed new development areas of Old Connaught and Fassaroe (Wicklow County). The Corridor and Route Selection Process outlined by Policy T24 should be followed”

- Amendment to provisions of section 4.3.1 (Provisions under Policy PHP20):

The Plan sets out 4 No. requirements for proposals to support the achievement of PHP20. Two of these state:

1. “On sites abutting low density residential development (less than 35 units per hectare) and where the proposed development is four storeys or more, an obvious buffer must exist from the rear garden boundary lines of existing private dwellings.
2. Where a proposal involves building heights of four storeys or more, a step back design should be considered so as to respect the existing built heights.” These requirements are very prescriptive and not always necessary/appropriate. Good design and layout will as a matter of course consider issues such as separation distances and protection of existing residential amenities; appropriate transitioning scales and formats of development; impact on the streetscape / landscape etc. Protecting existing amenities however and appropriate design responses (layout, site positioning, building height, form and configuration etc) must be considered on a site-specific basis. Examples given in relation to rear garden buffers and setbacks for buildings over 4 storeys.

Therefore, the submission requests the following:

“Omit the final two bullet point requirements under Policy Objective PHP20”

- Omit or revise parts of section 12.3.2.4 (Timing of delivery of childcare facilities)

While an overall development subject of an application may generate a demand for a childcare facility, the timing of the emerging demand will depend on dwelling type (house versus apartment) and size (1, 2, 3, 3+ family units).
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bedrooms), such that a new development may not be occupied by family households with children for some time. Linked to this is the phasing of the delivery of this mix. The requirement to secure an operator of a facility at an early stage and to submit details of the intended operation of the facility relative to the completion and occupation of dwellings / commercial buildings in practice is likely to be unworkable in many scenarios. The requirement to ‘complete’ the childcare facilities prior to any residents moving in will likely result in vacant developments on site for some time. Upfront costs will need to be borne by developers, often with low prospects of securing an operator until such time as a critical mass of population is resident on site.

So, while the requirement of section 12.3.2.4 will require the childcare facility itself to be physically present prior to any houses being occupied, the likely timing of securing an operator and actually delivery childcare services will not likely occur more quickly. It should be noted that constructing a childcare facility upfront prior to securing an operator can also on occasion reduce interest from childcare operators who often wish to input to the design and layout of the facility themselves. This policy is contrary to the spirit and sense of the Childcare Facilities Guidelines for Planning Authorities. These guidelines set out a requirement for one childcare facility providing 20 childcare spaces for each 75 dwellings. In this regard, there is some recognition within the Guidelines that a development should at least be of the order of 75 dwellings to generate a reasonable childcare demand sufficient to justify a childcare facility. Recommend the following amendment:

“Omit the second and third paragraphs of section 12.3.2.4, and replace with a policy requiring that applications for development comprising childcare facilities should present proposals for the timing of delivery of the childcare facility relative to the delivery of housing having regard to the total number, mix and size of units proposed, the associated likely population profile, the phasing proposed for the dwelling delivery, the location of the site and the existing childcare facilities within the area.”

Or, in the alternative:

“Revise paragraph 3 of section 12.3.2.4 to require that childcare facilities be completed prior to occupation of more than 100 dwellings.”

- Omit Table 12.1 (Apartment Mix Requirements)

The Draft County Development Plan states that the housing mix proposed is informed by the analysis undertaken in the Housing Strategy and the Interim HDNA. There does not appear to be an evidenced calculation or rationale however for why the 3+ bedroom unit provision in an apartment development above 50+ units should be set at a minimum specifically of 40%. Furthermore, we have not identified a rationale or evidence as to why an apartment element within a mixed house and apartment scheme should also deliver a minimum of 40% 3+ bedroom units. This policy makes no provision for the wider mix that is being achieved within the overall development with both houses and apartments combined. We cannot identify the calculation or rationale within Appendix 2 as to why specifically the 40% 3+ bedroom unit requirement should be applied to all mixed scheme while some may already have a large proportion of the overall development comprising of 3 bed and 3+ bed units. We respectfully question this determination of the Draft Housing Strategy and Interim HDNA on two bases:

- Does the Interim HDNA presented in Appendix 2 comprise of a suitably ‘evidence-based Housing Need and Demand Assessment (HDNA), that has been agreed on an area, county, city or metropolitan area basis and incorporated into the relevant development plan(s)”

- Does the provision within the second part of SPPR that a statutory development plan may specify a mix for apartment or other housing developments allow such a specified mix to deviate from the high level mix parameters specified in the first part of SPPR1.

- Amendment to section 12.3.4.2 (Extent of glazing to habitable rooms):

“...glazing to all habitable rooms should not be less than 20% of the floor area of any habitable room”. This minimum threshold for glazing will not be achievable and/or will be undesirable in certain developments for design considerations other than lighting availability. The extent, form and configuration of glazing in a building needs to be considered in parallel with a variety of other design and construction considerations, eg. May affect passive solar gain and fire cert requirements. A more appropriate policy provision would be to require that daylight provisions to habitable rooms should have regard to best practice guidance. It is noted that section 12.3.4.2 already makes such provision. In this regard we request that the second paragraph of section 12.3.4.2 be simply revised to omit the specified requirement for the extent of glazing. The revised paragraph would state as follows: “All habitable rooms within new residential units shall have access to appropriate levels of natural / daylight and ventilation. In this regard, development shall be guided by the principles of Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight, A guide to good practice (Building Research Establishment Report, 2011) and/or any updated guidance. A daylight analysis will be required for all proposed developments of 50+ units. The impact of any development on existing habitable rooms should also be considered.”
Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 4, Chapter 12, Chapter 14 (Map 14), Appendix 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0874</td>
<td>Suzanne McClure</td>
<td>Ted Living Ltd.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission notes that the inclusion of Dunleary House, Old Dunleary Road (RPS No. 2131) onto the RPS is unwarranted and is not supported by any professional assessment.
- Submission includes professional assessments demonstrating that the building does not merit inclusion on the RPS. It is noted that the building is of modest local interest and does not meet the technical criteria necessary for inclusion on the RPS.
- Submission states that the RPS should not be used as a mechanism to inhibit potential development. Submission considers that the motivation to include the building to the RPS is to prevent its demolition and the redevelopment of the wider site.
- Submission includes a site description and sets the context of the site. Imagery of the building is included.
- Submission states that there is no known architect associated with the building and that it may have been in use as a residence and/or offices for the associated company on the industrial site.
- Submission notes that overall site, including the existing building, is proposed for re-development to provide a residential development with ancillary retail floorspace. A detailed, relevant planning history is set out for the site and includes references to the value of the building in various reports.
- Submission sets out the development plan context prior to 2016 citing a motion and the Chief Executive’s responses during the 2010-2016 plan making process.
- Submission sets out the current zoning objective (NC), SLO 153 and commentary with regard to the redevelopment of the site in the DLUFP.
- Submission considers that SLO 153 was adopted as the RPS was not the appropriate mechanism to protect the building.
- Submission sets out the zoning objectives relative to the site as set out in the Draft Plan and Interim DLUFP noting additional text under SLO 37. The submission cites the motion to add the structure to the RPS and CE response to same.
- Submission notes that the addition onto the RPS did not arise from a Ministers recommendation.
- Submission contains 2no. assessments from David Slattery Conservation Architects Ltd (Appendix A) and Bronagh Lanigan, Architectural Heritage Consultant (Appendix B). Both professional Conservation experts assessed the building with regard to the appropriate technical criteria as set out in the Planning Act and conclude that it does not meet the required standard for addition to the RPS.
- Submission notes implications to the property owner with regard to adding a structure to the RPS.
- Submission states that there is no evidence of reasonable research and the proposed addition is contrary to the professional opinion of the Council’s Conservation Officer and no rationale for the addition to the RPS has been provided as per the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines, Section 2.6.2.

Summary of Appendix A:

- Appendix includes an assessment of cultural significance with regard to Ministerial Guidance on Architectural Heritage.
- Appendix notes that criteria set out within the Guidelines have been ignored with regard to the addition of the structure onto the RPS.
- It is noted that the building has previously been assessed by dlr Conservation Department whom considered it unworthy of Protected Structure status.
- Appendix sets out the criteria for adding a structure to the RPS under the Planning and Development Act and assesses the building with regard to same.
- Appendix notes that the building cannot be considered to have architectural significance, it is not attributed to an architect and has the appearance of something created from a pattern book. Modifications and extensions to the building have been carried out resulting in the building having been significantly altered.
- It is noted that there is nothing crafted or hand made in this building and the building cannot be considered to represent any outstanding design features.
The building does not meet the architectural criteria set out in the guidelines for inclusion onto the RPS.

Appendix notes the historical significance criteria set out in the guidelines and does not consider that the building meets any of these and cannot therefore be considered to be of any particular historic significance.

It is noted that the building was associated with an industrial coal merchants site but was a later addition to this site – it is noted that development of the former Gas Works site demolished almost all surviving buildings associated with the Coal Merchants and altered the industrial character of the area and reduced the historic significance of the site. It is noted that the subject building is not industrial in character and there is no surviving evidence which illustrates the relationship that the building formerly had with the former Coal Merchants.

Appendix sets out the artistic, cultural, social, scientific and technical significance criteria from the Guidelines and states that the building cannot be considered to be of any particular significance under any of these criteria.

Appendix states “it is not considered that the building contributes in any meaningful way to the character and significance of the streetscape or surrounding area” and that “the retention and reuse of the subject building will limit the quality of the streetscape and setting in any new development.”

Summary of Appendix B:

Appendix B “examines the structure and setting, identifies original fabric and features of significance, identifies changes made to the structure since its construction in c.1880 and its history.”

Appendix B states that “inventory and assessment in this report adheres to recording standards set by the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH) and has regard for the publication Architectural Heritage Protection, Guidelines.”

Appendix provides a detailed description of the building noting that the structure has lost many original features. The site is also described providing details of boundaries and access.

A photographic inventory of the building has been included which shows the exterior, including boundaries and the interior of the building.

Appendix sets out a detailed site history and its development noting that the site was owned by business man William Wallace (1843-1923) with the subject house being built c.1880.

Historical O.S. maps are included dating from 1866/1870 with the subject building first appearing on the 1908/1910 map.

Historical aerial imagery has been included to show the site from 1947.

Appendix B sets out an assessment of significance having regard to architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, social and technical interest. It is noted that the building is of limited architectural interest, is of local historical interest only and is not of any other special interest.

Appendix B sets out the NIAH rating for buildings and considers that this building is of local significance and therefore would not merit inclusion on the RPS.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Appendix 4

| DLR Submission No: B0875 | Person: Manahan Planners | Organisation: On behalf of Mia and Jeff Stokes | Map Nos: 9 |

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission refers to lands located to the rear of the Mill House, which is located to the west of the Enniskerry Road in Kiltiernan. The location, context, family requirements and planning history of the site is set out.

- The existing property comprises a Protected Structure (An Muillean; RPS No.1813) and is zoned Objective ‘A’. A large green area to the west which comprises part of the landholding is zoned Objective ‘G’. The Kiltiernan Local Area Plan boundary runs directly through the centre of the landholding.

- Requests the re-zoning of the Objective ‘G’ zoned lands to Objective ‘A’ and also the extension of the Kiltiernan LAP boundary to include the entirety of the landholding, to take account of land ownership, land topography and access to mains drainage.

- States that the site is located within a development hub, which is part of the ambition of the Local Authority to create a settlement at Kiltiernan, and close to a range of services and amenities including a public transport terminus. Suggests the entire site is urban in nature and location and this should be reflected with an appropriate residential zoning and contained within the Kiltiernan LAP boundary.
Notes that the site is surrounded by a series of houses which have a history of permissions being granted in their gardens for downsizing purposes.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0876</td>
<td>Paula O’ Riordan</td>
<td>ArtNetdlr (Artist Network dun Laoghaire Rathdown)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- ArtNetdlr is a network of practising artists in the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown area representing over 260 artists of different disciplines.
- In light of recent events, fresh thinking is required for cities in order to improve resilience and to create a people centric creative city. The Development Plan must lay the foundations and invest in the arts for this to happen.
- Dún Laoghaire Harbour and the coastal area have provided breathing space during the Covid-19 pandemic, however, public life and public realm demands more breathing space in the wake of the pandemic and more connected public space and public art.
- The key planning opportunity for the Draft County Development Plan is to focus on the opportunity to regenerate Dún Laoghaire and integrate the town centre with a bold imaginative vision for investment in public art and use of the harbour.
- There is a need to integrate IADT and its creative potential with the Dún Laoghaire town centre through investment in infrastructure art hubs and workshops to provide a public profile and sense of place.
- Reliance on an out of date Interim Urban Framework Plan for Dun Laoghaire for a second development plan period and not progressing the Local Area Plan is short sighted.
- There is a need to engage in a more meaningful manner with Dún Laoghaire Harbour and postponement of decisions until two studies are produced undermines public participation in the development plan process and vision for the harbour. Overall principles for a vision to guide a planning framework for the harbour need to be produced as part of the development plan. Such a vision needs to fully embrace an arts strategy and policy.
- There is a sense from the Draft Development Plan that the opportunity presented by Dun Laoghaire Harbour and the attraction of the creative class to Dún Laoghaire to establish a vibrant creative community has been missed.
- The submitter has uploaded two proposals made in relation to arts infrastructure in the area, one a proposal entitled the Bath House Arts Centre and the other a proposal regarding a creative hub at the Carnegie library building and notes that these examples set out a compelling case for an arts strategy as the foundation of the urban regeneration of Dún Laoghaire.
- The submission also notes that there may be more opportunities at the Old Fire Station, The Harbour and IADT, which need to be investigated and explored.
- Specific changes to the Development Plan are requested as follows:
  **Development Plan Vision (Chapter 1, page 2)**
  - Request that the existing Development Plan Vision is replaced with the following:
    The Vision for Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown is to embrace arts and culture and the unique coastal location of Dún Laoghaire Harbour as a signifier of regeneration amenity and artistic expression and identity for the county. The development plan will ensure inclusiveness fairness transparency and public participation in all aspects of policy and implementation.
    Central to this vision is healthy placemaking, encouraging a resilient creative economy and delivering the development plan objectives in a manner that enhances our environment for future generations.
  **Table 1.4 – Five Strategic County Outcomes (Chapter 1, page 17)**
  - Request that a sixth strategic outcome is included as follows:
    The integration of Dún Laoghaire Harbour and Town Centre by a bold and imaginative plan and investment strategy for the arts and water based recreation and amenity sustaining a creative hub for Dún laoghaire is an overarching strategic outcome.
  **Core Strategy (Chapter 2)**
  - Policy Objective CS10– Local Area Plans should be amended as follows:
    To prioritise the preparation of the Dun Laoghaire LAP to promote the regeneration and integration of Dún Laoghaire harbour and town centre, sustaining a resilient creative collaborative connected vibrant
town centre and harbour based on a bold imaginative public arts initiative as the foundation of urban regeneration policy and objectives.

Policy Objective CS14 - Vacancy and Regeneration (Chapter 2)
- Request that Policy Objective CS14 is replaced with the following:
  It is a Policy Objective to address issues of vacancy of buildings and underutilisation of lands by facilitating and promoting and subsidising their use for art initiatives addressing any impediments to such vibrant art use.

Policy Objective CA17: Urban Greening (Chapter 3)
- Request Policy Objective CA17: Urban Greening is amended as follows:
  It is a Policy Objective to promote urban greening and invest significant public funds in a coherent town centre strategy for Dun Laoghaire Town Centre as a pilot case study linked to art policy. etc

Table 4.1 and Map 3 – Old Fire Station (Chapter 4)
- Request that Table 4.1 and Map 3 is amended as follows:
  Omit objective ED from map 3 at the old Fire Station site and include instead an objective on map 3, AS for art studios as follows:
  The Old Fire Station site lends itself more suitably to Art and cultural uses including artist studio spaces, exhibition space and a sculpture garden and a food hall which would provide much needed artist studio space and would regenerate the vibrancy of the area.

Interim Dún Laoghaire Urban Framework Plan (Appendix 8)
- Amend Urban Framework Plan map as follows:
  The potential redevelopment area to the west of the west pier which is identified for redevelopment should seek to explore the opportunity for investment in a major arts based initiative, public park and water based recreation and amenity uses. There is significant demand for public investment in multipurpose arts facilities, studios and exhibition and performance space for all of the performance arts in Dun Laoghaire.

Port Access/ Harbour Regeneration (Chapter 5)
- Section 5.8 Ports and 5.8.1 Policy Objective T32 requiring improved access to the port should be omitted as the Ferry has stopped and instead a policy statement for Dún Laoghaire Harbour should be substituted as follows:
  A major public arts initiative for Dun Laoghaire harbour should be promoted as a means of sustaining resilience and creativity, urban regeneration and integrating the harbour with the town centre.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, Appendix 8

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Welcomes the recognition that the CDP will play an important role in influencing a reduction in Green House Gas (GHG) Emissions by guiding the sustainable growth of the County.
- In reviewing Chapter 3 - Climate Action and associated Wind Energy Strategy (WES), acknowledge the overall consistency and alignment with the objectives of the NPF, RSES and national guidelines.
- The importance of existing infrastructure and the associated Electricity Generation, Storage, Transmission and Distribution operations are strategic and national in nature (supports retention of policy objective EI19) and support the retention of support for route corridor protection in section 10.5, where it states; “…where strategic route corridors have been identified, to support the statutory providers of national grid infrastructure by safeguarding such strategic corridors from encroachment by other developments that might compromise the provision of energy networks.”
- The final Plan should maintain the planning policies (CA11 and the Wind energy Strategy) which protect the county’s future capacity for the development of energy infrastructure whilst encouraging the sustainable development of renewable energy resources, including energy storage systems and landside developments for offshore wind.
- DLR has significant existing grid network presenting the opportunity to maximise energy generation by solar means.
- Welcomes the Solar Energy Development Management Guidance. These could be strengthened with the inclusion of clear guidance on the duration of permission with a lifetime up to a maximum of 40 years which reflects the operational life and financial modelling for current solar technologies.
In addition to the support included in Chapter 3 for seasonal storage, encourages the inclusion of a specific policy as follows:

“It is Council policy to promote the use of efficient energy storage systems and infrastructure that supports energy efficiency and reusable energy system optimization, in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development.”

Policy to Promote encourage and facilitating the use of sustainable modes and patterns of transport, including electric vehicles, with appropriate Parking Standards that will set minimum levels of parking provision for EVs is welcomed. ESB, with the support of the Government’s Climate Action Fund, is rolling out high power charging hubs across the country. Notes that the requirement for 20% of car parking spaces to have provision for electric vehicle charging infrastructure is consistent with the EU Energy Performance of Buildings Directive.

Supports the approach to telecommunications infrastructure. Indicates that they will need additional masts to facilitate the he roll-out of ESB’s ‘Smart Metering’ project. The successful delivery of ‘smart metering’ is a central component of Ireland’s plan to combat climate change through the reduction of unnecessary energy usage.

Supporting National and Regional policies regarding the intensification and potential for enterprise and job creation at key locations such as Sandyford and Carrickmines which have significant locational advantages and benefit from substantial infrastructural investment.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 3, Chapter 10 and Chapter 12

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Request that the height permitted for Whelan House & Accenture House at South County Business Park is increased from 3 to 3-5 storeys which requires an amendment to Map 3- Buildings Heights of Appendix 17 ‘Sandyford Urban Framework Plan’.
- Outlines national, regional and local plans and policies to support this request.
- Refers to Specific Planning Policy Requirement 1, notes that the site has good transport accessibility and therefore the plan should identify it as somewhere increase heights are appropriate.
- Site is located within the built up existing footprint of Dublin and therefore the increase in permitted height would support the consolidation of development in within the existing urban footprint whilst providing significant employment opportunities.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 17

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission seeks the development of the green space between Tivoli Terrace South and North for use for school children.
- Submission requests that the green space in the Harbour beside Irish Lights could also be developed for school children.
- Submission requests that Dunedin Park is used for Dún Laoghaire Educate Together School.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4, Chapter 9

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission seeks the development of the green space between Tivoli Terrace South and North for use for school children.
- Submission requests that the green space in the Harbour beside Irish Lights could also be developed for school children.
- Submission requests that Dunedin Park is used for Dún Laoghaire Educate Together School.
• Submission requests the re-zoning of an identified creche site at Cualanor from Objective ‘F’ to Objective ‘A’, in order to reflect the approved use of the site and ensure the future development of a creche would be in line with the CDP.

• An overview of the planning history pertaining to the Cualanor development is set out. Notes the creche that forms part of the parent permission (Ref. D08A/1379 / ABP Ref. PL06D.235181) has not yet been constructed but that the permission is still live. The subject site was used temporarily as a site compound and staff parking purposes and is currently unused.

• The planning history pertaining to the Honeypark development is also set out (Ref. D06A/0927 / ABP Ref. PL06D.225947) and it is noted that the permitted creche which comprises part of the Honeypark scheme has also not yet been constructed. Submits that the sites are fundamentally similar, with both granted planning permission for the development of a creche in the context of a wider residential development and both creche sites positioned within the context of the main central open space serving each site.

• Submission highlights that the permitted creche site in the Cualanor development has been included in the open space zoning, Objective ‘F’ and submits this comprises an inadvertent error which does not reflect its planning status. Requests the zoning objective proposals of the Draft CDP be amended to accurately reflect the planning history and current planning status of the site to which there is an extant planning permission attached.

• Suggests that zoning the site Objective ‘F’ was an inadvertent oversight in the zoning objectives proposed in the 2016 CDP which was carried forward to the current Draft CDP. Suggests this assumption is supported by comparing it with the approach adopted at the Honeypark development where the Honeypark creche site was zoned Objective ‘A’ under the 2016 CDP and continues to be proposed as such under the Draft CDP.

• Highlights the developer remains committed to the provision of a creche at the site, and while the current permission is due to expire in August 2022, a new permission will need to be secured at the site. Notes that while the provision of childcare services is open for consideration in Objective ‘F’ zoned lands, there is a condition that the services are provided in existing premises. Highlights that the development of the creche at this site has not been carried out yet, and therefore the works to construct this premises could be considered contradictory to the zoning designation. In comparison, childcare services are permitted in principle under Objective ‘A’ zoned lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 3

DLR Submission No: B0881 Person: Mark Doggett Organisation: N/A Map Nos: 6

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Concerned with the use of Stillorgan reservoir for a public park. Quality of life will be negatively impacted upon due to overlooking of house and garden.
• Should such a development proceed it should be at street level with appropriate boundary.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14

DLR Submission No: B0882 Person: Tony Manahan Organisation: Manahan Planners on behalf of Maxbelle Junction Ltd and Pathesa Ltd Map Nos: 6

Summary of Submission and Observation:
Submission is on behalf of on behalf of Maxbelle Junction Ltd and Pathesa Ltd as the owners of the Beacon South Quarter
• Beacon South Quarter (BSQ) is a mixed use complex with a supermarket, large floor plate furniture shops etc with residential use over.
• Sandyford Business District is not listed in the retail hierarchy of the county and is therefore considered by the plan to be operating at the neighbourhood centre level only. This is inconsistent with the existence of a significant quantity of retail development and constrains the expansion of the existing retail units in BSQ.
• Request that Sandyford Mixed use district be designated at an intermediate level above level 4 neighbourhood and below level 3 district and that table 7.1 be amended accordingly.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>B0883</th>
<th>Person: James Devlin</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Request the deletion of the following text from Section 8.5.6 George’s Place: “The first phase of the redevelopment of the former Council Depot at George’s Place to provide new social housing and expand the residential population of the Town has been completed. The ongoing redevelopment of the site offers an opportunity to provide a mixed-use redevelopment that includes educational uses and the Plan supports the adaptation and reuse of the existing buildings on the site including the sensitive redevelopment of the Protected Structures. The first phase of the development has anticipated a new pedestrian/cycle link between George’s Place and Crofton Road and the completion of this route across Stable Lane to further strengthen the connectivity between Georges Street and the Waterfront is a strategic objective of this Plan. Any redevelopment will include upgrades to the public realm along Georges Place to include traffic calming, extensive tree planting, pollinator planting schemes, creative water connectivity attenuation, wider paving, improved surfaces and new public lighting to create a stronger sense of place.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Most of the houses on Crofton Terrace, Connaught Place and Stable Lane have no private off-street parking. Spaces are often full, requiring people to park some distance from their home. The proposed redevelopment of Stable Lane will remove all parking on the lane. This will very significantly reduce the parking provision and convenience available to the local residents. The submitter attaches photos of parking on Stable Lane in support of this position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of necessity / public benefit / waste of public money. Anyone wishing to access the seafront need only walk 25 metres further to the top of Kelly’s Avenue where there is a well-maintained, tree-lined footpath available. There are numerous other routes available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stable Lane has not been legally taken in charge. The submitter attaches correspondence from DLRCC in this regard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The lane is private property in the ownership of some of the residents of Crofton Terrace, Connaught Place and Stable Lane. The submitter attaches old deeds in support of this position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No public right of way exists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ownership of the wall in which the gate is inserted has not been established.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is an injunction on the DLRC, preventing it from using the gate between Stable Lane and George’s Place as anything other than an emergency exit, obtained in 1993 by Edmund Kenny of 7 Crofton Terrace.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The connection will damage residential amenity and privacy. Several houses have no buffer space between the now-private lane and their walls/windows/doors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>B0884</th>
<th>Person: Michael Gilmartin</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Excessive use of traffic light and traffic light on roundabouts. Roundabouts are more effective when dealing with car movements and more attractive when they are landscaped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Request that the use of roundabouts in preference to traffic lights is incorporated into the Plan for future developments and where they can be accommodated into existing junctions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>B0885</th>
<th>Person: Emma Cahill</th>
<th>Organisation: APW 2650193</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cycle network – request that is continued to be expanded for all abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- S2S seems to have disappeared from the plan. Please reinstate the policy for a coastal greenway.
- Booterstown Avenue/Cross Avenue - please help to slow the traffic down.
- In residential developments make bike parking more accessible than car parking to encourage more bike use.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Architects Declare, as part of Construction Declares, is an international movement to address the global Climate and Biodiversity Emergency, in the aftermath of the IPCC’s 2018 report.
- The declaration recognises the huge impact the built environment and construction sector have on the planet, and the urgent need for change that is now required across the construction industry.
- Our proposal to integrate the ‘Green Factor Approach’ into urban planning policy should be included in the Plan.
- The “Green Factor Method” or “Biotope Area Factor” (BAF) is an ecological planning tool which provides an opportunity to improve planning practices as it provides a means to assess and develop ways to build an ecological, climate-resistant and dense city in which the social values of urban greenery are a priority. The goal of the Green Factor Approach or BAF is to mitigate the effects of construction by maintaining sufficient levels of green infrastructure while enhancing the quality of the remaining vegetation.
- Successful in cities such as Berlin, Seattle, Toronto, Malmö, Southampton and Helsinki.
- In the green factor method, the relevant planning authority can set a green factor target level for the site. The method provides for a number of green elements relating to planted and maintained vegetation, various run-off water solutions, green roofs, permeable surfaces, etc. The green factor is calculated as the ratio of the scored green area to the total site area:
  \[
  \text{Biotope Area Factor (Green Factor Method)} = \frac{\text{Scored Green Area}}{\text{Area of Site}}.
  \]
- All green factor methods use the same calculation principle, however, the green elements, surfaces and structures included in the methods vary significantly, as do their weighted scores. The objectives, practices and principles of the various green factor methods are developed to take into account the specific climate conditions, geographic characteristics, local planning conditions, and the functional values and perceptions of what constitutes an urban environment.
- Discussed case studies in Berlin, Seattle, Toronto, Malmo, Southampton, London and a methodology study in Helsinki.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 3

Summary of Submission and Observation:
Submission concerned that certain policies in the Draft Plan may make urban regeneration more difficult. Concerns are listed.

Residential Development Standards.
- Amend Section 4.3.1.1 (accompanying text to ‘Policy Objective PHP18: Residential Density’) to include reference to the provisions of the ‘Design Standards for New Apartments’ Guidelines 2020 and the ‘Urban Development & Building Height’ Guidelines 2018 as they relate to higher density apartment development;
- Remove reference at Section 12.3.5.1 of the draft Plan which defines ‘DLR as a County is classified as a suburban or intermediate location’ to align with the provisions of the ‘Design Standards for New Apartments’ Guidelines 2020;

Housing Mix
- Requirement in relation to 3+ beds in in conflict with SPPR1 of the Apartment Guidelines
- Amend ‘Table 12.1 Apartment Mix Requirements’ to align with the provisions of Specific Planning Policy Requirement 1 of the ‘Design Standards for New Apartments’ Guidelines 2020 in terms of Apartment Unit Mix;
- Rationale for using Interim HNDA to justify a departure from section 28 Guidelines on mix is inappropriate and should be omitted. HNDA does not provide evidence base.

### Dual Aspect
- The requirement for 50% of all apartment units to be dual aspect set out in section 12.3.5.1 of the draft Plan should be omitted, with SPPR 4 of the Guidelines noted as the relevant standard.

### Open Space
- Objects to the Public Open Space requirement of 15% for residential development in existing built-up areas as set out at Section 12.8.3.1. This requirement is clearly in conflict with Section 28 Guidelines on ‘Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas’ which recommends a minimum of 10% on infill/brownfield sites.

### Building Height Strategy
- Omit additional performance based criteria so as to reflect ‘Urban Development & Building Height’ Guidelines 2018’;

### Build to Rent
- Submission requests that BTR should be removed as a separate use class or else incorporated as permitted in principle in all land use zoning objectives.
- Objects to inclusion of standards set out in section 12.3.5 in relation to BTR.

### Car parking
- Requirement for on site parking for BTR is contrary to SPPR 8 of Apartment Guidelines.

### Roof Gardens
- Considers that the size of roof garden which can contribute to communal open space should not be limited to 30%

Submission concludes by stating that all Development Management policies in the Plan should align with National Policy Guidelines.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Chapters 4, 12, 13, Appendix 5

### DLR Submission No: B0888
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Steph Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Nos:</td>
<td>9,13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Do not remove the Ballybetagh right of way and the Dingle right of way, which are of natural and historical significance.
- Measures to deter walkers should be resisted.
- These walkways and green areas were important physical and mental health assets during the pandemic and should be retained.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Appendix 12

### DLR Submission No: B0889
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>John Spain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Ronan Group Real Estate (RGRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Nos:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission provides commentary on RGRE and also provides commentary on various aspects of the Draft Plan.

**Core Strategy**
- Submission welcomes application for 25% headroom but notes that housing targets set in 2016 plan have not been met and that this portion has been brought forward into the next Plan, rather than remaining with additional provision added.

**Central and Accessible Location classification**
- Support the omission of classification of the County as a suburban or intermediate location.

**Build to Rent Development**
- Submission considers that Build to Rent is not a separate use from residential.
• Plan should comply with SPPR8 of Apartment Guidelines and omit additional standards in relation to
dual aspect, separation distances, unit storage and car parking. Requests amendments to section
12.3.5 and 4.3.2.3
• Built to rent is essential in delivering viable development.

Density.
Revise Policy objective PHP18 as follows (Additions underlined)
_It is a Policy Objective to:_ - _increase housing supply and promote compact urban growth through the_
consolidation and re-intensification of infill/brownfield sites having regard to proximity and accessibility_
considerations, and development management criteria set out in the ‘Design Standards for New Apartments’
(December 2020) and the ‘Urban Development & Building Height Guidelines’ (2018). - _Encourage higher_
residential densities provided that proposals provide for high quality design and ensure a balance between
the protection of existing residential amenities and the established character of the surrounding area, with
the need to provide for high quality sustainable residential development._

Housing Mix
• Considers that data analysis in the HNDA does not support housing mix requirements particularly those
around 3+ bed and seeks removal of table 12.1 of the Draft Plan.
• Unclear if housing mix applies to Build to Rent

HNDA
• Overview provided of HNDA
• To restrict development on the basis of unit mix would restrict private rental market
• By limiting Built to rent and placing significant emphasis on larger units, Planning Authority are not
providing for those without the ability to access a mortgage or persons in smaller households.
• HNDA should balance existing stock
• HNDA is broad analysis which does not take account of location, context or mix of tenures and overall
quality of those schemes
• Mix of developments should be assessed on a case by case basis.

Dual Aspect
• Requirement for 50% of apartments to be dual aspect should be omitted

Building Height
• Building heights Strategy is not consistent with Section 28 Guidelines as it undermines an applicants
ability to obtain permission under SPPR 3. Request omission of policy approach set out in BHS.
• Height limitations currently conflict with SPPR1.
• Omit additional criteria

Open space
• Seek retention of 10% open space in existing built up area as set out in current Plan.

Flood Risk
• Policies in to relation drainage and attenuation along with policies on flood risk require further
consideration along with application of the DM flood risk Justification Test

Car parking
• Request that the parking zones are reviewed and that the parking standards are indicated as maximum
for residential development.
• Requests amendment to section 12.4.5 to address parking requirements for Build to Rent as set out in
the Apartment guidelines which allow for significantly reduced car parking

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapters 2, 4, 12, Appendices 2, 5, 16

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Aware that there are National and Regional Planning policies that underpin and guide the policies of
the new Plan. Concerned that this makes the provision of a Development Plan specific to DLR very
difficult to achieve.
• Drive to build new housing but continuous development within sites of houses with large gardens will
result in a huge change to the character of the town and its environs. As Dalkey is recognised as a
Heritage Town it is important to proceed with caution when permitting new development as there is a
danger that excessive development could lead to the loss of the unique setting of Dalkey which has led to its designation.

- Concerned that this intensive development would result in the loss of many green spaces throughout Dalkey with a huge loss in ecosystems and biodiversity.
- DLR should acknowledge the high amenity value of Dalkey’s numerous parks (Killiney Hill Park, Sorento Park, Dillon’s Park, Hyde Park and also Bullock Harbour, Hawk Cliff and White Rock beach, Dalkey Island) and should put in place appropriate policies and protocols to provide for their care and maintenance, especially due to their popularity since Covid-19.
- Coliemore Harbour - harbour walls and slipway should be regularly checked for damage in light of both its heritage and amenity value.
- Some lowering of density rates should be considered for Dalkey if large developments are seeking planning permission due to traffic congestion the developments create.
- Welcome the continued inclusion of Dalkey and its special status as a Heritage Town in the Plan.
- Newly restored EIRE site at Hawkcliffe be recognised for its historic value and need for appropriate measures to be taken for its continued maintenance.
- The removal of “Residential Development” from the list of developments “Open to Consideration” from the W zoning for Bullock Harbour would be appropriate due to flooding of the site.
- Request that SLO28 which refers to Bullock Harbour is re-worded: “any development shall have regard to the special nature of the area in terms of the height, scale, architecture and density of built form and shall comprise commercial marine-based activity and public water-based recreational uses, and shall only comprise uses that are compatible with the flooding and overtopping to which the site is subject.”
- Some of the measures and suggestions of the Masterplan for Sandycove and Bullock Harbours should be considered for inclusion in the Plan.
- Little reference in the Plan for windfarm development at sea. Some policies about marine planning should be included in the Plan, including that such developments are located outside a 22km Buffer Zone, as in may parts of Europe already.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapters 3, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14  Appendix 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0891</th>
<th>Person: John Spain</th>
<th>Organisation: CWTC Multifamily ICAV</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9,10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
Submission requests that the estimated residential yield in the Plan should be increased and that the Draft Pan is the appropriate place to revisit this figure. Additional yield could be accommodated in Cherrywood. Submission provides detailed commentary on various aspects of the Draft Plan and quotes National Policy.

**Core Strategy**
- Population growth figures used to formulate targets set out in Table 2.5 are outdated and should be brought in line with more recently published CSO Population figures which include a higher level of inward migration as opposed to those set out in the NPF.
- The application of the 25% headroom should be applied beyond 2026 to 2028 owing to the anticipated continued population growth above the national average in DLR.
- Request that the Planning Authority review the current population trends as set out by CSO data published in 2020 and the anticipated continued above national average population growth rate throughout the Plan period to 2028 and beyond
- Cherrywood should be regarded as a suitable location for an increase in projected population, due to its strategic location and extensive facilities and services under construction and permitted.

**Residential Development Standards.**
- Amend Section 4.3.1.1 (accompanying text to ‘Policy Objective PHP18: Residential Density’) to include reference to the provisions of the ‘Design Standards for New Apartments’ Guidelines 2020 and the ‘Urban Development & Building Height’ Guidelines 2018 as they relate to higher density apartment development;
- Remove reference at Section 12.3.5.1 of the draft Plan which defines ‘DLR as a County is classified as a suburban or intermediate location’ to align with the provisions of the ‘Design Standards for New Apartments’ Guidelines 2020;

**Housing Mix**
Chief Executive’s Report on Draft Plan Consultation

Volume II – Summary of Submissions Received

- Plan should not restrict mix in apartment developments.
- Requirement in relation to 3+ beds in in conflict with SPPR1 of the Apartment Guidelines
- Amend ‘Table 12.1 Apartment Mix Requirements’ to align with the provisions of Specific Planning Policy Requirement 1 of the ‘Design Standards for New Apartments’ Guidelines 2020 in terms of Apartment Unit Mix;
- Rationale for using Interim HNDA to justify a departure from section 28 Guidelines on mix is inappropriate and should be omitted. HNDA does not provide evidence base.

Climate Action
- Welcome focus on Climate Action but cautions against overly prescriptive standards linked to climate action

Dual Aspect
- The requirement for 50% of all apartment units to be dual aspect set out in section 12.3.5.1 of the draft Plan should be omitted, with SPPR 4 of the Guidelines noted as the relevant standard

Open space
- Notes new distinction between public and communal open space and consider this requirement could compromise the design and layout of residential proposals.
- Seek retention of 10% open space in existing built up area as set out in current Plan.
- The 15% requirement is clearly in conflict with Section 28 Guidelines on ‘Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas’ which recommends a minimum of 10% on infill /brownfield sites.

Roof Gardens
- Considers that the size of roof garden which can contribute to communal open space should not be limited to 30%.

Building Height Strategy
- Omit additional performance based criteria in table 5.1 as they are inconsistent with Section 28 Guidelines.
- The Building Height Strategy states that subject to the implementation of performance based criteria for assessing height (at Section 5 of the Appendix), that SPPR 3 (1) and (2) have been incorporated into DLR policy and the line “the planning authority may approve such development, even where specific objectives of the relevant development plan or local area plan may indicate otherwise” is defunct as policy is consistent with the SPPR’. It is requested that this statement be omitted as it will prevent applicants whose proposal may demonstrate full compliance with the criteria set out at Section 3.2 of the Building Height Guidelines gaining permission.

Build to Rent
- Submission requests that BTR should be removed as a separate use class.
- Objects to inclusion of standards set out in section 12.3.5 in relation to BTR.

Car parking
- Requirement for on site parking for BTR is contrary to SPPR 8 of Apartment Guidelines.
- Support for car sharing particularly for higher density schemes should be provided in the Plan. Submission concludes by stating that all Development Management policies in the Plan should align with National Policy Guidelines

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 2, 4, 12 Appendix 5

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission sets out background information with regards to the Glencullen Adventure Park facility and business and outlines the role of the Park as a resource to DLR Tourism and the Dublin Mountains.
- Requests the inclusion of a Specific Local Objective within the Glencullen area (Land Use Objective ‘G’) to allow for low density sustainable accommodation e.g. glamping, pods and camper van parking to cater for tourism and outdoor recreation. Suggests that provision should be limited and, working with local landowners and business, could be done in a sympathetic, sensitive and non-impactful way on the environment.
- Considers the request to be consistent with the Council’s objectives in relation to the Core Strategy, Uplands Strategy and Tourism Strategy and makes reference to policies contained in the Draft Plan.

DLR Submission No: B0892

Person: Matt Davy

Organisation: Glencullen Adventure Park (The GAP)

Map Nos: 12

282
• Suggests that an overall sewage scheme may need to be considered as part of a LAP for Glencullen.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0893</th>
<th>Person: Carmel &amp; Don O’Brien</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission requests that Ardmeen House (RPS No. 2058) and Ardmeen Gateway (RPS No. 2068) are removed from the RPS.
• Adding to the RPS imposes onerous conditions on essential work, would devalue the property and deter and purchaser and would frustrate any renovation work.
• The submission requests that the 50 year ownership of the property is taken into account along with the unstructured evolution of the property.
• The submission sets out a number of observations in relation to the NIAH including occupancy, evolution of buildings, access, categories of special interest and ongoing maintenance.
• Submission notes that the property is split into 3 units and it no longer served by its original bell mouth access. The new access does not merit mention as a protected structure under RPS No. 2068.
• It is acknowledged that the façade has artistic and architectural features of interest, however, there is insufficient architectural merit to warrant its inclusion in the RPS as having ‘regional’ importance.
• There is no evidence that anyone of special interest lived at the property.
• Submission cites maintenance works to the property that would not be supported by current conservation practice.
• Placing the property on the RPS would place demands on the public purse which should be avoided.
• The preservation of the house would be best secured by living in it as a home.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0894</th>
<th>Person: Mike McGuire</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• The submission fully agrees and supports the attached submission document and comments made by the residents at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace, Sandycove, Co. Dublin for the 2022-2028 Development Plan.
• The congestion and safety issues in particular adequate space for emergency vehicles could be resolved by allowing off-street parking.
• Furthermore, the restrictions on off-street parking for these Protected Structures are too onerous and sensitive off-street parking should be allowed at this location. They should be given the same leniency by the planning authority as the off-street parking granted at the nearby 1,2,3,6 Elton Park, which are also Protected Structures.
• The submission acknowledges the volume of traffic related issues submitted by other residents within Sandycove.
• The submission also acknowledges the CRM, however, the traffic congestion fallout in Sandycove needs to be resolved by the Council.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5 and Chapter 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0895</th>
<th>Person: Martina Moran</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9,13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Do not remove the Ballybetagh right of way and the Dingle right of way, which are of natural and historical significance.
• Measures to deter walkers should be resisted.
• These walkways and green areas were important physical and mental health assets during the pandemic and should be retained.
### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
**Appendix 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person: Shane Dineen</th>
<th>Organisation: Fáilte Ireland</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission seeks to enhance the policy coverage in the Draft CDP and ensure a meaningful framework for the enhancement of tourism in the County. Notes that many of the issues highlighted in Fáilte Ireland’s submission at pre-draft stage were addressed in the Draft Plan.
- Requests the inclusion of a dedicated Chapter on tourism. Submits that the current level of detail doesn’t reflect the role and importance of tourism in DLR.
- Notes that Fáilte Ireland are in the process of preparing Regional Tourism Plans and that these Plans will provide a strategic framework for a suite of Destination and Experience Development Plans. Requests the inclusion of an objective supporting the preparation and implementation of Regional Tourism Plans and to support the continued collaboration with Fáilte Ireland and tourism stakeholders to ensure their successful implementation and delivery.
- Highlights the importance of public realm projects and quality urban design and acknowledges the work undertaken by DLR in this regard. Considers DLR to be well positioned to develop motivating tourism outdoor experiences. Recommends continued investment in pedestrian and cyclist facilities near the County’s rivers and seafront. Recommends that continued partnership and collaboration between Fáilte Ireland and DLR should be supported in the CDP.
- Highlights the potential role of Dún Laoghaire Harbour as a sustainable activity-based tourism economic driver.
- Provides an overview of the Dublin Coastal Trail and requests the inclusion of an objective for the Council to support all tourism initiatives developed in collaboration with Fáilte Ireland, such as the Dublin Coastal Trail, in terms of marketing and communication of the trail.
- Submission supports Policy Objective T13 which seeks to promote the development of coastal cycling infrastructure.
- Welcomes the Council’s support for Smart Dublin and requests additional text to be added to page 129 of the CDP to reflect Smart Tourism, as follows:
  - ‘Smart Tourism is an important component of the Smart City concept and refers to the use of information and communication technology to develop innovative tools and approaches to improve tourism’.
- Outlines the importance of transport and mobility for tourism. Recommends the CDP should position Dún Laoghaire as the gateway from the City to the Dublin Mountains and support greater access to the Dublin Mountains and the Coast via public transport options.
- Considers the CDP would benefit from a section on Accessible Tourism and the incorporation of a Policy Objective as follows:
  - ‘It is a Policy Objective of the Council to support the provision of accessible tourism.’
- Outlines the importance of festivals and requests that support for festivals is specifically supported in the CDP.
- Outlines the URBACT programme and considers the CDP would benefit from a section on Urbact and the incorporation of a Policy Objective as follows:
  - ‘It is a Policy Objective of the Council to support the implementation of the Urbact Integrated Action Plan in respect of Tourism Friendly Cities.’
- Outlines the Dublin Brand Proposition and requests the ‘Dublin’ identification and branding is integrated into the CDP, where applicable, and that an objective aligning with, supporting and promoting the initiative is also included.
- Submission requests the inclusion of a new Policy Objective relating to visitor experience, as follows:
  - ‘It is a Policy Objective to support the development and implementation of Destination and Experience Development Plans through continued collaboration with Fáilte Ireland and tourism stakeholders.’
- Additional changes to text in the Draft Plan are recommended as follows:
  - Page 132 – ‘The Council acknowledges Fáilte Ireland’s intentions to activate a Destination and Experience Development Plan (DEDP) for the Coast and develop one for the Mountains of Dublin...’
- States that the potential for improved access to water and water-based activity is a significant asset for DLR and recommends the inclusion of a new Policy Objective in Chapter 8 as follows:
  - \textit{8.5.6 Policy Objective GIB12: Access to Water}
    
    \textit{It is a Policy Objective to support both the enhancement of existing and development of new access to water locations in the County for recreation purposes. The provision of shared facility centres for water-based activities in the County shall be supported by the Council.}
  
- Requests the inclusion of a map to illustrate the tourism and recreation strategy for the County.
- Considers that greater focus should be placed on improving connectivity between Dún Laoghaire Town and the Harbour and, in this regard, recommends amending SLO 25 as follows:
  - \textit{‘To improve/upgrade access to and from Dún Laoghaire Harbour and lands adjacent to the West Pier at Coal Quay Bridge to Dún Laoghaire Town.’}

### DLR Submission No: B0897

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>John Spain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>On behalf of The Comer Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Nos:</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Welcomes retention of mixed use inner core area zoning on lands in SUFP area but is concerned with removal of residential from permitted in principle. Requests reinsertion.
- Capping of residential population is contrary to NPF which seeks to provide additional population close to high quality public transport. Request removal of cap as it contravenes RSES which specifically identifies SUFP area as an area to be targeted for re intensification.
- Provides site description and planning background and context for sentinel site in the SUFP area.
- Sets out NPF and RSES and Greater Dublin Area Transport Strategy background and policy context.
- Omission of SUFP area from table 2.10 Core Strategy Table is a missed opportunity.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 17 SUFP**

### DLR Submission No: B0898

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Ruth Bowers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Nos:</td>
<td>9,13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Do not remove the Ballybetagh right of way and the Dingle right of way, which are of natural and historical significance.
- Measures to deter walkers should be resisted.
- These walkways and green areas were important physical and mental health assets during the pandemic and should be retained.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 12**

### DLR Submission No: B0899

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Lisa Wabel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Nos:</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space
- Submission states that the open space is supporting wildlife (bees, birds, squirrels, foxes) that would be disturbed if a housing development was to be considered there, not just by losing the field, trees and greenery, but also considering additional noise, traffic and littering.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 2**

### DLR Submission No: B0900

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Miguel Fitzgerald and Natacha Soto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Nos:</td>
<td>10, 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Challenge to SLO93
- Young family with a site in the subject area (Old Rathmichael) with plans to build an eco-friendly family home, both from an energy and a water conservation perspective. Family has always lived within the subject townland and has significant ties to the community.
• A report from three hydrologists accompanies the submission.
• Details in relation to Council meetings in 2015 concerning the SLO (previously SLO126 under 2016-2022 CDP)
• The Council is not giving any application the option to adequately address the issues concerning SLO 93 in new planning applications. It is considered that this is inappropriate and damaging to the community as the Council seems to have not taken into account the new Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Waste Water Code of Practice 2021, which provides methodologies for dealing with this type of soil/location.
• There are significant issues with how the information regarding SLO 93 is shown to the public. Constituents should not need to dig to find this information, it should be readily available in terms a lay person can understand. Full and current scientific information and relevant reports should be made available iteratively. The Council should also only be able to implement such heavy SLOs when it is clearly implementing, achieving, and reporting on the recommendations made by experts.
• The Aqua GeoServices report does strongly indicate that the potential problems in the Rathmichael/Crinken stream are related to direct discharges through piped drainage as well as forestry and land use, such as agriculture and golf courses. Septic tanks/on site systems per se are not identified as a cause of the poor quality in the stream.
• Discussion regarding United Nations Sustainable Developments Goals.
• SLO 93 in the Rathmichael area should be toned down or removed so as to allow on site wastewater treatment facilities where the Council’s concerns can be “adequately addressed” using the 2021 EPA Code of Practice. The Council should be open to new systems, technologies, and techniques to achieve this.

2021 EPA Code of Practice extracts relevant to the Rathmichael area:

• “The use of new and innovative products and technologies must be considered in detail by local authorities on a case-by-case basis(...)”.
• “Water conservation measures should be adopted to reduce water consumption and the quantity of waste water generated in a household. It is a requirement of the Building Regulations that sanitary conveniences are designed to facilitate efficient use of water for flushing. Decreased waste water production through water-saving devices will reduce the hydraulic loading rate, improving the performance of the soil attenuation system. The installation or replacement of plumbing fixtures and appliances that reduce water use is successful in reducing waste water flows. Available water-minimisation technologies include: o dual flush toilets (recommended under TGD G of the building regulations); o low-flow shower heads (credited in the Building Energy Rating calculation software, DEAP 4.1); o tap aerators; o water-efficient washing machines and dishwashers; o water butts for rainwater collection and re-use.”
• “The EPA Strive Report No. 108, Water Saving Technologies to Reduce Water Consumption and Wastewater Production in Irish Households (Dubber and Gill, 2015), contains additional details on these technologies and additional technologies such as urine-diverting urinals, air-assisted flush toilets and composting/dry toilets. It also has a useful table showing achievable water consumption for certain combinations of installed water-saving devices.”
• “Grey water recovery systems are encouraged to be used in individual homes, clustered communities and larger institutional facilities such as office parks and recreational facilities.”

While the Council maintains there is an issue in the area, this actually represents an opportunity to implement best practice water/eco-friendly solutions and an prospect to push for better water use and conservation technologies in Rathmichael, particularly in relation to reducing load and stopping pollutants at source. Water saving techniques outlined above by the EPA combined with, for example, urine diversion composting toilets would help reduce the load so significantly it is hard to argue new housing should be blanket banned via SLO 93. Centralised composting tanks are readily available and there are experts who are willing to service and maintain them. Furthermore, these are technologies and techniques that have been proven internationally, especially in Northern European countries where they have been in use for several decades.

• Letter of support from Professor Laurence Gill (leading academic and author for the two most recent editions of the 2021 EPA Code of Practice on wastewater). He states in the attached supplemented letter (Appendix F) “very little real evidence is presented. The density of on-site systems in the catchment is not particularly high and there are much larger potential sources of nutrient contamination in the catchment from the agricultural and forestry landuses. I am making this comment on the basis of my recent experience having recently carried out a project for the EPA on this very issue.
of trying to disentangle the impacts of on-site wastewater effluent from agricultural pollution in small streams, using specific tracers of human effluent”.

- Engineering Hydrologist Paul Johnston summarises the whole situation well in his attached report (Appendix E), but particularly in this sentence: “The current blanket ban on on-site wastewater disposal systems in the area is unnecessarily conservative in the face of the evidence.”

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 10, 14 (maps 10 and 14)**

---

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The submission requests that the west pier should be classified to allow dogs off leash at all times, all year round, but are required to be under effectual control per the Control of Dogs Act 1986.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Miscellaneous**

---

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission relates to lands south of Ghort Mhuire, Dundrum. Details are set out with regard to the site including ownership. A landscape assessment is also submitted. Commentary is set out in relation the Draft Plan and specifically in relation to policy on Institutional lands.
- Submission provides commentary on a recent court judgment relating to the INST designation and argues that “ownership” and “use” are key determinants in defining what lands should be subject to an INST designation in the new County Development Plan”.
- It is argued that the lands at Ghort Mhuire are not used for any institutional purposes and were the remainder of a working farm that operated within a larger landholding owned by the Order.
- The Landscape Character Assessment states that the site did form part of the Carmelites Centre lands at the time of the adoption of the 2016 Plan but also argues that the lands were in agricultural use.
- Contend that the INST designation needs to be more clearly defined by way of actual boundaries on the zoning maps so as to avoid confusion. A map is provided for the Ghort Mhuire land in Dundrum.
- Request that the Planning Authority amend the map to clearly show the INST designation on the Ghort Mhuire lands not applying to certain portions of the overall lands.
- Submission considered that the HNDA is lacking in its evidence base to support mix proposals and is contrary to SPPR 1.
- Submission provides commentary on SPPR1 of the Apartment guidelines and states that the use of the word “shall” in the SPPR is mandatory which means in their opinion that there must be no three bed requirement even where mix is specified. Submission therefore request removal of 3 bed requirement.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 2, Land Use Mapping**

---

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission requests the council consider the adoption of a S.L.O. status for the Sandycove point area in relation to traffic management.
- Submission notes that traffic congestion is adding to commute time, increased emissions and noise pollution.
- Submission asks the following to be considered:
  - Make Sandycove Avenue West one-way travelling south from the Otranto Place/S.A.W intersection.
  - Place deterrents to illegal parking in the pinch-point area as S.A.W turns right into S.A.N. – nots difficulty for emergency vehicles and waste collection trucks to pass down the road.
  - Consider local access only (allowing for disability access) during peak times
  - Video Clip of Sandycove traffic was attached with the Submission.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chief Executive's Report on Draft Plan Consultation

Volume II – Summary of Submissions Received

Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0904</th>
<th>Person: Niamh McDonald</th>
<th>Organisation: Irish Water</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- This is a supplementary submission to earlier submission from Irish Water.
- Irish Water notes Specific Local Objective (SLO) 85 in the Draft Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 regarding Stillorgan Reservoir, which has a stated objective: ‘To secure the use of lands at Stillorgan Reservoir for Public Amenity Purposes’.
- IW consider that the site is of critical importance and the critical areas of the site are not restricted to the proposed covered storage area. The security of the Stillorgan site is vital to the protection of the existing and future public drinking water supply within the Water Supply Zone, which extends through Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown and into Dublin City. Irish Water must maintain a secure site to protect its critical water supply assets.
- Irish Water requests the removal of SLO 85 ‘To secure the use of lands at Stillorgan Reservoir for Public Amenity Purposes’ from the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan on the grounds that the use of any of the site is not compatible with the need to maintain a secure site to protect the critical water supply assets of Irish Water.
- In addition, Irish Water also requests that the zoning objective for Stillorgan Reservoir be amended from Zoning Objective F: ‘To preserve and provide for open space with ancillary active recreational amenities’ to the current use of ‘Public Infrastructure and Utilities’ and similarly establish a zoning matrix that specifically describes water supply infrastructure as being permitted in principle.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Chapter 14, Appendix 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0905</th>
<th>Person: Frances Kelly, Chairperson</th>
<th>Organisation: Dún Laoghaire Central Residents Association</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Dún Laoghaire needs a Town Architect.
- There should be a forum for open communication and cooperation between the Council, commercial interests, and the community.
- Acknowledge that all urban environments across the county need to be higher density in order to achieve sustainability goals, while also making vibrant communal spaces.
- Locating nursing homes and assisted living spaces within urban centres should also be a goal.
- Requesting that high speed fibre broadband be available everywhere across the county.
- Support in principle the creation of a pastoral and community centre on the land beside the church at the corner of Eblana Avenue and Marine Rd.
- Restrictions on apart-hotels, co-living developments and 1-bedroom apartments should be considered. Residential development should have a mix of unit types, suit a variety of households and cater to people with disabilities.

**Climate**

- Dún Laoghaire could be developed as a model sustainable town. This could involve re-use of old-buildings over building new build, encouraging walkability by incentivising parking in existing car parks surrounding the town (harbour; library etc); provision of frequent electric eco shuttle-buses to move in a loop in and around the town, etc...
- There should be more recycling facilities across the county, specifically facilities that are easily accessible on foot.
- The planting of more trees, mindful of climate change appropriate species, should be pursued.
- The submission outlines a range of operational matters, including street cleaning, bins, littering and dog fouling that could be improved.
- Flood defences should be a focus.

**People, homes & place**

- The Lexicon has been a noted success, but the town is still lacking in community spaces and if the Boylan centre was to go it would have a severe impact. More spaces are needed.
• New state of the art HSE facilities should be provided within Cherrywood to address the health needs of the county.
• Promoting a mix of residents is important for a healthy society. Towns and villages should be easily accessible and inviting places for all socio-economic and age groups.
• Supporting an Age Friendly county includes increased lighting, reducing antisocial activities, promoting community policing and enabling step down housing & assisted living within the town.
• Any new attempt at pedestrianisation of George’s St should be on a temporary trial basis and an impact study should be done to assess the effects on traffic and footfall on the surrounding streets.

Transport
• More could be done to promote drivers to use the car parks surrounding the town centre, at the harbour as well as privately owned locations such as Bloomfield. Visitors should be encouraged to enjoy the town centre on foot.
• While public transport is vital, consider moving some services out of Georges St to make the town centre more pedestrian friendly.
• While many initiatives to promote cycle lanes and remove cars are to be welcomed, efficient movement of traffic on artery routes across the county and into towns is vitally important. Measures to slow or hinder traffic on core roads will encourage ‘rat running’.
• There should be an incentive to provide short term car rental provisions, (ie GoCar) in new development.
• Council employees could lead by example if the council investigated opportunities for car sharing facilities.
• It is essential that there is safe cycling infrastructure between the Honeypark, Cualanor and Dún Laoghaire town.
• There is significant demand for Electric Charging points in public spaces across the county. Dún Laoghaire town has a large number of properties without off street car parking and it is very important that the council assist residents who wish to charge their cars in public street parking.

Economic Development & Employment
• More emphasis could be put on tourism with a focus on heritage and facilities such as the sea and the hills.
• The continued maintenance and improvement of the swimming areas in Seapoint and the 40 foot should be a priority.
• The enterprise office in the county council is doing a wonderful job. The Lexicon and its facilities are used by many sole traders and contractors and there might be room to give them more assistance or to use the library as an outreach facility or an ad hoc incubator for new enterprises.

Retail
• Facilitating the redevelopment of Dún Laoghaire Shopping centre should be a priority.
• Commercial vacancies can continue to be addressed by the retention of commercial rates, which should be increased to 75%.
• Rates are too high within the county. More support should be given to traders, preferably a return on their rates by drastically increasing street cleaning.
• Less food retailers in the CoCo markets, more arts and crafts. Maybe offering wooden cabins which are better for bad weather.

Parking
• There is the widely held belief that car parking within the town centre detracts from the town and its retail environment. Many feel that on street parking charges have become a source of income for the council and that the town suffers as a result.

Green County
• The green space on Tivoli Terrace South should be kept as a public amenity and should not be rezoned.
• The Incredible Edibles initiative is just one example of how the land could be used in a way that gives an educational benefit to the community.
• Following the policy of Accessibility in the Urban Area, green space is a key part of the HSE’s strategy of encouraging and empowering people to lead healthier lifestyles.

Environmental
• Noise pollution is a bigger problem with higher density living and it is vital that individuals who create problems for their neighbours with anti-social noise at high levels, particularly during the night, can be
punished. If the individuals are in social housing it is essential that they can be moved for repeated offenses.

- Wastewater management facilities in the county need to be enhanced.

**Heritage**

- Many parts of Dún Laoghaire town centre are rightly within areas that have been designated as Architectural Conservation Areas. However, residents need to be positively engaged with this.

- The majority of the Victorian architecture is held in private ownership. No public assistance is available and parking restrictions can make renovations difficult. Parking restrictions relaxed to allow for skips etc. without charge.

- Any future redevelopment of the Dún Laoghaire Shopping Centre should be respectful to its surrounds

**SLOs**

- Reinstate SLO 152, which stated *To enhance the character, ambiance and quality of the environment, historic streetscapes and public realm of the residential streets in the adjoining Lower George’s Street, Dún Laoghaire and in particular, the areas of early twentieth century social housing, to ensure that the public realm in this older residential area – in close proximity to the core business district of the Town – is enhanced, improved and maintained to the standard provided for other residential and business districts adjoining Upper and Lower George’s Street*. The "pilot scheme" for SLO 152 has proven to be an excellent way to restore and enhance this historic neighbourhood in the heart of our Town. It was seen by the public as a very positive development by the Council.

- SLO 33 – To prepare a Local Area Plan for Dún Laoghaire and Environs. It is understood that an LAP for Dún Laoghaire town has been discussed for over 12 years but has not been commissioned. It is vital for the future of Dún Laoghaire that a comprehensive LAP is undertaken within the lifetime of the next Development Plan.

- SLO 38 – To encourage and support the redevelopment and refurbishment of the Dún Laoghaire Shopping Centre Site - in accordance with the provisions of the Interim Dún Laoghaire Urban Framework Plan - in advance of the adoption of the Dún Laoghaire and Environs Local Area Plan (LAP). The redevelopment of this building would be beneficial to the town as a whole. Stating that DLR recognises the potential for the site to be a high-density mixed-use development, might encourage the building’s redevelopment.

**Proposed New SLO’s**

- Field on Tivoli Terrace South – The sports grounds on Tivoli Terrace South should be given a Special Local Objective to ensure that it does not get rezoned from Objective F: To preserve and provide for open space with ancillary active recreational amenities. These lands should stay in use for the whole community.

- Clarinda Park – Support the residents of Clarinda Park in their wish to restore and enhance this Victorian Park to increase the green space within the town and provide for its safe use by families by the restoration of fencing. Clarinda Park was the first Victorian square in Dún Laoghaire and its heritage should be respected by reinstalling railings and the removal of all car parking from within the actual park. The following SLO is proposed: *To promote the heritage and restoration of green space within Clarinda Park. Any development or refurbishment of the park should include the removal of all car parking spaces within the park to rewild the park while also installing appropriate railings to return the park to its original historic environment.*

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

- Chapters 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, Miscellaneous, Appendix 8, Appendix 16
Submission also relates to an objective relating to the preservation of trees and woodland that currently pertains to the subject lands but which is removed in the Draft Plan.

Submission sets out details and commentary of the planning history of the site including the current live application on the site.

Submission considers that the decision to rezone the site in part to open space is not in accordance with best practice planning principle.

Submission goes into detailing in relation to the special Council meetings held, motions submitted, discussions that took place and reasons given for motions.

Submission then provides some commentary on the SHD process and expresses opinion in relation to the elected members of the Council and considers that it is unfair to use the land in question as a “pawn” in expressing any grudge

Submission states that the proposed rezoning is a breach of their clients’ legitimate expectation to use the lands to provide residential development and states that should the rezoning occur, substantial loss and damage will be sustained by their client, loss and damage that the Local Authority and Minister will be liable for.

Submission is opposed to zoning of land being used as a mechanism to prevent an SHD application.

Site location, description and context

Commentary provided including the fact that the lands are not accessible to the public, the lands are located between 2 Neighbourhood centres, the lands are highly accessible in terms of public transport.

Current policy context and recent planning history

Policy context and planning history are set out including commentary on the INST symbol which it is stated does not prevent alternate use of lands to which it pertains, the objective to preserve trees and woodlands currently on the site, key changes to the policy environment since the adoption of the current Plan (NPF and RSES), detailed planning history of the site, including the recently quashed decision and the current application for student accommodation.

It is stated that it should be noted that Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Council have confirmed that the principle of student accommodation development on the subject lands is deemed acceptable.

Relevant planning history adjoining the site is also set out and it is noted that the base map used for the Draft Plan zoning map has not been updated to reflect the realigned hockey pitch

The Draft Plan

Submission provides commentary in relation to the plan making process and questions whether the Planning Regulator would consider the interference that is taking place at the subject site to be acceptable.

Submission then sets out details in relation to the Draft Plan which pertain to the site.

Commentary is set out in relation the SNI land use zoning objective and the F land use zoning objective.

Requests that the extent of the ‘Objective SNI’ zoning be reduced slightly so that it is restricted to the lands within the school’s ownership and respects the realignment of the hockey pitch which has taken place.

Requests the rezoning of the portion with the F land use zoning objective to A as the lands are not suited to the provision of a parkland/recreational use or similar owing to their size, location and the surrounding context.

Submission sets out the changes in the Draft Plan in relation to the INST symbol including the requirement for public open space, provision of 20% open space (noting this may be an error as it conflicts with section 12.3.8.11) and removal of text that appears in the current Development Plan regarding the requirement for residential development on ‘INST’ designated lands to have regard to ‘the future needs of the school and allow sufficient space to be retained adjacent to the school for possible future school expansion/ redevelopment’

Submission understands that the removal of the text in relation to school expansion is because the ambiguity of the ‘possible future’ expansion overdevelopment of schools is too vague and uncertain to impose a requirement on landowners to retain space for expansion/redevelopments of school. Therefore, it is considered that there is no need to reserve space for expansion.

To require a school site with the ‘INST’ objective to retain 20% publicly accessible open space would compromise the security of children by having open spaces dispersed within school environments.

Request removal of INST symbol from the site as the lands are no longer within the ownership of the Religious Congregation associated with Our Lady’s Grove School campus and both Schools have confirmed they do not require the lands for their future expansion.

Support expressed for removal of tree symbols from the site.
Background to changes made.

- Submission then includes a detailed section relating to Special Council Meetings held in December 2020.
- Details of motions tabled are set out including motion 122, 123 and 124 which relate to the subject lands and the rezoning to F and the insertion of INST symbol.

Motion 122

- Submission sets out the reasons provided at the meeting.
- Contends that the INST symbol is not required and should be removed.

Motion 123

- Submission quotes from Council meeting including reasons given for motion.
- Submission considers that the requirement for public open space on the entire ‘INST’ designated lands should be a cumulation of usable spaces across the lands as opposed to a single block of open space as suggested under Motion No. 123.
- There is no stipulation in both the current Development Plan and the future Draft Development Plan that the public open space provision on lands with an ‘INST’ designation must be provided in a single tract of land.
- It would be more appropriate for any future provision of public open space on the subject lands to be integrated within residential development on the lands, thus providing a better quality of public open space which would have the benefit of passive surveillance from the new residential units.

Motion 124

- Motion rezoned lands to F. Submission sets out reason given by elected member.
- Submission considers that the motion put forward by a Councillor for the proposed re-zoning of the subject lands as ‘Objective F’ was not founded in planning merit but consider it is a stated attempt to prevent SHD development.
- Seek retention of A zoning.
- Sets out how the executive did not agree with the motion.
- Support is expressed for position of executive.
- Submission considers that if the zoning remains as it is in the Draft Plan the lands will not be redeveloped.
- Submission considers that zonings on the site in the Draft Plan hamper efforts by the planning system to strive for social equality.

Appendices

4 appendices are included as follows:
- Appendix A: Letter from Our Lady’s Grove Primary School Confirming Any Future Expansion of the School will be Accommodated within their Lands.
- Appendix B: Letter from Our Lady’s Grove Secondary School Confirming Any Future Expansion of the School will be Accommodated within their Lands.
- Appendix C: Transcript of the Council Meeting of Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council, 15th December 2020 – Relating to Motions Pertaining to the Subject Lands – This sets out what was said at the Special Council Meeting in relation to motions 122, 123 and 124.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 4, 12, Land Use Mapping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0907</td>
<td>Erica Magee</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9,13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Do not remove the Ballybetagh right of way and the Dingle right of way, which are of natural and historical significance.
- Measures to deter walkers should be resisted.
- These walkways and green areas were important physical and mental health assets during the pandemic and should be retained.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0908</td>
<td>S &amp; F Cantrell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The submission indicates that their original house was one of 17 houses constructed between 1928 and 1932. These 17 houses were poorly built, constructed with mass concrete and metal window frames and had no insulation. Work was recently carried out to the property including a redevelopment and subdivision of our property in a sympathetic design and layout and have achieved an A3 energy rating.
- Of the 17 houses built between 1928 and 1932, most have been altered and extended over the years, but several houses still require major refurbishment.
- The other houses on Marlborough Road date back to before 1888 and are significant houses of fine architectural heritage.
- The architectural heritage of the wider area has been recognised by the Council when designating Silchester Road as an Architectural Conservation Area in the 2016-2022 Development Plan and adding Adelaide Road, Station Road (part of) and Marlborough Road, as Candidate ACA.
- The submission indicates that it is concerning, that the Council now proposes to exclude Adelaide Road and Station Road from the ACA while including houses that were built in the 1928-1932.
- A number of these dwellings have been substantially altered.
- The submission requests that the Council include the greater area as an ACA.
- The submission includes an Architectural Heritage Commentary on the proposed Architectural Conservation Area at Marlborough Road, also bounded by Station Road and includes a comment on the heritage value of buildings proposed to be included in, or proposed to be excluded from, the proposed Architectural Conservation Area, and on the evidence available for determining the heritage value of these buildings.
- Included within the report is an Extract from the Ordinance Map Sheet XX111 of 1888 and Extract from the Ordinance Map of circa 1907 with 1928-1932 Houses and Tamney added.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person: Tony Manahan</th>
<th>Organisation: Rathmichael Hill Residents c/o Manahan Planners</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The submission has been made on behalf of the residents of Rathmichael Hill, located off the Rathmichael Road. Rathmichael Hill is a development consisting of 4 no. dwellings.
- Rathmichael Hill adjoins Rathmichael Lane which is a designated public right of way. The lane leads from Rathmichael Road up to the former Rathmichael Church, Round Tower and Graveyard and from there up to Rathmichael Wood and the Dublin Mountains.
- The section of the lane from Rathmichael Road to Brides Glen road is currently overgrown and largely impassable. Request that the development Plan contains an new objective to reopen Rathmichael Lane from Rathmichael Road to Brides Glen Road and to provide suitable and paving and lighting. This would enable pedestrian (and potentially cycle) access to the LUAS Brides Glen terminus stop in Cherrywood for residents of Rathmichael Hill and the houses opposite.
- This measure would also facilitate access from the LUAS through the adjoining lands along Rathmichael Lane up to the Rathmichael Wood and the Dublin mountains, which could be designated as a recreation route and amenity walkway.
- Hines Ltd have provided a walkway through their temporary carpark for which a permission was granted for a period of five years pending the provision of a more permanent walkway from Brides Glen to the LUAS stop.
- The walkway would also provide a welcome facility for the residentially zoned lands when they are developed, allowing existing and future residents easy access to public transport and the facilities of Cherrywood when they are developed.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 12**
### DLR Submission No: B0910
Person: Tony Manahan  
Organisation: Manahan Planners on behalf of The Society of the Sacred Heart (Irish/Scottish Province)  
Map Nos: 2

#### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the addition of the Glasshouse at Mount Annville (RPS No. 2100) onto the RPS.
- Submission details the location and extent of Mount Annville lands.
- The submission seeks clarification in relation to the extent of the protection with regard to the curtilage of the glasshouse – it is considered that this should not extend beyond the upper walled garden and does not extend to the lower walled garden or former farmhouse area and remainder of lands.
- The submission refers to the potential future provision of age friendly accommodation within the grounds.
- The submission seeks the insertion of an Age Friendly Strategy in the Development Plan.
- Submission requests that the Council prioritise funding the strategy in particular in relation to age-friendly housing and transport and notes the high age profile of the County relative to national figures.
- Submission suggests that as a minimum, low cost evidence based improvements across the county to improve the life of older people are implemented such as more public seating, increasing the duration of pedestrian light signals. The TILDA study is cited in this regard.
- Submission urges the creation of “a sustainable and a vibrant urban village” at Goatstown junction and care for the elderly in accordance with the LAP.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 4, Appendix 4

### DLR Submission No: B0911
Person: Abigail Moore  
Organisation: Happyteeth Ltd  
Map Nos: 4

#### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission notes concern regarding parking on her road, that the road is busy and a danger to cross.
- Submission notes there is significant air pollution at busy times.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5.

### DLR Submission No: B0912
Person: Orlaith Fortune  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 2,6

#### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space.
- Submission suggests that the current housing crisis should not be used to put pressure on the council to eliminate local amenities and green spaces such as this.
- This open space should be retained as Zone F as it currently fulfils 3 of the dlrcoco 5 strategic county outcomes.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Land Use Mapping

### DLR Submission No: B0913
Person: Tony Manahan on behalf of Denis Brennan  
Organisation: Manahan Planners  
Map Nos: 10

#### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission describes the location and planning history relative to Sea Lodge, Strand Road, Killiney and includes a map, aerial view and extract from the Draft Plan relative to the site.

**Route of cycleway:**
- Submission notes that a cycleway route shown in a green, passes through the subject site and along Strand Road – the site owner and residents of Strand Road object to this route.
- Submission notes that the proposed cycle route is unrealistic, impractical and unlikely to ever be achieved at this location – it is considered that the route should travel alongside the beach.
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A letter signed by residents of Strand Road is appended to the submission noting that the route of the cycleway, along the private road, is not appropriate.

**0/0 Designation:**
- Submission notes that the site is subject to the 0/0 designation and sets out the policies relative to same, noting that the designation was designed to reduce the amount of subdivision of properties that might impact upon the architectural character of the area.
- Submission considers that the subject site is in an area where “small scale, sensitive infill development” should be considered and notes that an additional dwelling at this location would be in keeping with the character of the immediate surrounds.
- Submission requests that the Council remove the 0/0 designation from this particular location.

**Zoning Boundary with the Beach:**
- Submission notes that the property boundary with the beach does not correspond with the zoning line on plan maps.
- Submission notes that the planning authority moved the boundary of the adjoining property on zoning maps eastwards to reflect the ownership resulting in the entire garden being zoned A.
- Submission notes that part of the garden of the subject site is zoned F – maps illustrating ownership vs zoning have been submitted.
- Submission requests that the F zone within the ownership of the site is rezoned to A.

*Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0914</td>
<td>Dara Carroll</td>
<td>Joint submission Cabinteely Football Club</td>
<td>7, 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- It is noted that a joint submission was submitted by the four main clubs in Kilbogget Park (Cabinteely FC, Cabinteely Athletics Club, Foxrock Cabinteely FC and Seapoint Rugby Club).
- The following should be considered for inclusion in the Plan:
  - Specific strategic policy objectives to improve the sports infrastructure in Kilbogget Park (pitches, running track, clubhouses) in order to maximise its ‘active amenity potential’.
  - To provide a focus for an active amenity spine running parallel to the N11, from Kilbogget Park, to Loughlinstown (Leisure Centre), to Ballybrack, Cabinteely, Meadow Vale and to Deans Grange/Blackrock.
  - To provide a commitment in the shared clubhouse facility project, as already included in DLR’s Space to Play strategy.
  - Kilbogget Park has the potential to act as a national exemplar in climate action - through the incorporation of sustainable, decarbonised energy generation alongside the enhancement of playing pitches.
  - The submission states that it is disappointed that the Draft Development Plan 2022 -2028 makes no reference to, or consideration of, the previous submission with respect to SLO 67. SLO 67 is meaningless as there is no DLR Masterplan for Kilbogget Park in existence.
  - In acknowledgment of Kilbogget Park’s active amenity potential and strategic growth location adjacent to Cherrywood and the N11, the submission requested that the following Specific Local Objectives (SLOs) are included in the Plan as follows:
    1. Upgrade of existing sports facilities in Kilbogget Park, including playing pitches and running track
    2. Progress the development of the Kilbogget shared clubhouse project from current concept design to construction, in accordance with DLR’s existing Sports Strategy.

*Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0915</td>
<td>Teresa Sweetman</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen Collage to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

*Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):***
## Summary of Submission and Observation:

- **Submission** notes how the popularity of Sandycove and the Forty Foot has increased in recent years, which has caused a number of issues including traffic jams, congested roads, parking problems, pollution, noise, bottle necks and safety issues.
- **Submission** requests County Council find practical solutions so that residents and non-residents can use the facilities.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0916</td>
<td>Karina Lennon</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0917</td>
<td>Dara MacCarthy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0918</td>
<td>Mary Martin</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9,13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0919</td>
<td>Tony Manahan</td>
<td>Manahan Planners</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Summary of Submission and Observation:

- **Submission** notes there are parking issues arising from removal of existing public parking spaces from Sandycove Ave West and due to installation of cycle lane on lower 1/2 of Sandycove Ave West.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0917</td>
<td>Dara MacCarthy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Summary of Submission and Observation:

- **Submission** notes that the Ballybetagh or Dingle rights of way, which are ancient and belong to the people.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0918</td>
<td>Mary Martin</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9,13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Summary of Submission and Observation:

- **Sandford BID** vision for Sandyford Business District (SBD) is as an integrated and sustainable world class mixed-use business and residential district. An estimated 26,000 office workers are working in SBD. It has been estimated that this has the potential to increase to 48,500. Feedback from employers in the District is that some workers are reluctant to take up employment opportunities here due to commuting difficulties and accordingly, the vision is to increase the quantum of residential development so that workers can walk to their employment in line with the vision of “the 15 minutes city”.
- **Designation of SBD** as a mixed use district in the Plan is welcome; but, the SUFP is unduly restrictive as the zoning overly segregates the uses. Density and heights are also too restrictive. These restrictions mean that SBD will not facilitate employment growth, increased living accommodation and support amenities.
- **Consider that dlr should encourage and facilitate development more in the SBD.**
- **SUFP has not changed much** since 2011, new plan should provide more scope to react to the changing circumstances in coming years.
- **Quote the following SLOs 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 59, DS1 which they agree with.**
- **Recommend that SLO 57 location is changed Bracken Road location may be more suitable.**
- **SLO 85 unlikely to achieved within the plan period - other open space proposal should be pursued instead pocket parks or boulevards to include Ballymoss Road, and Three Rock Road and the addition of a Kiosk building overlooking the reservoir should also be considered.**
- **The new central neighbourhood (ZONE 5) proposed at 3 to 5 storeys high, is too limited; increased height and density is needed to make a world class mixed use location. If a series of tall buildings is permitted in Zone 5 on a say 60% site coverage, will allow 40% of each site to be developed for amenity open space – several could be planned together to provide a larger useable open space.**
In the absence of the recommended changes to heights and density residential development should be open for consideration in zones 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Need to increase the integration and linkages of cycleways and walkways so as to ensure easy mobility within the District. Add an Integrated Mobility Infrastructure Plan for the SUFP Objective.

Need for informal community meeting places to be located throughout the District culminating in a central civic hub to create a sense of place and belonging for both residents and workers.

SBD is not specifically listed in the Retail Hierarchy. It should be categorised at a new level above Level 4 neighbourhood and below Level 3 District Centre.

Add a Specific Policy Objective recognising and facilitating the Smart Sandyford programme in respect to new emerging technology solutions to address SBDs requirements.

Submission refers to inconsistency in naming of Sandyford and Stillorgan Business Parks.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 7, 13, 14, Appendix 17

---

Summary of Submission and Observation:

Submissions relates to John of God site at Stillorgan.

Lands comprise the The Hospital Buildings, the Order’s Community House and burial grounds and the Granada House (Provincial Curia) and Administrations Buildings. To the rear of the hospital buildings are outdoor, active recreational facilities - tennis/basketball courts, football pitch and pitch and putt course. There are also horticultural gardens and glasshouses on the lands and a graveyard for members of the Order.

Commentary is set out in relation to the Facility and also in relation to the Draft Plan.

It is requested that the following SLOs be included in the Plan for the lands at St John of Gods

“To support the retention of the existing medical/hospital uses at the St John of God Hospital on Stillorgan Road and facilitate its future development including the provision of supporting facilities and complementary uses”

“To provide for residential uses on the St John of God Hospital outside of the medical/hospital campus in accordance with the zoning objective and a masterplan”

Future plans for the lands include a new hospital and a new head quarters, heritage and hospitality centre.

Request that a degree of flexibility is incorporated in the provisions of the Development Plan that would allow for other uses, particularly residential on the site that are complementary to the hospital use and the context of the lands.

Submission request removal of the Travellers accommodation symbol from lands at John of Gods Stillorgan as it is considered that the proposal to locate grouped housing could conflict with current provision of hospital services, could conflict with proposals which it has for the development of the hospital and its services, is unlikely to be deliverable and therefore should not be identified on the land.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14, Map 6, Land Use Mapping

---

Summary of Submission and Observation:

Submission requests that Ivy Grove (RPS No. 2092), Eglinton House (RPS No. 2093) and Eglinton Lodge (RPS No. 2094), added to the RPS, should be made an ACA instead.

Following on from submission no. B0042 (summarised above) an additional sewer breather pipe has been identified on Dundrum Rd, opposite Bankside Cottages

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

---

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space.
• Given the amount of development in the area - no part of it should be set aside for housing.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 2, Land Use Mapping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0923</td>
<td>Joan Cullen</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The submission highlights the importance placed on increasing amenities and improving those which already exist, and considering the recent pandemic more consideration should be given to informal amenities such as the Country lanes and roads around areas such as Rathmichael, Killiney, Dundrum, areas which have essential those who have small, or no gardens.
- The formal recreation centres such as Killiney Hill, Blackrock Park, Dún Laoghaire Pier, etc., have been under enormous pressure.
- The addition of more developments in these and other areas, i.e. the apartments on the Bray Road will need to be factored in in the event of another pandemic.
- When the Plans was drawn up no one foresaw this, in addition to people working from home, therefore, the Plan should be reviewed in the light of recent experience.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 6 and Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0924</td>
<td>John Forde</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The submission requests that dogs be allowed off lead on the west pier at all times (or, failing that, at designated times) throughout the year, with the obvious caveat that the animal should be under the control of the owner at all times, that it should not be bothering or worrying any people, animals, or birds, and that all faeces be picked up and disposed of in accordance with the laws.
- There has been a huge increase in dog ownership during the Covid-19 pandemic and many dogs are now in the possession of owners who live in apartments without gardens.
- For these animals to exhibit good behaviour they need to be exercised properly, and off-leash exercise is a much more effective.
- The area of the west pier is a safe place for dogs to be allowed off-leash and can allow the dog to become socialised to other dogs.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Miscellaneous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0925</td>
<td>Paul Doyle, Bannon</td>
<td>Congregation of Christian Brothers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Playing grounds at CBC Monkstown are owned by the Christian Brothers and the Edmund Rice Schools Trust (ERST) only have a license. The Brothers are currently in the process of transferring this over to the ERST.
- A portion of the land can be excluded from the licensed area at any time. This is a long time arrangement.
- Consider SNI rezoning appropriate for the school and ancillary playing pitches but not for the .34 hectares which is suited to infill development. Request reinstatement of the A zoning.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 3, Land use Mapping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0926</td>
<td>Donna Ryan on behalf of Crosswaite Developments Ltd.</td>
<td>Downey Planning</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Rezoning of lands at Farmer Browns Public House, Enniskerry Road, Kiltiernan, and lands to the west and south of the Public House.
- Zoned ‘A’ - “To provide residential development and/or protect and improve residential amenity” in Plan but zoned ‘NC’ as part of the Kiltiernan Glenamuck Local Area Plan 2013-2019 (extended to September 2023) and currently adjoin existing commercial units fronting onto Enniskerry Road.
- The subject lands should be re-zoned from ‘A’ Residential to ‘NC’ Neighbourhood Centre in line with the Kiltiernan Glenamuck LAP. Rezoning the lands to “NC” would consolidate the provision of retail provision in a strategic location, in the centre of Kiltiernan which is well-served by existing road networks, pedestrian infrastructure and bus services.
- The level of neighbourhood centre provision in Kiltiernan is deficient at present, with the population increasing in line with new developments under construction in the area, this deficiency will be further exacerbated.
- Further south of the subject lands, a parcel of land remains zoned Objective ‘NC’ - “To protect, provide for and improve mixed –use neighbourhood centre facilities”. It is unlikely that these lands will be realised during the lifetime of this Plan, as they are currently occupied by existing users.
- Under the Kiltiernan Glenamuck LAP, the subject lands are located within the ‘Golden Ball Node’, and zoned ‘Neighbourhood Centre’. The LAP envisaged that this area would form a secondary neighbourhood centre to the one further south within the LAP zoned lands.
- Large residential developments with planning permission listed – at present potential for 695 additional residential units over lifetime of Plan.
- Proposal complies with policy obj RET7 of the CDP: “facilitate the provision of local convenience shops in residential areas where there is a clear deficiency of retail provision, subject to protecting residential amenity”.
- Complies with the Retail Planning guidelines, which outlines the need for convenience shopping provision to provide for the day-to-day needs of locals within easy walking distance of residential areas.
- Prime location, current retail provision is deficient, local need now more than ever with more people working from home, lands are available and ready to be developed for retail use with parking and pedestrian access available.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Land Use Mapping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person: Ronan O Flaherty</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Objection to the proposed development (proposed development not stated, person lives in Kiltiernan).
- The proposed development is not good for sustainable community development and will radically alter the amenity of the local area.
- Developing the areas around Kiltiernan village should be undertaken with caution and sympathy - that is not apparent from the document published.
- The proposed development will have a negative effect on house values due to the despoiling of the natural beauty and scenery which forms a major part of the attraction for prospective house purchasers and it will have a negative visual impact on the landscape of the area.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Miscellaneous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person: John Spain Associates on behalf of The Congregation of Christian Brothers</th>
<th>Organisation: The Congregation of Christian Brothers</th>
<th>Map Nos: 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
Submission relates to lands at Old Connaught in ownership of Congregation of Christian Brothers, east and west of N11. Map provided outlining lands.
Appendices attached – Analysis of the Draft Core Strategy and Residential Zoned Land Capacity and Guidance Note on Core Strategies
Lands to west of N11:
• Description of landholding (c.25.5ha), zoned A1 and GB, within OCLAP boundary.
• Designation of lands as SLR is welcomed – A1 zoning should be extended to these lands as well (zoned GB at present). The SLR objective reflects the strategic location of the area within the Dublin Metropolitan Area and existing and planned services and public transport provision, with an LAP being prepared for the area. The justification for the extension of A1 zoning is based on analysis of the draft core strategy, housing allocations, and the Tier 2 nature of the subject lands based on the criteria and phasing approach espoused within the NPF.
• Appendix 1 of submission sets out a detailed rationale for the zoning, having regard to the potential under-estimation of housing delivery requirements over the CDP period within the current draft core strategy.
• The educational (ED) and institutional (INST) objectives applying to the lands to the west of the N11 should be removed as there is no existing institutional or educational use on the subject lands at present, and future requirements for additional schools in the area are more appropriately dealt with under the forthcoming LAP for the area.
• Rezoning of land would also require an amendment to Tables 2.8 and 2.10, and Section 2.4.5 of the Draft CDP.

Lands to east of N11:
• Description of landholding which is zoned GB and partially subject to SLO22. Located within Woodbrook LAP boundary.
• Agreed in principle with adjoining Woodbrook College (operated by Edmund Rice Schools Trust) and DLRCC to donate .1acre of land to allow extension of playing pitches and facilitate access road, to facilitate delivery of school amenities.
• Request that the lands (c. 17 acres) next to Woodbrook College are rezoned A having regard to their serviced and accessible location, the existing pattern of development in this area, which includes existing residential development such as Woodbrook Downs, the location within the Dublin Metropolitan Area and given that the area no longer represents a functional greenbelt. Furthermore, RSES settlement strategy does not envisage the long-term retention of the quasi greenbelt between Bray and Shankill, as the metropolitan area extends from the City to Bray, and is further supported by objective NPO 62 of the NPF which acknowledges that certain greenbelt lands will be required for settlement expansion.
• Aerial map provided showing extent of mixed use development (residential, educational, healthcare) adjoining lands – character is more peri-urban than rural.
• If DLRCC do not consider a residential zoning objective to be possible at this time due to Core Strategy projections, which we would argue is not the case, we request that at the landholding be subject to a Strategic Land Reserve objective to reflect their suitability for residential development in the medium term.

Tier 1/Tier 2:
• Description of Tiers 1 and 2 in accordance with the tiers set out within the NPF. The Draft Core Strategy indicates capacity for c. 2,005 units within Old Connaught. The SLR are not regarded as either Tier 1 or 2 lands, Table 2.11 of the Draft Plan identifies a potential residential yield of c. 840 residential units on the SLR at Old Connaught North. The delivery of these residual units is indicated as being post 2028, i.e. the next Plan period.
• Section 2.4.4 relates to the Core Strategy and the allocation of future growth in the County. “Based on allocated future population growth for DLR it is considered that broad equilibrium exists between the supply of zoned land for primarily residential purposes, and the projected demand. On this basis it is recommended that the existing quantum of land zoned for primarily residential use in the County, excluding the lands identified in this Draft Plan for ‘Sustainable Neighbourhood Infrastructure’, is maintained for the County Development Plan period 2022-2028 and that additional zoning of land for residential purposes is not required.”
• Table 2.10 identifies a total proposed residential yield over the 2022-2028 plan period of between 22,763- 25,353 units, which is a ‘relatively minor excess’ of the DLR housing target from the NPF Roadmap / EMRA RSES population projections. This figure assumes that development will take place in all identified infill sites over the plan period and that all housing within the Cherrywood SDZ will be completed, which section 2.4.4 of the CDP accepts is unlikely, stating that ‘it is acknowledged that the full build-out of Cherrywood may extend beyond the timeframe of the Plan’ - overly conservative approach to residential land use zoning and will result in a significant shortfall in housing delivery during the next Plan period. Contrary to the ‘Guidance Note on Core Strategies [attached as
Appendix) which specifically allows planning authorities to allow for an offset for those lands identified for strategic long-term (i.e. 10 to 15+ year) development as part of SDZs or major regeneration sites within key areas, which in DLR would include Cherrywood SDZ, Sandyford UFP regeneration and potentially other locations such as Kilternan – Glenamuck.

- Lands identified as SLR at Old Connaught should more appropriately be classified as Tier 2 lands, as they currently (or over the lifetime of the new Development Plan) will benefit from the requisite infrastructure to facilitate development, and noting the existing public transport services serving the area as summarised below, even in advance of a more definitive commitment to the Luas extension to Bray.

Justification of zoning of lands to A1:

- Welcomed that the draft Core Strategy does not adopt a ‘low’ growth projection per the NPF, but noted that the Draft Plan requires updates to take account of the latest population growth figures published by the CSO.

- These up-to-date Census figures indicate a significantly higher level of inward migration, and higher overall population growth than anticipated within the NPF, and this needs to be reflected in CDPs being prepared for the Dublin Metropolitan Area. Eg. NPF estimated net migration of c. 12,500 per annum, the actual number is substantially higher at 33,700 and 28,900 respectively to April 2019 and 2020. Every 10,000 in net migration roughly equates to demand for some 4,000 dwellings (based on an average household size of 2.5 people).

- The application of 25% headroom should be applied beyond 2026 to 2028 owing to the anticipated continued population growth above the national average in the DLR.

- The shortfall in the construction of housing and delivery of units is set out in Figure 2.4 of the Draft Core Strategy which illustrates a population growth of 11,757 in DLR between 2011-2016, with a housing stock increase of just 1,066. This population increase would require a minimum of c. 4,700 units based on a household size of 2.5. This highlights the acute need for an appropriate quantum of residential zonings in the County which are capable of delivering housing within the Plan period and beyond, and to address the continuing housing crisis.

- The Draft Plan recognises the significant proportion of permissions for residential development which are not implemented for some time after they are granted, or not implemented at all. The ongoing Covid-19 restrictions will further exacerbate this issue and therefore the draft CDP must acknowledge this and ensure sufficient zoned lands are provided to ensure significant supply issues does not arise in the delivery of new housing.

- Unrealistic to assume that all, or even the majority, of land zoned for residential development will be developed over the Plan period, with an optimistic estimate based on industry experience being closer to 50% of sites being developed over that timeframe.

- Therefore the Planning Authority should review the current population trends as set out by CSO data published in 2020 and have regard to the anticipated continued growth above national average population growth rates throughout the Plan period to 2028 and beyond, as noted at 2.8.1 of the Interim Housing Need and Demand Assessment (Appendix 2 of the Draft Plan). A re-assessment would support the zoning of additional lands for residential development.

- The Draft Plan states that the total 553 hectares of zoned land is a reduction of c. 90 hectares from the land availability audit that informed the current CDP. The Draft Plan proposes to rezone a considerable area of land that was previously zoned residential to ‘SNI’, further reducing the extent of land in the County available to deliver new housing.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Chapters 2, 14, Map 14, land use mapping, and Appendix 1
Embrace the key tenets of the Programme for Government (PfG), which was published in June 2020, including the need for a national policy focusing on Town Centres First, the enhancement of the built heritage in urban villages, and the reuse and repurposing of vacant buildings in historic town centres.

Ensure the Dun Laoghaire Heritage Plan is updated to support the CDP’s heritage objectives and to achieve stated government policy as set out in the National Heritage Plan 2002.

Heritage Council notes and supports the recent progress on DCC’s Biodiversity Action Plan.

Ensure all aspects of the management of Dublin Bay Biosphere Reserve are implemented in line with the LIMA Action Plan.

Assess the impact of climate change on current heritage and future development in the county - any assessment should include opportunities for green-ecosystem services.

Establish sustainable key indicators to ensure that Town Centre First Policy is working.

Recommended that DLRCC and its partners could involve international peer reviewers on town centre matters and network within the CTCHC Programme to ensure that this recommended monitoring takes place.

Planning policy needs to reflect the embodied carbon in existing building structures and fittings, and establish a ‘Carbon Accountancy’ for development proposals to ensure that existing buildings are not needlessly demolished to be replaced by new buildings of equivalent spatial characteristics.

Planning policy needs to move away from a basic, one-dimensional zoning approach to the three dimensions of townscapes, streets, buildings and multi-use occupancy. In particular, housing policy needs to promote mixed housing forms, and move away from large-scale developments for highly-defined market segments.

The protection of exemplary and pivotal modern buildings as part of the architectural heritage should be actively considered in the review of the RPS.

Urgent consideration should be given to the provision of a One-Stop Shop service for the owners of buildings to harmonise DLRCC’s diverse functions.

Include specific policy to support the Collaborative Town Centre Health Check Programme for Dun Laoghaire and other key settlements and do these health checks every 2 years.

‘Pilot’ a Conservation Area Regeneration Scheme (CARS) in partnership with the Heritage Council.

‘Pilot’ a Heritage Action Zone (HAZ) in Dun Laoghaire in partnership with the Department of Housing, Heritage Council and other stakeholders.

Formulate and deliver a Dun Laoghaire Town Centre and Buildings Renewal Plan. This plan should also promote historic towns centres as Strategic Energy Zones (SEZs).

Promote the reuse of traditional and landmark buildings in historic town centres as digital hubs, in line with government policy.

Support an audit of embedded carbon in existing buildings in historic town and village centres within the plan area.

Ensure that all SHD proposals are within or adjacent to town centres and are close to public transport hubs.

Undertake full review of existing opportunity sites in town centres.

In line with EC policy, formulate a Town Centre Living Strategy.

Prepare a sustainable regeneration plan for publicly-owned land banks focusing on ecosystem service provision.

Develop robust Enabling Policy and Streetscape Design Guidelines.

Formulate and deliver a Strategic Development Plan to set up Business Improvement Districts (BIDs).

 Undertake Riverscape and Canalscape Studies in partnership with the NPWS and the Heritage Council and strengthen existing greenways and blueways, etc.

Undertake Noise and Air Quality/Pollution Mapping for key towns.

Establish a priority Greenway linking Dun Laoghaire and other town centres to the main railway and bus stations and establish a Heritage Loop walk in town centre environs.

Work with all third level institutes located within or adjacent to the county at large to identify and develop a vibrant Student Quarter within existing town centres.

Adopt the All-Ireland Pollinator Plan and the National Biodiversity Action Plan.

Prepare for full implementation of Marine Protected Areas, both within the current list of designated Natura 2000 sites, proposed Natural Heritage Areas and Refuges for Fauna, but also seek to protect other significant biologically diverse areas.

Ensure all data, geospatial in nature, is mapped.
- Engage the public in the management of traditional buildings in historic settlements within the county.
- Formulate a Public Communications Strategy to ensure the CDP is successfully monitored and delivered.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapters 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, Miscellaneous and Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0930</td>
<td>Sabrina Boland</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Requests a review of whether additional secondary schools or extension to existing secondary schools are required in Sandyford/Stepaside area.
- Request whether consideration could be given to the addition of a skate park / bike park to Fernhill.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 4, chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0931</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Glenveagh Homes Ltd.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission relates to a site adjacent to the Cluain Mhuire Family Centre, Newtownpark Avenue, Blackrock. Sets out background information relating to the site and notes that the site has an extant planning permission for a residential scheme (Ref. D15A/0036/ABP245945). Furthermore, the site is currently under consideration by An Bord Pleanála for a SHD application (ABP-308946-20).
- Requests the re-zoning of a small portion of the site from Objective ‘SNI’ to Objective ‘A’. Notes the subject area which comprises a shed and entrance (modern additions) form part of the residential proposal at the site and will no longer be part of the operation of the Cluain Mhuire Family Centre. States that the zoning amendment would be consistent with the extant permission and future residential use of the site.
- Submission refers to the inclusion of a new objective at the site ‘to protect and preserve trees and woodlands’ and requests the tree preservation objective be removed to reflect the extant permission at the site. Submits that the presence of Japanese knotweed at the site impacts the trees and the removal of a number of trees is recommended in tandem with the proposed residential scheme.
- Submission includes a Tree Removal Plan submitted as part of the SHD proposal which identifies trees for removal. Notes that while the SHD is currently under assessment with ABP the proposal was generally accepted in the DLR Chief Executive Report dated 22nd of February 2021 (ABP-308946-20).

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 2 (land use mapping)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0932</td>
<td>IMG Planning Limited on behalf of Forgebell Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission relates to c. 7.7 ha of land at Clontra, Quinn’s Road, Shankill.
- Requests the inclusion of a new Specific Local Objective to be attached to the lands, as follows:
  - ‘To prepare a masterplan and conservation plan for the ‘Clontra’ lands, to ensure the continued use of Clontra and associated structures into the future, by providing for residential development, and associated structures, subject to the appropriate protection of the setting, fabric and character of the Protected Structure and its attendant grounds; to provide for public access and an integrated coastal walkway and cycleway within the lands in furtherance of the objective to promote the development of the National East Coast Trail Cycle Route; to provide for measures to mitigate the erosion of the coastline; to enhance the amenity, usability and attractiveness of the open and sylvan character of the lands; and to provide for sensitively designed and sited dwellings. The masterplan shall consider issues such as access, the phasing of the delivery of the residential development and access to the coastal zone as well as architectural design and the historic, visual and ecological sensitivity of the area.’
• Requests the CDP objective in relation to Quinn’s Road (p. 112 of the Draft CDP) be amended as follows:
  • ‘It is also a long-term objective of the Council to retain Quinn’s Road Shankill, between the south of the entrance to the Shankill Tennis and Bowling Club and the sea, as an attractive ‘country’ road.’

• An overview of the physical context of the lands is provided including a site description, details regarding Clontra House (a Protected Structure), ongoing conservation works and a landscape analysis. It is submitted the subject lands comprise an infill consolidation opportunity site which maximises efficiencies for established physical and social infrastructure.

• An overview of physical infrastructure and the availability of services at the lands is provided and it is submitted that the site could be appropriately serviced and protected from coastal erosion.

• A comprehensive overview of current and proposed planning policy is provided, and it is considered that a sensitive and responsive element of development would make a significant and sustained contribution towards a number of planning and development objectives for the area. Submits the subject lands are not contiguous to any other Green Belt zoned land.

• Submission outlines a Masterplan and Conservation Plan Strategy and includes sketches identifying potential development areas and a preliminary high-level Masterplan and Conservation Plan framework.

• Establishes Masterplan Guiding Principles to provide a framework within which the existing land assets could be protected and enhanced as part of a sustainable development approach which incorporates new residential development. The proposed approach seeks to reconcile and maximise the heritage, recreational, amenity and development potential of the site having regard to its location, character, asset base and context as a highly sustainable and accessible location. A comprehensive summary of the community and planning gains associated with the proposed amendments is provided including inter alia enhancement of the natural environment, amenity value and character of the area, the preservation and enhancement of the historical and architectural value of the lands and the delivery of a sustainable community.

• The submission highlights that a re-zoning of the lands is not proposed but rather the inclusion of the above SLO to enable the delivery of residential development consistent with the principle of a ‘sustainable neighbourhood’, while also affording an appropriate level of protection to the setting, fabric and character of the Protected Structure and its grounds. It is considered that the Masterplan’s Guiding Principles represent a unique opportunity to safeguard the future of ‘Clontra’ and realise a range of community benefits.

• It is submitted that the inclusion of the new SLO at the lands would not have any consequence for the Core Strategy of the CDP.

• Submission acknowledges the high amenity value of Quinn’s Road but proposes the objective be amended to afford the ‘country road’ status to that part of Quinn’s Road to the south of the access to the Shankill Tennis and Bowling Clubs, in acknowledgement of the urban character and uses utilising the road to that point.

| DLR Submission No: B0933 | Person: Sadhb O’ Connor | Organisation: Mr James & Mrs Ursula Dowling; Donohoe Property and Investment; and Grafton Group PLC | Map Nos: 6 |

Summary of Submission and Observation:

• The site has frontage on Three Rick Road, Ravens Rick and Carmanhall Road.

• Description of the lands and how they relate to the Draft SUFP are set out. Location is well served by high-frequency public transport- Luas, existing bus network and proposed BusConnects, and site has excellent connectivity to the surrounding area and therefore suitable for higher residential densities in accordance with regional and national policy. Also, good existing and proposed pedestrian and cycle networks.

• Support the Residential zoning of the site.
• Height is noted at 3-5 stories. Density for the site is noted at 95 uph and in current SUFP as 75 uph. Note that due to the multiple shades of blue this was difficult to read, and it would be useful to provide greater variety in the colour coding.
• Consider that the height and densities are too prescriptive.
• Height and Density should be left to Development Management instead as it overly constrains development and does not allow for the efficiency of the accessible zoned lands to be maximised not prescribed in the SUFP.
• Height has not changed and therefore has not responded to the S.28 Height Guidelines. Height should be determined on foot of multiple multi-disciplinary assessments to ensure that such development can be readily assimilated into the receiving context as opposed the imposition of a blanket height limit prior to any such assessments taking place. Don’t understand why other sites located within 100 m of the site are 8-17 stories. Location adjoining the proposed park would also indicate that the site is suitable for an increased height.
• Sandyford Business District Strategic Study and Action Plan’ identified the need to improve Sandyford as ‘a place to live’. A sense of community is lacking as commercial development predominates. A key factor for businesses in site selection is the availability of accommodation and support neighborhood services to ensure employee attraction and retention. There is also a need to transform the transient community that predominates to a more permanent community in order to allow a neighbourhood character to develop.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0934</th>
<th>Person: Jorge Handl</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 2 (land use mapping)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0935</th>
<th>Person: Edmund Rice School Trust CLG</th>
<th>Organisation: Edmund rice Schools Trust</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Playing grounds at CBC Monkstown are owned by the Christian Brothers and the Edmund Rice Schools Trust (ERST) only have a license. The Brothers are currently in the process of transferring this over to the ERST.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A portion of the land can be excluded from the licensed area at any time. This is a long time arrangement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider SNI rezoning appropriate for the school and ancillary playing pitches but not for the .34 hectares which is suited to infill development. Request reinstatement of the A zoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7 (land use mapping)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0936</th>
<th>Person: Harriet Donnelly</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Issues raised with regards to traffic and refuse lorry access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerned with emergency service to the 40 foot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerned with rubbish in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0937</th>
<th>Person: Alan Saunders</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Speed ramps on Avondale Road are not aggressive enough. Request electronic speed notification signs.
- More bathrooms are needed along the waterfront at Dun Laoghaire.
- Acknowledge the volume of traffic related issues in Sandycove.
- Support the CRM but not the traffic congestion fall out in Sandycove that needs to be resolved by the Council.
- Supports submission of the residents of Breffni Terrace. Congestion could be resolved by allowing off-street parking for those protected structures.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5, 9 and 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0938</th>
<th>Person: Ann Mulcrone</th>
<th>Organisation: Reid Associates and as a resident of the town centre</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Request the omission of the pedestrian link through Stable Lane to Crofton Road as shown on the Urban Framework Map.
- Request the deletion of the following text from Section 8.5.6, Appendix 8:
  > The ongoing redevelopment of the site offers an opportunity to provide a mixed-use redevelopment that includes educational uses and the Plan supports the adaptation and reuse of the existing buildings on the site including the sensitive redevelopment of the Protected Structures. The first phase of the development has anticipated a new pedestrian/cycle link between George’s Place and Crofton Road and the completion of this route across Stable Lane to further strengthen the connectivity between Georges Street and the Waterfront is a strategic objective of this Plan’.
- Request the omission of objective 5 in section 8.8 of the Urban Framework Plan Objectives ‘Encourage and provide for increased pedestrian and cycle permeability between George’s Street and Crofton Road’.
- Instead of the route through Stable Lane pedestrian linkage and upgrading should be redirected to the natural pedestrian desire line on Kelly’s Ave where the existing public footpaths are narrow and inadequate, thereby addressing existing pedestrian need.
- The link would adversely affect the residential amenity of the recently constructed social housing at Georges Place, wherein the courtyard provides a secure, communal shared pedestrian/vehicular amenity space for residents.
- Stable lane is a private laneway owned by the residences on Connaught Place and Crofton Terrace and legally precludes any pedestrian link or public access from Georges Place.
- In 1993, Edmund Kenny, 7 Crofton Terrace, obtained an injunction against the local authority preventing it from using this gate as anything other than an emergency exit.
- No public right of way has ever been established.
- Stable Lane has not been legally taken in charge by DLRCoCo.
- A public pedestrian through way would significantly and adversely impact on the privacy and security of the mews dwellings on Stable lane, which have no surrounding defensible space.
- Stable Lane provides for essential parking for the residents on Connaught Place and Crofton Terrace who have no alternative parking provision. Public pedestrian access from Georges Place to Stable Lane would interfere with essential residential parking provision.
- There was significant investment in conservation and regeneration of Connaught Place and Crofton terrace residences from former substandard bed sit accommodation in recent times, which would be undermined by the link.
- There are adequate alternative routes.
- This link was opposed by all the residents in the area in submissions to the 2019 development plan and in submissions to the Part 8 Social Housing application. It was consequently omitted from that development to the benefit of that development.

Old Fire Station Georges Place
- Request the omission of Objective ED from the Fire Station site from zoning Map 3 and the substitution with objective AS to provide for Art Studios.
• Request the deletion of text in the Urban Framework Plan Appendix 8 which suggests educational use for the Old Fire Station.
• Request the deletion of “The Old Fire Station site” from Table 4.1: Location of future school sites.
• The Old Fire Station is a significant landmark in the area and has remained in a largely derelict condition for years. It has significant potential to underpin the community artistic vibrancy in the area by the introduction of creative art studios and a sculpture garden.
• The Old Fire Station site lends itself more suitably to Art and cultural uses including artist studio spaces, exhibition space and a sculpture garden and a food hall.
• The selection of the Old Fire Station location for a new school, is not planned in alignment with new residential population growth. Consequently, it would generate travel demand outside of residential catchment areas and outside a 15min walk zone. As such, it fails to integrate land use and transport.
• The site is inadequate in size to accommodate a school being a maximum of 0.2Ha including the existing building footprint while the Department of Education generally seek provision of a site of minimum area 0.6Ha.
• The Fire Station building fabric and layout is unsuited to school use.
• Site contamination issues from its previous use as the Council Yard are not addressed.
• The old Fire Station site capacity and the site access has been compromised by provision and layout of social housing on the site. If the site was required for a school then the entirety of the site should have been reserved for this purpose.
• The site cannot accommodate post COVID-19 pandemic health design principles which would necessitate significantly increased provision of outdoor open space and recreational amenity.
• Request an ancillary Amendment to Sec 4.2.1.6 Policy Objective PHP7: Schools to add at the start:
  The design of all schools should be pandemic proofed by the provision of heat and ventilation systems, use of technology for the creation of a touch less antimicrobial environment and provision of adequate outdoor space for both class rooms and play areas as a critical defence against future disease outbreaks in the decades ahead.

Access at Coal Quay Bridge and the Coal Harbour
• Request the amendment of Objective 25 on zoning Map 3 and Specific objective 25 to omit the current objective to upgrade road access. Replace with the following:
  To upgrade pedestrian safety and crossing facilities at the access from the Coal Quay to Crofton Road by a narrowing of the junction radii to provide more pedestrian space and safe crossing facilities on both sides of the junction.
• Request Objective 17 of the UFP is replaced as follows:
  To seek the designation of the access to the West Pier as a pedestrian priority zone.
• There is a current pedestrian safety hazard at the junction of Coal Quay and Crofton Road where pedestrian sightlines are limited and there is inadequate safe crossing space combined with the absence of safe crossing on both sides of the junction or on the bridge itself. This is a significant hazard in light of the significant increase in intensity of pedestrian movement as a result of COVID-19.
• There is no need to improve vehicular access along the Coal Harbour and the objective in line with sustainable transport management should be to designate this route as a pedestrian priority zone.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4, 14 and Appendix 8

| DLR Submission No: B0939 | Person: John Spain Associates on behalf of Park Developments | Map Nos: 10 |

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission requests the re-zoning of lands at Ballycorus from ‘B’ - To protect and improve rural amenity and to provide for the development of agriculture – to Objective ‘A’ - To provide residential development and/or protect and improve residential amenity. Alternatively, the submission seeks the designation of the lands as a Strategic Land Reserve.
• An overview of the landowner and a description of the site and surrounding context is provided. It is submitted that the zoning of the lands for residential development would be appropriate on foot of the existing and planned infrastructure, services and accessibility provisions in the area.
- It is submitted that re-zoning the lands for residential use would serve as a sequential and logical expansion of existing Objective A lands.
- Submission makes the case that there is a shortfall of land zoned for residential development in the Draft Plan. Considers the Core Strategy to both underestimate housing need and overestimate the speed at which development is likely to come forward.
- It is considered that the Core Strategy should be re-assessed, and a number of suggestions are made in this regard, including, inter alia: factoring in the latest CSO population growth figures; the application of ‘headroom’ beyond 2026; addressing pent-up demand and ongoing supply constraints; assumptions relating to the timeframes for the development of land; and, additional off-setting of lands with significant infrastructural and phasing requirements.
- Suggests that such a re-assessment would support the zoning of additional lands and, in this regard, requests the Council give consideration to the re-zoning of the subject lands. Notes, the landowner is in a position to rapidly deliver housing at the lands.
- Without prejudice to the re-zoning request, it is alternatively requested that the site be considered for designation as a Strategic Land Reserve. States the designation would reflect the fact the lands are well located, adjacent to existing zoned lands, served by existing/planned public transport, and are capable of being developed in the short to medium term.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 2 and Map 10 (land use mapping).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0940</td>
<td>Eoin O Cionnaith</td>
<td>Kelly’s Avenue Residents Group</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Request a proper traffic management plan be implemented for Kelly’s Avenue on foot of the proposed school development at Old Fire Station to include calming measures, address illegal car parking and cars travelling the wrong way up the one way street which will be compounded even more by Schools drop off and collection traffic.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0941</td>
<td>Sarah Jermyn</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission is requesting that the Plan considers eco-friendly sustainable urban park planning with eco-friendly (nature) playground facilities to improve and encourage the provision of sustainable neighbourhood facilities at the green spaces of Arnold Park, Cluny Grove and/or Thomastown Park which would ensure a more multi-functional use of the parks.
- This will enhance the quality of life and to provide liveable neighbourhoods that are inclusive and cater for the needs of children, people of working age, older people, and people with disabilities.
- Nature playgrounds are relatively cheap to build, planting new trees and flowers and providing rocks and wood structures to climb changes the visual landscape for all the community and boosts the biodiversity of the area. Creating circular walking paths and seating/benches around a green space such as Arnold Park, encourages walking, cycling and scooting by the community and promotes the 10-minute settlement concept.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0942</td>
<td>Josepha Madigan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Welcome the Plan’s five strategic outcomes.
- Support of Core Strategy Policy Objectives: CS1, CS3, CS6, CS7, CS8, CS10, CS11, CS12, CS13, CS14, CS15, CS17.

SLOs:
• Particularly interested in SLO 1-11, 15, 21-22, 50-64, 75-83, 85, 97, 113-114. Looking forward to these being implemented.

Climate Action:
• Commend DLRCC in driving action at local level to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to improve our natural environment.
• CA1: Will the Climate Action and Low Carbon Development (Amendment) Bill 2021 have any input on this plan?
• CA3: Does the Council intend to report on this at Council meetings, and will the new Amendment Bill 2021 have any impact on this plan?
• CA4 and CA10: Will the new Amendment Bill 2021 have any impact on this plan?
• CA14: Has the Council liaised with the EU Commission and Parliament on this issue?
• Also support CA2, CA5-CA9, CA11-CA13, CA15-CA17.

Neighbourhood – People, Home and Place:
• This Plan can empower communities to knit together their diverse elements and sustain communities that enable a vibrant and supportive environment for those of all ages and in all parts of the County.
• Support PHP2 -PHP5, PHP9, PHP12, PHP15, PHP25, PHP32 – PHP33, PHP35-PHP36, PHP38
• PHP6 Childcare Facilities: New civic, cultural and community centre in Dundrum can be an ideal location for the location of childcare services. Strongly urge that the Council try to ensure large scale housing in Goatstown and Dundrum are followed by the provision of additional childcare facilities.
• PHP7 Schools: Interested that objective is met.
• PHP8 Further and Higher Education Facilities: Interested in plans for UCD, Stillorgan CFE, Dundrum CFE
• PHP10 Music, Arts and Cultural Facilities: Hope new County Arts Development Plan can support this.
• PHP11 Libraries: Interested in plans for Dundrum and Stillorgan libraries and provision of service in Stillorgan during development at St. Laurence’s Park.
• PHP13 Equality, Social Inclusion and Participation: Hope that the Plan ensures DLR is one of most welcoming and inclusive Counties.
• PHP14 Age Friendly Strategy: Will the new Age Friendly Strategy consultation feed into the Plan?
• PHP26 Housing Mix: will the Affordable Housing Bill 2021 (if passed) have any impact on this objective and if so, how?
• PHP29 Housing for All: Important objective that will hopefully be linked to PHP26.
• PHP30 Provision of Social Housing: Very important objective.
• PHP31 Homeless Accommodation: Thank you to staff and organisations for appropriate supports.
• PHP39 Building Design and Height: This should play a major role in LAPs.

Transport and Mobility:
• Strong believer that transport infrastructure should be developed alongside housing developments in our County so that communities can flourish.
• Support objectives T1, T3, T4, T6, T8, T9, T11, T12, T14, T18, T19, T23, T25 – T27, T29, T30
• T2: Delivery of Enabling Transport Infrastructure: Strongly encourage DLRCC to ensure that this objective can be achieved.
• T5: Quality Bus Network/Bus Connects: BusConnects will remove some existing services which will lead to a reduction in services and may go against objective of encouraging the promotion of public transport.
• T7: Green Line Capacity Enhancement (GLCE) Project: Objective should be prioritised asap.
• T10: Walking and Cycling: Hope Safe to Schools Programme can feature in this objective. Note NTA’s recent investment of €34m in the County.
• T17: Car Sharing Schemes: Support idea of objective but Covid-19 may cause unease.
• T20: Park and Ride: Objective has good intentions but may be counter intuitive as Luas carriages may be over capacity.
• T22: Roads and Streets: Note a number of projects have been prioritised and trust these can be delivered asap.
• T28: Traffic Management: Needs to be looked at in tandem with large-scale housing developments.
• T33: Section 48 and 49 Levies: Will be following the Glenamuck Distributor Road Scheme with a close eye.

Enterprise & Employment:
• This Plan helps to achieve the rights of having an opportunity to get a job, go to
work and earn a decent wage, and also helps workers in having the opportunities to up-skill and retrain so people have continued opportunities throughout their working life.

- Support objectives E1, E4, E5, E7-11, E13, E14, E16
- E6: Tackling Unemployment: DLRCC should play a role in targeting initiatives that can provide jobs to younger generation.
- E15: Home Working/ E-Working: Wil Dept. of Enterprise’s Remote Working Strategy feed into this objective?
- E18: Rural Development: What is DLRCC intending to provide over next 6 years?
- E19: Low Carbon Economy: Will the Climate Action and Low Carbon Development (Amendment) Bill 2021 have any impact?

**Towns, Villages and Retail Development:**
- Fully support objectives MFC1-MFC3, RET6, RET8-RET10
- RET4- Major Town Centres: Support Dundrum as MTC and that civic, cultural, community centre will be in Dundrum LAP. Suitable site needs to be found for this.
- RET5 - District Centres: Support that the District Centres of Stillorgan and Nutgrove are maintained and promoted.
- RET7: Local Shops: Consideration should be given to Belarmine/Aikens village area.

**Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity:**
- Fully support objectives GIB1, GIB12, GIB13, GIB15, GIB17, GIB20, GIB25, GIB30.
- GIB2: Historic Landscape Character Areas: Note that HLCAs completed in Kiltiernan and Glencullen – this should be followed through.
- GIB24: Rivers and Waterways: Note littering of rivers and streams. Should be carried out in tandem with Council’s Litter Management Plan.

**Open Space, Parks and Recreation:**
- The Council will be aware that I have been very vocal in my calls for a National Litter Awareness Campaign.
- Fully support objectives OSR2, OSR4, OSR5, OSR8, OSR10.
- OSR1: Open Space Strategy: Look forward to seeing plans of new park at Glenamuck.
- OSR6: Allotments and Community Gardens: Works are underway in Fernhill for community gardens.
- OSR9 - Sports and Recreational Facilities: Phase II of Samuel Beckett Civic Centre should be rolled out under this objective.
- OSR13: Play Facilities and Nature Based Play: More emphasis on accessibility of location of playgrounds needed.

**Heritage and Conservation:**
- Our heritage needs to be properly protected, promoted and to the greatest extent possible accessible.
- Fully support objectives HER1, HER2, HER5, HER7, HER9, HER12, HER19, HER20 - HER23, HER25.
- HER26: Historic Demesnes and Gardens: Marley House and Fernhill should be protected under this objective.
- HER27: Civic Memorials: Due consideration needs to be given to including statues of women in the County.

*Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11 and 14.*

**DLR Submission No:** B0943  
**Person:** Edmund Rice School Trust  
**Map Nos:** 3  
- Duplicate of 1238 (see below for summary)

*Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 3*
Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission on the Draft Dún Laoghaire Rathdown Development Plan 2022-2028 relating to the zoning of Tower Green and Clareville, on Cross Avenue, Blackrock.
- Site is located to the northside of Cross Avenue, to the south and west of Blackrock College, which is in educational use. The site was formerly part of Blackrock College, however, it was sold in 2020 to our client. There are two existing residential properties on the site, Tower Green and Clareville and is separated from Blackrock College by a road. Site never used for educational purposes.
- Reasons are set out for why the site is considered to be a highly sustainable site with excellent amenities, facilities and employment opportunities.
- Submission requests retention of current A land use zoning objective on site (SNI to A)

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0945</td>
<td>Lua McIlraith</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Submission notes an increase in traffic on Sandyhaven Avenue North including parking on double yellow lines
- Submission is not in favour of paid parking in the area and requests Traffic wardens Patrol the area.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0946</td>
<td>Mary Delahunty</td>
<td>Monkstown Tennis club</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Request that Monkstown Lawn Tennis club is rezoned from A to F

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0947</td>
<td>Susan Spain</td>
<td>National Yacht Club</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The submission provides a history of the National Yacht Club and states that the Club are broadly supportive of the content of the Plan as it relates to the harbour and it recognises the associated recreational amenities and economic enterprises currently operating in and around the harbour. The submission also welcomes the upcoming LAP for Dún Laoghaire and Environs.
- The submission highlights a number of changes since the adoption of the last Plan, which are relevant, including:
  - The transition of the responsibility of the harbour to the Council.
  - Funding has been granted under the governments National Sports Policy for large scale sports infrastructure projects (i.e. for marine activities) for Dún Laoghaire, subject to feasibility and design study.
  - Two URDF funded economic plans for Dún Laoghaire are nearing completion which will inform the future development and direction of resources for the harbour.
  - With respect to Policy Objective OSR12: Dún Laoghaire Recreational Harbour, the submission considers that the harbour should be considered as a public amenity similar to other public parks in the County and the policy should be extended to include the protection and enhancement of recreational and sporting activities (including sailing, racing and competitions of National and European significance) in the County which would align with Policy Objective ORS10: Protection of Sports Gounds/Facilities and Policy Objective OSR11: Water Based Sports.
  - Policy objective ORS12: Dún Laoghaire Recreational Harbour should also be further clarified to refer to ‘industrial proposals’, within the harbour.
  - The submission requests the inclusion of an additional SLO to address the pressing need for public access to the waters of Dún Laoghaire Harbour, for example “To improve and upgrade public slipways
and develop new larger public slipways within the harbour allowing improved access to the water at all points of tide.

- The objectives for the largest area within the harbour is not included in the Draft Plan i.e. the extensive site of the former ferry terminal and hard standing area at St. Michael’s pier. This represents an outstanding opportunity to open up access to the waterfront and such improvements would raise the standard of facilities at the harbour to those provided in countries such as the UK, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy, Australian and New Zealand and would be consistent with Policy Objective ORS11.

- The submission request that the following SLO is included in the Plan, “To seek the redevelopment of St. Michael’s Pier as a centre for water sports activity allowing extensive access to the water and opening up a considerable space for public municipal events”.

- The submission also request and SLO providing for the updating and revision of the extant Harbour Masterplan to take account of the harbour lands and its curtilage and to guide future development.

- The submission includes Appendix 1 which is a visualisation of the future of St. Michael’s pier.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2, 9, 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission notes safety concerns in Sandycove and 40ft, nothing that pedestrians, cyclists and motorists are in competition for access.

- Submission suggests reduced access for motorists at peak times, signage, parking of cars in designated car parks and encouraging cyclists to dismount.

- Submission suggests having lifeguards on duty throughout the year especially at weekends in winter.

- Suggests parking regulation and the provision of more disabled parking and wheelchair access to 40ft.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Description of Glasthule village, including its character and architecture.

- Public Realm Study is required to address urban realm. Recommendations of details to be included in the study provided. Works carried out in Monkstown are a good example.

- Roads and pavement are in disrepair and need repair at same time as works from other departments eg. Drainage so road is not continuously dug up for different issues.

- Request a Specific Objective in the Development Plan that an effective Traffic Management Scheme (including parking) for the area should be prepared by the Council in consultation with the local residents as a matter of urgency.

- Sandycove ACA – threat to ACA and its character due to car parking issues in area, unsightly overhead wires, poor street lighting, lack of public toilet facilities, lack of bins, poor signage which needs to be standardised.

- Refurbishment, renewal and repair of lower coastal pedestrian walk between Sandycove beach to the baths in Dun Laoghaire.

- Flooding concerns and coastal defences should be a priority in the CDP.

- Stormwater Management Plans and SuDS policies in low lying areas need to be reviewed and updated in the context of rising sea-levels.

- Sea defences and expert advice on this should be a high priority focus.

- Risk of flooding due to climate change has not been addressed sufficiently in the Plan – little consideration in the SFRA of risk of flooding due to rising sea levels caused by climate change.

- Previous submission in relation to flooding, SuDS, Stormwater Management Plans, flood relief works, coastal protection works, localised flooding in Sandycove/Glasthule, seeking expert advice, not responded to.
- Storm surges and overtopping need a medium to long term response – installation of retractable steel barrier.
- Storm surge barrage - CDP should refer to possibility of CDP objectives being assisted by this issue being considered a national/regional project.
- Additional litter bins, and the maintenance of these bins is required in Sandycove. In areas of high usage there is an urgent need to replace the manually operated solar bins with foot/pressure operated bins.
- Hudson Park is a welcome addition but would also benefit from the provision of an enclosed community garden in the park.
- Technical working group should be set up to improve broadband in the County – Council needs to invest in Communications Strategy and invest significantly in broadband provision/improvement.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 4, 8, 9, 11, 14, Appendix 16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0950</th>
<th>Person: Heather McMeel in Avison Young Planning and Regeneration Ltd.</th>
<th>Organisation: On behalf of An Post</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Description of An Post’s services and the expansion of An Post.
- Request that DLRCC provide a supportive policy framework for the future provision of postal infrastructure.
- As part of their overall consolidation and optimisation strategy, An Post may consider the potential to redevelop sites which are no longer fit for purpose and may consider the potential to relocate to new sites that are considered better suited to meet the operational requirements of An Post. Request that DLRCC provide flexibility under their land use zonings and objectives in relation to An Post’s facilities and operational requirements.
- Requested that DLRCC include provisions for both An Post Retail and An Post Mails & Parcels operations as permissible or open for consideration land uses across all zoning objectives in the CDP.
- Request the inclusion in the CDP of following policies:
  - “To support An Post in the provision of new postal facilities and the enhancement of existing facilities, including operational requirements, in Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown.”
  - “To facilitate the provision of postal infrastructure at suitable locations in Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown.”
  - “To promote the integration of appropriate post office facilities within new and existing communities that are appropriate to the size and scale of each settlement.”
- Request that DLRCC provide flexibility with car parking standards for postal facilities which require sufficient car parking spaces to operate in an efficient manner. Postal facilities may require a greater quantum of car parking spaces going forward as postal trends continue to evolve, making it imperative that facilities are future proofed to ensure the long-term viability of An Post’s operations.
- Request that the CD provision any restrictions on the times of deliveries/collections to/from An Post facilities could have a serious impact on the ability of An Post to meet the postal needs of the public and agreed service legal agreements with the State. Also request DLRCC to engage with An Post should any future area plan propose to amend delivery hours in town/city centre locations.
- Request that during the preparation of any future public realm and movement strategies, DLRCC recognise that a sufficient level of vehicular access is maintained and that sufficient loading bay space is provided to accommodate the collection and delivery of mail and to accommodate customers who require use of a vehicle to visit an An Post facility.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 12, 13 and Miscellaneous.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0951</th>
<th>Person: Adrian Cassidy</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission welcomes East Coast Cycleway/ coastal protection works at Corbawn Lane and Woodbrook DART Station.
- Submission notes concern about coastal erosion in Corbawn estate.
- Submission notes concern surrounding safety and congestion issues around the current East Coast Cycle Trail route. The alternative cycle route will provide a top-class cycle route with the benefit of a proper Coastal Protection Plan.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Chapter 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0952</td>
<td>Shirley Finnegan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9,13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Request that the right of way that was taken away in 2013 be reinstated to the Dolmen, which is a historical site.
- Do not remove the Ballybetagh ROW.
- There is a huge amount of historical sites and monuments. History should be preserved for future generations.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Appendix 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0953</td>
<td>Paddy Daly</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The submission requests more youth cycling facilities, such as Pump tracks and proper skate parks.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Chapter 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0954</td>
<td>Tony Manahan</td>
<td>On behalf of OHM Group</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission relates to a number of sites connected to the Spirit Motor Group. The Draft Plan proposes no zoning changes, and this is considered a lost opportunity.
- Welcomes the designation of Sandyford as a Mixed Use District in the Core Strategy. However, the SUFP is overly restrictive in terms of the Business District. Zoning is too strictly segregated in specified parts of the District and is inconsistent with the vision for the majority of the District as a Mixed Use zone.
- A report on Sandyford by Knight Frank 'The Sandyford Business District An Analysis Of Residential Supply Issues' is also included with the submission. In summary this report puts forward the argument that there is a mis-match between working and living population (26,000 employees and 5,000 residents). It finds that this imbalance is likely to persist. The working population of the district is likely to grow to 48,500 whereas the residential population only has the capacity to grow to almost 12,000. Report considers that the areas zoned residential is unlikely to deliver as the ownership is fractured.
- The viability of development is faced with many challenges currently including the high costs of construction, narrow range and expensive sources of finance as well as planning and development risk. The report identifies a variety of sites that could play a meaningful role in reducing the imbalance between employment growth and residential capacity in the district during the lifetime of the next Sandyford Urban Framework Plan. A failure to consider other potential land for development would mean that the shortage of accommodation in the area will persist and the district could lose its competitive edge/attractiveness with other surrounding areas becoming more attractive for companies looking to create employment.
- The report notes that “there is very little industrial stock available in the Dublin market and this is unlikely to be alleviated anytime soon given the low levels of new industrial accommodation in the development pipeline.”
- Submission considers that a 2 fold approach is needed in the SUFP area to address issues raised in the Frank Knight Report.
- substantially increase the permitted height, density, and site coverage in Zone 5 as an incentive for land owners to consider residential alternatives and permit residential to be “open for consideration” in Zones 1, 2, 3 and 4.

**Requested Designation in Plan**
- At present Blackthorn Drive, which is a getaway into the district is unbalanced visually and lacks a sense of place.
- Submission requests that an area outlined, currently occupied by car sales showrooms and other commercial uses;
  - Should be replaced by multi storey developments, so as to create streetscape, and this should be a Specific Objective of the development plan.
  - Should allow Increased Density/Plot Ratio of 1:2 and Heights of 6-8 storeys
  - Should include a star annotated on the Zoning Map for additional heights and buildings of noticeable design
  - Should allow residential Use as well as commercial uses as open for consideration
  - Should also have an SLO for a comprehensive study as to how best to achieve a suitable redevelopment in this area and the height, plot ratio and use limitations on the site amended in light of the outcome of that study.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 13, Chapter 14, Appendix 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0955</th>
<th>Person: Gavin</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If the lands surrounding the Kilternan Sports Hotel are rezoned, then efforts should be made to restore public access to the old Glencullen church mass path/Ballybetagh woods Right of Way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This path is marked on the interactive county maps but in recent years has been fenced and wired off by both the equestrian centre and landowners off Killegar Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0956</th>
<th>Person: Lisa MacNicholas</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Request the deletion of the following text from Section 8.5.6 George’s Place:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first phase of the redevelopment of the former Council Depot at George’s Place to provide new social housing and expand the residential population of the Town has been completed. The ongoing redevelopment of the site offers an opportunity to provide a mixed-use redevelopment that includes educational uses and the Plan supports the adaptation and reuse of the existing buildings on the site including the sensitive redevelopment of the Protected Structures. The first phase of the development has anticipated a new pedestrian/cycle link between George’s Place and Crofton Road and the completion of this route across Stable Lane to further strengthen the connectivity between Georges Street and the Waterfront is a strategic objective of this Plan. Any redevelopment will include upgrades to the public realm along Georges Place to include traffic calming, extensive tree planting, pollinator planting schemes, creative water connectivity attenuation, wider paving, improved surfaces and new public lighting to create a stronger sense of place...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stable Lane is a private lane and has not been legally taken in charge. The submitter attaches a letter from DLRCC in this regard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stable Lane is a private lane and no permission has been sought or granted from the rightful owners for it to be used as a public pedestrian and cycle link.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An injunction has previously been obtained against the local authority preventing the gate being used for any other purpose other than as an emergency exit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ownership of the wall in which the gate has been inserted has not been established and it predates Local Authority use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are multiple alternative routes from George’s Street to the waterfront - York Road, Kelly’s Avenue, Crofton Avenue and Charlemont Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Stable Lane is a private lane used by residents of Connaught Terrace, Connaught Mews' and Stable Lane Mews and their visitors. There are six young children who reside here and use the Lane as a recreational play area. Any opening up of the emergency gate would detrimentally impact residential amenity.
• The connection would result in a loss of privacy and safety as the mews houses have not front garden.
• The existing provision of parking is grossly inadequate to serve the needs of those living or working on Crofton Terrace, Connaught Terrace, Connaught Mews and Stable Lane (the submitter attaches photos in this regard). The proposed removal of car spaces would worsen the situation.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0957</th>
<th>Person: Ms C L Ryan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission seeks the re-zoning of all houses accessed of Slate Cabin Lane in Sandyford to Objective A. Highlights that Slate Cabin Lane comprises the existing boundary between lands zoned Objective A and lands zoned Objective B. Suggests that the boundary causes an inconsistency in planning policy and decision making as one side is assessed as a wholly residential area, and the other as a wholly rural area. Notes that the vast majority of residents do not work in the local rural community or in agriculture.
- Suggests that moving the boundary would succeed in: creating a more consistent planning system which ensures that all decisions at Slate Cabin Lane would be made in a consistent manner; marginally increasing the short fall of available housing in the DLR area, with little cost due to local infrastructure upgrades; and, creating a truer reflection of the existing land uses.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0958</th>
<th>Person: Michael Creegan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission notes an increase in the volume of cars using the Sandycove area, making the area unpleasant.
- Submission considers the area is too small to accommodate high volumes and a traffic management plan is required.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0959</th>
<th>Person: Tony Manahan</th>
<th>Organisation: Manahan Planners on behalf of MHO Properties</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission relates to a site bounded by Blackthorn Road to the north, Heather Road to the west and Fern Road and industrial/commercial buildings to the south and east. The context for the site is outlined. Zoning of the site is Zone 3 and SLOS8 applies, height max at 6 storeys and plot ratio of 1:2. The site is constrained by the 6 Year Road Objective reservation splitting the site in two.
- The site is close by and directly south of the Zone 5 “Residential Neighbourhood A”. Submission outlines details of the Frank Knight report which is submitted and considers that as this area is already occupied by existing buildings it is unlikely to develop. Plan needs to address the shortage of residential development before it acts as a disincentive to attracting new businesses to the area.

A twofold approach is required as follows;
(A) substantially increase the permitted height, density, and site coverage in Zone 5 as an incentive for land owners to consider residential alternatives and
B) permit residential to be “open for consideration” in Zones 1, 2 and 3.

Requested Designation in Plan
• Residential use is added as an “Open for Consideration” designation to Zone 3 (Office Based Employment use) in line with the mixed use nature of the District.
• If it is not considered appropriate not acceptable for the whole zone it should be permitted on this particular site, having regard to its nature, location and capacity to satisfactorily accommodate residential use.
• Having further regard to the splitting of the subject site in two, thereby reducing the area for development, it is requested that the plot ratio be increased from 1:2 to 1:3.
• Height permitted on this site should be increased beyond the 6 storey permitted, having regard to the visually strategic location of these sites on a curved section of Blackthorn Road and adjacent to the proposed new entrance road to SBD from junction 14.
• substantially increase the permitted height, density, and site coverage in Zone 5 as an incentive for land owners to consider residential alternatives and
• permit residential to be “open for consideration” in Zones 1, and 2.
• A report on Sandyford by Knight Frank ‘The Sandyford Business District An Analysis Of Residential Supply Issues’ is also included with the submission. In summary this report puts forward the argument that there is a mis-match between working and living population (26,000 employees and 5,000 residents). It finds that this imbalance is likely to persist. The working population of the district is likely to grow to 48,500 whereas the residential population only has the capacity to grow to almost 12,000. Report considers that the residential is unlikely to happen as the ownership is fractured.
• The viability of development is faced with many challenges currently including the high costs of construction, narrow range and expensive sources of finance as well as planning and development risk. The report identifies a variety of sites that could play a meaningful role in reducing the imbalance between employment growth and residential capacity in the district during the lifetime of the next Sandyford Urban Framework Plan. A failure to consider other potential land for development would mean that the shortage of accommodation in the area will persist and the district could lose its competitive edge/attractiveness with other surrounding areas becoming more attractive for companies looking to create employment.
• The report notes that “there is very little industrial stock available in the Dublin market and this is unlikely to be alleviated anytime soon given the low levels of new industrial accommodation in the development pipeline.”

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 13? Appendix 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0960</td>
<td>John Spain</td>
<td>Park Development Group</td>
<td>7,9,10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission provides commentary on Park Development Group and their development sites in the County and also provides commentary on various aspects of the Draft Plan and national policy. A summary of requested amendments is set out.

Central / Accessible Locations, Apartment Density and Unit Mix
Central and Accessible Location classification
• Suggest that a map could be prepared to reflect those areas in the County which meet the definition of ‘Central / Accessible’ locations as set out in Section 2 of the Apartment Guidelines.

Dual Aspect
• Requirement for 50% of apartments to be dual aspect should be amended and made consistent with SPPR4 of Apartment guidelines

Density.
Revise Policy objective PHP18 as follows (Additions underlined)
It is a Policy Objective to: - increase housing supply and promote compact urban growth through the consolidation and re-intensification of infill/brownfield sites having regard to proximity and accessibility considerations, and development management criteria set out in the ‘Design Standards for New Apartments’ (December 2020) and the ‘Urban Development & Building Height Guidelines’ (2018). - Encourage higher residential densities provided that proposals provide for high quality design and ensure a balance between the protection of existing residential amenities and the established character of the surrounding area, with the need to provide for high quality sustainable residential development.

Housing Mix
• Considers that data analysis in the HNDA does not support housing mix requirements particularly those around 3+ bed and seeks removal of table 12.1 of the Draft Plan.

Car parking
• Substantial areas of the County can be classified as ‘Central / Accessible’ locations, aligning most closely with Parking Zone 2 in Map T2 and therefore the car parking requirement for Zone 2 should be a maximum of 1 space per unit and allow for a reduced provision to be considered consistent with the recommendations of the Guidelines.
• Request that the parking zones are reviewed and that the parking standards are indicated as maximum for residential development.
• Notes additional requirement for Build to Rent schemes in the Draft Plan which ‘must comply with the requirements set in Section 12.4.5’, and considers that this is contrary to SPPR 8 of the Design Standards which state there shall be a default of minimal or significantly reduced car parking provision.

Build to Rent Development
• Submission considers that Build to Rent is not a separate use from residential
• Plan should comply with SPPR8 of Apartment Guidelines and omit additional standards in relation to dual aspect, separation distances, unit storage and car parking. Requests amendments to section 12.3.5 and 4.3.2.3
• Built to rent is essential in delivering viable development.

Open space
• Seek retention of 10% open space in existing built up area as set out in current Plan.
• Request that open space requirements for institutional and SNI zoned lands should be 20% as recommended in the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas, 2009.

Building Height
• Building heights Strategy is not consistent with Section 28 Guidelines as it undermines an applicant’s ability to obtain permission under SPPR 3. Request omission of policy approach and additional criteria as set out in BHS.

Conclusion
• Submission does not support dezoning of lands and would encourage the Council to look ahead beyond the next 6 years given the long delay between zoning and delivery.
• Categorisation of the entire County as a ‘suburban or intermediate urban location’ is clearly in conflict with the content of the Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines 2020 and has the potential to undermine the National Strategic Outcome No.1 of the National Planning Framework promoting Compact Growth

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 2,4,12,13
- Submission notes that development on this site was being progressed in 2017 which included for an alternative pedestrian connection from the school.
- It is noted that there is no shortfall of open space in the area and it is requested that the site be rezoned back to NC as this site forms part of the existing neighbourhood centre.
- Submission details the site location and context.
- Submission details existing neighbourhood and open space provision serving the area that includes Cabinteely Public Park.
- Submission notes that there is no justification for the downzoning of the area to F as there is no deficiency of open space in the area.
- Submission states that the Planning Authority did not make the site owner aware that the subject site was no longer considered appropriate to be zoned objective NC.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0963</th>
<th>Person: Peter Kerruish</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission highlights issues around construction activities and their impact on residential areas, which have come into sharp prominence with the increase in working from home.
- Present requirements for site environmental controls are insufficient to prevent noise, vibration, and dust nuisance.
- Several significant developments in those parts of the County with underlying hard granite bedrock have proceeded under the previous Plan at considerable distress to local communities.
- To reduce the level of such nuisance, the 2022-2028 Development Plan needs to be more specific:
  (i) Hours of Construction - After “Site development and building works shall be restricted to 7.00am to 7.00pm Monday to Friday and 8.00am to 2.00pm Saturdays.” Include the following - “The first hour of which shall be for preparation of the working areas only”.
  (ii) Percussive Rock Breaking - for environmental reasons percussive rock breaking will not be permitted for more than two hours per day. When substantial rock excavation is anticipated or subsequently encountered, non-percussive methods of extraction shall be adopted to reduce any percussive element to less than two hours per day.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0964</th>
<th>Person: Shirley Gleeson</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission does not support rezoning of land at the sports hotel due to impacts on wildlife and biodiversity.
- Submission notes the beauty of the area that should be preserved.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0965</th>
<th>Person: William Hourie</th>
<th>Organisation: Taney Parish Centre</th>
<th>Map Nos: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission notes the there are two churches within Taney Parish - St Nahi’s and Christ Church and notes that over 2000 parishioners, Taney is now the largest numerical Church of Ireland parish in the Country.
- Submission notes that Christ Church opened in 1818 and incorporates a Parish Centre, built in 1991, and is regularly used by the wider community.
- Submission notes that St Nahi’s was the original site of Dundrum Parish Church, built about 800AD. It is noted that the churchyard is open for burial to those who live in the parish.
• Submission notes the land use zoning and policy objectives relative to the Parish properties including the SNI zoning at Christ Church and its inclusion on the RPS, F zoning at St. Nahi’s and its inclusion in the RMP etc.
• Submission includes an excerpt from Map 1 of the development plan that references the Parish ownership of Tennis grounds on Taney Road. Submission requests that the A zoning is retained at this location.
• Submission notes the location of St Nahi’s proximate to the library and disused HSE Dispensary on lands zoned MTC.
• It is requested that building heights within the location of the extracted map 1 submitted take existing structures in the surrounding area into consideration, in particular proximate to St Nahi’s.
• Submission notes that a Garden of Remembrance & Graveyard already exists and consider that Columbarium/Garden of Remembrance on a derelict site next to St. Nahi’s graveyard would be an enhancement to the area.
• It is requested that Zoning Objective F is extended to permit the construction of a Garden of Remembrance/Columbarium.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 13, Appendix 5, Map 1.

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission relates to a site on Blackglen Road
• Submissions sets out detail in relation to Blackglen Road Improvement Scheme
• subject site comprises a mix of Zoning Objective A (Residential) to the north, with the main part of the site zoned Objective G High Amenity
• Submission considers that the zoning represents an anomaly and also cuts across property ownership.
• Request rezoning from G to A

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 5

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Description of lands owned by Ballymore including a map provided.
• Appendices provided of Calculation of Housing Target, Submission to NTA GDA Strategy, IW response of pre-connections water enquiry of lands.
• Welcome designation of lands as SLR to west of M11 but lands should also be rezoned for residential.
• Failure to zone these lands means they cannot be taken into consideration by other agencies and infrastructure providers such as Irish Water, TII and the NTA in their capital planning programmes. Also they will not be ready for development straight away as a SLR.
• Welcome the acknowledgement in Section 2.3.3 that there is unmet pent-up demand for housing in the county but disappointing that the draft Plan targets the delivery of only 20,669 no. additional housing units by 2028. This is 10,216 fewer units than the 30,885 no. units the current CDP targets as being required by 2022. Given the current housing crisis - extraordinary conclusion - question the assumptions on which it is based. Additional 35,000 housing units would be an appropriate target for the 2022-2028 CDP.
• Support SCOs in Fig 1.4
• Question Table 2.8 and the capacity of both the Infill/Windfall sites and of the Rathmichael Strategic Growth Area to deliver the anticipated housing yield as no LAPs prepared highly optimistic figures.
• Support the following in Chapter 5:
  “The Council recognises the fundamental link between mobility and land use so as to reduce reliance on car-based travel for daily journeys and to ensure more sustainable patterns of travel, transport and development. An essential element of this is the need to plan to integrate spatial planning policies with key mobility requirements, mainly through such mechanisms such as higher development densities and mixed-use development within walking and cycling distance of high-quality public transport corridors.”
Rathmichael:  
- Description of Rathmichael area given and lack of planning permissions.  
- Extract from Residential Availability Land Survey 2014 regarding development and development potential in the Rathmichael area.  
- Overall pattern of planning decisions in the area demonstrate that there is very limited scope for Rathmichael to absorb a substantial quantum of new residential development, particularly the southern end, and priority should be to protect the visually attractive and ecologically sensitive character of the area.  
- Appropriate target for residential development in the Rathmichael area should be 1,000-1,500 units in total, remaining 1,000 units currently allocated to Rathmichael should be re-allocated to the Ballymore lands identified as a SLR in the plan.

Ballymore’s Vision:  
- Historically, the development of this area has been stymied by the complexity of delivering several complex pieces of infrastructure by multiple agencies in a coordinated manner. Water supply/foul drainage for the area is largely resolved, the opportunity arises to coordinate the delivery of housing with transportation infrastructure, so as to deliver housing at scale that is truly sustainable.  
- Preparation of South East Dun Laoghaire Rathdown LAP, embracing Rathmichael, Old Connaught, Woodbrook and Shanganagh, and the development of lands from east to west.  
- Welcome the commitment to the delivery of Bus Connects, the LUAS extension to Bray and the recommendations of the Bray and Environs Transport Study. Extract of Preferred Option from BETS provided.  
- New transport bridge over M11 connecting Allies River Road and linking with Woodbrook DART station, BusConnects corridor.  
- Bridge over M11 is in BETS but is not on Map 14 as an SLO or in Table 5.3.  
- Bridge will release the potential of all lands west of the M11 and allow development to decouple from any upgrade of the M11 and Wilford Interchange.  
- The zoning of Ballymore’s lands at Shankill together with the construction of a new road over the M11 motorway linking the two land parcels would not only deliver much needed housing, open space and playing fields, it would also unlock the existing zoned lands at Old Connaught and protect the unique rural character of Ferndale Rd by providing an alternative to the upgrade of the Ferndale and Rathmichael roads. Will also support investment in Luas infrastructure.  
- Allow Ferndale Road is remain as is.  
- Ballymore-owned lands to east of M11 are serviced and close to public transport routes.  
- Undeveloped lands on both sides of the M11 are in the ownership of a willing, single landowner - a rare opportunity.  
- Map provided showing Ballymore’s vision with proposed transport infrastructure, LAP boundary, school site and parkland east of M11, GAA pitches along western boundary with M11, residential development on remaining Ballymore lands west of M11.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 1, 2, 5, 14, Map 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0968</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>on behalf of Gena and Brendan Byron</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:  
- Submission requests that Mangerton, Westminster Road (RPS No. 2051) is removed from the RPS and map 6 updated accordingly.  
- It is noted that this structure was recommended for adding to the RPS by the Minister of Housing, Local Government and Heritage.  
- The submission sets out the site context and notes its inclusion within the Foxrock ACA.  
- The submission includes a report by John Redmill, Conservation Architect, in relation to the merits of the property for inclusion on the RPS and an appraisal of the NIAH record. A summary of this report notes that the property has no elements or features of any significance or interest and the location within the ACA provides sufficient protection and there are a number of inaccuracies in the NIAH record.
Submission requests that the inclusion of structure is not bases solely on foot of its inclusion on the NIAH but that the local authority assess each property. It is not clear if the property was assessed by the local authority.

**Summary of Submission Appendix 1 – Report for Mangerton:**
- Report sets out the legislative background, includes references to the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011) and the NIAH Handbook Edition March 2021, with regard to determining the special interest of a structure, its rating and adding structures to the RPS.
- Report notes that a copy of the recommendations made by the Minister to the Planning Authority does not appear to be available online.
- Report notes that an ACA is another, less onerous, way of offering legal protection to buildings.
- Report notes shortcomings of the legislation in terms of not distinguishing between different levels of architectural merit.
- Report notes that the RPS does not reflect the NIAH rating of a structure – this can result in over protection of structures.
- Report sets out a description of the property and provides detail of its NIAH entry.
- Report notes that it is unclear where the basis for interior references arose whether through a physical inspection or through photos obtained from the property sale in 2015.
- Report comments upon practices employed by NIAH during their surveys of structures.
- No justification using the phrase in the NIAH entry for ‘an integral component of the early-20th century domestic heritage of south County Dublin’ or for any attribution to the architect Richard Orpen. In addition historic connections refer to George Malcom Cruikshank – it is not clear if this was a person of any note.
- Report states that the structure has no elements or features that are ‘special’ or of any particular significance.
- Report questions the definition and application of the NIAH ‘regional’ rating and considers that Mangerton does not make any significant contribution to the heritage of Leinster or Greater Dublin and should not be included on the RPS.
- The Minister should be informed that the property is not to be listed on the RPS until such time that the Local Authority have made their own assessment of the property.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0969</th>
<th>Person: Marie Morgan-Burgess</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission notes as result of recent developments in Sandycove, residents are experiencing disruption in terms of parking - parking across gateways, on yellow lines and pavements.
- Submission notes there is no scope for further parking.
- Notes an increase in traffic and the lifeboat has seen its response time affected.
- Notes the proposed portaloo will be an eyesore.
- Notes the road to the Point past Joyce’s tower should be pedestrianised for safety and ecological reasons.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0970</th>
<th>Person: John Mc Guire</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Parents live in no 14 (no street name given) difficulty with getting parking close by because of the swimmers converging in the area.
### DLR Submission No: B0971

**Person:** Tony Manahan on behalf of John Donnelly  
**Organisation:** Manahan Planners  
**Map Nos:** 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission notes that the draft plan has split the designation of the site, at Mount Eagle, into two, between the western half alongside of the Vico Road and the eastern half alongside the railway track and beach.
- Submission includes maps / aerial views of the site and photos of the gallery building.
- Submission sets out planning history on the site, which includes for a single storey structure to accommodate a private collection of art, noting that conditions were attached to the gallery in relation to opening times during the year.
- It is noted that the building has been unoccupied since 2008. It is noted that a number of bodies were approached in relation to acquiring the property for use as an art gallery, however this was unsuccessful.
- Permission to change the use of the structure to residential was refused permission having regard to the land use zoning objective (F).
- Submission notes the expense associated with the upkeep of the building.
- Submission requests that the upper half of the site, adjoining Vico Road, where the gallery building is located, is rezoned for residential use. It is noted that the 0/0 objective can be retained at this location.
- It is noted that this site was originally the side garden of the private residential property.
- Submission incorporates a number of reviews of the gallery building and its Architect.
- Submission notes that the upper section of the site, adjoining Vico Road is almost entirely covered by a building and circulation roadway and parking that has been in place for over 20 years. It is therefore considered that it does not make sense to have ‘F’ zoning in an area already build upon as it is unlikely to return to use as open space.
- Submission notes that the ‘F’ zone does not reflect the reality of the site.
- Submission notes the pHNA designation and considers that a rezone would not interfere with this designation as it relates to the eastern half of the site. The eastern half of the site can remain zoned F.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B0972

**Person:** Michael Spellman  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 6

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Supports submission of the residents of Breffini Terrace. Congestion could be resolved by allowing off-street parking for those protected structures designed in keeping with the protected structure.
- A copy of the submission to amend the Plan is included with the submission which notes the planning history for the Terrace, the case for off-street parking at Breffni Terrace, including the positive interventions of same and requests that the Plan is amended to reset the parameters on off-street parking at this location, to sensitively incorporate off-street parking and to adopt a commensurate higher level of tolerance for future planning applications for off-street parking at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 12

### DLR Submission No: B0973

**Person:** John Spain Associates on behalf of Emma and Edward Hollingsworth  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 9

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests that Hillside, Glenamuck Road (RPS No. 2020) is removed from the RPS and map 9 updated accordingly.
- It is noted that this structure was recommended for adding to the RPS by the Minister of Housing, Local Government and Heritage.
- The submission notes the site context and identifies the site on map 9 of the development plan.
- The submission includes a report by John Redmill, Conservation Architect, in relation to the merits of the property for inclusion on the RPS and an appraisal of the NIAH record. A summary of this report notes that the property has no elements or features of any significance or interest for its inclusion on the RPS and there are a number of inaccuracies in the NIAH record.
- Submission requests that the inclusion of structure is not bases solely on foot of its inclusion on the NIAH but that the local authority assess each property. It is not clear if the property was assessed by the local authority.

**Summary of Submission Appendix 1 – Report for Hillside:**
- Report sets out the legislative background, includes references to the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011) and the NIAH Handbook Edition March 2021, with regard to determining the special interest of a structure, its rating and adding structures to the RPS.
- Report notes that a copy of the recommendations made by the Minister to the Planning Authority does not appear to be available online.
- Report notes that an ACA is another, less onerous, way of offering legal protection to buildings and noted that the property is not located within an ACA.
- Report notes shortcomings of the legislation in terms of not distinguishing between different levels of architectural merit.
- Report notes that the RPS does not reflect the NIAH rating of a structure – this can result in over protection of structures.
- Report sets out a description of the property and provides detail of its NIAH entry. It is states that the property was designed by Richard Francis Orpen however there is no documentary evidence of this.
- Report comments upon practices employed by NIAH during their surveys of structures and notes that it is unclear if an internal inspection was performed or if an assessment of interiors came from images available from the sale of the property.
- The report notes that it is not clear if Mr Maconchy or his son as referenced in the NIAH appraisal were any particular note or how they constitute a ‘historic’ connection to the property.
- Report states that the structure has no architectural or cultural elements or features that are ‘special’ or of any particular significance.
- Report questions the definition and application of the NIAH ‘regional’ rating and considers that Hillside does not make any significant contribution to the heritage of Leinster or Greater Dublin and should not be included on the RPS.
- The Minister should be informed that the property is not to be listed on the RPS until such time that the Local Authority have made their own assessment of the property.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Appendix 4
### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- **Submission supports the inclusion of the Former Cricket Pavilion (now part of the golf clubhouse), Woodbrook (RPS No. 2060) onto the RPS.**
- **Submission noted that it is understood that this protection does not extend to two later additions to the club house – clarification with regard to the extent of the structure and curtilage protected is sought.**
- **Submission notes the location of the golf club lands and structure to be protected.**
- **Submission confirms that the owner has no objection to the protection of the structure, they have taken care to maintain it to date and will continue to do so into the future.**

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4**

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- **The submission requests the development plan to incorporate a policy and objectives to promote and improve and develop sea swimming facilities by the ongoing management maintenance and investment in the existing sea swimming locations and the development of additional access ladder facilities at the existing forty foot and other sea swimming locations along the coast.**
- **In other countries such as Croatia there are access sea swimming ladders circa every 100m along the coast, which enables sea swimmers to access sea swimming without giving rise to crowded facilities and enables swimmers to swim along the coast from one ladder to the next.**

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 9**

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- **Submission provides information with regards to the location, zoning and future development intent of the landowner for lands referred to as Harbour Point, which include part of the former Bray Golf Club.**
- **Submission highlights an irregular area of ‘F’ zoned lands at the site and requests an amendment to the land use zoning alignment from Objective ‘F’ to Objective ‘A’.**
- **Reference is made to aerial mapping illustrating that the zoning maps in the Draft CDP do not correspond to what is physically or visibly apparent on the ground. Additional current and historical mapping is included, and it is suggested that there is no basis for the zoning as currently aligned.**
- **States that the alignment of ‘F’ zoned lands in such an arbitrary way into lands zoned for residential development has no meaningful purpose and has real disbenefits for the development of the lands and future residents. Suggests that the subject area of ‘F’ zoning imposes artificial constraints which would limit design options and could potentially weaken the final design of residential development at the site.**
- **States that the re-alignment of the zoning would not ultimately lead to a change in the quantum of amenity or residential lands but would address the anomalous land use zoning alignment and improve the quality of both future residential development and amenity lands.**

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 14**

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- **Submission confirms that the owner has no objection to the protection of the structure, they have taken care to maintain it to date and will continue to do so into the future.**

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4**

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- **Submission notes the location of the golf club lands and structure to be protected.**

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4**
Summary of Submission and Observation:

- An outline of the developer’s projects in the UK and Ireland are set out. The lands that they own in SBD are in Zone 6 (SNI) adjoining Beacon Hospital but are not part of the hospital. Intend to seek permission in the future for a mixed use development to include medical, commercial, tourism and residential. Uses may include a rehabilitation hospital and a hotel which may replace the existing Beacon Hotel (which may change to being part of the hospital). Seek greater flexibility in the permitted uses. Concern that hotel is no longer permitted.

- Submission considers plan is not clear on rationale for rezoning to SNI when land holding does not form part of the hospital.

- Requests that list of permissible use for the SNI zoning includes a hotel and residential or alternatively the zoning is changed to MIC with a specific local objective to allow residential.

- Also the requirement of 20 % useable open space is not appropriate for this infill brownfield site instead an amount of public amenities should be required with and equivalent area of 20 % with a minimum of 10 % open space would be more appropriate.

- Link road between Bracken Road and the Drumartin Link Rd is welcomed but concerned with facilitating the road prior to the construction of the development as it may prejudice the delivery of the development and it should be open to the applicants to demonstrate that the development can be delivered in the absence of the road (noting the high quality public transport existing and proposed in the area).

- Should the delivery of the road be needed for the development of the lands it is request that P6 is revised to allow permission to be granted but limit the operation of it until such time as the infrastructure is in place.

- With regard to Policy P4, it is considered that these infrastructural works can be agreed with Irish Water through connection agreements and should not be impeding development.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Chapter 5, 14, Appendix 17, Map 6

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission requests that Clayfarm, Kilgobbin Road (RPS No. 2119) is removed from the RPS and map 9 updated accordingly.

- It is noted that this structure was recommended for adding to the RPS by the Minister of Housing, Local Government and Heritage.

- The submission notes the site context and identifies the site on map 9 of the development plan.

- The submission includes a report by John Redmill, Conservation Architect, in relation to the merits of the property for inclusion on the RPS and an appraisal of the NIAH record. A summary of this report notes that the property has no elements or features of any significance or interest for its inclusion on the RPS and there are a number of inaccuracies in the NIAH record.

- Submission requests that the inclusion of structure is not bases solely on foot of its inclusion on the NIAH but that the local authority assess each property. It is not clear if the property was assessed by the local authority.

Summary of Submission Appendix 1 – Report for Clayfarm:

- Report sets out the legislative background, includes references to the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011) and the NIAH Handbook Edition March 2021, with regard to determining the special interest of a structure, its rating and adding structures to the RPS.

- Report notes that a copy of the recommendations made by the Minister to the Planning Authority does not appear to be available online.

- Report notes that an ACA is another, less onerous, way of offering legal protection to buildings. It is noted that the structure is not within an ACA.

- Report notes shortcomings of the legislation in terms of not distinguishing between different levels of architectural merit.

- Report notes that the RPS does not reflect the NIAH rating of a structure – this can result in over protection of structures.
• Report sets out a description of the property and provides detail of its NIAH entry. The report notes inaccuracies and assumptions within the NIAH description / appraisal.
• The report notes that the property is of a type built all over Ireland from the late 18th century onwards to the early 20th century as the residence of a local and reasonably successful farmer, doctor, merchant, and tradesman – many were built by the Church of Ireland’s Board of the First Fruits.
• Report comments upon practices employed by NIAH during their surveys of structures and notes that it is unclear what the basis for references to the interiors are or if a physical internal inspection was carried out.
• The report notes that it is not clear if John Richardson as referenced in the NIAH appraisal was of any particular note or how he constitutes a ‘historic’ connection to the property.
• Report states that the structure has no architectural or cultural elements or features that are ‘special’ or of any particular significance.
• Report questions the definition and application of the NIAH ‘regional’ rating and considers that Clayfarm does not make any significant contribution to the heritage of Leinster or Greater Dublin and should not be included on the RPS.
• The Minister should be informed that the property is not to be listed on the RPS until such time that the Local Authority have made their own assessment of the property.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0980</th>
<th>Person: McCutcheon Halley</th>
<th>Organisation: On behalf of Aultagh Construction Ltd</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission relates to a site on Commons Road Shankill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cherrywood SD2 discharges into the Shanganagh River. It there was to be a failure in the system there would be a significant impact dow stream including Commons Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• As a result of published flood risk plans many houses cannot gain insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Request that the Draft Plan be amended to include a specific objective to progress the Loughlinstown Scheme in an expedient manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 16, SFRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B0981</th>
<th>Person: John Spain</th>
<th>Organisation: On behalf of IPUT Plc</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission addresses key policies in the Plan which will impact on development of lands at Carrickmines. The Draft Plan is reviewed and various commentary is set out in the submission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In the E zoning objective, open for consideration nature of residential use is subject to ‘Objective E15’ of the draft Plan. This reference to Objective E15 in the zoning matrix would appear to be a drafting error as that objective relates to home-based economic activity in residential areas. It is assumed that this should have referred to Objective E14 which is “It is a Policy Objective to ensure that employment zoned land facilitates its primary objective which is to provide for economic development and employment. The Council will apply a restrictive approach to residential development on employment zoned lands”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Built to rent should be open for consideration in the E zone at Carrickmines. This amendment would also avoid the creation of a direct conflict between the land use zoning objectives of the Draft Development Plan and the adopted Ballyogan and Environs Local Area Plan, which specifically identifies The Park as an appropriate location for Build to Rent development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BTR is permissible under the NC zoning., but not at Quadrant 3 Carrickmines where there is an SLO for a Neighbourhood Centre. Table 13.1.13 should be amended.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Any proposal for Build to Rent would more appropriately be assessed on its merits under the overarching ‘Residential’ land use class, which would allow for the appropriate degree of flexibility to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
allow for Build to Rent development at appropriate locations, and not only under the A, A1, DC, MTC, A2, and NC land use zoning objectives as currently indicated within the Draft Plan

**Roads Objectives**
- Support for 6 year road objective for the Ballyogan Link Road

**Specific Local Objectives**
- The submission requests that the SLO pertaining to the lands at Quadrant 3 should recognise the suitability of the lands to provide for residential development as part of any neighbourhood centre development on the lands, to include Build to Rent development in accordance with the policies of the Ballyogan and Environs LAP.

**Build to Rent**
- That Build to Rent development should not be defined as a distinct use class within the land use zoning matrices of the Draft Plan. Draft Plan is ultra vires, as the zoning objectives and use classes should not differentiate on the basis of tenure.

**Neighbourhood Centre Objective at Quadrant 3 and Residential Development**

Amend SLO 82 as follows; (addition underlined in bold)
- To provide for the development of a Neighbourhood Centre in the north-east ‘quadrant’ of the Park, Carrickmines, with a net retail floorspace cap of 6000 sq.m. (approximately), along with residential development (including Build to Rent residential development), and a leisure facility, to assist the existing and future retail and leisure needs of the growth areas of Carrickmines, Stepaside Ballyogan and Kilternan-Glenamuck, while also protecting employment use at this location.
- The rationale for the amendment is set out including reference to the BELAP policies, and a request that the County Plan should correspond with these policies, by specifically making reference to Quadrant 3 at The Park, Carrickmines as an appropriate location for the delivery of residential development.

**Residential Mix/HNDA**
- Interim HDNA does not provide the evidence required to propose mix requirement
- Plan should refer to the unit mix requirements of the 2020 Apartment Guidelines, as set out within SPPR 1
- Interim HNDA demonstrates the opposite position in that it indicates a significant shortfall in 1 and 2 bedroom units in the county.
- There is an absence of a clearly reasoned rationale for the inclusion of 40% 3 bedroom + units

**Car parking**
- Submission includes a separate report on parking standards.
- Revised parking standards in some instances represent too drastic a reduction which would result in more undesirable longer trips, bypassing locations such as Carrickmines, Quadrant 3 which are destined to serve a surrounding locality, and instead encouraging longer trips to locations such as Dundrum or Cornelscourt, where parking is more readily available.
- Concern expressed in relation to reducing supermarket, cinema and office parking levels on Carrickmines which would impact on the viability and attractiveness of the NC at Quadrant 3 and encourage longer journeys to other retail locations.
- Consider parking standards are overly restrictive having regard to the National Climate Plan EV target which it is considered implicitly recognise that private vehicle swill remain a significant part of the Irish transport System..
- New standards are compared to DCC standards and it is argued that standards should be less restrictive in suburban areas than in more established area of the city.
- A worked example of the impact is set out in the technical guidance note
- Amendments are requested to car parking as follows;
  - Retail Supermarket: For retail food supermarket, the parking standard should remain as they are in the current development plan at 1 space per 20sqm gross floor area. Retail food supermarket should be specifically accounted for in the parking standards.
  - Cafes and Restaurants: For Cafes and Restaurants, parking standards should remain at the current provision, 1 space per 15sqm gross floor area. Bars should have a provision of 1 space per 20sqm gross floor area
  - Offices: Offices provision should be retained at 1 space per 100sqm gross floor area.
  - Cinemas: should be provided with 1 space per 5 seats per the current development plan.

**Retail**
• Submission welcomes policy direction that recognises experiential retail, however, Section 7.2.2 should also clarify that the Planning Authority will adopt a presumption in favour of change of use applications within retail areas of the county, having regard to the need to maintain a level of flexibility in order to maintain occupancy levels, avoid vacancy, and support the vibrancy of shopping areas and streets.

**Drainage and Attenuation**

This submission is accompanied by a technical submission note on water drainage issues which raises the following:

• The requirement for drainage design to be subject to an additional design factor of 1.3 to account for Climate Change represents an extreme future scenario.

• The application of an additional design factor of 1.1 to account for ‘urban creep’, combined with the foregoing requirement in relation to climate change would have a significant impact on pipe sizing and attenuation volumes for new development, resulting in significant cost and design impacts.

• The requirement for utility clash detection at planning stage would result in significant cost and time implications, with detailed utility surveys and detailed design coordination of utilities more appropriately taking place post-planning, via condition of planning or similar.

• Requirements in respect of pumped surface water design solutions set out in Appendix 7 would have further significant impact on storage volumes and structural design for new development.

• The requirement that hard standing / parking areas not be discharged to public sewers and that these areas be infiltrated locally will not always be practicable in new developments.

• The increased 70% surface area requirement for green roofs (an uplift from the current 60% requirement) may not always be practicable or achievable depending on requirements for solar panels, plant, and equipment at roof level.

• The suggested minimum substrate depth of 80mm for extensive green roofs is significantly greater than that outlined in the CIRIA SuDS Manual, which would result in a significant impact on structural design for new developments. In this regard the standard within the current Plan for 20-40 mm for sedum / moss type extensive green roofs would be preferable.

• Request that current standards are retained in relation to climate change provision, attenuation, green roofs, and infiltration from areas of hard standing within developments.

**Dual Aspect**

• Request that the categorisation of the entire County as an intermediate urban location is omitted.

• The requirement for 50% of all apartment units to be dual aspect set out in section 12.3.5.1 of the draft Plan should be omitted, with SPPR 4 of the Guidelines noted as the relevant standard.

**Build to Rent**

Requirement for onsite parking is contrary to SPPR 8 of the Apartment Guidelines. Amendment requested.

3 appendices are included,

**Appendix 2 – Atkins consulting engineers submission note on car parking.**

• Central concern is that the proposed parking standards in the Draft Development Plan would be overly restrictive for a suburban location such as Carrickmines.

• Report is divided into 4 sections as follows; Existing and Proposed Parking Standards • Comparable parking standards in Dublin City • Facilitation of Local Trip Making • Transition to Electric Vehicles

• Amendments are recommended (see above)

**Appendix 3 – OCSC consulting engineers technical note on drainage (see details above)**

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Chapters 4, 7, 12, 13, 14  Appendices 5, 7

---

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

• Submission notes issue with traffic in Sandycove. Difficulties parking and passing cars causing the footpath to get broken. Notes danger for pedestrians, Requests a one-way system.

• Submission notes two way cycling lanes do not work.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Chapter 5
### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The submission has expressed concern with respect to the protection of the area around Ticknock, Woodside, Blackglen, and in particular, Fitzsimons Wood.
- The 2016-2022 Plan emphasises the important role of wildlife corridors to the fauna and flora diversity throughout the County and highlights the legislative backing for the protection of wildlife corridors as set out in the Habitats Directive 1992 (92/43/EEC).
- The submission notes that the Council has created an excellent Biodiversity Education Programme relating to Fitzsimons Wood.
- The submission therefore requests that the following be included in the Draft Plan:
  1. A clear map showing the Wildlife Corridor from Three Rock Mountain to Fitzsimons Wood
  2. Clarification as to how Deer will be able to cross the widened Blackglen Road
  3. Confirmation that the widened Blackglen Road will allow Badgers to cross via a tunnel or culvert.
  4. Confirmation that any planning permissions for development along Blackglen Road will make provision for the proposed Wildlife Corridor.
  5. Fitzsimons Wood designated a Natural Heritage Area (NHA).

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Chapter 8

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- With respect to tree preservation and protection the submission notes that the Central Mental Hospital (CMH) grounds in Dundrum are home to some fine mature trees particularly at the location of the entrance. The draft development plan does not include the objective “To protect and preserve trees and woodlands” within the walls of the CMH and this should be rectified.
- The submission requests that this length of the river Slang be given the designation “To protect and preserve trees and woodlands”.
- The submission is in support of Specific Local Objective 113 and states that the CMH site is likely to become a home to well more than 2,000 residents and in order to share the burden of the traffic that this will generate, vehicular entrance and egress from Larchfield Road should be included in development proposals thereby ensuring a more sustainable development.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Chapter 9 and Chapter 14

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

Kiltiernan:

- Local infrastructure must be planned and implemented before additional construction takes place.
- Additional green areas required. Planned green area is too small, poorly located between major roads, attenuation pond and next to 220kv power lines.
- Additional amenities, services, primary and secondary schools needed in area to facilitate zoned residential land.
- Lands west of the Enniskerry Road, The Dingle and the Ballycorus Valley must be protected for future generations.
- Insist on good architectural design for apartments with adequate space and parking provision.
- New village centre should contain a variety of shops and amenities, should have high standard of architectural merit and not be developer driven.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Chapter 4, 5, 8, 9, 12
Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Remove or revise SLO93 so as to enable some new housing in the Rathmichael area. The new 2021 EPA Wastewater Code of Practice eliminates the need for this SLO as it provides up-to-date guidance on how to deal with wastewater and groundwater situations, including those present in Rathmichael.
- Ban on on-site wastewater treatment systems resulting from concerns about their impact on the quality of the groundwater is not warranted.
- AquaGeoServices found in its 2015 report to Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Council that the chemical status of the water in the Rathmichael/Crinken stream was “at risk”. However, now in 2021 the current online EPA map database gives the status of the Rathmichael/Crinken stream as “good”. This significant improvement indicates that the current density of septic tanks in the area, which according to the current DLRCC Development Plan is less than 1 per 125ha and hence relatively low, is not posing a chemical pollution hazard.
- The prevention of pollution of the Rathmichael/Crinken stream or the underlying bedrock aquifer should be addressed on a case by case basis using the new 2021 EPA Wastewater Code of Practice to address the groundwater concerns, thereby enabling planning permissions to be granted.
- Contrary to the objective of the Draft CDP to provide more new housing.
- For over 10 years SLO93 has prevented the development of new housing in the Rathmichael area thus has excluded a whole generation of younger residents. This has resulted in the age profile of the population in the area becoming predominately older, which is undesirable socially and does not the create a vibrant community.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 10, Chapter 14 (Maps 10 and 14)

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission requests that lands at Tivoli Terrace South, Dún Laoghaire are rezoned from F to SNI.
- Submission sets out the site context noting that is was formerly used as playing fields and is no longer available as this function.
- Submission includes a site context map illustrating the location of the site proximate to public transport, Dún Laoghaire and Monkstown.
- Submission considers that the location of the site requires a more appropriate use of the land than the current zoning allows.
- Submission notes that the site is in full private ownership and will not be made available to the general public.
- Submission notes submissions at pre-draft stage and the response to same in the Chief Executive’s Report.
- Submission refers to the application of the SNI zoning at the health centre adjoining the site and cites relevant zoning objectives and requirements in the draft plan.
- Submission considers that the synergies could be created with the site and uses within SNI zoned lands proximate to same. A number of such lands / uses are illustrated on associated mapping.
- Submission notes commentary made in third party submissions to the draft plan in relation to the site and note that SNI zoning could address some concerns raised.
- Submission notes that the land owner, Kivoli Ltd, have extensive and proven experience of working with Government Agencies and Semi-State Organisations.
- Submission seeks the inclusion of a SLO on the site stating:
  - “Any future development proposals contained within lands zoned objective ‘SNI’, and which immediately abut residentially-zoned land, shall clearly demonstrate that the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties will be respected and protected through sensitive design with reference to height and scale and including the provision of appropriate boundary landscaping and considered boundary treatments”.
- Submission suggests that the adjoining Tivoli Training Centre should also be considered for being rezoned to SNI as the ‘F’ zoning does not support fully the use at that facility.
- Submission refers to National and Regional policy with regard to sustainable residential development. Having regard to the RSES, it is considered that the site constitutes an infill/brownfield site.
- Submission states “that the delivery of a wider range of community and people focused uses at this location is considered appropriate.”
- Submission references examples of similar sites and their zoning:
  - the Workmans Club, Rochestwon Ave that were rezoned from F to E under the previous plan cycle.
  - the application of SNI to pitches to the rear of Loughlinstown Hospital.
- An appendix to the submission references the site owners work with Government and Semi-State Bodies including St John of God Community Services, Spinal Injuries Ireland and the Road Safety Authority.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Map 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0988</td>
<td>Alice O’Connell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Dogs should be allowed off lead on West Pier in Dun Laoghaire.
- Blackrock DART station link to park needs to be widened.
- Complimentary of new cycleway along Seapoint Road.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Chapter 5, Miscellaneous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0989</td>
<td>James Dunne</td>
<td>Irish Rail</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Welcomes that ‘Transport and Sustainable Mobility’ and ‘Climate Action’ are within the key themes that form part of the Development Plan and the aligning of the Development Plan’s growth strategy with that of National and Regional policy, concentrating on facilitating compact growth and the alignment of future development with public transport infrastructure.
- Notes the NTA strategy for the GDA is under preparation at the moment which will provide a framework for the planning and delivery of transport infrastructure and services in DLR.
- Welcomes the Avoid-Shift-Improve approach and integration of land use and transport planning and demand management, the railway has a strong role to play in facilitating this approach.
- Sets out the core objectives of Iarnród Éireann’s and the benefits of rail.
- Submission sets out the DART + programme which will double the peak passenger capacity into Dublin. The DART+ Coastal South passes through the DLRCC boundary.
- Requests that the Plan supports the implementation of the full DART+ Programme. The DART+, when completed, will have significant benefits to rail passengers from DLR offering a higher frequency, integrated rail connection to the heart of Dublin city centre with enhanced interchange possibilities with other modes (Luas, bus, Intercity & Commuter rail, and the new MetroLink once developed) ensuring network wide connectivity. Would welcome the Council’s support on the removal of Merrion Gates (although not in DLR) level crossing and the alternative road infrastructure solution identified.
- The Plan should support the further expansion of our Accessibility Programme. By providing more accessible stations on the rail network, it enables and encourages journeys that would otherwise have to be taken by road-based transport, or perhaps even no journey, onto the rail network. This has sustainability benefits in terms of the reduction of emissions that result from it, while also ensuring that all who wish to use the railway and can avail of its benefits in terms of frequency, reliability, and journey time.
- The development of Customer Information Services (CIS), should be supported by Plan when they are developed and finalised in 2021 as it is a vital customer experience capability required to both attract and retain customers using sustainable rail services and a wider integrated sustainable public transport network.
- The Plan should support the implementation of the Sustainable Interchange Programme. This includes the provision of facilities in stations and local environs to provide for ease of interchange between rail and all other modes, prioritising those that are sustainable – cycling, electric charging, wayfinding and shared mobility. This has the potential to promote the concept of Mobility-as-a-Service (MaaS) in the
longer-term as digital platforms could be linked to sustainable mobility providers at either end of rail journeys as the interchange capability improves.

- The Strategy will include the opening of Woodbrook station on the South-Eastern Line in DLR. It is currently expected that construction will commence in 2022. The delivery programme is dependent on the planning outcome and the conclusion of discussions with the developer. The station will facilitate sustainable mobility in Woodbrook-Shanganagh catchment and support the LDA’s development of c.600 homes. Woodbrook station is also located minutes from the M11 motorway, providing the potential for a key future strategic park and ride site, relieving congestion on the M11.

- The following are the priorities for the Plan:
  - Priority should be given to Public Transport and Active Travel schemes, with a particular focus on high capacity modes, such as rail, which are carbon efficient.
  - Continue to expand heavy rail as a high capacity high frequency mode choice in DLR with proven ability to attract private car users, as part of a wider GDA integrated mass transit system.
  - Promote Transit Orientated Development (TOD) with mixed-use high-density development at key rail nodes and along key rail corridors.
  - Develop new rail stations in line with emerging spatial planning policy, subject to business case evaluation.
  - Support ongoing investment in rail infrastructure to ensure its continued renewal, maintenance, and improvement to a high level to ensure a high quality of rail frequency, safety, service, accessibility and connectivity across DLR and the GDA.
  - Develop an integrated, user friendly, and highly connected public transport network. Expand park and ride capacity at strategically located rail stations to encourage modal shift. Plan should support the implementation of the Park and Ride Strategy which is being developed in conjunction with the NTA and Councils.
  - Plan should support the electrification of Intercity routes.
  - Iarnród Éireann is in the final stages of developing a revised rail freight strategic plan - DLRCC should consider the findings of that report when they are made available.
  - The strategic focus should be on the development of Dun Laoghaire harbour into a distinctive district for Dún Laoghaire maximising the use of existing and future public transport options available to the harbour to promote sustainability.
  - Concerned with the impact of planning applications and National East Coast Cycle Trail on the Dalkey Railway Tunnel which is proposed to cross the tunnel multiple times. There are various safety concerns outlined in terms of the proposed construction in the vicinity of the tunnel. Request that, in the County Development Plan, the Council puts a reservation on the tunnel corridor for railway purposes only in the interests of railway safety.
  - The control of drainage is also an issue for developments along the Vico Road from Dalkey Tunnel to Killiney Station where a major slip occurred in the 2000s due to attenuation drainage from hard standing being diverted down the railway escarpment. For this reason, any developments along this or any other railway cutting should be required to drain to a public sewer rather than to soakaways. Request that there should be a drainage policy not to permit soakaways adjacent to railway cuttings.
  - Positive outcome from Covid-19 is the opportunity to change habits resetting people’s method of travel, and the promotion and priority of sustainable transport can be a key driver for the recovery of growth, thus making its inclusion a priority in the Development Plan.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapters 5, 10, 14, Appendix 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0990</td>
<td>Conor Mulcrone</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

Note: This submission has been made in the form of three attached documents. One of those documents was previously submitted as B0938. The additional 2 no. documents summarised below relate to Sea Swimming and Rosary Garden East respectively.

- Request the omission of the pedestrian link through Stable Lane to Crofton Road as shown on the Urban Framework Map.
• Request the deletion of the following text from Section 8.5.6, Appendix 8:

- ‘The ongoing redevelopment of the site offers an opportunity to provide a mixed-use redevelopment that includes educational uses and the Plan supports the adaptation and reuse of the existing buildings on the site including the sensitive redevelopment of the Protected Structures. The first phase of the development has anticipated a new pedestrian/cycle link between George’s Place and Crofton Road and the completion of this route across Stable Lane to further strengthen the connectivity between Georges Street and the Waterfront is a strategic objective of this Plan’.

• Request the omission of objective 5 in section 8.8 of the Urban Framework Plan Objectives ‘Encourage and provide for increased pedestrian and cycle permeability between George’s Street and Crofton Road’.

• Instead of the route through Stable Lane pedestrian linkage and upgrading should be redirected to the natural pedestrian desire line on Kelly’s Ave where the existing public footpaths are narrow and inadequate, thereby addressing existing pedestrian need.

• The link would adversely affect the residential amenity of the recently constructed social housing at Georges Place, wherein the courtyard provides a secure, communal shared pedestrian/vehicular amenity space for residents.

• Stable lane is a private laneway owned by the residences on Connaught Place and Crofton Terrace and legally precludes any pedestrian link or public access from Georges Place.

• In 1993, Edmund Kenny, 7 Crofton Terrace, obtained an injunction against the local authority preventing it from using this gate as anything other than an emergency exit.

• No public right of way has ever been established.

• Stable Lane has not been legally taken in charge by DLRCoCo.

• A public pedestrian through way would significantly and adversely impact on the privacy and security of the mews dwellings on Stable lane, which have no surrounding defensible space.

• Stable Lane provides for essential parking for the residents on Connaught Place and Crofton Terrace who have no alternative parking provision. Public pedestrian access from Georges Place to Stable Lane would interfere with essential residential parking provision.

• There was significant investment in conservation and regeneration of Connaught Place and Crofton terrace residences from former substandard bed sit accommodation in recent times, which would be undermined by the link.

• There are adequate alternative routes.

• This link was opposed by all the residents in the area in submissions to the 2019 development plan and in submissions to the Part 8 Social Housing application. It was consequently omitted from that development to the benefit of that development.

Old Fire Station Georges Place

• Request the omission of Objective ED from the Fire Station site from zoning Map 3 and the substitution with objective AS to provide for Art Studios.

• Request the deletion of text in the Urban Framework Plan Appendix 8 which suggests educational use for the Old Fire Station.

• Request the deletion of “The Old Fire Station site” from Table 4.1: Location of future school sites.

• The Old Fire Station is a significant landmark in the area and has remained in a largely derelict condition for years. It has significant potential to underpin the community artistic vibrancy in the area by the introduction of creative art studios and a sculpture garden.

• The Old Fire Station site lends itself more suitably to Art and cultural uses including artist studio spaces, exhibition space and a sculpture garden and a food hall.

• The selection of the Old Fire Station location for a new school, is not planned in alignment with new residential population growth. Consequently, it would generate travel demand outside of residential catchment areas and outside a 15min walk zone. As such, it fails to integrate land use and transport.

• The site is inadequate in size to accommodate a school being a maximum of 0.2Ha including the existing building footprint while the Department of Education generally seek provision of a site of minimum area 0.6Ha.

• The Fire Station building fabric and layout is unsuited to school use.

• Site contamination issues from its previous use as the Council Yard are not addressed.

• The old Fire Station site capacity and the site access has been compromised by provision and layout of social housing on the site. If the site was required for a school then the entirety of the site should have been reserved for this purpose.
- The site cannot accommodate post COVID-19 pandemic health design principles which would necessitate significantly increased provision of outdoor open space and recreational amenity.
- Request an ancillary Amendment to Sec 4.2.1.6 Policy Objective PHP7: Schools to add at the start:
  - The design of all schools should be pandemic proofed by the provision of heat and ventilation systems, use of technology for the creation of a touch less antimicrobial environment and provision of adequate outdoor space for both class rooms and play areas as a critical defence against future disease outbreaks in the decades ahead.

**Access at Coal Quay Bridge and the Coal Harbour**
- Request the amendment of Objective 25 on zoning Map 3 and Specific objective 25 to omit the current objective to upgrade road access. Replace with the following:
  - To upgrade pedestrian safety and crossing facilities at the access from the Coal Quay to Crofton Road by a narrowing of the junction radii to provide more pedestrian space and safe crossing facilities on both sides of the junction.
- Request Objective 17 of the UFP is replaced as follows:
  - To seek the designation of the access to the West Pier as a pedestrian priority zone.
- There is a current pedestrian safety hazard at the junction of Coal Quay and Crofton Road where pedestrian sightlines are limited and there is inadequate safe crossing space combined with the absence of safe crossing on both sides of the junction or on the bridge itself. This is a significant hazard in light of the significant increase in intensity of pedestrian movement as a result of COVID-19.
- There is no need to improve vehicular access along the Coal Harbour and the objective in line with sustainable transport management should be to designate this route as a pedestrian priority zone.

**Sea Swimming**
- The development plan should incorporate a policy and objectives to promote, improve and develop sea swimming facilities.
- Request additional access ladder facilities at the forty foot and other sea swimming locations along the coast. Sea swimming ladders circa every 100m along the coast would enable sea swimmers to access without giving rise to crowded facilities and would enable swimmers to swim along the coast from one ladder to the next (e.g. as in Croatia).

**Rosary Gardens East**
- Note that SLO 10 replaces and significantly weakens the current SLO152 for the same map area, covering Library Road, Rosary Gardens East and West, and Cross Avenue. Request the retention of Policy 152 as currently framed, or strengthened.
- SLO 10 is a wholly inadequate and a meaninglessly vague replacement for the existing SLO 152 which is necessary to provide at least some degree of additional protection to the historically valuable heritage of the houses within this area, particularly the architecturally valuable streetscapes and Arts and Crafts cottage designs of the Rosary Gardens East and West cul-de-sacs.

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Request the deletion of the following text from Section 8.5.6 George’s Place:
  - "The first phase of the redevelopment of the former Council Depot at George’s Place to provide new social housing and expand the residential population of the Town has been completed. The ongoing redevelopment of the site offers an opportunity to provide a mixed-use redevelopment that includes educational uses and the Plan supports the adaptation and reuse of the existing buildings on the site including the sensitive redevelopment of the Protected Structures. The first phase of the development has anticipated a new pedestrian/cycle link between George’s Place and Crofton Road and the completion of this route across Stable Lane to further strengthen the connectivity between Georges Street and the Waterfront is a strategic objective of this Plan. Any redevelopment will include upgrades to the public realm along Georges Place to include traffic calming, extensive tree planting, pollinator planting schemes, creative water connectivity attenuation, wider paving, improved surfaces and new public lighting to create a stronger sense of place.”
- There is inadequate parking available in Dún Laoghaire town in general and specifically near Crofton Terrace, Connaught Place and Stable Lane. Although there is some off-street parking, it is insufficient.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Chapter 4, Chapter 14, Appendix 8, Map 3
Most of the houses on Crofton Terrace, Connaught Place and Stable Lane have no private off-street parking and rely on parking on Stable Lane, which is often occupied. The proposal will remove all parking on the lane and will make the situation worse. The submitter attached photos of parking on Stable Lane.

- Lack of necessity / public benefit / waste of public money. Anyone wishing to access the seafront need only walk 25 metres further to the top of Kelly's Avenue. There are numerous other routes available.
- Stable Lane has not been legally taken in charge. The submitter attaches a letter from DLRCC in support.
- The lane is private property in the ownership of some of the residents of Crofton Terrace, Connaught Place and Stable Lane.
- No public right of way exists.
- Ownership of the wall in which the gate is inserted has not been established. The wall predates local authority ownership.
- There is an injunction on the DLRCC, preventing it from using the gate between Stable Lane and George's Place as anything other than an emergency exit.
- The connection would damage residential amenity and privacy. Many houses have no buffer space between the now-private lane and their walls/windows/doors.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 8

**DLR Submission No:** B0992
**Person:** Fergal Costello
**Organisation:** N/A
**Map Nos:** 3

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Urge the Council to re-establish a ferry service from the terminal, ideally catering to foot passengers, cyclists, motorcyclists, cars, vans and caravans. Dublin Port is focused on commercial traffic and wholly unsuitable for these groups.
- Moves are underway in the EU to support alternatives to air travel, due to lower emissions and better ability to accommodate pandemic safety measures, such as ferry and rail. Funding may be available from the EU for any new Dun Laoghaire Ferry.
- A ferry to the UK could be smaller and could be trialled initially during the Spring/Summer/Autumn of 2022. With the development of cycleways and greenways there is great potential for tourist traffic in both directions on this route.
- Unlike Dublin Port, Dun Laoghaire Port is well served throughout the day by Dart and bus. It is also a much safer and cheaper option for foot passengers and cyclists. Such a development would provide badly needed funding for the Port and would help local hotels and businesses.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 8

**DLR Submission No:** B0993
**Person:** Michael Casey
**Organisation:** N/A
**Map Nos:** 4

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission fully agrees and supports the attached submission document and comments made by the residents at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace, Sandycove, Co. Dublin for the 2022-2028 Development Plan.
- The severe congestion and risk of accident could be resolved by allowing off-street parking.
- The submission acknowledges the volume of traffic related issues submitted by other residents within Sandycove which has increased with the introduction of the Coastal Mobility Route.
- A copy of the submission to amend the Plan is included with the submission which notes the planning history for the Terrace, the case for off-street parking at Breffni Terrace, including the positive interventions of same and requests that the Plan is amended to reset the parameters off-street parking at this location, to sensibly incorporate off-street parking and to adopt a commensurate higher level of tolerance for future planning applications for off-street parking at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5 and Chapter 12
**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The submission indicates that ‘Cultra’ (observers house) is one of the original pre-1888 (or thereabouts) houses on Marlborough Road and Adelaide Road. These houses reflect the architectural heritage of the time and these earlier houses are significant houses of fine architectural heritage.
- The architectural heritage of the wider area has been recognised by the Council when designating Silchester Road as an Architectural Conservation Area in the 2016-2022 Development Plan and adding Adelaide Road, Station Road (part of) and Marlborough Road (excepting our own property (Cultra) and Rath Ruadh, No. 21 and No. 22, as Candidate ACA.
- The submission indicates that it is concerning, that the Council now proposes to exclude Adelaide Road and Station Road from the ACA while including houses that were built in the 1928.
- Cultra, Rath Ruadh, No. 20 and No 21 which had not been included in the Candidate ACA are now included in the Proposed ACA while all the fine houses of architectural heritage and style on Adelaide Road and Station Road are now proposed to be excluded from the Proposed ACA.
- This breaks the undeniable continuum of architectural heritage starting from Silchester Road and extending through to Marlborough Road.
- The submission requests that the Council include the greater area as an ACA.
- The submission includes an Architectural Heritage Commentary on the proposed Architectural Conservation Area at Marlborough Road, also bounded by Station Road and includes a comment on the heritage value of buildings proposed to be included in, or proposed to be excluded from, the proposed Architectural Conservation Area, and on the evidence available for determining the heritage value of these buildings.
- Included within the report is an Extract from the Ordinance Map Sheet XX111 of 1888 and Extract from the Ordinance Map of circa 1907 with 1928-1932 Houses and Tamney added.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Appendix 4**

---

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- It is noted that this submission is a duplicate of B0987 which has been summarised in full above.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Refer to issues raised under B0987

---

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Current Plan has Passive House Standard as the energy performance standard. The removal of this is a retrograde step.
- Benefits of having this in place is that the Shanganagh LDA scheme will be the largest Passive House development in the world; created a s strong branding for DLRCC as a leading light in Climate Action. Passive House policy adopted by DLRCC also strongly aligns with the United Nations Framework Guidelines on Energy Efficiency in Buildings.
- Passive House buildings offer the very best interior air quality due to the frequency of air changes and the filtering of outdoor air an important conservation in terms of Covid 19.
- Recommend a wording to promote and Support the Passive house standard as a path to achieving net zero emission buildings.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Chapter 3

---

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The submission indicates that ‘Cultra’ (observers house) is one of the original pre-1888 (or thereabouts) houses on Marlborough Road and Adelaide Road. These houses reflect the architectural heritage of the time and these earlier houses are significant houses of fine architectural heritage.
- The architectural heritage of the wider area has been recognised by the Council when designating Silchester Road as an Architectural Conservation Area in the 2016-2022 Development Plan and adding Adelaide Road, Station Road (part of) and Marlborough Road (excepting our own property (Cultra) and Rath Ruadh, No. 21 and No. 22, as Candidate ACA.
- The submission indicates that it is concerning, that the Council now proposes to exclude Adelaide Road and Station Road from the ACA while including houses that were built in the 1928.
- Cultra, Rath Ruadh, No. 20 and No 21 which had not been included in the Candidate ACA are now included in the Proposed ACA while all the fine houses of architectural heritage and style on Adelaide Road and Station Road are now proposed to be excluded from the Proposed ACA.
- This breaks the undeniable continuum of architectural heritage starting from Silchester Road and extending through to Marlborough Road.
- The submission requests that the Council include the greater area as an ACA.
- The submission includes an Architectural Heritage Commentary on the proposed Architectural Conservation Area at Marlborough Road, also bounded by Station Road and includes a comment on the heritage value of buildings proposed to be included in, or proposed to be excluded from, the proposed Architectural Conservation Area, and on the evidence available for determining the heritage value of these buildings.
- Included within the report is an Extract from the Ordinance Map Sheet XX111 of 1888 and Extract from the Ordinance Map of circa 1907 with 1928-1932 Houses and Tamney added.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Appendix 4
Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission requests that a collaborative approach be taken to sustainable movement and transportation up to and across the DLRCC and SDCC county boundary to facilitate development of the ‘Edmonstown Lands’ located in SDCC. Network improvements for pedestrian and cycling infrastructure on the county boundaries are required to achieve compact, sustainable development, as envisioned in the context of National and Regional policy, including the MASP.
- In the Pre-Draft CE Report the Council did not support the provision of an inter-county cycle link between DLR and South Dublin County Council (SDCC) modifying and extending the Southern Cross Route (College Road section) to the county boundary and from there in a westerly direction to serve ‘Edmondstown Lands’ as provided for in the South Dublin County Development Plan.
- DLRCC expressed concern with regard to the proposal because of difficulties related to impact on amenity landholding, proposal not being in the NTA cycle strategy and a very narrow corridor on the section of the College Road north of the M50.
- In the Draft Plan Harold’s Grange/College Road is included in Table 5.3.
- S247 pre-application engagement with the Traffic and Transportation Division in DLRCC and it is on record that the improvement of pedestrian and cycle infrastructure on College Road is considered to be both feasible and essential.
- The submission goes through a range of approaches and policies which support the development of pedestrian and cycle links.
- Submission notes a number of significant new sports and recreation infrastructure accessed from Whitechurch which were not in existence when the County Cycle Strategy was developed in 2012.
- Improvement to the cycle and pedestrian route on a short section of College Road would improve safety and accessibility of this recreational infrastructure. The potential for this route is shown on the DLR Active Travel Map linking into the Slang River Greenway and the Wicklow Way.
- Submission includes a cross section of the proposed route.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0998</td>
<td>Carl O’Sullivan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Object to the planned walkway, the redevelopment of Stable Lane and the opening of the emergency gate at the back of Stable lane.
- Stable lane is private property, owned by the residents who should have a strong input into the process.
- Stable Lane currently provides parking for a number of different houses.
- There will be damage to the privacy of local residents.
- The proposal has limited upside benefit, given there is already access between the two roads a short distance away on Kelly’s Avenue.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0999</td>
<td>Niall O’Byrne</td>
<td>Marlett</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission sets out background relating to Marlett Property Group and also detail their interests and plans in the County.
- Submission notes the addition of Kylemore House to the RPS
- Submission requests that the Planning Authority reconsider overly prescriptive DM standards as they are considered to be contrary to National Guidance and could impact on delivery of homes in the County.
- Request that Build to Rent is included within the Permitted in Principle matrix in all residential zoning categories i.e. Zoning Objectives A, A1, and A2
- Considers that County contains areas that are accessible and central locations and request that reference to the county being entirely described as an intermediate location be revised.
• Request omission of additional development management standards and assessment criteria beyond that set out in the 2018 Apartment Guidelines and 2018 Building Guidelines.
• Request Planning Authority to reconsider 50% dual aspect requirement
• Request Planning Authority to reconsider separation distance requirement. Case by case approach advocated.
• Request Planning Authority to reconsider minimum car parking standard for apartments of 1 space per unit
• Request Planning Authority to reconsider unit mix requirements which are it is considered contrary to SPPR 1. A case by case approach is advocated.
• Request Planning Authority to reconsider Building Height Strategy and omit the additional performance based criteria.
• Policy Objective BH2 is considered overly prescriptive with regard to heights where an LAP is in place for example within the confines of the Sandyford Urban Framework Plan. The proposed heights policy in particular fails to have regard to recent permissions granted above the Sandyford UDF limits for example at the Former Avid Site (ABP Ref. 303467), the Rockbrook site (ABP Ref. 304405) and the Former Aldi site (ABP Ref. 305940). It is submitted that Policy Objective BH2 is in contravention of the Building Height Guidelines namely SPPR1 which requires planning authorities to explicitly identify areas where increased height will be actively pursued while removing blanket numerical height limitations
• Considers that a comprehensive review of the SUPF is required
• BH3 proposes a general building height of 3 to 4 storeys in ‘residual suburban areas’. The Building Height Guidelines reference an objective for a default objective of four storeys to provide substantially more population growth within existing built-up areas. The policy should therefore be amended.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapters 4, 13, Appendix 2, 5, 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1000</td>
<td>Paul Price</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• The submission requests that the Development Plan incorporate a sea swimming policy and objectives to promote and improve and develop sea swimming facilities by the increasing the attention to ongoing management maintenance and investment in the existing sea swimming locations.
• The submission also requests the development of additional access ladder facilities at the existing Forty Foot and other sea swimming locations along the coast to enable swimmers to swim along the coast from one ladder to the next, which is the case in other Countries.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1001</td>
<td>Marie Murphy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
Submission from Marie Murphy also under submission no B1058
• Submission objects to opening the reservoir to the public.
• Concerned that anti-social behavior and littering can destroy the area/encourage vermin.
• Concerned that privacy will be compromised due to overlooking of house.
• Notes that rocks/rubble are being compacted on site and the reservoir walls need to be reinforced.
• Submission considered the structure is a permanent first floor structure.
• Notes concern that access will adversely affect quality of life of residents
• Notes there has been excessive noise at unsocial hours and requests the proposal is abandoned.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1002</td>
<td>Gavan Doherty</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• The CDP maps show several pedestrian rights of way, some of which have been blocked by landowners.
• The blocking of the Ballybetagh ROW was discussed at the Council meeting on 16th June 2015 and again on 14th March 2016 and on 12th September 2016 where the following resolution was considered “That this Council agrees that the Chief Executive urgently deal with the blocking of two sections of a public right of way at Ballybetagh Wood and Barnaslingan Lane and to take legal action if required to have these rights of way open for public use.”
• The submitter has included a photo of a section of the ROW blocked by barbed wire.
• Rights of Way throughout the County should be preserved for future community use.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1003</th>
<th>Person: Sarah O’Connor</th>
<th>Organisation: Rathmichael Residents Association</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10, 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• The submission compliments the DLR Parks Department on the marvellous planting of spring flowers and bulbs in the public parks and along the road networks.
• The submission requests that the council give special attention to Rathmichael as an amenity and recreational area for the hinterland. The Council should preserve & protect the attributes of the area by keeping housing density low. Any high-rise development would detract from the area.
• This accords with all the climate change mitigation policies because most people can walk here from Shankill, Ballybrack and nearer parts of Killiney.
• The submission considers that small cluster low rise development would also align with DLR policy NPF of infiel/brownfield development, which would provide housing and enable the enhancement and interconnectivity of green spaces.
• The submission notes that while housing density is 35 per hectare along transport networks, it has been stated by the council that it will ‘have regard to the character of the area’ and have regard to ‘the recommendations and findings of historic landscape character assessment for Rathmichael’. The designated density could be reduced.
• The submission highlights the importance to have clear delineation between urban areas otherwise there will be a linear urban sprawl, which would be contrary to proper planning & development.
• The submission suggests that SLO 92 should contain the following working,’ No building above the 90metre contour at Rathmichael’ and failing this it is imperative to implement SLO 92 rigorously. There have been recent planning transgressions and resources need to be allocated to planning enforcement.
• The submission welcomes preserving the prospect to Carrigolligan from Shankill.
• With respect to transport, the submission considers that if a strategy like Bus Connects goes through Shankill it will be detrimental to the community atmosphere.
• The proposed road from Cherrywood to Rathmichael will increase traffic and cause ‘rat runs’ endangering vulnerable road users.
• Flooding and leaking pipes is a big problem on Ballybride Road that needs attention.
• The submission requests more solar and electric power for transport infrastructure.
• The submission welcomes the recent resurfacing of the M11 and the Strategic Environmental Assessment, Eu Habitat Directives and Appropriate Assessments in the Draft Plan.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 2, Chapter 3, Chapter 4, Chapter 5, Chapter 14, Appendix 16, Map 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1004</th>
<th>Person: Avison Young Planning and Regeneration Ltd.</th>
<th>Organisation: Leopardstown Park Hospital &amp; the Health Service Executive</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission with regard to Leopardstown Park Hospital includes a map of the subject ands and notes that the on-going provision of healthcare services and their future expansion must be provided for in the draft plan to ensure the continued operation of the hospital.
• Submission notes that LPH is a specialist facility offering long term residential care, rehabilitation, respite, day services and supported living services to the older person many of whom suffer with dementia.
• Submission requests that the draft plan recognises the specific and unique care provided ensuring that the needs of the hospital are not inhibited in the plan, requesting that the plan is practical and flexible removing barrier to the continued operation of the hospital.

• Submission notes that demand for the service provided by the hospital will grow with Ireland’s aging population and will result in an increase in the number of patients who will require a complex set of clinical needs.

RPS:
• Submission states that the inclusion of the barrel-vaulted hospital building (RPS No. 1963) is not warranted and should be removed from the RPS.
• The building is already afforded adequate protection as it is within the curtilage of 2 protected structures a house (RPS No. 1634) and stables (RPS No. 1630).
• Submission considers that the NIAH rating should be local rather than regional. It is considered that the NIAH appraisal undertaken was based on incomplete information with regard to the building.
• Submission includes commentary with regard to the NIAH assessment of the building vs the NIAH handbook stating that the structure could not be described as making a significant contribution to the architectural heritage of the Region, rather it does make a contribution to heritage at a local level.
• Submission notes that the building is of little architectural interest as there are no external or internal features of interest.

• Appendix A to the submission includes a report on the significance of the building, known as The Hostel, by Grade 1 Conservation Architect Cathal Crimmins.
• Appendix incorporates a brief history of the site including historical mapping and drawings.
• It is noted that Leopardstown Park was gifted to the Ministry of Pensions for the treatment of Irish veterans of the war in 1917.
• It is noted that the structure was not actually built as a hospital rather it was likely a shed that was incorporated into the expansion of the hospital in 1919 where the structure was converted to accommodation. Details of this conversion and drawings are set out in the Appendix.
• It is noted that the structure has been subject to significant alterations internally and externally as set out in the appendix.
• Appendix A includes imagery of the structure in question noting the condition and changes to elevations, roof and interior.
• Appendix notes the significant of the structure based upon the criteria of special interest, concluding that “the Hostel is of some minor local interest, historically and technically” and notes the existing protection on site owing to existing protected structures.

Zoning:
• Submission notes the change in zoning from MH to SNI.
• Submission notes that the direct support for medical/hospital uses detailed in the current SUFP Zone 6 zoning objective has been removed suggesting that Zone 6 could be viewed as being less supportive of this use.
• Submission welcomes the inclusion of SLO 63 on the site with regard to the medical/hospital campus, however it could be strengthened by rewording it to state “To improve, encourage and facilitate the provision and expansion of medical/hospital campus at Beacon and Leopardstown Hospital.”
• Submission states that LPH requires direct policy and guidance support to ensure the enhanced healthcare facilities required under the National Quality Standards for Residential Care Settings for Older People in Ireland, 2016 and future improvements, can be delivered.

Car Parking:
• Submission notes that flexibility is required in the application of car parking standards for healthcare facilities and seeks a caveat to Table 12.6 with regard to consultation with the HSE and other healthcare providers.

Observations specific to the Sandyford Urban Frameworks Plan

Open Space:
• Submission requests that Drawing 11 in the SUFP is amended to avoid conflict with the zoning objective for the site by removing the designation of an area of the site as ‘Open Space’ on the drawing as this gives the impression that it will be accessible to the public.
• Submission states that the subject area, and other similar areas within the campus, cannot and will not be accessible to members of the public due to the nature of the care provided at LPH.
Submission notes that a range of external spaces are required for a residential care setting allowing vulnerable residents to walk the grounds within an enclosed site.

Submission states that there may be areas to the north of the LPH lands that have public access.

Masterplan Requirement:
Submission notes a contradictory requirement for a masterplan in zone 6 that refers to ‘residual land’ and the ‘overall site’. The requirement of masterplan, as per Section 3.5, is considered to be extremely onerous.
Submission requests that applications for extensions / improvements to the existing use on site do not have to be accompanied by such a master plan but apply only to residual lands.

Height:
Submission requests that, as a minimum, the generic maximum height caps on Map 3 in the SUFP are removed as this would be contrary to the Building Heights Guidelines. It is suggested that map 3 is removed entirely.
Submission notes that the Guidelines do not support the imposition of maximum height limits and supports increased height in location with good public transport links.

Peak Hour Trips:
Submission requests the rewording of that requirement of future development at LPH “will not impact on peak hour trips” to allow for a degree of flexibility in terms of traffic impact and to ensure that the hospital can continue to operate and expand to provide enhanced healthcare facilities to residents.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4, Chapter 12, Chapter 14, Appendix, 4, Appendix 17

DLR Submission No: B1005
Person: Gavan Doherty
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 7, 9, 10

Summary of Submission and Observation:
Submission seeks to ensure public access to Historical sites, specifically Portal Tombs (dolmens).
Submission refers to the Ballybrack Dolmen (Duchas number 026-30) as a good example.
Submission notes that the Kilternan dolmen (Duchas number 026-019) has been lost to public enjoyment as it has been fences off and requests that the same does not occur to the Brennanstown Dolmen (Duchas number 026-007).

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 11

DLR Submission No: B1006
Person: Peter O’Brien
Organisation: NA
Map Nos: 4

Summary of Submission and Observation:
Submissions notes the traffic situation that has developed in Sandycove which she notes is causing serious problems for residents, including problems of access, parking, noise and air pollution.
Notes traffic funnelled into Sandycove Avenue East, a narrow one-way residential street.
Considers that the wellbeing of residents is affected by the current situation as is their ability to access their homes and requests a Traffic Management Plan to be developed in consultation with residents.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

DLR Submission No: B1007
Person: Brendan & Alice Rooney
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 4

Summary of Submission and Observation:
Submission considers Sandycove cannot accommodate the volume of traffic it currently experiences.
Notes cars park on double yellow lines outside their property, impacting their use of their driveway.
Notes concern about difficulty emergency services can have accessing the houses in the area.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5
### DLR Submission No: B1008
Person: Mary Byrne  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen Collage to SNI.
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Map 7

### DLR Submission No: B1009
Person: Margaret O’Reilly  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: N/A

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission relates to the protection of Wildlife Corridors in the County.
- The current Development Plan 2016-2022 clearly recognises the importance of Wildlife Corridors and the wildlife corridor connecting the Three Rock Mountain and Fitzsimmons Wood via Woodside and Blackglen Road is well established. The Council have Deer crossing signs to alert road users to the crossing of Deer.
- The Council must continue to include a specific objective in 2022-2028 Development plan to protect wildlife corridors throughout the County in compliance with Habitats Directive.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 8

### DLR Submission No: B1010
Person: John Spain Associates on behalf of Park Developments  
Organisation: Park Developments  
Map Nos: 9

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests the re-zoning of lands to the south east of Glenamuck Road from Objective ‘B’ - To protect and improve rural amenity and to provide for the development of agriculture – to Objective ‘A’ - To provide residential development and/or protect and improve residential amenity, and additional parcels of land from Objective ‘G’ – To protect and improve high amenity areas - to Objective ‘F’ - To preserve and provide for open space with ancillary active recreational amenities. Alternatively, the submission seeks the designation of the lands as a Strategic Land Reserve.
- An overview of the landowner and a description of the site and surrounding context is provided. Submits the subject lands are located in an area of abundant social, community and infrastructural resources and are sequentially located adjacent to the existing built-up footprint.
- Submission makes the case that the subject lands constitute Tier 1, serviced lands, as defined in Appendix 3 of the NPF, which supports the case for their re-zoning for residential development.
- Submission considers that the Core Strategy of the Draft Plan both underestimates housing need and overestimates the speed at which development is likely to come forward. Submits that, based on demographic evidence, the quantum of residential zoned lands in DLR is insufficient to meet the population growth that is likely to occur over the 2022-2028 period and that it incorrectly assumes all zoned lands will be developed over the plan period. Highlights that latent demand for housing in DLR is high given the lack of new builds over the preceding years and that existing unmet demand has not been adequately factored into the Core Strategy.
- Suggests the Core Strategy should be re-assessed, and a number of suggestions are made in this regard, including, inter alia: factoring in the latest CSO population growth figures; the application of ‘headroom’ beyond 2026; addressing pent-up demand and ongoing supply constraints; assumptions relating to the timeframes for the development of land; and, additional off-setting of lands with significant infrastructural and phasing requirements.
- Suggests that such a re-assessment would support the zoning of additional lands for residential development in the County, and in particularly appropriately located sites such as the subject lands.
- Notes that a portion of the lands to the south east are identified as a proposed Natural Heritage Area and submits that the re-zoning of these lands from Objective ‘G’ to Objective ‘F’ would provide for the protection and enhancement of the proposed NHA at this location and provide better integration of future development with the adjoining landholdings.
Without prejudice to the re-zoning request, the submission alternatively requests that the site be considered for designation as a Strategic Land Reserve. States the designation would reflect the fact the lands are well located, adjacent to existing zoned lands, served by existing/planned public transport, and are capable of being developed in the short to medium term.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 2, Map 9

Summary of Submission

- Submission welcomes the rezoning of lands at the Beacon Hospital from MH to SNI, however, it is considered that SNI is an overly prescriptive use class and requirements that do not reflect the true nature of the subject site or the requirements for the lands to serve the wider area.
- Submission requests that the definition of SNI is amended to include residential and hotel as permitted in principle. It is noted that SNI does not include ‘hotel’ in its land use table.
- It is noted that amending the SNI use classes would not be appropriate across the County, therefore, an alternative option is to rezone to subject lands to MIC with a local objective for residential development – an illustration of this land use change is included.
- Submission notes that the subject lands comprise office and warehouse uses.
- Submission notes that Beacon Hospital has recently acquired the Beacon Hotel that will result in additional hospital facilities that would result in the removal of essential overnight accommodation for patients and workers.
- Submission notes that short term accommodation will be required for those visiting patients / day patients unable to travel home therefore there is a specific demand for a hotel whilst also requiring residential accommodation for the workforce and supporting facilities for the wider community.
- Submission states that “the vision for the subject lands is to provide complementary uses to the Beacon such as a primary care centre and a rehabilitation centre as well as residential development, hotel and associated community/public facilities responds to the local needs of the area whilst providing long term residential accommodation, short term hotel accommodation and care facilities.”
- Submission notes the nature of lands to the east of the site comprising predominantly office use.
- Submission provides a description and sets the context of the subject site noting its proximity to public transport and facilities / amenities – a map showing the subject lands and photos of the site are included.
- Submission sets out the National planning context including reference to the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas (2009) with regard to infill development.
- Submission sets out the current land use and policy objectives in relation to the site in the 2016 development plan and SUFP. It is highlighted that assisted living accommodation, hotel and residential are open for consideration under the current MH zoning objective.
- Submission sets out the land use zoning objectives in the draft plan relative to the site and details the provisions of the sustainable neighbourhood infrastructure land use zoning objective and policy objectives.
- Submission notes the changes to the SUFP with regard to the replacement of Zone 6 with Zone 8.
- Submission notes the application of SNI in the SUFP at Beacon and Leopardstown Park Hospital campuses and at Legionaries of Christ lands.
- Submission sets out the application of building height in the SUFP relative to the site.
- Submission notes that the MH zoning was applied at this location to allow for an expansion of the hospital when it was considered that a major Maternity and Children’s Hospital would be provided at Sandyford. This is no longer realistic, and the Beacon Hospital is expanding to the west.
- Submission requests that SNI is broadened to include residential uses, employment uses supporting established uses such as medical, short stay visits such as a hotel and tourism.
- Submission considers that SNI should provide a multi-faceted function and provide infrastructure that meets the needs of the local area in Sandyford noting that the Beacon Hotel will no longer offer this service.
• It is not considered that the entire block at Sandyford Business Park can only provide for medical related uses, rather flexibility would allow for sustainable communities.

• Submission states that there is a lack of commentary or policy objectives in the Draft Development Plan in respect of the potential for residential use on ‘SNI’ zoned lands – clarity is requested in this regard.

• Submission considers that that ‘residential’ is an appropriate and acceptable use which would be in accordance with the objectives of ‘SNI’ zoning to provide for sustainable neighbourhood infrastructure and any proposal should be assessed on its merits.

• Submission considers the subject site to be ideal for residential development due to its proximity to public transport, being a brownfield site that can achieve appropriate height and density and the surrounding range of services.

• The zoning objective for matrix for MIC zoned lands as it relates specifically to the Specific Local Objective Lands should be amended to include residential as a ‘Permitted in Principle Use’ noting the sustainable benefits of including residential development in mixed use centres.

• Submission requests that the provision of 20% of useable open space be dependent on specific site proposals and existing site conditions. The lands at Sandyford do not provide a campus or institutional environment where significant open space is available. A flexible approach in this regard should be applied.

• Submission notes that the wording of Objective P6 in the SUFP restricts the development of SNI lands at this location – it is considered that the objective should include a statement indicating that development may be considered if no adverse impacts can be demonstrated.

• Submission considers that Objective P4 has been resolved and this objective should be removed.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4, Chapter 13, Appendix 17

| DLR Submission No: B1012 | Person: Jim Brogan Planning and Development Consultant | Organisation: Cumann Luthcleas Gael Coiste Átha Cliath (Dublin G.A.A. County Board) | Map Nos: N/A |

Summary of Submission and Observation:

• The submission provides history and detail with respect to the Cumann Luthcleas Gael Coiste Átha Cliath.

• With respect to Open Space:

• The submission highlights their support of Policy Objective OSR10 - Protection of Sports Grounds/Facilities. With regard to the second of the sub-objectives i.e. the maximization of the use of playing pitches, in the context of Gaelic games, there has been a significant increase in numbers playing and an increased number of competitions and extension to the playing season, which poses a challenge in relation to the adequacy and capacity of the available pitches and ancillary facilities.

• Additionally, the increased densification of residential development being undertaken on, for example, brownfield sites/institutional lands in established built-up areas will serve to intensify this challenge. The submission suggests an amendment in the related text in the Draft Plan in the form of a clear commitment by the Council to facilitate and engage in the necessary works required to achieve the ‘maximisation’ objective through upgrading existing pitches.

• The submission also suggests the Draft Plan includes specific provisions for engagement by the Council at the commencement stage of the process with the local stakeholders e.g. clubs with respect to rehabilitation programmes for playing pitches to ensure full engagement is such a programme.

• The submission suggests that the following should also be considered and included to the sub-objective of the policy, with regard to the maximisation of the functional capacity of existing and proposed playing pitches:

• Flood lighting to enhance the utility of the pitches.

• Attention to be given to the provision or upgrading of essential complimentary facilities such as pavilions for example dressing rooms and toilets.

• A policy provision should also be included to facilitate such developments within public parks through active collaboration between the Council and local clubs. Precedents already exist for this type of collaboration with regard, for example, to the erection of floodlighting systems within public parks e.g. Clanna Gael Fontenoy GAA club in Sean Moore Park; Clontarf GAA Club in St. Anne’s Park.
The provision of all-weather playing pitches and related facilities should be considered, in the context of availability of such facilities of an appropriate size, layout and design to accommodate the playing/training requirements of G.A.A. games. The use of playing pitches within Council parks for training is, however, often prohibited under the terms of the leases/licenses issued to the clubs for their use, which represents a problem for the subject clubs.

Consideration should also be given to the possibility of siting smaller scale facilities of this type within residential areas, to facilitate the participation of children in active recreation and sports in local parks close to their homes. The submission requests that appropriate amendments be included in the Draft Plan relating to the provision of the all-weather pitches and smaller all-weather facilities within local parks in residential areas.

Consultation in this regard should take place at the pre-design stage in partnership with the prospective stakeholders etc. e.g. the G.A.A. to ensure the provision of adequate facilities.

The submission notes that ‘Policy Objective OSR10’ incudes an amendment which relates to development within 10m of established sporting facilities/grounds and that “there will be an obligation on the developer to demonstrate that the ameliorative measures proposed will ensure that the subject development will not interfere with the operational capacity or recreational amenity function of the sports facility/sports grounds.”

The onus is now imposed on the prospective developer to demonstrate how the proposed ameliorative measures will ensure that the subject development will not interfere with the operational capacity or recreational/amenity function of the adjacent sports facility/sports ground the Council shall provide reassurance that this amendment will not in any way weaken or undermine the intent of this particular provision.

With respect to Development Management:

The new Draft Development Plan requires that the rate of provision of public open space for new residential development is 15% of the site area, with 25% of the site area for development on institutional land and redevelopment of Sustainable Neighbourhood Infrastructure uses. In high density urban schemes or infill projects where no public open space is provided, it provides for the payment of a financial contribution in lieu of the shortfall. It also provides that in residential development schemes on site less than 0.25ha, the Council may levy a contribution in lieu of providing public open space. The submission states that this represents a significant material departure for the Council in abandoning the per capita approach to the determination of the requirements for the provision of public open space in residential development schemes.

The submission also notes the reference to the “Guidelines for Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas” (May 2009), which consider the assessment of open space requirements on a population basis to be difficult because of the unpredictability of the role of occupancy of large house and apartments, where the number of occupants is often less than the number of bedspaces.

The submission refers to comments made in the Pre-Draft submission with respect to open space provision.

It continues that the adoption of the ‘Project Ireland 2040 National Planning Framework’ with its focus on the compact development model within built- up urban areas and the publication of the Sustainable Urban Housing Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities (March 2018)’ and ‘Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines for Planning Authorities (December 2018)’. In terms of deciding on the appropriate approach for the determination of the area of public open space to be provided in residential development schemes, these Guidelines are much more relevant than those referred to in the Draft Development Plan which were made in 2009. The significant ensuing changes from these recent Guidelines, in terms of the increased density and increased height of residential development schemes will result in a significant increase in the population per hectare being accommodated in residential areas.

The submission considers that the application of an area-based standard, as proposed in the Draft Development Plan, to these developments will inevitably result in the under provision of public open space and the application of the existing standards as presented in the current Development Plan represents a much more appropriate method in a planning context of determining the public open space requirements of the residents of such development schemes.

The submission states if an area-based provision of 15% is to be adopted, it should be as the default provision in the event of the population based approach resulting in a requirement less than that percentage of the site area for any particular residential scheme.
• The submission supports in principle the payment of a financial contribution in lieu of the provision of part or all the public open space required for a residential development scheme where the required level of provision cannot be provided on-site. The submission requests to ensure that the contributions are specifically used for the purpose of infrastructure improvements, that the provision be more explicit, with provision being made for them to be ringfenced for the provision of new/upgrading of existing sports facilities including playing pitches in the proximity of the development.

• Regarding institutional lands, the submission requests that where land in institutional use is currently being used for sporting or recreational use there should be a general presumption included in the Development Plan against the development of these lands except in exceptional circumstances. A similar presumption should be raised in relation to sports facilities on institutional lands, especially given the need as articulated by the Council in its pre-Draft document that maximising the efficient use of Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown’s existing recreational assets is necessary.

• The submission notes discrepancies in the Draft Development Plan regarding the minimum level of public open space provision required in development projects on institutional lands. At sub-section 12.3.8.11 in the Draft Development Plan, the figure referred to is 20% whereas in Table 12.8 it is stated to be 25%, as it is in Policy Objective PHP 21 ‘Development on Institutional Lands’. The submission requests that the figure be standardised to provide for a minimum level of provision of 25%.

• With respect to Neighbourhood - Peoples, Homes and Places:
  • The submission notes that the related provisions in the Draft Plan provide, inter alia, that where development is proposed on SNI lands, that to maintain the recreational value of the site a minimum of 20% of usable open space be retained. In the interests of consistency, it is submitted that this figure should be increased to 25% to be the equivalent of that required on institutional lands.

• With respect to School Development:
  • The Draft Development Plan provides that in the consideration of individual planning applications for new schools or the redevelopment/extension of existing schools, the Council will have regard to, inter alia, the following criterion:
    • “Dual function of sports facilities/halls etc. outside of school hours will be encouraged where the use of such facilities will be of a benefit to the wider community, however any outside hours usage of the school should not be to the detriment of adjoining residential amenities. Full details of all anticipated uses outside of school hours should be provided with the application”.
  • The submission notes that support was expressed at the Pre-Draft consultation stage in the Plan making process, for the related provisions in the existing Development Plan to encourage the dual use of school facilities through the development management process and in conjunction with the Department of Education and Skills. While this inclusion is welcomed the submission requests a clarification of the requirement that “Full details of all anticipated uses outside of school hours should be provided with the application” as to (a) whether or not it is envisaged that these ‘uses’ would be regulated by any grant of permission issued for the development and (b) what approach would be adopted by the Council if the school, at a later stage, wished to accommodate an ‘unanticipated use’.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1013</th>
<th>Person: Darina Tully</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Rights-of-Way were a huge amenity during COVID 19 lockdown for walking and access, but several are overgrown or have been blocked.
• All Rights-of-Way should be clearly marked and maintained.
• DLRCC should appoint a named person as contact for problems and updates on Rights-of-Ways.
• Where local landowners have claimed ownership or registered the surrounding waste ground in their name their responsibilities to public access must be enforced.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1014</th>
<th>Person: Niall Meagher</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission notes that the Local Authority has supported mews lane development and have identified lanes in the development plans ‘for taking in charge’.
- Submission sets out the typical setting and character of mews lanes including details of buildings that were typically located upon same and the evolution of their typologies.
- Submission notes that as mews structures evolved, they retained the hierarchy of scale and building plot arrangement – it is considered that these are key characteristics that need to be safeguarded and considered in mews development.
- Submission states that suburban typologies are rarely appropriate and detract from the sense of place of historic mews lanes.
- Submission requests that design criteria to guide remaking or infilling of mews sites, lane access layouts, amenity and boundary wall conservation, is required, particularly in lanes that are not immediate to the historic town or village centres.
- Submission notes that many historic lane ways have distinctive mature and natural settings that are supportive of local wildlife and biodiversity. Engineering specifications for access roads in new housing schemes and street lighting etc., are not appropriate or supportive of the character and biodiversity of mews lane settings.
- Submission notes that the maintenance and repair of stone boundary walls need to be considered, roller shutters and poor quality materials should be avoided, and appropriate laneway finishes to compliment the historic character and support wildlife is desirable.
- Submission seeks a review of the taking in charge policy with regard to mews lanes.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 12

DLR Submission No: B1015
Person: Maighread Ní Ghallchobhair, O.P.
Organisation: Congregation of Dominican Sisters
Map Nos: N/A

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission objects to rezoning in the draft plan as it discriminates against religious.
- Submission notes that this is the only area in the city where this zoning pertains.
- Submission states that it is not just or reasonable to prevent housing development on available land.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 13

DLR Submission No: B1016
Person: Anne Healy
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 14

Summary of Submission and Observation:
Submission refers to Old Connaught lands:

Density:

- Description of density in Chapter 4 of CDP and Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas 2009.
- A1 lands should be capable of delivering a min of 50uph and rise to 80uph within 200m of the proposed Luas station.
- Will DLRCOCO be maximising the zoning of the A1 land especially near the transport modes in line with Chapter 4 of the CDP and Guidelines for Planning Authorities?

Flooding:

- Parts of A1 lands are at risk of flooding as shown at Appendix 16 SFRA of the Draft CDP and also on the OPW website Floodinfo.ie. These are categorised within Flood Zones A and B.
- SFRA states “Where zoning for development is proposed within Flood Zones A or B, the Justification Test for development plans must be applied, and passed.”
- A1 lands at Old Connaught, are identified in the RSES, and the A1 lands have been identified as fulfilling RPG. These and other criteria allow for the Flood Zone lands at Old Connaught to pass the Justification Test.
- DLRCOCO will not meet the density levels as outlined in the Draft CDP to justify building in flood zones, if you develop land with a restricted number of units. Eg, in order to build in Flood Zone A and B, a min of 50uph (and up to possibly 80) would have to be developed to satisfy the Justification Test. If
DLRCCOC were to develop a hectare of A1 land (Flood Zone A and B), with 9 units instead of 50-80 units this would not satisfy the Justification Test as the criteria outlined in the RSES and RPG have not been satisfied. DLRCCOC would not be able to go ahead with the development of land at the much reduced density.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 4, Appendix 16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1017</td>
<td>Clare Sheehan</td>
<td>St. Michael’s Rowing Club</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Description of St. Michael’s Rowing Club.
- Policy Objective OSR11: Water Based Sports – welcome the support from DLRCC and would appreciate having access to facilities that would allow membership to grow.
- Policy Objective HER24: Protection of Coastline Heritage – CDP and Heritage Plan should take note of the cultural, social and historical heritage of skiff rowing, specific only to the East coast. While heritage rowing is not an architectural item, the skill, craftsmanship and passing of the tradition of skiff rowing from the hobbler of old is an important aspect that helped shape the economic and social life of the local community since the 18th century.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1018</td>
<td>Cunnane Stratton Reynolds on behalf of Katrin and Paul O’Shea</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests the re-zoning of lands at the Ballycorus Road from Objective ‘G’ - to protect and improve high amenity areas, to Objective ‘A’ – to provide residential development and/or protect and improve residential development’, or alternatively as a least preferred option to Objective ‘B’ – to protect and improve rural amenity and to provide for the development of agriculture.
- A description of the subject site, surrounding environment and zoning context is provided.
- Submission disagrees with the zoning of the site. Suggests there is no consistency in the approach to zoning in the area and that the existing physical form of development is inconsistent with zoning provisions. Highlights the subject lands are effectively being sterilised from future development and retained as open space, while open space to the south of Ballycorus Road is zoned for future residential development. Suggests the subject site is not of any more worthiness for inclusion as High Amenity - Objective ‘G’ - than the lands to the south of Ballycorus Road. Suggests the re-zoning of the site to Objective ‘A’ would be consistent with adjacent lands to the east and south along Ballycorus Road and the wider Rathmichael area.
- Submission puts forward a number of landscape based reasons to support the re-zoning request. Reference is made to the Landscape Character Assessment contained in Appendix 9 of the Draft CDP. Notes that the landscape sensitivity of the area has been identified as ‘low-medium’ in the Council’s Landscape Character Assessment and suggests there is scope for residential development at the subject site. Furthermore, it is considered that the low to medium sensitivity ascertained in the Landscape Character Assessment does not reconcile with the zoning of the lands as High Amenity (Objective G).
- Suggests that the re-zoning of the subject lands to Objective ‘A’ would not negatively impact upon the local landscape area and would be beneficial in terms of consolidating the ribbon development and preventing pressure for less physically and visually connected sites in the area.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1019</td>
<td>Ciarán Callan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Request rezoning of lands at Wesley Height from A to F
- This area is under the care of the DLR Co. Co. to be kept in perpetuity for the benefit of the Wesley Estate and was provided for that sole purpose by Sorohan Builders the developers of the Wesley Estate.
- In a letter to Mr Al Crowley (dd 15th August 2002) of 42 Wesley Heights from DLR Co.co., it advised that the advice received from the Council’s Law Agent stated “the land in question is dedicated open space as an amenity for all the residents of Wesley Estate and is conditioned under the planning permission for the development of the Estate, to be left in perpetuity.”
- Therefore it is incorrect to declare that the area of land is zoned to provide residential development.
- Submission notes change in definition of A zoning objective with addition of “To provide residential development” This change highlights the misleading direction / misdirection the previous zoning description provided to citizens.
- Submission requests advise as to whether planning consents provided by the Council or in the Council area by An Bord Planala over the period of the current plan can be determined to be unlawful and that any developments not yet under construction be prevented until the issue is closed legally.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 5, Chapter 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1020</th>
<th>Person: Patrika Mani</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Many empty retail units in Belarminé and Aiken’s village – could the Council stronger anti-dereliction legislation, or could they be Council supported arts centres/childcare facilities etc.
- More bins needed in area (Aiken’s village) and maintained regularly.
- Too many developments being permitted around Lamb’s Cross – adding to traffic congestion – needs to stop.
- Owners of dogs off leads in Fernhill being fined but no signage for dogs to be kept on leads.
- Traffic speeding offences and their practices need to be reviewed.
- School Transport Scheme needs to be actively expanded to allow safe transport for pupils and reduce traffic on roads.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5,7, Miscellaneous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1021</th>
<th>Person: Tracie James</th>
<th>Organisation: Sweetmount and Laurels Residents' Association</th>
<th>Map Nos: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The Residents Association represents just over 70 households in The Laurels and Sweetmount Park area of Dundrum, but not Sweetmount Avenue, Sweetmount Drive, Laurel Drive, Laurel Avenue or Laurel Road.
- Oppose any pedestrian walkway or footbridge being constructed from Sweetmount Park/The Laurels across to Main Street or the Dundrum Village Centre over the Dundrum Bypass for the following reasons.
  - Access – A pedestrian bridge is unnecessary as there are a number of alternative access routes to Main Street Dundrum either via the Library or via Ballinteer Road/ Dom Marmion Bridge.
  - Traffic and Parking – A walkway would lead to a marked increase in the number of cars driving into residential cul de sacs, either to drop off pedestrians or to park on the road.
  - Footfall – Pedestrian traffic through Sweetmount Park/The Laurels would grow, resulting in increased levels of anti-social behaviour. This has already been witnessed in the last year or two in Sweetmount Park and any additional access routes would lead to further loitering and anti-social behaviour.
  - Litter – Litter is already a problem at Sweetmount Park/The Laurels and would increase in the area. Litter currently ends up in the Slang river which runs through Sweetmount Park. Pedestrians might also dispose of rubbish into the Slang river or onto the bypass while crossing a pedestrian bridge, which in turn could pose serious danger or harm to traffic below.
• Security and Safety – Neighbourhood security is also an issue, and increased activity in the area would be of grave concern to residents, many of whom live alone, are elderly or have young children.
• Environmental – Increased human activity in the area has potential to disrupt what little ecosystems we have left in the area.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1022</th>
<th>Person: John Willoughby in Avison Young Planning and Regeneration Ltd on behalf of</th>
<th>Organisation: Tesco Ireland Limited</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Background to Tesco Ireland provided – 151 shops across Ireland, Head Office in Dun Laoghaire, 8 shops in DLR.
• Population increases forecast in DLR. CDP should accommodate growth in the County, by not only providing supportive policies and objectives to provide for residential and employment lands, but also the supporting infrastructure and services such as education, commercial, and retail, specifically scale-appropriate new convenience retail floorspace at suitable locations across its administrative area.
• New residential growth areas should be adequately served by retail facilities and as such, it is requested that the DLRCC provide flexibility with regard to zoning policies in order to facilitate the provision of scale-appropriate retail floorspace at appropriate locations.
• The growth of convenience and ancillary retail facilities should be accommodated at appropriate locations, across the County at the periphery of the core retail areas, regeneration areas and new residential development.
• The importance of neighbourhood and district centres should not be underestimated for facilitating the day-to-day needs of residents.
• Due to Covid, local retailing has grown significantly and DLRCC should take this opportunity to support the continued growth of local convenience with supportive policies, objectives and flexible zoning in the CDP to ensure the continued vibrancy and viability of towns across the County.
• The CDP should safeguard the delivery and access routes and spaces to undertake deliveries to existing retailers.
• Request that no policies are introduced that could lead to any restrictions on deliveries and that DLRCC engage with retail operators as part of any future public realm or transportation strategies.
• Request that the delivery requirements of convenience foodstore operators are acknowledged and that policies providing for deliveries, including early morning deliveries, should be encouraged.
• CDP and Retail Strategy needs to acknowledge the needs of modern retailers including appropriate floorplates, car parking and servicing access.
• Generally, modern larger retail convenience layouts require unobstructed and level floorplates with associated car parking, and where sites with these characteristics become available in or around town centre areas, it is important that DLRCC recognise these sites are suitable for accommodating the provision of convenience retailing facilities, rather than having to rely on consolidating the existing urban fabric to try and achieve a suitable conforming site.
• Support and accommodate the growth of ‘Click and Collect’ retail services and grocery home shopping.
• Recommended to include the following policy in the CDP:
“To support and accommodate the growth of ‘Click and Collect’ retail services and grocery home shopping.”

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 7

|--------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-----------|

Summary of Submission and Observation:
The submission relates to lands located at Rocklawn, Leopardstown Road, Dublin 18.
A design is currently being worked on for a high-quality residential development.
A number of ‘Objectives to Protect and Preserve Trees and Woodlands’ are now indicated along the southern and western boundaries of the site at Rocklawn, Leopardstown Road, Dublin 18.
While the submission acknowledges the objectives for the protection of trees, it is considered that this must be undertaken regarding the quality and expected lifespan of those trees subject to the identified objective.
The submission wishes to highlight the quality of several of the existing trees on the site to the Planning Authority. These trees have been subject to a detailed Arboricultural Assessment. It is submitted that due to the poor quality of the existing trees on the western boundary of the site, the placement of an Objective to Protect and Preserve Trees and Woodlands at this location is not appropriate.
The submission is accompanied by a Tree Constraints Plan (Appendix A) prepared by Arborist Associates which is based on a Condition Tree Assessment dated July 2020 (Appendix B). Except for the trees at the north west and south west corners, it is considered that most of the trees located on the western boundary are categorised a Category U trees – trees which have little or no potential
The submitted Condition Tree Assessment indicates that most of the trees on the western boundary are noted as having no long-term potential due to crown suppression, deadwood and decay. Therefore, the removal of the objective for their preservation would not impact any plans to provide for high quality replacement planting which would have a much-improved expected lifespan and overall quality.
The submission noted that of the c. 25 trees located on the western boundary of the subject site, just two are listed as Category C – trees of low quality with a minimum 10-year life span. As such, in consideration of the evidence provided the submission submits that the placement of an Objective to Protect and Preserve Trees and Woodlands is not appropriate at this location.
Additionally, in consideration of the documented, poor quality of these Category U trees on the western boundary of the subject site, it is requested that the Objective to Protect and Preserve Trees and Woodlands as identified in red in Figure 2.3 of this submission, be removed by way of amendment to the Draft Development Plan.
The submission is accompanied by maps of the site area, Appendix A: Condition Tree Assessment (July 2020) and Appendix B: Tree Constraints Plan.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 9

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Advocates for the S2S and improvements to cycling and walking infrastructure.
• Allocation of space in dlr is weighted towards the motor vehicle.
• Lists Barton Road East/ Churcktown Road/ Breamor Road/ Nutgrove Avenue as being in need of traffic calming and speed reduction

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Request a skate park in Dún Laoghaire, preferably free to use and near ferry terminal or Carlisle pier.
• Skateboarding attracts healthy active youths and as a new Olympic sport, Dún Laoghaire has an opportunity to put itself centre stage in Ireland.
• There are not enough sports facilities for young people and this could open up great business and sporting opportunities.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 8
### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Request a skate park in Dún Laoghaire, preferably free to use and near ferry terminal or Carlisle pier.
- Skateboarding attracts healthy active youths and as a new Olympic sport, Dún Laoghaire has an opportunity to put itself centre stage in Ireland.
- There are not enough sports facilities for young people and this could open up great business and sporting opportunities.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1027</td>
<td>Andrew Hewat</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10, 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission seeks the protection of the Green Belt for the health, well-being and recreation of all residents in the County.
- Suggests the Council have not fully explored the brownfield and infill development potential within the existing urban areas. Considers the approach for the Rathmichael ‘strategic growth area’ to be an overly simplistic to additional housing development which simply looks to continually expand housing into Green Belt areas rather than maximising the development potential of existing urban brownfield and infill locations.
- Recommends the current Green Belt to the west of the M50/M11 motorways be maintained and that future development be restricted to the eastern side of this boundary. Furthermore, requests the removal of the Rathmichael lands to the west of the M50 as a ‘strategic growth area’.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Chapter 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1028</td>
<td>Tony Manahan</td>
<td>Manahan Planners (on behalf of Goldwing Real Estate Plaza Limited)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission relates to a site, known as Via Verde, bounded by Blackthorn Avenue, Blackthorn Road and Burton Hall Road, close to the Sandyford Luas terminus in the Sandyford Business District. It is located in a zone 3 which is zoned to provide for office based employment.
- A report on Sandyford by Knight Frank ‘The Sandyford Business District An Analysis Of Residential Supply Issues’ is also discussed in the submission. In summary this report puts forward the argument that there is a mis-match between working and living population (26,000 employees and 5,000 residents). It finds that this imbalance is likely to persist. The working population of the district is likely to grow to 48,500 whereas the residential population only has the capacity to grow to almost 12,000. Report considers that the residential is unlikely to happen as the ownership is fractured. A failure to consider other potential land for development would mean that the shortage of accommodation in the area will persist and the district could lose its competitive edge/attractiveness with other surrounding areas becoming more attractive for companies looking to create employment.
- A description of the site and the context in relation to SUFP background and policies is set out.
- Considers that the density proposed in the central Zone 5 at under 100 units to the Hectare is far too low as is the height at only 3-5 stories and therefore too restrictive to facilitate a successful residential development in this location.
- Sets out that a twofold approach is required as follows; (A) substantially increase the permitted height, density, and site coverage in Zone 5 as an incentive for land owners to consider residential alternatives and B) permit residential to be “open for consideration” in Zones 1, 2 and 3 in particularly in the Via Verde site.
- Set out a number of international case studies inspiring the vision for Sandyford in developing integrated office and residential areas.
- Zuidas Innovation District, Amsterdam - the vision is to shift away from work and more to residential and to improving accessibility by bicycle and public transport.
22@Barcelona Project - A regeneration project with an innovation district where the obsolete industrial fabric will be transformed into a diverse environment of production centres, social and affordable housing, public facilities and green spaces. The famous Barcelona "super blocks" – is the common spatial template that will be extended in the Poblenou’s re-urbanisation process.

Considers that:
- a) there is a need to deliver more residential development in the District
- b) the areas designated will not deliver the required development,
- c) The Via Verde site has the potential to plug the shortfall in residential development
- d) The layout and quantum of open space on this site is suited to a residential development.
- The plot ratio and height permitted on this site for office development is too low having regard to:
  - the size of the site in single ownership,
  - the capacity of the site to accommodate an integrated development,
  - the high quality proposal currently before the Planning Authority in a current planning application and the location of the site alongside a LUAS stop.
- Request that the current office based employment use zoning be amended so that a) the height and plot ratio for office use permitted be increased; and b) that the site contain a designation that residential use is “Open for Consideration subject to the proposal being consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area”.
- Requests increased height and density for zone 5 to make the demolition of existing buildings and relocation of business attractive for existing owners.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 17.

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Dublin Array is a proposed offshore wind farm located at the Kish and Bray Banks off the coast of Dún Laoghaire and north County Wicklow. The project is being jointly developed by RWE Renewables Ireland (previously referred to as Innogy Renewables Limited) and Saorgus Energy Limited.
- The Dublin Array project is expected to be have a total installed capacity of between 600 and 900 MW and between 45 and 61 turbines.
- The proposed development of an offshore wind farm at the Kish and Bray Banks is the subject of an existing foreshore lease application and is identified as such in both the Offshore Renewable Energy Development Plan (2014) and the draft National Marine Planning Framework (2019).
- The Dublin Array project has successfully secured a number of foreshore licences (for the purposes of survey) with the most recent being awarded by the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage in January 2021.
- The project has been identified by both the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage and the Department of the Environment, Climate and Communications in May 2020 as a ‘relevant project’ for inclusion under the transitional provisions identified in the Maritime Area Planning Bill.
- Welcome Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council’s inclusion in the Draft Plan of policies and objectives which acknowledge and support the development of offshore wind energy as well as supporting onshore infrastructure, as set out under Policy Objective CA11: 'Onshore and Offshore Wind Energy and Wave Energy', 'Policy Objective GIB7: National Marine Planning Framework and Section 12.2.3 Wind Energy'.
- Supportive of the action as envisaged under policy objective GIB3 and the preservation of coastal views as set out in the draft Plan, however it is important to ensure that this is achieved in a manner which is compatible with national offshore renewable energy, climate action and marine planning policies and plans.

Carrickmines 220 kV Substation
- EirGrid has identified that the Carrickmines 220 kV substation will be one of the main nodes in the transmission network to accommodate connection of offshore wind generated electricity. For this to occur, new high voltage infrastructure adjacent to the existing substation, and the installation of new underground electricity cable infrastructure, will be required.
The construction of this new transmission infrastructure will be completed by ESB/EirGrid or other parties undertaking the duties of a statutory undertaker. There is a history of private energy developers securing consent, constructing and handing over new build sections of the electricity transmission network to EirGrid/ESB, referred to as the Contestable Delivery Model. The CDP should recognise this and clarify the supporting objective accordingly as follows.

Request that Policy Objective EI19: Energy Facilities is amended to the following (proposed additions in bold):

It is a Policy Objective to encourage the provision of energy facilities in association with the appropriate service providers and in accordance with ‘Government Policy Statement on the Strategic Importance of Transmission and Other Energy Infrastructure’ (2012). In addition, the Council will facilitate the expansion of the services and infrastructure of existing service providers, notably Bord Gáis, Eirgrid, the Electricity Supply Board (ESB), other strategic electricity infrastructure developers and statutory undertakers, in order to ensure satisfactory levels of supply and to minimise constraints for development.

Maritime Economy Opportunity

Notes that Policy Objective E17 Maritime Economy states that it is a Policy Objective to support the sustainable development of the maritime economy.

ORE Policies 10 and 11 in the draft National Marine Planning Framework recognises the significant opportunity for economic development and enterprise in coastal local authorities, such as Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown, to support the offshore wind industry, such as development of existing harbour infrastructure and associated services.

Ensuring support for offshore wind development in the County Development Plan and its associated enabling landbased infrastructure needs will pave the way for attracting and securing additional investment in harbours and coastal communities.

Dún Laoghaire Harbour has significant potential for the location of Operations and Maintenance Hub for the offshore wind industry. Jobs within the installation and commissioning, operation and maintenance and decommissioning supply chain areas are predominantly based in the vicinity of the host port. The supply chain also has potential to result in indirect employment opportunities within the local area to benefit the local community.

The submission includes a link to the Wind Energy Ireland publication entitled ‘Harnessing our Potential’ (WEI, May 2020).

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 6, Appendix 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1030</td>
<td>Ben Fitzgerald</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10, 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Remove SLO93 or tone down significantly due to 2021 Wastewater Code of Practice which deals with many of the issues presented.
- DLRCC are failing to publicly provide the full reports to back up putting SLO93 in place.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapters 10, 14 (map 10 and 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1031</td>
<td>Michael O’ Neill</td>
<td>Gas networks Ireland</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission sets out that GNI is involved in facilitating the injection of renewable gas, a carbon neutral energy source, into the gas network. The DLR Spatial Energy Demand Analysis document highlights that there is rural land in the south of the county that is suitable for growing energy feedstocks. Renewable gas, which is often produced from waste materials improves security of energy supply and helps diversify energy sources.
- A KPMG evaluation concluded that with regard to the decarbonisation of the one million Irish residential homes currently connected to, or within close proximity to the existing gas network that renewable gas is the lowest cost option to decarbonise the domestic heat sector.
- Recommends a fabric first approach.
The Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Eastern and Midlands Region calls for increased availability of low carbon fuels such as Compressed Natural Gas (CNG). CNG provides a lower emission alternative to diesel and compressed renewable gas provides a carbon neutral alternative to diesel for heavy good vehicles. Would welcome the inclusion of a policy on and CNG infrastructure in Chapter 5 and suggests a wording.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1032</td>
<td>Suzanne Docherty</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission notes concerns relating to Sandycove Avenue West in the areas of Speeding and Traffic congestion.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1033</td>
<td>Gavin Buckley</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission objects to the listing of Emerald, Ballybride Road (RPS No. 1973) to the RPS as it is in need of modernisation and its listing would make this virtually impossible.
- Submission notes that that interior has little architectural merit and there would be no objection to the protection of the exterior, however, this is not possible.
- Submission argues that protecting buildings in the area is contradictory to the development plans plan to destroy the heritage, ambience, charm and attraction of this rural area through increased densities.
- The submission envisages that the area would be transformed into a house dominated town bereft of amenities and opposes medium density development of the area.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 4, Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1034</td>
<td>Gary Cooper</td>
<td>Landmarque Property Group Ltd</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- This is a duplicate of B0978 which is summarised in full above.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Refer to issues raised under B0978.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1035</td>
<td>Chris Doorly</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission states that Dunleary House (RPS. 2131) should be listed.
- Submission raises issue with recent applications in Dún Laoghaire, specifically 12-13 storey development.
- Submission agrees with the reference to church spires being points of reference.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Appendix 4, Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1036</td>
<td>Maureen Clarke</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission notes people regularly park on double yellow lines in front of their home 9 Sandycove Ave East) and considers there is a need for more wardens patrolling the area.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 5

356
Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission requests the re-zoning of lands at the Frankfort Centre, Dundrum Road from Objective ‘NC’ – To protect, provide for and/or improve mixed-use neighbourhood centre facilities – to Objective ‘A’ - To provide residential development and/or protect and improve residential amenity.
- A description of the site context and surrounding environment is set out. The locational advantages of the site are set out including proximity to Dundrum, UCD, employment centres, and high frequency and quality transport routes. Suggests the site’s location in terms of accessibility to existing transport nodes and residential development requires a more appropriate use than the current zoning allows.
- An overview of national policy is provided, and it is suggested that the site comprises a prime, infill, underutilised site. Submits that the delivery of uses such as residential at the site would be consistent with the policies and intentions of the NPF, Rebuilding Ireland and the RSES.
- Suggests the existing zoning of the site as Objective ‘NC’ comprises a legacy zoning based more on the existing use rather than the opportunities presented by the site’s strategic location.
- Submission provides an overview of ‘NC’ zoned lands in the wider area and submits that there is a proliferation of retail/service uses in close proximity. Suggests these zonings reflect a fading pattern of occupation not relevant to the up-to-date requirements of the immediate population. Suggests the current uses at the site don’t fit comfortably within the definition of what is appropriate to a Neighbourhood Centre.
- A commercial rationale is set out and it is submitted that there is no sustainable market for small retail uses in the area, and any larger uses would be direct competition with Dundrum Centre. States that the threat of vacancy at the site is significant and suggests that a zoning which allows for a more viable use would allow for the successful redevelopment of the site. A list is appended to the submission which identifies examples of vacancy along the Dundrum Road.
- Suggests the current use does not deliver any ‘Neighbourhood Centre’ value and could, in comparison, deliver much needed additional housing. Notes that under the residential zoning retail and service uses would still be open for consideration.
- Requests the Council also consider re-zoning the adjoining lands to the south from Objective ‘NC’ to Objective ‘A’ and suggests this would remove potential limitations on full residential use and better reflect the pattern of development in the area.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 1

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The submission notes that a section of Adelaide Road and Marlborough Road in Glenageary has been designated a candidate Architectural Conservation Area (cACA) since at least 2004. It is disappointing to see that under the Draft County Development Plan the Council propose to omit Adelaide Road from the ACA and would like the Council to reconsider this aspect of the CDP.
- Marlborough Road is a fine early 20th century development but the section of Adelaide Road in the cACA is of arguably greater historic and architectural interest.
- The submission requests the Council to preserve this fine Victorian road and to grant this section of road the protection of full ACA status, as envisaged when it first gave it the cACA designation over 15 years ago. This could be achieved by reverting to the original cACA boundary. Alternatively, perhaps Adelaide Road could be added to the adjacent Silchester Road ACA, with which it shares much character.
- The submission also includes some background information, maps, and photographs with respect to the existing cACA which spans Marlborough Road and a section of Adelaide Road from its junction to Marlborough Road to Station Road and adjoins the Silchester Road ACA.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4
### DLR Submission No: B1039
Person: Brendan Slattery  
Organisation: On behalf of Bartra Property (Dublin) Ltd  
Map Nos: 3, 4

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission relates to lands at the former Western Marine Building, Bullock harbour, Dalkey.
- Submission states that it is their understanding that the Council and its councillors may be requested to remove “residential” use from the classes of use “open for consideration” on those lands.
- When making this plan, the Council and its councillors are, under section 12(11) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended), restricted to considering the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- With respect to these lands at Bullock Harbour, the question of proper planning was decisively determined by An Bord Pleanála when granting permission reference no. ABP-301237-18.
- Absent a material change in circumstances (of which there is none to our or our client’s knowledge), the Council and its councillors are not free to form a different conclusion.
- The planning merits of mixed-use development, which includes residential use, on these lands is the subject of pending appeal before the Board.
- Submission considers that if the Council and its councillors were to amend the plan in an attempt to interfere with that pending process, such unlawful interference would be exposed to legal challenge and would, undermine the legitimacy of both the appeal process and the development-plan making process.
- Any suggestion to remove “residential” use from the classes of use “open for consideration” on these lands should be rejected, so that the pending planning process can conclude without unlawful interference.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 13

### DLR Submission No: B1040
Person: Michael FitzGerald  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 10

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Commends Plan especially tree mapping, biodiversity, 10 minute neighbourhood.
- Concern with East Coast cycleway at Corbawn – needs to be rerouted along or parallel to the coast.
- Plan B should route through Shankhill village.
- As currently proposed would disrupt residents of Corbawn Drive and Seafield.
- Concerned about crime, signage, unsafe for children in the area, litter, influx of scale would damage green areas.
- Undermine county lane at end of Quinn’s Road.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

### DLR Submission No: B1041
Person: John Spain Associates  
Organisation: On behalf of IMRFII Frascati Limited Partnership acting through its general partner Davy IMRFII GP Limited  
Map Nos: 2

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Anomaly on Map 2 of CDP. LAP boundary on Map 2 does not match the LAP boundary of the Blackrock LAP. On Map 2 the boundary does not include the A zoned lands to the north west corner of the Frascati lands. In the Blackrock LAP, the LAP boundary extends around these lands. Request to extend the boundary on Map 2 around the A zoned lands to match the LAP boundary.
- Anomaly on Figure 2.9 of the CDP. Blackrock is identified as a District Centre, however, in relation to Figure 2.9 the colour does not coordinate with the legend in respect to the District Centres designated.
- Requests the rezoning of the lands in the northern section of lands (next to tree symbol adjoining Frascati Road) from A to DC. This would address the current anomaly whereby a corner of the site is subject to zoning Objective A. See figure 4, page 5, of submission for location.

- Request update of Table 7.2 ‘Summary of Overall Strategy for Centres in the DLR Retail Hierarchy’ included in Chapter 7 Towns, Villages and Retail Development to reflect the fact that the shopping centres have / are being rejuvenated and support the provision of residential development within the Blackrock District Centre, specifically acknowledging the permitted residential development at the Frascati Centre (currently under construction). Suggestion that the text in Table 7.2 be updated as follows:

  "To support the ongoing redevelopment of the Blackrock Shopping Centre and the provision of additional residential development at the rejuvenated Frascati Shopping Centres and, along with the consolidation of Blackrock Main Street as a mixed-use centre in accordance with an approved Local Area Plan. Any retail expansion should be limited and proportionate to the current percentage share of the overall net retail floorspace in the core retail area, as indicated in the Local Area Plan”.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

- Chapters 2, 7, Map 2

---

### DLR Submission No: B1042

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ian Doyle</td>
<td>Ian Doyle Planning Consultant on behalf of Galadar Properties limited</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission requests a rezoning of lands from SNI to residential at a site located at Cherrywood Road, adjoining the hospital lands at St Colmcilles.
- Submission considers the proposed rezoning to be relevant in the context of an active SHD application.
- Submission sets out the site location and context noting that the site consists of a vacant brownfield plot.
- Submission includes maps and imagery showing the site in context with public transport and topography.
- Submission sets out the National policy context with regard to compact growth and infill development citing relevant objectives and NPO’s of the NPF.
- Submission notes that the subject site is defined as being an infill site consisting of underutilised lands zoned for development and proximate to established social infrastructure.
- Submission notes that the subject site would benefit from the social, community and physical infrastructure associated with Cherrywood.
- Submission notes the proximity of the site to public transport links including the Luas and a number of bus routes. Maps showing various walk times are included.
- Submission notes that the subject site is a 0.8ha portion of an overall 10.4ha SNI lands but is disconnected from the remainder of these lands due to topography.
- Submission notes that the rezoning of the site would retain sufficient SNI lands to accommodate the future expansion of the hospital. It is stated that the lands are unsuitable for hospital expansion due to level differences.
- Submission states that the Health Board have no plans to expand the facility at St. Columcilles Hospital and have no interest in or need for addition facilities at this location.

A letter from the hospital group is included stating that St Colmcilles is a public hospital and do not intend, at this time, to have a private practice facility and currently have no requirement for accommodation for staff.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

- Map 10

---

### DLR Submission No: B1043

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Donlon</td>
<td>Land Development Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary of Submission and Observation:
Submission provides background on the LDA sites in dlr including details and planning context in relation to the Central Mental Hospital Site in Dundrum.

Submission sets out National and Regional Planning Context – NPF and RSES and consider that the CMH has potential to contribute to national and regional policy objectives on brownfield development and compact growth.

Submission provides commentary on National guidelines on Apartment and Height and their applicability to the development of the CMH site having regard to its location and INST objective.

Submission considers that national guideline are key to unlocking the full potential of the site from a housing delivery perspective.

Submission sets out commentary in relation to the Draft Plan.

Submission considers that there is a positive alignment between the Strategic County Outcomes and the LDA’s remit to deliver housing and compact growth.

Highlights the role that tier 1 sites such as CMH play in delivering a significant quantity of housing.

**Building Height**

- Welcome updated policy but consider performance-based criteria are more prescriptive and onerous than the SPPR 3 criteria.
- Request that the Draft Plan amend the performance-based criteria to align with the SPPR criteria.

**Density**

- Requests that section 4.3.1.1 PHP 18 recognise the apartment guidelines and the role of apartments in delivery of national housing targets.
- Welcomes flexibility provided in relation to density in PO PHP 21.

**Locational classification of lands**

- Based on the criteria set out in the apartment guidelines in relation to central and accessible urban locations the submission queries the accuracy of the classification of the County as an intermediate County and requests that section 12.3.5.1 be amended to align with the guidelines.

**Car parking**

- Plan does not do enough to encourage modal shift from car use to more sustainable forms of transport.
- In the context of the apartment guidelines the Draft Plan provides for excessive parking for apartment development.
- Plan does not allow sites that may meet the criteria of central/accessible urban locations to provide less than 1 car parking space per residential unit.
- There is very little difference between zones 2 and 3 in respect of apartment development.
- Car parking standards should be maximums for locations with good access to public transport.
- Provision of blanket parking zones has the potential to result in rigid application for car parking standards and will not support a transition to a low carbon society.
- Request reconsideration of the concept of car parking zones so as to reflect national policy context.
- Submission consider that CMH would under the draft plan require 1500 spaces and consider that this would conflict with section 28 Guidelines.
- Submission requests further flexibility on car parking for the CMH site given its designation as a Strategic Regeneration Site. This could be through application of maximum standards.

**Strategic Regeneration Sites**

- Welcome designation of CMH as a Strategic Regeneration site.

**Land Use Zoning**

- Requests that a caveat be added to “offices less than 200sq m” in land use Objective A as follows; Greater quantum of office floorspace may be considered in respect of former institutional buildings where the Institutional Objective applies and will not have adverse effects on the ‘A’ zoning objective, ‘to provide residential development and/or protect and improve residential amenity’.
- Request that “Ancillary Infrastructure” be added to open for consideration on lands subject to zoning objective F with the following caveat - Applies only to Strategic Regeneration Sites as defined by Policy CS13 of the Core Strategy, where required to facilitate the optimal residential redevelopment of the site and its integration with the surrounding area.

**Specific Local Objective**

- Welcomes SLO 113

**Open Space**
Request that discrepancy between open space requirements within Section 12.3.8.11 and Table 12.8 of Section 12.3.8.3.1. is corrected to provide clarity surrounding the open space requirement for institutional lands.

RPS

Welcome addition of buildings at the CMH to the RPS but request a reconsideration in relation to the structures to the north of the main building so as to ensure that they meet the criteria for inclusion.

Conclusion

Requests that amendments are considered

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Chapters 1, 4, 12, 13, Appendices 4, 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1044</td>
<td>Amanda Healy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Request the deletion of the following text from Section 8.5.6 George’s Place:
  
  “The first phase of the development has anticipated a new pedestrian/cycle link between George’s Place and Crofton Road and the completion of this route across Stable Lane to further strengthen the connectivity between Georges Street and the Waterfront is a strategic objective of this Plan. Any redevelopment will include upgrades to the public realm along Georges Place to include traffic calming, extensive tree planting, pollinator planting schemes, creative water connectivity attenuation, wider paving, improved surfaces and new public lighting to create a stronger sense of place…”
  
- The proposal would increase pedestrian traffic on Stable Lane and result in loss of privacy & security. As a woman living alone with my children this is an honest and serious concern.
  
- During the development of the houses on Kelly’s avenue, the original wall was removed and as a result there were a number of car break-ins and attempted home burglaries which has still left a sense of fear and insecurity. Exposing the lane further will result in a return of this type of behaviour.
  
- Residents daily see people parking wherever they want and dumping their rubbish which will be worsened by the pedestrian connection.
  
- There are already multiple alternative routes to the waterfront, notably at Kelly’s avenue & Clarence street.
  
- Stable lane has not been legally taken in charge.
  
- No public right of way has been established.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1045</td>
<td>Stephen Little &amp; Associates on behalf of Adroit Operations Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submissions requests the re-zoning of lands in Kiltiernan from zoning Objective ‘B’ to zoning Objective ‘A’. Requests that should DLR not re-zone the lands Objective ‘A’, that the lands be identified as a Strategic Land Reserve.
  
- An overview of the site description, context, and developer is provided. An overview of developments in the Kiltiernan area is set out and it is highlighted that many residential schemes in the LAP area have received planning permission but not commenced development. It is submitted that the subject developer would be committed to commence development subject to planning permission.
  
- Notes that the subject site is bounded to the east by lands subject of a current SHD planning application by the same developer and highlights that the scheme has been designed in such a manner to not preclude the development of the subject site.
  
- A summary of relevant national and regional guidance and policy is set out. Suggests that at a national and regional level a significant degree of focus is placed upon the significance of areas such as Kiltiernan and their importance in meeting future housing need. Notes that the RSES seeks the consolidation of existing settlements and the proposed re-zoning would assist with this. Furthermore, the lands would lend themselves to a natural extension of the Local Area Plan and ensure sequential compact urban growth.
• Contends the lands comprise ‘Tier 1’ serviced land (NPF – Appendix 3) and are ideally positioned to accommodate future population and housing growth.

• An analysis of Census data and new dwelling completions is provided. A shortfall in housing completions versus population growth is highlighted. Submits there will be a housing shortage for longer than envisaged and a higher demand for housing due to reduced supply. Suggests that it is now even more important to ensure delivery of housing in a timely manner on lands that have the potential to accommodate compact growth.

• Reference is made to the Implementation Roadmap for the NPF and the provision of an additional 25% ‘headroom’. Submits DLR and Kiltiernan can take into account this ‘headroom’.

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The submission is broken into the relevant Chapters/Appendices as follows:
- Chapter 4 - The Policy on Protection of Existing Residential Amenity Policy Objective (PHP20) does not go far enough to protect Residential Amenity within the Development Plan Area and should include a criterion that no taller buildings i.e. in excess of 2 storeys above surrounding existing development, should be permitted within 100 metres of existing buildings.
- Appendix 15 - In the Green Infrastructure report reference is made to the importance of rivers and streams for ecology such as the River Slang, however this is not carried through into the detailed strategies for protection of the environment. There needs to be a positive contribution towards the maintenance of existing green infrastructure and associated ecosystem services.
- The objective “to protect and preserve Trees and Woodland”, should be added to the planting along the banks of the River Slang between the Dundrum Shopping Centre and the River Dodder on Map 1 to reflect its importance as an ecological habitat and connection.
- Appendix 16 – The text in relation to the Dundrum Slang seems to allow for considerable development which could negatively impact the residents within the flood risk areas for example the development of the Central Mental Hospital site.
- Therefore, the submission suggests ensuring that the risk of flooding to properties along the River Slang are managed, all developments within the pluvial run off catchment of the River Slang must be assessed to ensure that existing threats of flooding are not increased. There should also be an objective that bridges across the River Slang be assessed for potential of blockage and that remedial works undertaken to manage such a risk.
- That the objective “to protect and preserve Trees and Woodland” be added to Map 1 at the mature woodland at the entrance to the Central Mental Hospital and specimen trees within the complex.
- The submission also supports Specific Local Objective 113.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

- Map 9

**DLR Submission No:** B1046  
**Person:** John Cahill  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 1

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Commentary is set out on the Dublin Chamber.
- Commentary is provided on the 15 minute city for Dublin and submissions considers that the principles outlined in the 15 Minute City report prepared by Dublin Chamber should be adopted by planners.
- Submission welcomes 10 minute neighbourhoods.
- Submission welcomes the new SNI zoning objective and commend the Council for this innovative approach in identifying ‘existing facilities and services considered to be central to sustaining and building neighbourhoods’. The Council should consider integrating this approach into identifying future sites for Sustainable Neighbourhood Infrastructure.
- Welcome commitment to carrying out community strategy and consider it should be carried out in first year of the Plan.
- Submission emphasises importance of the public realm.
- Sets out commentary and support for joint public private collaborations and working with local communities at early project stages.
- Submission considers Plan should prioritise being more ambitious in terms of developing the community infrastructure required to enable compact growth.
- The Plan must acknowledge the importance of putting in place the infrastructure in advance of, and to facilitate, development.
- Submission welcomes the emphasis in the NPF on brownfield development and the renewal and development of existing urban areas and considers that the change in zoning of well serviced but under-utilised employment zones to become high-density residential and mixed use developments will be critical to meeting the goals set out under the NPF and MASP.
- The Development Plan must embrace the vision of compact growth through high density contained in the NPF and MASP. Particular focus should also be given to areas at the edge of the Local Authority’s boundary. These areas may be subject to ineffective planning and development due to incongruent decisions taken by bordering Local Authorities. Co-ordination with South Dublin, Dublin City, and Wicklow is essential in these areas.
- The development of significant transport projects within the county represents the greatest opportunity for the Plan as these will serve as enablers of sustainable economic, social, and population growth for Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown.
- Considers that there is a need for a clear and ambitious commitment given to improving public transport provision.
- Welcomes the ambition to reduce the reliance on the private car. A clear commitment to prioritising investment in active and public transport infrastructure is needed to achieve this goal.
- The number of car parking spaces within Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown should be gradually reduced on a phased basis to reflect and encourage modal shift to public transport and active travel. Car parking should also be future proofed to accommodate electric vehicles. Other spaces should be considered for conversion to accommodate active travel options, by including bike parking, e-scooter sharing schemes, or new pedestrian plazas as appropriate.
- Submission provides commentary and support for various public transport projects
- The Plan must create the right conditions for the creation of quality jobs in the right locations.
- Compact growth involves locating employment hubs in close proximity to high density residential areas, thereby eliminating or reducing the need to commute. This should be a feature of the Development Plan. Public transport should also be considered in this context, with employment zones located close to key transport hubs such as DART or Luas stations.
- There is a notable absence of commercial development in Cherrywood.
- The future Development Plan should be flexible, considered, and adaptable in its approach to town centres as the change in the retail sector emerges and stabilises over the next few years.
- A Bannon report on Dublin City is referenced.
- Town centres, both historic and new, also need to be planned and carefully managed in accordance with place-making principles, ensuring a high-quality public realm to encourage people to visit, stay, and shop, but also to encourage over the shop living and increased residential uses within our town centres.
- The Development Plan must be underpinned by a firm commitment to be responsive to our national environmental challenges and to ensure that development occurs within environmental limits.
- Considers that the circular economy should be considered in relation to the reduction and reuse of waste through the procurement and delivery of services.
- Commentary provided on green procurement.
- Request consistency with the vision and objectives in the National Planning Framework and the Dublin Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan.
- Requests that the Plan commit to a 15 Minute City / 10 Minute Neighbourhood pilot programme to establish learnings and identify implementation issues arising from such an ambitious plan.
- Request that the Plan commit to
  - Use of the Local Area Plan and Strategic Development Zone models to deliver the 15 Minute City / 10 Minute Neighbourhood vision and to encourage further development and regeneration in built parts of the city.
  - Use of the SNI to identify brownfield and infill sites to be used to address infrastructure deficits.
• An ambitious approach to the town centre and retail strategy while maintaining the need to be flexible as the sector experiences rapid change.
• Ensuring the development of enabling infrastructure to meet the needs of Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown’s growing population.
• Co-ordination with the rest of the Dublin Metropolitan Area to ensure consistency in planning and development across the four Local Authorities.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, SEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1048</th>
<th>Person: Shane Lavelle</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen Collage to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 13, Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1049</th>
<th>Person: Barry Thornton</th>
<th>Organisation: Blackrock Athletic Club</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The vision of Blackrock Athletic Club is to “fulfil the athletic ambition of everyone in the community”, which is very consistent with the Objective OSR5 in this plan to “to increase physical activity levels across the whole population”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Blackrock Athletic Club has grown in recent years and is the largest athletics club in Ireland with athletics now the fourth most popular sport in Ireland after GAA, Football and Rugby. Yet athletics facilities in DLR are significantly weaker than in other counties, despite the popularity of this sport.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The submission welcomes Policy Objective OSR9 “to promote the provision, and management of high-quality sporting, and recreational infrastructure throughout the county”, and requests that athletics is not overlooked.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Significant improvement is needed to athletics facilities in DLR, especially as it is one of the few counties in Ireland without an athletics track. This means that our athletes regularly need to travel outside DLR (to Irishtown, Abbotstown, Tallaght or Greystones) to train, which is at odds with the stated objective in the Plan “that facilities are located where they are of most value and accessible to the community being served. Accessibility should be promoted primarily through public transport links and by walking/cycling.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Council should provide athletics facilities for example tracks, sprint lanes in parks, marked and well-lit trails in parks or alongside proposed greenways and provision of field event facilities (long jump, shot put, etc).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1003</th>
<th>Person: Martin O’Donnell</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10, 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Objection to SLO93 - 2021 EPA code of practice which gives methodologies for dealing with wastewater treatment should be taken into account.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Any groundwater issues can be dealt with the latest high-tech wastewater treatment systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All planning applications should be dealt with on their merits and where it can be proven that waste and ground water can be safely and correctly treated, this issue should not be a barrier to a planning permission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 10, 14 (map 10 and 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1051</th>
<th>Person: Barry Ward</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2, 3, 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Summary of Submission and Observation:
- S2S running from County boundary to Sandycove, a long standing universally supported policy, seems to be omitted although there are still references to East Coast Trail.
- Multiple benefits of the S2S are set out including access to coast, superior to on-road routes.
- Welcome the recent improvements for cyclists.
- Suggests a wording for a policy objective for the S2S.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>B1052</th>
<th>Person: N/A</th>
<th>Organisation: Explorium Limited and Dockfare Management Limited</th>
<th>Map Nos: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission relates to lands at Explorium, Blackglen Road, Sandyford, Co. Dublin. Notes that the facilities were purchased in 2017 and subjected to a €35m rehabilitation as a sports/science facility located in a building extending to over 10,700sq.m. Suggests that the new CDP should recognise the achievement in rehabilitating the infrastructure and facilities and support further development of the potential of Explorium as a national sports science asset.
- Background information is set out including both the contents of a pre-draft submission made and the Chief Executive’s response as part of the current plan-making process, and also historical information in relation to a request for a zoning change at the lands through the 2016 CDP plan-making process.
- Requests the inclusion of a new Specific Local Objective at the site to provide for expansion of the sports/science institutional use as an extension to the Explorium facilities.
- Makes the case and requests that the fitness centre related accommodation, located to the south of the main Explorium building, and adjacent lands, are re-zoned from Objective ‘F’ to Objective ‘A’. States that they are no longer required in connection with the Explorium activities and that they are a non-conforming use under the Objective ‘F’ zoning.
- Provides that the zoning change would provide a more integrated zoning arrangement on Blackglen Road; notes that there is ‘A’ zoning on higher land to the south of the Blackglen Road; and that the lands are accessible to ‘NC’ facilities and served by public transport. Refers to access issues on the north side of the Blackglen Road due to level changes. Suggests re-zoning the lands would facilitate better standard and safer access by using the existing Explorium road infrastructure and access to the properly formed junction at Blackglen/Rockview distributor road junction after completion of the Blackglen Road Improvement Scheme.
- Requests the re-zoning of lands to the west of the Explorium facility from Objective ‘F’ to Objective ‘SNI’. Refers to current Specific Local Objective 159 which is identified at the site as part of the 2016 Plan. Notes the range of uses envisaged under the SLO 159 are covered under the new zoning Objective ‘SNI’. Requests the re-location of the SLO to lands to the west and replaced with the land use zoning Objective ‘SNI’.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>B1053</th>
<th>Person: Mary Byrne</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen Collage to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>B1054</th>
<th>Person: Tom Phillips</th>
<th>Organisation: Tom Phillips + Associates</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission disagrees with BTR being set out as a separate use class.
Submission notes that out of 19 no. zonings, 6 no. include BTR and also include residential – it is considered that such a distinction is contrary to government policy.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 13

### DLR Submission No: B1055
Person: Brian Swan  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 1

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission does not consider that the proposed tree symbols on Map 1 at the Junction of Churchtown Road Upper and Whitehall Road (and Landscape Park) with the proposed designation ‘to protect and preserve’ is sufficiently adequate in relation to the very specific nature of the cherry blossom trees at this location.
- Therefore, an additional designation is requested in the Plan to designate the length of Churchtown Road Upper from the junction with Riverside Drive to the junction with Landscape Crescent as a “Cherry Blossom Arboreal Sanctuary”, requiring the development of an implementation plan for its protection, enhancement, and long-term sustainability.
- The submission also notes the importance of the cherry blossom tree given at this location and that Dún Laoghaire Rathdown has recently been designated a “Tree City of the World” by the Arbor Day Foundation and United Nations.
- The submission also includes a map and photographs of the existing trees.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 9

### DLR Submission No: B1056
Person: Aileen Eglington  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 9

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- CDP needs to be long term sustainability and citizen needs driven, not developer driven.
- SHD developments have stopped public and Council input into the creation of communities.
- Kilternan’s character must be maintained and DLRCC must preserve and protect its environment.
- Proper village design for Kilternan needed and presented to Councillors and public for approval, as per LAP.
- Green space needed in Kilternan.
- Lands west of Enniskerry Road must be protected in terms of height, density and views.
- Enough land is zoned in Kilternan.
- Kilternan LAP needs to be adhered to.
- Access to heritage sites such as Druid’s Altar must be addressed as well as protection of mass paths, etc.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 2, 9, 11 and Miscellaneous.

### DLR Submission No: B1057
Person: John Spain Associates on behalf of the Jackson Family  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 9

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests the re-zoning of lands at Glenamuck from Objective ‘B’ and Objective ‘G’ to Objective ‘A’ and Objective ‘I’. An Architectural Concept Masterplan is included which identifies the component parts of the zoning request.
- An overview of the site location and planning and development context of the lands is set out. Submits that the locational and geographical attributes of the lands militate in favour of them being put to active and beneficial use through their development for residential purposes.
- Submission provides an analysis of the Core Strategy and considers the quantum of residential zoning proposed is insufficient to meet population projections / housing need over the Plan period. A rationale for same is detailed and includes; requirement to factor in the latest CSO population growth figures; the application of ‘headroom’ beyond 2026; addressing pent-up demand and ongoing supply
constraints; assumptions relating to the timeframes for the development of land; taking account of the rezoning of residential lands for sustainable neighbourhood infrastructure; and, additional off-setting of lands with significant infrastructural and phasing requirements. Submits that the Core Strategy doesn’t have regard to the Guidance Note on Core Strategies 2010 in respect of allowing for strategic long-term development areas.

- Submits that the Core Strategy should be revisited and amended. Requests that, in the event that the revisiting of the Core Strategy results in a requirement for additional residential zoning, that the logical location for additional residential development would be the lands subject of the submission.
- Makes the case that the proposed re-zoning of the lands would be appropriate having regard to existing and planned physical, social and community infrastructure. Furthermore, the extension of Kilteernan / Glenamuck residential zoned lands would be appropriate as key infrastructure is in place, or planned, to support the development of the area and deliver compact sustainable growth.
- Submits the proposed re-zoning would ensure the CDP aligns more fully with the policies and objectives of the NPF and RSES, including in particular the Dublin MASP.
- Considers the subject lands comprise Tier 1 lands (NPF – Appendix 3), which would provide for development at a suitable, serviced location over the lifetime of the CDP.
- Suggests regard should be had to the contribution made by the Jackson Family to the area in the form of existing and planned physical, social and community infrastructure. Furthermore, the extension of Kilteernan / Glenamuck residential zoned lands would be appropriate as key infrastructure is in place, or planned, to support the development of the area and deliver compact sustainable growth.
- Notes the number of permitted and proposed residential developments in the Glenamuck Road / Enniskerry Road area. Emphasises the need to identify future lands for expansion given the timeframe to bring forward development. Considers the subject site to be sequentially appropriate for future development.
- Submits that zoning part of the landholding Objective ‘F’ further supports the case made for the residential re-zoning request, whilst also offering environmental protection to a pNHA (part of the lands requested to be re-zoned Objective ‘F’ are located within a pNHA).
- Considers the proposed re-zoning would be positive in respect of climate change. Submits that re-zoning the lands would represent sequential development in close proximity to services and amenities and would promote a more sustainable modal split.
- Submits the proposed re-zoning would enhance the publicly accessible green infrastructure in the area including parks, greenways and cycleways.
- Without prejudice to the primary re-zoning request, it is alternatively requested that, should the Council consider that zoning Objective A can’t be applied to the full extent of the lands requested, that the lands within the boundary of the Kilteernan / Glenamuck LAP be re-zoned Objective ‘A’, and the remaining lands designated a Strategic Land Reserve. This alternative zoning request is illustrated in a Concept Masterplan included as Appendix 2.
- Submits that the inclusion of the adjoining lands as a Strategic Land Reserve would indicate their suitability for future residential development under the subsequent CDP and allow appropriate investment in infrastructure.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 9

| DLR Submission No: B1058 | Person: Marie Murphy | Organisation: N/A | Map Nos: 6 |

Summary of Submission and Observation:
Note submission from Marie Murphy also under submission no B1001
- Submission objects to opening the reservoir to the public.
- Concerned that social behavior and littering can destroy the area/encourage vermin.
- Concerned that privacy will be compromised due to overlooking of house.
- Submission notes that rocks/rubble are being compacted on site and the reservoir walls need to be reinforced.
- Submission considered the structure is a permanent first floor structure.
- Submission notes concern that access will adversely affect quality of life of residents.
- Submission notes there has been excessive noise at unsocial hours and requests the proposal is abandoned.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1059</td>
<td>Gerard O Sullivan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1060</td>
<td>Brendan Hudson</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1061</td>
<td>Tim Crowley</td>
<td>On behalf of Kilternan Cemetery Group Ltd</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1062</td>
<td>Maire O Meara</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1063</td>
<td>Barry Cullen</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- **Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
  - Chapter 14
  - Chapter 9
  - Appendix 16

- **Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
  - Chapter 5

- **Summary of Submission and Observation:**
  - The submission suggests that the Council increase the extent of public spaces available and to continue to enhance those facilities to preserve and enhance our valuable public spaces and resist any pressure to use them to build housing.
  - The Council should promote cycle ways / walkways where combined need to be wider - an example is new path/cycle way in Blackrock part is a great facility but is extremely crowded.
  - The Council need to ensure public spaces are cleaned up more regularly and that more open space and playgrounds are provided locally for example in Redesdale estate and at Mullens field.
  - The Council should resist any pressure to use public spaces to build housing -there is more than enough private green field sites for the latter if that is an issue.

- **Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
  - Chapter 9

- **Summary of Submission and Observation:**
  - The submission requests that the Development Plan incorporates a policy and objectives to promote, improve and develop sea swimming facilities by the ongoing management, maintenance, and investment in the existing sea swimming locations with particular reference to the Forty Foot.
  - Repair to the additional ladder access at the Forty Foot with additional ladders considered at this location.

- **Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
  - Chapter 9

- **Summary of Submission and Observation:**
  - Submission relates to the flood maps, specifically map 9 where it relates to the existing Kiltiernan Cemetery Park.
  - No extensive flooding has occurred on lands at Kiltiernan Cemetery Park and it is considered that flood map 9 does not reflect the genuine risk and overestimates that risk
  - Flood info maps show no flood risk in the area.
  - Any flooding is attributed to minor bank overflow and poor maintenance and stream blockage.
  - Request that flood Map 9 be updated to reflect that flooding does not occur on the site.

- **Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
  - Appendix 16

- **Summary of Submission and Observation:**
  - Regarding the proposed cycleway via Bayview under the Railway Bridge to beach and beyond – paths need to be widened, consideration given to local residents, improvements to the beach etc.
  - Local consultation is needed.
• Concerned with the way cycle lanes have been introduced disregarding environmental and traffic implications and consultation. No EIA or traffic analysis was undertaken.
• Concerned that traders might be negatively impacted upon.
• Concerned with impact of introducing cycle lanes increased congestion and significantly increased journey times.
• Suggest a different design should have been used for the CMR to minimise congestion - Baths site and Otranto Park should have had cycle lanes incorporated in their design.
• Draft Plan does not give sufficient regard to the fact that all cars sold in the near future will have zero emissions, and will retain a significant percentage total personal transport going forward.
• Plan discriminates against older people who can not cycle and need to use car for mobility reasons.
• No additional measures or finance has been allocated to improving the safety and security of the public on any of the suggested new methods of mobility.
• Concerned with the lack of investment in public transport and making it accessible.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission made on behalf of number of cemetery and crematorium providers in the Greater Dublin Area.
• Submission notes that the only zoning designation under which crematoriums are listed is Objective F where the use is open for consideration.
• It is understood that this limitation arose to cater for a crematorium at Shanganagh Cemetery, however, it has resulted in excluding the possibility of providing crematorium in other suitable locations within the County that are not zoned F. This is described as “an unintended anomaly in the current County Development Plan” and was not the intention of the Planning Authority.
• Submission notes that ageing profile of the County and refers to an under provision of crematorium facilities and a growing need for burial space.
• Submission requests that the Draft Plan be amended to provide a more proactive and flexible approach to the provision of crematoria in the County.
• Submission notes that the nearest crematorium facility is at Mount Jerome where there are significant delays and inconvenience in using the facility.
• Submission notes that the facility at Shanganagh has not been progressed to date.
• Submission requests that ‘Crematorium’ be included as a permitted or open for consideration use under Zoning Objective B and potentially other appropriate land use zonings where cemetery is permitted or open for consideration.
• Submission states that there is no planning rationale for not including crematorium under other zonings where Cemetery use is already permitted or open for consideration.
• Submission states that it is well recognised that crematoria are best sited in or close to cemeteries. Submission notes that crematoria are governed by statutory regulations in respect to emissions, separation distances from residential properties, etc. therefore the appropriateness of such a facility would be assessed through the development management process.
• Submission notes that there is an urgent need in the county and a need for more than one crematorium in Dun Laoghaire Rathdown.
• Submission sets out a rationale for the proposed amendment including:
  • There are only 7 crematoria operating in the entire Republic of Ireland with none in the County.
  • Ireland lags behind its European counterparts in terms of the numbers of Crematoria per head of population.
  • Cremation is an acceptable form of burial for a number of religions and for those who don’t practice religion.
  • There has been a marked increase in the number of cremations in recent years and there is a rise in demand for same, particularly as the population continues to increase in the region.
  • Delivery of such facilities would result in associated economic benefits.
Chief Executive’s Report on Draft Plan Consultation

Volume II – Summary of Submissions Received

• Submission sets out the land use zoning objectives and use definitions relative to cemeteries and crematorium in the Draft Plan and notes the SLO for the provision of a crematorium at Shanganagh.
• Submission considers that it was not the intention of the planning authority to exclude crematoria specifically from all other zonings where cemeteries are permissible. There is no justification for this in terms of proper planning and development.
• Submission states that there is a conflict between the inclusion of cemetery and place of worship as permitted uses under zoning objective “B” and the exclusion of crematorium which is a directly related use, and would logically constitute similar local impacts.
• Submission notes that there is no reference to crematorium in policy or text, save for SLO 106 and the zoning matrix. It is considered that objectives in relation crematoria in the County should be clarified.
• Submission references relevant policy objectives in the Development Plans of other Dublin Authorities including land uses where crematoria would be permissible. The submission notes that other local authorities provide a more flexible approach.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Chapter 13

DLR Submission No: B1065
Person: Rita O’Reilly
Organisation: Dunleary Lifeboat Restoration Project Association
Map Nos: 3

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• The submission is made on behalf of the Dunleary Restoration Project Association and includes an attachment that sets out a proposal for the restoration of the historic ‘Dunleary’ lifeboat, which was built in 1919 and served Dún Laoghaire until 1938.
• The proposal sets out the history of the lifeboat, works to date, and future proposals for restoration (including estimated costings) and operation, initially for static public display and subsequently as a seagoing vessel.
• If restored to sea-going ability, it is envisaged that it would provide a tangible link for the public to engage with the many historic and modern features of the coast and harbour and would be a major tourist attraction.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Appendix 8

DLR Submission No: B1066
Person: Alan Hanlon
Organisation: Department of Education
Map Nos: 1, 5 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Department welcomes the Draft Plan and the work which reflects the schools needs for the County.
• Submission acknowledges that the suburban areas of the County bleed into one another with no clear boundaries between areas which creates challenges in relation to planning for school places.
• It is confirmed by the Department of Education and Skills that every school site depicted in the Draft Plan is required to meet projected educational need as plan shows both new growth areas and infill brownfield development all of which will accommodate compact growth.
• Department notes the significant number of units under construction and the high number of extant permissions.
• Submission notes the core strategy, the use of the high growth scenario in the RSES, the reallocated population Bray under NPO 68 and considers that in terms of prudent planning the Department must assume maximum population targets are reached.

SNI zoning objective
• Department of Education and Skills welcomes the new SNI zoning particularly its application to existing schools in the County as they will be critical for meeting additional educational requirements that arise due to infill development of windfall sites.

Proposed ED symbols
• Welcome the inclusion of the ED symbols on sites including Newtownpark Avenue, George’s Place and 2 sites in Sandyford Commentary is then provided on a number of areas as follows;
Cherrywood
- Submission provides an update on school provision in the Cherrywood area and notes the two scenarios in terms of residential yield.

Ballyogan and Environs
- Submissions considers that the population growth set out in the BELAP which is an area where there is a significantly higher proportion of the population in the 0-20 and 30 – 50 year old brackets, will generate demand for school places. Submission details the consultation that took place as part of BELAP and welcomes the identification of 3 sites within the Plan lands.

Woodbrook Shanganagh
- In 2018 a new 8 school classroom primary school was announced for the Woodbrook Shanganagh area. It is intended that this school would be expandable to 24 classrooms if required. The Department notes the preference for a more urban school typology. The Department considers that existing schools can meet the post primary requirements.

Kiltearnan Glenamuck
- Submission notes the site allocated in the Plan and would also consider that further school may be required as stated in the written statement. When the LAP is being reviewed the Department will give close consideration to whether a further post primary school is required in the area.

Old Connaught
- In relation to Old Connaught the department notes that a joint approach to the development of Bray has to be undertaken by WCC and DLRCC. The department are currently seeking a site for a post primary school in Bray and whilst the search has been taking place in Bray the Department could give potential suitability of land in old Connaught.

Rathmichael
- The Department notes the residential yield of lands at Rathmichael and considers that the time to properly address the needs to zone future school sites for the area will be in the context of the future LAP.

Dun Laoghaire
- Submission requests that consideration is given to the zoning of lands at the National Rehabilitation Hospital on Rochestown Avenue for a permanent school site for a new school for the Sallynoggin/Killiney-Dun Laoghaire school planning area.

Mount Anville Depot
- Submission requests that consideration is given to the zoning of lands at the Mount Anville Depot for a school to accommodate Gaelscoil Laighean which is currently temporarily located in Deansgrange.

Sandyford/Stillorgan (Map 6)
- Department of Education and Skills reaffirms requirement for both sites in the SUFP area and states that it will liaise with the Council with regard to their development.

Goatstown
- Submission notes that there is a strong demographic need for more educational provision in the Goatstown Area and this is set to increase further. The Department have purchased the former IGB site and plans to construct permanent school buildings on the site for the recently established Goatstown Educate Together Secondary School and the Goatstown-Stillorgan Educate Together National School.
- Submission requests a rezoning from F to SNI on the Irish Glass Bottles site. Under current zoning education is only open for consideration as opposed to permitted in principle. There is also a restriction in relation to built footprint (confined to 40% of the site with the remaining 60% to be used as public open space) which it is considered would create issues in relation to access. The requirement for a section 47 agreement to sterilise the remaining 60% of the lands also is a concern as it reduces the area available to develop 2 schools on the site.
- Submission requests the retention of the ED symbol on the Irish Glass Bottles Site. The constraint to the current zoning compromises the ability of the Department to deliver on the site. It is put forward that the use of the subject lands for school provision is in keeping with the SNI zoning objective.
- Submission states that school facilities on the IGB site, would be made available to the wider community outside of school hours and that arrangement can be made to allow access. The Department also state that they are willing to explore the provision, in conjunction with the local authority, of outdoor sports and recreational facilities on a portion of this site which would be made accessible to the public outside school hours.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 4, 13, Map 1, 5, 7
DLR Submission No: B1067  
| Person: Ray Ryan | Organisation: On behalf of Hines | Map Nos: 10 |

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Cherrywood Planning Scheme forms part of the County Development Plan and for this reason submission is made in relation to Strategic planning policy and Zoning and SLOs

**Strategic Planning Policy**
- Concern that Cherrywood is constrained and is being held back by its SDZ designation and whilst it does access new policy, it is at a slower pace due to amendment process.
- Covid 19 crisis necessitates a review of town Centre Strategy in Cherrywood as retail led schemes are replaced with mixed use schemes.
- Residential now much more viable in Cherrywood and the Draft Plan has captured this trend in Policy Objective RET5 District Centres in chapter 7. This sentiment supports the view that the Cherrywood Town Strategy should be reviewed in terms of land use mix and density/height.
- Request that chapter 7 be amended to refer to the need to amend the Cherrywood Planning Scheme Town Centre Strategy.

**Residential density and building heights**
- Res 3 and 4 plots in Cherrywood are constrained by unit per hectare density metrics which are out of date.
- Urge dlr to give full effect to the Building heights Guidelines in Cherrywood. A similar performance based criteria approach as set out in the Draft Plan is required.

**Parking**
- Cherrywood should be designated as Parking Zone 1 not 2
- If retained as zone 2, the town centre lands at Cherrywood should be Zone 1

**Zoning and maps**
- Request that the background map for Cherrywood as shown on map 10 be updated with OS map or map 2,1 of the Planning Scheme.
- Request rezoning of lands at Ticknick from Objective B and Objective G to Objective F: To preserve and provide for Open Space with ancillary active recreational amenities.

**Specific Local Objectives**
- Amend SLO 69 to read as follows (addition in bold)
  To implement and develop the lands at Cherrywood in accordance with the adopted Strategic Development Zone Planning Scheme (SDZ) as may be amended to take account of emerging national policy."
- Amend Plan to add additional SLO on Map 10 as follows;
  Insert Specific Local Objective at locations with red asterisk in the Map 10 extract below as follows: To facilitate and encourage the provision of a range of open space and recreational facilities within the townlands of Laughanstown and Ticknick as an extension of Ticknick Park within and adjacent to the Cherrywood SDZ boundary west of the motorway corridor

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Chapters 7, 12, 14 Appendix 5

DLR Submission No: B1068  
| Person: John Spain | Organisation: Philip J Russell | Map Nos: 9 |

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission by the owner of Dingle House, Ballycorus relates to flood extents shown on Flood Map 9 in the area surrounding Dingle House.
- Request that the flood risk zones indicated on map 9 are revisited, given the historical lack of flooding. Any flooding that has occurred has been due to poor river maintenance and it is considered that these type of events are unlikely in the future.
- It is also considered that flooding in the area is not due to the Loughlinstown River but is due to poor drainage from previous road upgrades.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Appendix 16
Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission seeks the re-zoning of lands located between Connawood Drive and Connawood Grove from Objective F – ‘To preserve and provide for open space with ancillary active recreational amenities’ to Objective A – ‘To provide residential development and/or protect and improve residential amenity’.
- States that the lands are fully serviced and could be developed quickly, providing much needed housing, helping to alleviate the current shortage of housing stock.
- Notes that the lands were previously zoned residential and should revert to this status. Suggests that the open space zoning of the site does not acknowledge changes that have taken place in terms of housing need and the continuing opening up of the south of the County. Considers the lands to be underutilised considering their location beside the strategic growth town of Bray, the availability of services and continuing pressure on housing supply.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 14

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Queries where is all the traffic to go? Proper traffic management is required in the area.
- Document pertaining to wildlife corridors is attached to the submission principally relating to Fitzsimons Wood.
- Concern that the lack of a proper wildlife corridor would contribute to the reduction of biodiversity in this very important pNHA.

This document requests that the following is included in the Plan:

1. A clear map showing the Wildlife Corridor from Three Rock Mountain to Fitzsimons Wood
2. Clarification as to how Deer will be able to cross the widened Blackglen Road
3. Confirmation that the widened Blackglen Road will allow Badgers to cross via a tunnel or culvert.
4. Confirmation that any planning permissions for development along Blackglen Road will make provision for the proposed Wildlife Corridor.
5. Make Fitzsimons Wood a Natural Heritage Area (NHA). Why is it a pNHA after so many years?

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5 and Chapter 8

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen Collage to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The submission was made on behalf of Dundrum Retail Limited Partnership (DRLP) and sets out the relevant landholding (which includes much of the MTC zoned lands in Dundrum), as well as the recent development history of the landholding, including some more recent development at the former Hamley’s Store (known as Building 13) and at Pembroke Square. It also outlines the characteristics of the Dundrum Phase 2 planning permission that wasn’t enacted due to the economic constraints of the time (2009) and is now expired. DRLP is a partnership between Hammerson plc and Allianz Gmbh.
- A revised, residential led planning application is currently being prepared for the Phase 2 lands, with non-residential uses along Main Street to provide active frontages.

Zoning
• No change is sought in respect of the zoning of DRLP lands, but it is noted that a portion of the roadway at Waldemar Terrace is zoned MTC, while the balance is not. Request that council confirm the intent in this regard.

**Specific Local Objectives**

• Request change to SLO 8 as per the following (bold is a proposed insertion, strikethrough a proposed deletion):
  
  SLO8 - That any future development of the old shopping centre lands, Dundrum shall provide for predominantly residential use and retain a range of complementary non-retail uses including, but not limited to – retail and non-retail neighbourhood facilities, employment, restaurant, leisure, entertainment, cultural, and community and civic uses – to supplement that already provided within Dundrum Major Town Centre.

• SLO 9 – Seeks the deletion of SLO9 from all DRLP lands that were previously approved for demolition under the previous planning permission (D08A/0231). The request does not apply to Glenville Terrace, which it was proposed to retain.

• Request the deletion of SLO 10 ‘To retain, improve and encourage the provision of sustainable neighbourhood facilities’ as it is unclear what it is intended to provide. It is considered that SLO8, which covers ‘retail and non-retail neighbourhood facilities’ covers this point.

• Request the deletion of SLO 11, which refers to the CCCAP. The deletion is requested on the basis that the CCCAP is not a public document and hasn’t undergone formal public consultation. Insofar as the recommendations of the CCCAP appears to affect the DRLP lands, DRLP is willing to explore options with DLRCC to consider the most suitable scale, design and location(s) for such facilities in order to progress this initiative. However, DRLP does not support the provision of building(s) on the northern part of the “Phase 2” lands, which is incompatible with DRLP’s approach to the lands and it is also requested that the symbol for Specific Objective No. 114 is removed or repositioned.

**Building Height**

• Interpret the reference to building heights being sensitive to Main Street as allowing appropriate increases in scale and have no objection to the wording, but note that Dundrum is a Major Town Centre which is the highest level in the Settlement Hierarchy after Dublin City. Therefore, building height must recognise local conditions but also have regard to strategic planning policy.

• Dundrum scores very well against the criteria for height as framed in the Building Height Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2018), a fact that is recognised in Section 4.2.5 of the Building Height Strategy.

**Proposed Candidate ACA**

• The Proposed Candidate ACA on Main Street consists of DRLP properties including Glenville Terrace and adjoining properties to the south. Permission has previously been granted for the demolition of the adjoining properties to the south of Glenville Terrace and this approach remains the intention in forthcoming planning applications. Therefore, while respecting the position that pertained in the previously granted developments that Glenville Terrace should be retained, the other properties to the immediate south must be removed from this area (No’s 8, 13 and 15 Main Street).

**Settlement Hierarchy**

• The policies and objectives of the new Development Plan reflect and reaffirm Dundrum’s place in the settlement hierarchy as a “Major Town Centre”. These provisions are welcomed and no change is required in the Final Plan.

**Neighbourhood – People, Homes and Place (Chapter 4)**

• The policy vision outlined in Chapter 4 which promotes intensification of urban areas based on high density housing developments, improved transport infrastructure and good access to high quality community facilities is to be welcomed and gives effect to the National Planning Framework and other Section 28 Guidelines issued since the last Development Plan Review. DRLP does not support the approach taken in the Draft Plan to rely on the “Interim Housing Demand Needs Assessment” (HDNA).

**Transport and Mobility (Chapter 5)**

• DRLP welcomes opportunities to improve the accessibility of the Dundrum area and are supportive of the overall “Avoid-Shift-Improve” approach to transport and has been working toward sustainable modes for staff.

• Note capacity enhancements to the Luas Green Line and broadly welcome the Bus Connects proposals to deliver three orbital core bus corridors.

• The creation of a new interchange hub at Dundrum, however, requires consultation and dialogue to understand the nature of the proposals as they impact on DRLP lands and to ensure that the future development of the lands is integrated with the new hub facility. Suggest that a key aspect to the
development of the interchange concept at Dundrum should be improvements to the pedestrian linkage between the Dundrum Luas station and Main Street.

- Important to ensure that the designed capacity at key road junctions on approach to the Dundrum Town Centre is available to prevent congestion and to ensure that Dundrum Town Centre maintains its status as a successful regional retail development.

**Towns, Villages and Retail Development (Chapter 7)**

- The position of Dundrum in the retail and settlement hierarchy has been strongly reaffirmed in the Draft Plan and this is welcomed.

- Note that the reference to the Phase 2 retail expansion of Dundrum has been removed, which reflects the DRLP intention to consolidate retail and commercial uses within the Phase 1 site and to provide a residential-led regeneration of the old Dundrum Shopping Centre lands.

- This project will also address the western side of Main Street and provide appropriate uses and activation of ground floors and the streetscape with a range of units that will accommodate retail/non-retail, café/restaurant and other appropriate leisure uses.

- The Draft Plan (p. 135 - 7.2.2 Recent Trends Towards Multifunctional Centres) accurately characterises the structural shift in the retail sector which is and will continue to lead to a reduction in retail-led “shopping centres” and a move to more mixed-use developments.

- Seeks amendment to Table 7.2 – Dundrum – Refer to ‘Residential’ uses to be consistent with Section 7.5.2.1 Policy Objective RET4 : Major Town Centres, which refers to residential uses.

**Dundrum Urban Structure Plan**

- In keeping with other Amendments Sought to reflect the residential-led nature of the proposed development on the “Phase 2” lands, the following change is sought (bold is a proposed addition, strikethrough a proposed deletion):

  > The need to ensure an appropriate balance of retail and non-retail uses is achieved in Dundrum Major Town Centre, taking account of the centre’s requirement to serve the day to day needs of its local catchment in addition to continuing its role as a leading comparison retail destination with a regional catchment. The provision of a wide range of uses in Dundrum Major Town Centre, including employment, leisure, entertainment, cultural, hotel, restaurant and significant residential development, in addition to residential development will create additional activity and enliven the area.

**William Dargan Bridge/ Waldemar Terrace**

- DRLP agrees that there is significant potential for development at the William Dargan Bridge undercroft/Waldemar Terrace area through the amalgamation of lands in private and public ownership to create a significant development site to bookend the Town Centre and to improve the relationship between the Town Centre and Dundrum Luas Stop. The Waldemar Terrace lands are part of the DRLP ownership and may be considered in this context separate to the main Phase 2 site. The following change is sought in this regard (bold is a proposed addition):

  > The comprehensive redevelopment of the environs of the William Dargan Bridge undercroft, Usher House and Waldemar Terrace. This area provides a significant opportunity for a new community, cultural and civic hub and to create a new focal point and sense of enclosure at the northern ‘gateway’ to Dundrum Main Street. At present this area is dominated by heavy vehicular traffic volumes and the bus interchange.

**CCCAP**

- DRLP has engaged with DLRCC in relation to the CCCAP and agrees in principle with the Council’s intentions to develop a new community, cultural and civic hub at Dundrum. There are a number of options for this facility, including the north end/Waldemar site referred to above. However, DRLP is not in favour of this facility being located on the main Phase 2 site.

**Community Infrastructure**

- Seeking amendment (Section 7.5.2, page 147) as per the below in order to aid clarity (bold is a proposed addition, strikethrough a proposed deletion):

  > The provision of appropriate community infrastructure to meet the needs of the current and future population in accordance with the recommendations of a detailed study of the broader Dundrum area. With its high quality transport links, Dundrum Major Town Centre should provide community facilities to cater to a population catchment greater than that of the more narrowly defined LAP boundary. The redevelopment of the old Dundrum Shopping Centre and the Central Mental Hospital site represents an opportunity to achieve additional community infrastructure in this regard.

**Restaurant, Leisure and Evening Uses**
The below objective has supported the granted of permission for significant planning applications for restaurant, leisure and evening uses at Ashgrove Terrace/ Pembroke Square and Building 13, however, it could be broadened to include reference to Millpond Square and Main Street as follows (bold is proposed addition):

‘The promotion of Dundrum Major Town Centre in general, and the Millpond Square, Pembroke District and Main Street in particular, as an important focus of restaurant, leisure and evening uses - subject to the safeguarding of surrounding residential amenity’.

Dundrum Main Street

The forthcoming Phase 2 redevelopment application will remove the set back and surface car park at the old shopping centre and will create a streetscape along the full length of the street to the junction with the bypass. All buildings on Main Street, with the exception of Glenville Terrace, were approved for removal previously and this remains the intention.

Heritage Conservation / ACAs

Following the principles established in the context of the previous planning permissions, the forthcoming Phase 2 redevelopement will retain, enhance and bring back into use Glenville Terrace as a centrepiece and will replace all other buildings on the western side of Main Street from the Parochial House to the Bypass. Mahers Terrace is also within the DRDP portfolio and a reference in the Plan to this important element of the Dundrum Crossroads would be supported. The following additional point is sought: To promote the sensitive adaptation and redevelopment of Mahers Terrace to open up the courtyard and rear buildings for attractive and viable town centre uses.

Parking

Seeking an amendment to the parking objective, which is based on a retail/commercial scheme at the Phase 2 site. The objective should be amended as follows (strikethrough are proposed deletions):

The planned provision of significant additional off-street and underground car parking provision with appropriate access routes (both surface and sub-surface). This will help minimise vehicle movements and facilitate the complete removal of surface parking from the Main Street, immediately connected streets and surrounding residential areas.

Environmental Infrastructure and Flood Risk (Chapter 10) and Appendix 16 – Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

DLRCC have recently completed hydraulic and flood risk modelling for the Dundrum Slang Integrated Catchment Study which identified a significant number of properties along the Slang stream and in the Dundrum area are at risk of flooding in 1 % and 0.1% AEP events. DLRCC should build on this comprehensive study and set an objective to manage the flood risks identified.

An Amendment to the Draft Plan is sought that would include a specific Policy Objective to encourage the OPW to advance the design and construction of flood relief measures to reduce the flood risk to old Dundrum Shopping Centre and other properties arising from capacity and other constraints on the Dundrum Slang stream.

Climate Change

Section 7.1.1 of Appendix 7 requires that all developments must apply a factor of 1.3 to their drainage design and attenuation volumes to accommodate climate change and a factor of 1.1 to accommodate urban creep. This corresponds to a requirement that exceeds that envisaged for the High End Future Scenario (HEFS) in Table 5-1 of the Flood Risk Management Climate Change Sectoral Adaptation Plan. The Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works (v6.0) recommends a 10% increase in depth of rainfall for Climate Change. A climate change factor of 1.2 (corresponding to the Mid-range Future Scenario) in conjunction with the universal application of the urban creep factor of 1.1 should represent an appropriate allowance for climate change adaptation in drainage design. Revised wording under the Climate Change heading (Section 7.1.1) is sought as follows:

All developments must apply a factor of 1.2 to their drainage design and attenuation volumes to accommodate climate change.”

Hardstanding/Parking Areas

Wording under the heading ‘Hardstanding/Parking Areas’ in Section 7.1.3 “All Other Developments” is ambiguous. Recommend that alternative wording to provide for situations where infiltration to ground is not feasible as follows:

All proposed parking and hardstanding areas should not be discharged to the public sewer where ground infiltration conditions are suitable but should be infiltrated locally, via a specifically designed
permeable paving/porous asphalt system, in accordance with the requirements of Section 12.4.8 of the County Development Plan 2022-2028.

Green Roof Policy
- Green Roof Policy in Appendix 7B should be aligned with Dublin Fire Brigade requirements in respect of risk of fire spread and location of Photovoltaics relative to Green roofs and mitigation measures.

Residential Unit Mix in Apartment Schemes
- The Draft Plan provisions in relation to unit mix at Chapter 12.3.3.1: Residential Size and Mix are at variance with SPPR1 the Apartment Guidelines, which prohibit blanket unit mix restrictions (as well as being at odds with recent precedents).
- This section states that applications for 50+ residential units will be required to incorporate a variety and choice of apartment units by type and size set out in Table 12.1. This unit mix restriction relies on the “Interim HNDA” at Appendix 2 to justify the provision of 20% 3 bed units. However, as the HDNA has been prepared in the absence of the regional / metropolitan HDNA the proposals in relation to apartment type mix are not consistent with SPPR1, should be omitted in the Final Plan, and cannot be deemed to support the prescriptive unit mix provisions set down at Table 12.1 and Section 12.3.3.1.
- Seek the removal of Table 12.1 and Amendment to Section 12.3.3.1 to correspond with SPPR1 of the Apartment Guidelines (2018).

Development Management Standards re Dual Aspect Apartments
- Section 12.3.5 ‘Apartment Development’ contains provisions that are contrary to national guidance and that need to be reconsidered. Specifically, we note the following:
  - Under ‘Dual Aspects in Apartments’ (Section 12.3.5.1), DLR County is described a suburban or intermediate location in the context of the Apartment Guidelines. DRLP would dispute that this categorisation and particularly regarding Dundrum.
  - SPPR4 of the Apartment Guidelines makes provision for ‘a minimum of 33% of dual aspect units will be required in more central and accessible urban locations’ and it is considered that this could be applied to Dundrum. The submission quotes a recent ABP Inspector’s Report in this regard. Consequently the submission seeks that the requirement for 50% of all apartment units to be dual aspect set out in section 12.3.5.1 should be omitted or amended in accordance with SPPR4.

Public Open Space Requirements
- Section 12.8.3.1 / Table 12.8 of the Draft Plan relates to Public Open Space and includes a minimum public open space standard of 15% across all residential development. The current standard is 10%. The 10% standard is a well-established standard and is enshrined in the ‘Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas: Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2009’ in relation to infill sites or brownfield land in the existing built-up area.
- The 15% standard is entirely unworkable and impractical, particularly on sites within the designated Town and District Centres where provision of this level of “open space” would not be the most efficient use of land. The option for a financial contribution to be provided ‘in lieu’ by the applicant suggests that the real effect of this policy could be to result in a double charging of levies towards public open space imposed on residential development. Consequently, DRLP seeks an amendment from 15% to 10% in Section 12.8.3.1 / Table 12.8 of the Draft Plan.

Communal Amenity Space / Roof Gardens
- Section 12.8.5.4 of the Draft Plan restricts the use of roof gardens as communal open space to no more than 30% of the total communal open space provision. It is submitted that this should be removed and the quantitative and qualitative assessment of communal amenity space provision should be assessed on their individual merits based on the provisions of the relevant Section 28 Apartment Guidelines 2018.

Building Height
- No specific height limits are referred to in the Draft Plan and the criteria-based approach will apply, which is welcomed (in the context of comments in relation to SLO 9 above).

Parking Standards
- The inclusion of Dundrum in Zone 1 is welcomed in principle and offers the potential to facilitate residential developments with parking at ratios of less than 1 space per unit, however, the submission notes that permission was granted at Dundrum Building 5 for a parking standard of c.0.4 spaces per unit and there are other SHD permissions within the Dundrum area where lower than 0.4 ratio has been granted.
- The market is seeking rates of between 0.3 and 0.55 spaces per apartment and lower in some locations where “car free” development could also be pursued over the life of the Development Plan.
• Concern that the Development Plan policy (and in particular its implementation in practice) will fall short of what is intended under the Apartment Guidelines and various other policy sources.
• Development Plan policy needs to be flexible to adjust to proposals on a case-by-case basis. It is suggested that DLRCC updates the Plan to acknowledge where low parking/car free parking provision will be accepted.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapters 5,7,12,14, Appendices 2, 4, 7, 16 and Map 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1073</th>
<th>Person: Trevor Sadler</th>
<th>Organisation: On behalf of Aldgate Properties</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6,9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission on behalf of Aldgate who have 3 sites in the SUFP area – Leopardstown West (FAAQ), Febreve and Termini. The submission sets out the site context for the FAAq site. The submission provides details in relation to Aldgate Developments and includes photos of the completed Termini Offices.
• The planning history in relation to the Leopardstown West (FAAq) site is set out along with detail from the SUFP pertaining to the site.
• Submission considers that the FAAQ site is suited to a landmark building and that maintaining the baseline of 5 – 6 storeys, is contrary to the Building Heights Guidelines.
• Policies in the draft SUFP are welcomed but it is still considered that the baseline height limit should also be increased on the southern portion of the FAAQ site to 9 storeys (from 6 storeys). Modelling is submitted to support this argument for increased height.
• Request that the contradiction between policies BH3 SUFP and BH4 SUFP be clarified. BHS SUFP 3 refers to star symbols and BH4 SUFP refers to triangle symbols on Map 3 and it is noted that Map 3 has no triangle symbols, rather a number of red star symbols. Support BH3 SUFP if the star symbol applies to the FAAQ site. If there is a drawing error and the symbol is intended to be a triangle as per Policy BH4 SUFP it is requested that the wording of that policy be elaborated so that additional height may be permitted subject to Policy BH5 SUFP.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1074</th>
<th>Person: Sean O' Neill</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen Collage to SNI.
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1075</th>
<th>Person: Simone Sav - DLR PPN</th>
<th>Organisation: Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Public Participation Network</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission provides information in relation to the PPN and welcomes the Draft Plan as a worthwhile initiative for the county.
• Submission welcomes the creation of a coherent community strategy.
• Submission refers to the provision of social and affordable housing, inclusion of targets for housing for people with disabilities and the building of housing that takes account of all four pillars of disability.
• Submission references the allocation of resources to the preservation of monuments and sites and access to same, a strategy to raise awareness of local heritage sites, preservation of forestry heritage and coastal heritage.
• Submission seeks a coherent development of climate action initiatives that can be replicated across the county, develop a network of climate action mentors and the making of retrofitting homes affordable.
- Submission seeks the provision of frequent public transport from east to west and north to south linking local villages with facilities (healthcare / civic offices), provide realistic plans in terms of Luas capacity, expand cycle infrastructure and improve signage on new cycle paths and at intersections.
- Submission seeks the increase of public litter bins including segregated waste bins and solutions to dog fouling.
- Submission seeks provision of suitable seating in parks and public places.
- Submission seeks the inclusion of new communities through support of multicultural initiatives that showcase diversity.
- Submission seeks active investment in activities that reduce digital poverty and would welcome a strategy of supporting the community in becoming for digitally confident and increase free wif-fi hotspots across the county.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapters 1, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, Miscellaneous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1076</td>
<td>Simon Butler</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1077</td>
<td>Patrick Molloy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission refers to two areas in Dún Laoghaire, the area to the rear of the West Pier and the Old Ferry Terminal-Carlyle Pier area.
- The area to the west of the West Pier is an opportunity for a major arts-based initiative with studios and exhibition gallery and a performance space. The submission provides international examples of how this might work.
- As the Ferry has stopped, the old Carlyle Pier and part of the Ferry Terminal could become Dun Laoghaire’s Waterfront Restaurant/Jazz/Latin area, which might go some distance towards integrating the harbour with the town centre. International examples are provided.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1078</td>
<td>Ruth Colbert</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen Collage to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1079</td>
<td>Billy Wallace</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Car Sharing requests that the provision of car sharing options such as “GO” cars be available in close proximity to all new developments.
- Apartment Developments and lack of storage – requests greater storage facilities such as a basement lock-up facility should be a condition of planning.
- Public Transport – Urgent requirement for a review of public transport in our County before granting planning for yet more high-density housing; there are an additional 1,235 apartments in the pipeline whose residents will be using the Glencairn Luas Stop and pre-Covid these trams and the local bus service were already full at peak times and the same applied to the local bus service.
- Bus Service – Existing service needs to be improved to move people away from cars not only in relation to facilitating transport to the city centre but also east – west to facilitate access to other large centres of employment.
- Road Infrastructure – urgent consideration should be given to the construction of the proposed Southbound Ramp to the M-50 from Leopardstown Road and the ESB Link Road from Junction 14 M-50 to Arena Road.
- Barrier created by M-50 - junctions 14 and 16 and M50 creates a physical barrier between communities either side of it. The proposed additional crossing points for pedestrians and bikes should be progressed as a priority.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5, 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1080</th>
<th>Person: Declan Gibbons</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission queries the justification for the inclusion of land at 32 Killiney Heath within the Killiney Architectural Conservation Area (ACA).
- Submission notes that the property is devoid of any special or unique interest.
- Submission defines what an ACA is under the Planning and Development Act.
- It is noted that the Council, by resolution, recognised that the property had no special architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, technical, social interest or value, 6th July 2009 and excluded the property from the ACA boundary. Details of the report C/342 brought to council and the resolution are provided.
- Submission notes that the matter was raised again for reasons unknown, 14/2/11 under report C/114 which ignores the 2009 resolution.
- Submission considers that an erroneous cartographical analysis of the site resulted in its inclusion within the ACA and that this decision was based on misinformation.
- Submission requests that this recommendation is overturned.
- Planning history and mapping proves that the site formed part of the setting to the driveway for Killiney Park.
- Submission sets out planning history for the site from 1965 following the demolition of the original house, Killiney Park. It is noted that no.32 had no physical or historical association with properties on either side - Ashton or Hill Side House.
- Submission includes an analysis of historical maps dating from 1837.
- Submission requests that the property be excluded from the ACA and notes that the granite wall can be maintained within the ACA as this is a reasonable and balanced approach.
- Historical mapping has been appended to the submission showing the location of the site.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1081</th>
<th>Person: Michael Cullen</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3, 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission welcomes the inclusion of Marlborough Road ACA in the Draft County Development Plan (CDP).
- However, there is a concern that the boundaries of the proposed ACA have been too restrictive.
- The large houses on Adelaide Road are of considerable heritage value and they constitute the link between the developments of Silchester Road and Marlborough Road.
- The submission requests that the Council amend the Marlborough Road ACA to incorporate a wider area including the lands along Adelaide Road and Station.
- It would also accord with the advice in the Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities, at par 3.2.5 that “The boundaries of a candidate ACA should make physical, visual and planning-control sense”.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4
### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- **Submission** relates to lands at Kilgobbin, located within the areas described as Kilgobbin South and Kilgobbin West in the Ballyogan and Environs LAP 2019 – 2025 (BELAP). Notes that the lands are amongst the largest single bank of serviced, zoned, and undeveloped lands in the BELAP area with potential for over 600 homes and a school.
- **Requests** the inclusion of a new Specific Local Objective, or an amendment of the existing SLO 61, to allow a temporary access from Kilgobbin Road to enable a phased development of the lands, with a provision that the temporary access would close on the completion of the Clayfarm Loop Road.
- **Highlights** that the ‘Clayfarm or Ballyogan’ Loop Road has been a part of CDP’s and LAPs since the 1990’s and is still no closer to full delivery. Notes that the delivery of the Loop Road, or an alternative solution, would open the lands for development, provide local infrastructure and community linkages, and a site for a badly needed school.
- **Submits** that the issue in relation to the delivery of the Loop Road arises because of DLR’s failure to take in charge a section of the road currently completed.
- **Reference** is made to the inclusion of the road in the State’s ‘Local Infrastructure Housing Activation Fund’ for the delivery of infrastructure to open lands for development, but notes that in 2020, DLR formally advised the engaged parties that it had ceased its direct engagement to deliver the Loop Road.
- **Submits** that the Draft CDP, as with the BELAP, has no proposal to advance the Loop Road. Suggests that DLR will know, from its own engagement, that the Loop Road cannot be delivered unless an alternative approach is taken.
- **An overview of the SWOC analysis contained in the BELAP** is set out and it is submitted that the provision of a temporary access would build on many of the ‘strengths’ of the area identified in BELAP, and furthermore, would address several of the key ‘weaknesses’, ‘opportunities’, and ‘challenges’.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

- Chapter 14

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- **Submission** supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen Collage to SNI
- **Requests** that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

- Map 7

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- **The mission for the Plan aligns with the UCD Strategy 2020-2024.**
- **Details of planned UCD campus growth is outlined.** Within a decade it should grow to 40,000 employees and students.
- **UCD is delivering on the Belfield Strategic Campus Development Plan 2016-2021-2026 including a substantial increase in residential accommodation as well as new and refurbished academic and recreational and sports facilities.** The new Future Campus Phase 1 project is referred to.
- **SLO 1 is welcomed.**
- **Sustainable Travel – 7 million journeys are made per annum and c. 20,000 trips are made per day.**
- **UCD are implementing their sustainable transport strategy and are fully committed to increase sustainable modes to 81 % over the lifespan of the Plan, reducing reliance on the private car and working with the NTA and DLRCC.**
- **Welcomes SLO7.**

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

- Chapter 14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1085</th>
<th>Person: Ruth Barry</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 1, 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission seeks the development of the green space between Tivoli Terrace South and North for use for school children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that the green space in the Harbour beside Irish Lights could also be developed for school children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that Dunedin Park is used for Dún Laoghaire Educate Together School.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests the provision of a skate park and remove the fee for the park at the Blue Pool.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that public bins are reinstated, particularly along the Dodder.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that signs are erected along shared pedestrian cycle routes showing where pedestrians have right of way and to ‘go slow’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 4, Chapter 5, Chapter 9, Chapter 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1086</th>
<th>Person: John Redmill on behalf of Mr and Mrs David Murray</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that Ingleside, Brennanstown Road (RPS No. 2029) be removed from the RPS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission sets out the legislative background, includes references to the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011) and the NIAH Handbook Edition March 2021, with regard to determining the special interest of a structure, its rating and adding structures to the RPS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes that a copy of the recommendations made by the Minister to the Planning Authority does not appear to be available online.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes that an ACA is another, less onerous, way of offering legal protection to buildings – it is noted that Ingleside is not within an ACA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes shortcomings of the legislation in terms of not distinguishing between different levels of architectural merit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes that the RPS does not reflect the NIAH rating of a structure – this can result in over protection of structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission sets out a description of the property and provides detail of its NIAH entry – it notes that the property was enlarged in 2008/9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes that interiors are not referenced in the NIAH record, and it comments upon practices employed by NIAH during their surveys of structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inaccuracies of NIAH descriptions are noted and no justification has been given for using the phrase ‘an integral component of the early-20th century domestic built heritage of south County Dublin’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission states that the structure has no elements or features that are ‘special’ or of any particular significance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission questions the definition and application of the NIAH ‘regional’ rating and considers that Ingleside does not make any significant contribution to the heritage of Leinster or Greater Dublin and should not be includes on the RPS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Minister should be informed that the property is not to be listed on the RPS until such time that the Local Authority have made their own assessment of the property.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests the re-zoning of lands to the west of the Enniskerry Road in the Kilternan-Glenamuck area from Objective ‘B’ – agricultural, to Objective ‘A’ - residential. In addition, it is requested that the boundary of the Kilternan LAP be expanded to incorporate the lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• An overview of the location of the lands including proximate uses and amenities is set out. Submits that the site is more advantageously located compared to many other residential zoned sites in the surrounding area in the context of proximity to existing and proposed community and recreational amenities.

• Submits that the housing target in the Core Strategy should be re-evaluated in light of the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic. Suggests the Council should analyse potential new residential sites and submits that the subject lands provide for an ideal location for helping meet housing need.

• Highlights that 7 no. houses are located on part of the lands. Submits that the lands should not have an agricultural zoning and instead should have a de facto residential zoning. Notes that residential housing has begun to be developed on lands surrounding the site.

• Notes that the Kilternan-Glenamuck area is designated a ‘New Residential Community’ in the Draft CDP and suggests this implies new residential is desired in the area. Contends that, in the current housing climate, that not re-zoning the lands, is contrary to national policy.

• Highlights that there is SNI zoned lands beside the subject lands. Suggests there should be residentially zoned land surrounding the ‘SNI’ zoned lands to help form a logical and coherent neighbourhood and community.

• Submits that the subject lands are an ideal location for the sustainable development of housing, with high-capacity sustainable transport routes available. The adjacency of the Glenamuck Distributor Road is highlighted but it is noted that the lands are not reliant on the new road. Reference is made to a proposed Greenway through the future Jamestown Park which would provide local and wider connections. States that the lands are approx. 1.5 km from the Ballyogan Luas stop and less than 100m from Dublin Bus stops.

• Highlights that the lands are in close proximity to ‘SNI’ and ‘NC’ zoned lands and submits that re-zoning would help deliver on the ‘10 Minute Neighbourhood Concept’.

• Submits that the lands have the potential to provide a sustainable residential scheme incorporating medium-high density, active frontages, enclosure, and permeability.

• The submission includes an appendix which includes a number of aerial photos and maps which support the re-zoning request.

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Commends the overall approach to climate change in the plan.

• Outlines that the plan should incorporate the ‘first principles’ in order to ensure that the goal of zero carbon is fully aligned across the Plan. Submission sets general commentary on Local Authorities, the Built Environment & Climate, Development Management Standards and Net Zero Carbon Buildings; Embodied Carbon. This includes references _inter alia_ to approaches used in London, referring to development consent; submission to the Dublin City Issue’s paper recommending that new development standards should apply in Decarbonising Zones to ensure that they meet net zero carbon standards; suggest reviewing best practice, target setting for all new developments to be zero carbon and having policies to reduce embodied carbon.

Chapter 2

• Regarding Section 2.3.4.1 - might consider adopting new measures to trigger faster development that meets both its housing delivery as well as wider climate objectives such as Decarbonization Zones.

• Compact growth - In term of density, policy should therefore encourage densification and infill development over new build as much as possible. It is imperative that planning policy ensures that homes are delivered within existing settlement boundaries.

Chapter 3

• National Objective - Plan must be designed so that all is aligned with the overall national objective of reducing carbon by 30% by 2030 or by 7% per year incrementally and then to a position of net zero carbon, by 2050. These targets mean that work needs to happen immediately so that the costs of transition can be minimised. Councils have a responsibility to lead by example and oversee decarbonisation in their own area.

Built Environment

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 2, Map 9
• Has concerns that the Council is not leading by example in that it has not committed to Net Zero for Council buildings ie to a standard which exceeds NZeb.

• Given that buildings account for 67% of total carbon emissions in DLR, the urgency and importance of retrofitting existing building stock, as per targets included in Ireland’s Long-Term Renovation Strategy, needs to be recognised. The plan should make reference to more holistic assessment methodologies on sustainable construction.

• Built Environment and Embodied Energy - Notwithstanding the work of EMRA, examining the role of planning policy in climate mitigation referred to in the Draft, the Council should also be looking at international examples of how to introduce measures so that the planning process can lead to the measurement and management of carbon emissions throughout the whole life cycle of buildings from sourcing of materials, through to construction (i.e. embodied carbon), operational life and end of life disposal.

• Expansion of urban meadows is recommended in accordance with the All Ireland Pollinator Plan.

• Housing - should propose new objectives for the Whole Life Carbon approach to buildings and the use of Home Performance Index (HP) I in addition to BER to ensure that new buildings constructed during the lifetime of the plan are assess for their total carbon contribution.

Chapter 5

• ‘Travel plans’, Traffic Impact Assessment and any mobility management must make reference to the need to measure, monitor and reduce carbon emissions.

Chapter 8

• Green Infrastructure - The Plan should emphasise the importance of green infrastructure for climate change adaption and mitigation from planting, to limiting conversion of gardens to driveways, to promoting the increased planting of native trees/community planting/gardens, and the need to protect, develop and manage existing ecological networks for their many varied and important ecosystem services.

• Food Growing: Plan should promote the use of open space in housing developments and underutilized public land, for communal gardening and/or growing of vegetables.

Chapter 10 Waste Management

• Should consider re-wording references to ‘Waste Management’ and replacing it with ‘Circular Economy’ so there is a shift in understanding and emphasis moving from waste to circularity or consider the inclusion of a standalone Chapter on Circularity, providing for waste re-use as a concept from, cradle to cradle, which is the linchpin of decarbonisation.

Chapter 12

• Urban Development and Design Principles - Consider adding indicators of housing sustainability such as a Home Performance Index-Sustainable as a tool to move beyond BER assessment.

• Car Parking - reduction in the car park standards for housing units and reduce the amount of excessive parking provision in new developments and discourage the use of private car-based transport and support and encourage alternatives, including car-pooling, cycle and walking, where feasible.

• Sustainable mobility standards should be drafted by the Council in terms of sustainable transport hierarchy. New developments should require cycle parking and EV charge points, as standard.

• Bicycle Parking -recommend alternative bicycle parking standards including spaces for 50 % of all employees or 2 bike spaces for each car space (whichever is the higher). Showers and drying rooms should also be included for new school/office development.

• Green Infrastructure - should require higher standards in design and planting mix to support biodiversity, carbon sequestration and the creation of wildlife and pollination corridors across the county and refer to the ecosystem service approach.

• Flood Risk Assessments – Require a site specific Flood Risk Assessment appropriate to the type and scale of the development, should be undertaken in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment Guidelines.

• Recommend Council consider how as s planning condition, to have efficient water systems in all buildings

Chapter 15

• Commends SMART system.

• More should be done in terms of monitoring carbon measurement, notwithstanding the work of EMRA on this. Ecosystem Services gains/losses should be included in the plan. Renovation Strategy delivery – recommends an additional indicator linked to the Local Authorities monitoring the impact of their energy renovation programmes.
**SEA**

- **SEA should take into account** the measurement of carbon emissions arising, as an environmental impact, and evaluate changes against the DLR CC baseline emissions report and will include both measurement and mapping of ES in the county and report on measured changes in the delivery of services arising from the zoning provisions of the plan.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1089</td>
<td>Niall Mulqueen</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission requests that the field at Silchester Park is rezoned F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission notes that the field is in recreational use and serves approximately 154 households.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1090</td>
<td>Mgt Hynes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen Collage to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1091</td>
<td>Kate Healy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect the right of ways in the council area, including those at Ballybetagh and The Dingle and near Barnaslingan Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1092</td>
<td>Mary Scaggs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen Collage to SNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1093</td>
<td>Yvonne Lynch</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The submission notes it is very disappointing that, in fact, only 5 of the 15 cACA’s in Table 4.3 are proposed to be adopted as part of the CDP review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The important of The Metals, and in particular 'The Flags' has been long recognised by the Council and An Bord Pleanála. At a minimum, that part of The Metals that runs between Dalkey Avenue and Ardbrough Road (known as THE FLAGS) should be afforded protection as an ACA, given its great historic importance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Flags has retained its character and charm as a walkway enjoyed by many. To discourage attempts at unsuitable development and ensure that they are not successful, The Metals, or at a minimum that part known as THE FLAGS, ought to be designated as an ACA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of The Metals is acknowledged again in the Draft CDP 2022-2028 (Policy Objective HER28; SLO 27).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1094</th>
<th>Person: Joyce Richardson</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission requests that the Plan consider a SLO (Specific Local Objective) status for Sandycove that delivers lasting solutions to residents and swimmers in Sandycove Loop with respect to health and safety and the environment i.e. water quality, problems with Ringsend sewage plant, lack of recycling bins and associated littering, anti-social behaviour and lack of toilet facilities.
- To ease the stress on Sandycove the Council could create more alternative easily accessible swimming areas close by for example at the West Pier, inside Dún Laoghaire harbour during winter months, a safe roped off swimming area near Dún Laoghaire plaza and old ferry pier (currently unused), or a swimming area for all year-round swimmers is ideal at this location.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 9 and Chapter 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1095</th>
<th>Person: Sinead O'Reilly</th>
<th>Organisation: The Arts Council</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Commentary is set out on the role and function of the Arts Council / An Comhairle Ealaion as set out in the 2003 Arts Act.
- The Arts Council is guided by its strategy ‘Making Great Art Work, 2016 - 2025’. It sets forth a vision for an Ireland in which the arts are valued as central to civic life, as a hallmark of local and national identity, and as a sign and signature of our creativity as a nation.
- Commentary is provided in relation to a forthcoming spatial policy which will focus on the importance of place and spaces where people live, work and come together for cultural participation, as an essential component of life satisfaction.
- Submission sets out spatial considerations pertaining to the Arts including provision of the arts in the built and natural environment.
- Submission sets out how the arts contribute to community and societal development including via placemaking. Reference is made to use of space and particularly outdoor space during the current pandemic.
- Commentary is provided on the “The Report of the Arts and Culture Recovery Taskforce” (Nov 2020) which includes recommendations in relation to public realm funding for local authorities.
- Commentary is provided on the RSES and the RPOs contained therein which relate to the Arts (RPA 9.24 and RPO 9.25).
- Section 10 (2) of the PDA sets out a basis spatial planning for the arts by requiring each Development plan to include objectives for: “the integration of the planning and sustainable development of the area with the social, community and cultural requirements of the area and its population;”

The submission then sets out the following observations on the Draft Plan:
- Request greater integration and facilitation of, and for arts and culture in the development plan.
- Request identification and prioritisation of place making plans and projects within the development plan and/or the incentivise to the private sector in creative activation or facilitation of spaces of local or regional scale for public enjoyment.
- Considers that the Development Plan should include strategic policies on preservation and enhancement of the arts and culture taking into account, quality, quantity and demand for the formal arts and culture services infrastructure, and, informal spaces which can function as community assets.

Requests that the following be taken into account:
- Acknowledgement of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown Culture & Creativity Strategy 2018-2022 in the County Development Plan recognising the approach to creative place making and, its relevance to provision and enhancement of public parks and spaces across the County in contribution and facilitation of the arts as appropriate.
- Encourage the County Development Plan to adopt a strategic and policy approach for the preservation, enhancement and provision or Arts and Culture which have been/are identified of value in contributing toward physical, social and economic benefit for the County.
Future arts and cultural requirements could be informed by an evidence based local needs assessments taking into account – current and future population and age dynamics, current arts and cultural assets provision and access, community aspirations, opportunity for place making enhancement through physical infrastructure and development including provision of communal multi-use open space where it can have the most impact.

Baseline data could then be used to generate a database of arts and cultural assets and their spatial distribution/concentration across the county which could be used to inform locational decisions and future needs.

Request that the final Plan contain a Public Art and Architecture Strategy in tandem with its Arts office taking into account, assessment of potential types of public art and locations which could provide maximum benefit in terms of contribution towards community development, urban renewal or public realm.

In relation to development management the submission requests that Arts and culture infrastructure should be considered as part of social and sustainability audits carried out by perspective developers to ensure sufficiency of social infrastructure.

Request consideration of amendment to section 4.2.1 as follows; ... Creating spaces that are easy to access, navigate and promote sustainable community and cultural activities.

Request that PO PHP5 Community Facilities include reference to arts and culture as a community facility. Forthcoming community audit should include arts and culture as a community asset.

Consider that Policy Objective E3: Cultural and Creative Industries (Section: 6.4.2.2) could be strengthened by further consideration of ‘creative assets’ in the county and relationship with its Arts Plan. The following text amendments (underlined) are proposed to the draft text of section 6.4.2.2:

“Cultural and creative industries, as a subset of the knowledge economy, are an increasingly important area of economic growth, employment creation and social cohesion. They have been defined as activities and industries which have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property – including areas such as advertising, software, publishing, architecture, music and the visual and performing arts, film, video and photography. There is a growing movement internationally by cities to become recognised and organised as ‘creative cities’ and in this respect, the location of Ireland’s only institute of art, design and technology - IADT - in the County is a significant asset. IADT’s strategic vision is to be a leader in higher education with a specialist focus on the development of future makers and shapers, technologists, thinkers, storytellers and creators who lead and innovate in a changing digital world. Other examples of creative and cultural assets in the county include, dlr Lexicon, Mountains to Sea Festival, Pavilion Theatre, Mill Theatre, Bath Studios, Grainstore and Dance Theatre of Ireland along with a strong cohort of individual creative practitioners.

The dlr Arts Development Plan 2016-2022 (and its successors) provides the legislative policy framework for cultural development in the county. (see also Chapter 4, People, Homes and Place 4.2.1.9)

Suggests that chapter 9 could acknowledging the cultural use of open spaces.

Request that Section 12.6.1 be amended as follows; The provision within the overall design of the scheme for public facilities, e.g. toilets, advice centres, and supporting community, civic and cultural uses including festival activities or events, health clinics, crèches, theatres, libraries for example.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 4, 6, 9, 12

DLR Submission No: B1096  
Person: Heather Mac Donald  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 3

Summary of Submission and Observation:

Submission notes that protected structures on the map are surrounded by ‘Zone A’ - areas within the curtilage should be marked as protected.

Submission sets out the definition of ‘structure’ in the Planning and Development Act.

Submission notes the change to the A zone objective wording requesting that development land is differentiated.

Submission requests that there is a strategy for building social and affordable housing on brownfield state owned sites noting that the council is not building this housing stock itself.
- Submission states that buildings in council ownership and otherwise falling into disrepair should be investigated for housing.
- The area around the forty foot should be zoned high amenity.
- The MTC area of Dún Laoghaire should have a strategy for mixed use as there is too much retail.
- From Bloomfield’s to Cumberland St and the Post office to the People’s park should be designated residential.
- The proposed cycle route along Vico Road is important for all road users and provides one of the best vistas in the world – it would be unfair to remove this from road users and it should not be blocked off for one user, it should be a shared route.
- Innovation and traffic calming steps should be used on all roads than excluding and discriminating against one or more road user.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5, Chapter 11, Appendix 2, Appendix 8, Map 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1097</td>
<td>Lotus Dequina</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission seeks the development of the green space between Tivoli Terrace South and North for use for school children.
- Submission requests that the green space in the Harbour beside Irish Lights could also be developed for school children.
- Submission requests that Dunedin Park is used for Dún Laoghaire Educate Together School.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1098</td>
<td>H Burke</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Resident of Sandycove who is seeking the protection of the unique character and heritage of the area for the benefit of residents, local businesses and visitors.
- Annual problems with traffic and illegal parking, and with the pandemic, the issues have been exacerbated by the increase visitors and removal of parking spaces by the CMR.
- The Sandycove loop has become gridlocked and the air quality is impacted with so many cars idling.
- Request that these issues around traffic and illegal parking are resolved as a matter of urgency.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1099</td>
<td>Ciaran Moulton</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6, 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- DLR should connect the Cruagh greenway to the mountains to the metals cycleway being developed with the unused bridge over the M50.
- The green margin between stepaside should be developed to construct a cycle way between Jamestown and Stepaside.
- Traffic controls needed to reduce speed in Stepaside.
  The right filter lane to Kilgoben Road in Stepaside should be removed and the road space used for public space.
- EV charging needed in Stepaside.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1100</td>
<td>Conor Hurley</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Seeks safe, segregated cycle lanes which prioritise pedestrians and cyclists for the whole county. This will address the climate emergency, and traffic is increasing in the County.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1101</th>
<th>Person: Mary Cook</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2,6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1102</th>
<th>Person: Anne Marie O’Connor</th>
<th>Organisation: Office of the Planning Regulator</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

See Volume 1 for full summary of the recommendations, submissions and observations of the Office of the Planning Regulator.

A summary of the recommendations, submissions and observations of the Office of the Planning Regulator are located in Volume 1, Part 2.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1103</th>
<th>Person: Trevor Sadler</th>
<th>Organisation: Aldgate Developments Ltd</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission on behalf of Aldgate who have 3 sites in the SUFP area – Febrve, Leopardstown West (FAAQAQ), and Termini. The submission sets out the site context for the Febrve site (Burton Hall Rd). The submission provides details in relation to Aldgate Developments and includes photos of the completed Termini Offices
- The planning history in relation the Febrve site is set out along with detail from the SUFP pertaining to the site. On the Eircom site directly to the south-west there is an objective to provide a “tall building”.
- **Rezoning:** Requests rezoning of the site from Zone 3 office to Zone 5: residential. It is considered that the site is suited to a residential development noting that the Marlett site across the road will be the first phase of the Carmanhall Road residential neighbourhood and overall the character of the area is expected to change to residential. The site is also close to the Burton Hall residential neighbourhood to the south east. The subject site would connect the two sites which under the current SUFP are disconnected and provide pedestrian and cyclist permeability which is a cornerstone of the SUFP objectives. This would improve integration and enhance the sense of place.
- **Height:** Requests a significant increase in the height of the site from 6 storeys to allow for a tall building comparable to the adjoining Eircom site. Considers that maintaining the baseline of 6 storeys, is contrary to the Building Heights Guidelines
- **Policy BHS** in the draft SUFP are welcomed but it is still considered that the baseline height limit should also be increased significantly from 6 stories to tall building to develop a cluster of tall buildings in the centre of the Sandyford Business Estate to serve as a clear urban signpost. There are other clusters at Beacon//Rockbrook and Central park a similar cluster at Febrve/Eircom and potentially Marlett site would clearly define the heart of the business estate and establish a sense of place.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 17 and Map 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1104</th>
<th>Person: Eugene and Anne Gribbin</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Living in Sandycove for 33 years.
- Accepts that Sandycove as well as being a residential suburb is shared with many visitors because of its special quality. Notes the limited public realm especially at high tide which can not accommodate the volume of motor traffic, pedestrians and cyclists who crowd into it on a regular basis.
• Welcome the recent initiatives of the Council in introducing cycle ways but request a traffic management strategy to direct traffic away from the Sandycove Beach area rather than into it.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1105</th>
<th>Person: Derek Jago</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Section 12.9.2 Noise Pollution and Noise Nuisance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Where rock strata occurs at or near surface level, underground car parks should not be permitted due to the noise levels emanating from such sites during construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is sufficient empirical evidence to demonstrate that in suburban settings mitigation measures are not sufficient where mechanical rock breaking noise can be continuous from morning to night over long periods and is detrimental to the quality of the living environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The CDP must include adequate enforcement measures to dissuade developers submitting token noise abatement measures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapters 10, 12 Section 12.9.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1106</th>
<th>Person: Jacqueline Ní Fhearghusa</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dún Laoghaire is a wonderful place and amenity area but needs to provide specific amenities or facilities for teenagers and young people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilities for walking, cycling, swimming and outside areas for socialising already exist to some extent but could be further developed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A skate park for this age group would be a wonderful addition and the ferry terminus and car park represent a wonderful opportunity to do something meaningful and healthy for our young people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1107</th>
<th>Person: H Bourke</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resident of Sandycove.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plan should protect the unique character and heritage of the area. Every summer traffic is an issue on the Sandycove loop. Summer of 2020 this was exacerbated by Covid 19 and CMR (which removed car parking) leading to an increase in visitor numbers leading to traffic and parking chaos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests that a solution is found for residents and visitors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1108</th>
<th>Person: David Myers</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SLO 117 would be a better solution that SLO18. This should be the solution for Corbawn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1109</th>
<th>Person: Miriam Ryan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Submission requests that Dunedin Park is used for Dún Laoghaire Educate Together School as there is insufficient space at the school.

Submission requests that the green space in the Harbour beside Irish Lights could also be developed for school children.

Submission seeks the development of the green space between Tivoli Terrace South and North for use for school children.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 4, Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1110</td>
<td>Deirdre McGing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen Collage to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1111</td>
<td>Siobhan Graham</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission urges caution for future use of lands on the reservoir site when part of it is decommissioned.
- Submission notes there is green space with playground available at Clonmore Park and Sandyford within 5 mins walk of the site, as well as walkways and sports fields at St. Benildus Collage.
- Submission requests the council reinstate Glenalbyn swimming pool in place of putting funds into developing a public park at this site.
- Submission requests any future use of the reservoir does not impinge on the safety and privacy of adjacent residents.
- Submission suggests that Irish water, who have agreed to landscape the site which will provide green space and natural biodiversity on site, be allowed to proceed.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1112</td>
<td>Brian Espey</td>
<td>Dark Sky Ireland</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission includes an attachment of the Best Practice of Public Lighting, Dark Sky Ireland.
- Recommends lower CCT (warmer white) lighting - as well as the introduction of trimming and dimming.
- While the introduction of LED lighting has many positive benefits, the on-going replacement of older lighting with 4,000K white LED lighting has shown that reception, particularly in residential areas, has been mixed.
- Glare has been raised as an issue by many people – sleep disruption.
- Support the statement in Section 10.4 of the Plan to limit light pollution which should be improved by the use of modern LED lanterns, but note that the introduction of LED technology also has such a major and long-lasting impact on the light in the environment that the introduction of such lighting should be carefully considered.
- DLRCC should consider warm white LED lighting with a CCT of 3,000K for residential areas, in use by other Local Authorities – produces feelings of warmth. Use of blue/white lighting has opposite effect. This should be particularly considered in rejuvenation of Dundrum and Dun Laoghaire.
- Warm white lighting may also impact positively on wildlife.
- Light can travel long distances therefore the 15km distance (as used in Appropriate Assessments for Natura 2000 sites) should also be used as the distance to consider the impact of public lighting on environmentally-sensitive areas and that warm white lighting be considered in this zone, consistent with best practice in other countries and also as proposed by the Road Management Office for Irish authorities involved in their upgrade programme.
Impacts of lighting on bats are well known, but there are also impacts on insects, including night-time pollinators - caution is urged as increasing development encroaches further on former rural or suburban areas.

Support a more considered approach to the introduction of new lighting, including whether lower levels are desirable or possible, and also the use of less impactful lighting.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Chapter 10

#### DLR Submission No: B1113

| Person: Leslie Wrenn | Organisation: N/A | Map Nos: 5 |

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The submission highlights the importance of green space and public right of way trails for apartment residents. In this regard, outdoor spaces should be kept freely accessible to all and the County’s historic monuments are protected and restore access to all as these are currently inaccessible to residents.
- Traffic congestion in Stepaside and with the completion of new developments will get worse.
- The Council should exercise caution in continuing to overdevelop as this will ruin the natural beauty and green spaces which make the area unique.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Chapter 9 and Chapter 12

#### DLR Submission No: B1114

| Person: Bill Robinson | Organisation: N/A | Map Nos: 4 |

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission notes the traffic in Sandycove harbour has greatly increased affecting the enjoyment of the area for residents and visitors.
- Submission considers the area is not large enough to accommodate all the vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians and is in need of a traffic management scheme before an accident occurs.
- Submission suggests that traffic approaching Sandycove from the coast road could be diverted to the right and up to the main road.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Chapter 5

#### DLR Submission No: B1115

| Person: Mick Mc Aree | Organisation: NTA | Map Nos: N/A |

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

**Overview**

- The Core Strategy sets out population projections which align with the population targets set by the National Planning Framework (NPF) and the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES), i.e. the 2031 High scenario incorporating an additional 25% ‘headroom’ provided for in the Implementation Roadmap up to 2026, and the 3,500 relocated growth as provided for under National Policy Objective (NPO) 68 of the NPF. These also align with the figures given by DLR to the recently commenced review and update of the Transport Strategy for the GDA by the NTA.
- The NTA support the key objectives of the Draft namely, compact growth, higher residential densities, the provision of residential development and employment growth on brownfield/infill sites along public transport corridors, the 10-minute settlement approach, and the promotion of multi-functional urban settlements that reduce the need to travel as they reflect the Principles of Land Use and Transport Integration set out in the current NTA strategy for the GDA.

**Local Transport Plans**

- Supports proposals to carry out LAPs during the lifetime of the Plan and Policy Objective CS10 in terms of prioritising areas in terms of the core strategy. RPO 8.6 requires the preparation of Local Transport Plans for development areas within the Dublin Metropolitan Area. The Draft notes the intention to prepare them.
- Recommends that Local Transport Plans are prepared for all LAP areas in tandem with LAP preparation and for key strategic land banks within adopted LAPS such as the Racecourse South lands. The methodology should be as per the NTA/TII guidance on Area Based Transport Assessment (ABTA) 2019.

**Luas Expansion**
The alignment of the Luas Extension to Bray has not been finalised, however, the indicative alignment contained in the Transport Strategy is reflected in the Draft on Map 14. On the other hand, the inclusion on Map 14 of a Luas spur that branches at Old Connaught to serve Fassaroe, is not included in the Strategy nor proposed by the NTA.

Recommends that the proposed Luas spur to Fassaroe should be removed from the final Plan or, if retained, should be accompanied by an explanatory note outlining the status of the proposal and committing to further consideration informed by, and in the context of, the next GDA Transport Strategy.

**Bray and Environs Roads Proposals**

The inclusion of “a new link road from Ferndale Road to Dublin Road [and] M50 Cherrywood Interchange to Rathmichael Link Road” in Section 5.3.2 for Rathmichael and Old Connaught should be dependent on an assessment as set out in the *Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities*, and in accordance with Section 5.8.3 Principles of Road Development of the Transport Strategy and the text in Bray and Environs Transport Study, in which the schemes were initially outlined.

Recommends that Section 5.3.2 of the Draft Plan should be revised to reflect appropriately the current status of these roads and the statutory procedures for their assessment in due course.

**Roads Severance**

A comprehensive range of measures for settlements and town centres are noted in the Draft Plan to promote sustainable communities and transport. However, beyond such centres, addressing the severance effect of the two major road corridors in the county, i.e. the M50 and the M11/N11, will be critical in enabling sustainable transport use and reducing reliance on the private car.

Supports SLO 104, 107, 108 and 112 in this regard to address severance. The SLOs outlined in the Ballyogan and Environs LAP are similar to these, but the M50 Luas concerns are restated.

**Park and Ride**

In 2020 a new Park and Ride Development Office was established in the NTA and a Park and Ride strategy is being prepared for the GDA. It is likely to include sites in the dlr area. In advance of this the NTA are willing to consider temporary or short term park and ride facilities, including bus based park and ride which would complement public transport on key transport corridors such as the N11 subject to compliance with the principles of the strategy and agreement with the NTA.

Recommend the inclusion of a policy objective to liaise with the Park and Ride office regarding the development of short and long term park and ride sites.

**Revisions to NTA Cycling documents**

The Draft refers to the National Cycle Manual and the Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network Plan 2013. The NTA is currently reviewing and updating the Cycle Network Plan, in collaboration with the local authorities in the GDA, and the Cycle Manual to be concluded in 2021 and the documents, when complete, will provide a robust basis for the implementation of cycle routes in the GDA.

Recommend that references in the Draft Plan to the GDA Cycle Network Plan and the National Cycle Manual should be expanded to include these updated versions.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

**Section 2.3**

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Aware of the climate crises and the National Climate Action Plan to deal with it.
- The Passive House standard promoted in the previous Plan was seen as an exemplar reflection of what we need to do at a societal level and therefore encourages the retention of a reference and promotion of the standard in the Plan.
- Aware that the Council’s Architects are setting an exemplary standard in design construction and retrofit projects to these standards.
Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The submission relates to the Metals Candidate ACA, which has been a candidate ACA for some time. Submission requests that this ACA be prioritised.
- There are small interventions happening in terms of boundary treatments, as well as larger interventions such as insertion of pedestrian gates into back gardens.
- There are also parts of the Metals that are not included on the maps - for instance, the inclined plane at Dalkey Quarry which has historic elements in the ground.
- There are planning applications along the route that cannot adequately take into account the character of the Metals when that character has not been defined.
- It is also proposed as a designated school cycle route, however it was unclear at the time of consultation for these routes what physical works would be carried out.
- All of these have the potential to damage the character of this most unique piece of industrial heritage and what is potentially Ireland’s first greenway dating back to c. 1905.
- Rob Goodbody wrote the book on the Metals which should be referenced in any ACA document. This could also guide the Council in improving the physical management of the Metals and possibly guide future enhancements.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Person’s family live in the area and has significant ties to the community.
- Challenge to SLO93.
- Details in relation to Council meetings in 2015 concerning the SLO and Circular letter PSSP 1/10 which it seems to have originated from.
- The Council is not giving any application the option to adequately address the issues concerning SLO 93 in new planning applications. This is inappropriate and damaging to the community as the Council seems to have not taken into account the new Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Waste Water Code of Practice 2021, 5 which provides methodologies for dealing with this type of soil/location.
- There are significant issues with how the information regarding SLO 93 is shown to the public. Constituents should not need to dig to find this information, it should be readily available in terms a lay person can understand. Full and current scientific information and relevant reports should be made available iteratively. The Council should also only be able to implement such heavy SLOs when it is clearly implementing, achieving, and reporting on the recommendations made by experts.
- The Aqua GeoServices report does strongly indicate that the potential problems in the Rathmichael/Crinken stream are related to direct discharges through piped drainage as well as forestry and land use, such as agriculture and golf courses. Septic tanks/on site systems per se are not identified as a cause of the poor quality in the stream.
- Discussion regarding United Nations Sustainable Developments Goals (SDGs).
- SLO 93 in the Rathmichael area should be toned down or removed so as to allow on site wastewater treatment facilities where the Council’s concerns can be “adequately addressed” using the 2021 EPA Code of Practice. The Council should be open to new systems, technologies, and techniques to achieve this and SDGs.
- 2021 EPA Code of Practice extracts relevant to the Rathmichael area:
  - “The use of new and innovative products and technologies must be considered in detail by local authorities on a case-by-case basis(…)”.
  - “Water conservation measures should be adopted to reduce water consumption and the quantity of waste water generated in a household. It is a requirement of the Building Regulations that sanitary conveniences are designed to facilitate efficient use of water for flushing. Decreased waste water production through water-saving devices will reduce the hydraulic loading rate, improving the performance of the soil attenuation system. The installation or replacement of plumbing fixtures and appliances that reduce water use is successful in reducing
Available water-minimisation technologies include: o dual flush toilets (recommended under TGD G of the building regulations); o low-flow shower heads (credited in the Building Energy Rating calculation software, DEAP 4.1); o tap aerators; o water-efficient washing machines and dishwashers; o water butts for rainwater collection and re-use.”

- “The EPA Strive Report No. 108, Water Saving Technologies to Reduce Water Consumption and Wastewater Production in Irish Households (Dubber and Gill, 2015), contains additional details on these technologies and additional technologies such as urine-diverting urinals, air-assisted flush toilets and composting/dry toilets. It also has a useful table showing achievable water consumption for certain combinations of installed water-saving devices.”

- “Grey water recovery systems are encouraged to be used in individual homes, clustered communities and larger institutional facilities such as office parks and recreational facilities.”

While the Council maintains there is an issue in the area, this actually represents an opportunity to implement best practice water/eco-friendly solutions and an prospect to push for better water use and conservation technologies in Rathmichael, particularly in relation to reducing load and stopping pollutants at source. Water saving techniques outlined above by the EPA combined with, for example, urine diversion composting toilets would help reduce the load so significantly it is hard to argue new housing should be blanket banned via SLO 93. Centralised composting tanks are readily available and there are experts who are willing to service and maintain them. Furthermore, these are technologies and techniques that have been proven internationally, especially in Northern European countries where they have been in use for several decades.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapters 10, 14 (maps 10 and 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1119</td>
<td>Tom Phillips</td>
<td>Tom Phillips + Associates on behalf of The Executors of the Estate of the late Nora Tallon</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission requests clarification on the details surrounding Tallon House’s (RPS No. 2045) addition to the RPS.
- Submission notes that two there are two principal buildings / separate premises – Tallon House and the subsequent Gate Lodge. Clarification is required to distinguish what is ‘protected’.
- Submission seeks detail in relation to the designation including:
  - Confirmation of the Tallon House definition what designation encompasses.
  - Confirmation that neither the “Gate Lodge” nor the Potting Shed form part of the proposed addition.
  - Confirmation that there are no restrictions on the “House” and the “Gate Lodge” being sold as two separate entities at any time in the future.
- Submission notes that only the house is described in the RPS.
- Submission includes mapping and imagery of the landholding illustrating its configuration.
- Submission details the site location, its history and describes the property together with imagery of the property.
- Submission notes that the property was added to the NIAH in 2014 and sets out the NIAH description and appraisal for the house. It is noted that the NIAH entry does not include the gate lodge or potting shed.
- Submission sets out relevant planning history for the site and sets out relevant conditions. It is considered that Tallon House and the gate lodge are two separate dwelling units. Confirmation with regard to selling these separately is sought.
- Submission notes that the potting shed was constructed as an exempted development.
- Submission considers that the Gate Lodge is not part of and should not be part of the designation, and request that this is confirmed this in writing. It is noted that the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines states that “The planning authority should be clear about what land, structures or features it wants to protect”.

Appendices to the Submission:
- Appendix B sets out the details of planning application Reg. Ref. 87B/1272 in relation to extensions to the gate lodge, granted in 1988.
- Appendix C sets out the details of planning application Reg. Ref. 91A/2026 in relation to extensions to the main house, granted in 1992.
- Appendix D sets out the details of planning application Reg. Ref. 93B/0380 in relation to extensions to the main house, granted in 1993.
- Appendix E sets out the details of planning application Reg. Ref. D95/0443 in relation to extensions to the main house, granted in 1995.
- Appendix F contains the notice to the owner/occupier of “Tallon House” (RPS No. 2045) regarding its addition to the RPS.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1120</th>
<th>Person: Stephen Little</th>
<th>Organisation: On behalf of Quintain</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Introduction is provided which references the need for housing which is supported by government.
- An overview of Quintain Developments Ireland Ltd is provided including details of current projects both within dlr and elsewhere.
- Request that Council ensure sufficient land is zoned plus headroom.
- Request that when determining extent of land to be zoned, that the desire for greater heights and densities is acknowledged as a means of addressing the housing crisis.
- Request the Council take into account pent up demand which appears to be reflected in circular that accompanies the new Housing Supply Targets.
- In terms of population growth the submission states that a modelled assessment of housing needs indicates that there is a requirement for circa 65,000 units to be completed in Dublin over the next 5 years.
- A pent up demand has been created by the fact that the residential development sector has not functioned correctly over last ten years.
- A shortfall in supply will persist and the submission requests that dlr be mindful of this shortfall before finalising the Plan.
- Research conducted by a consultant suggests that the supply of housing being delivered will be in sufficient to meet housing demand from 2019 – 2024.
- Development management standards should allow flexibility.
- Request that the Plan address the recent pandemic and changing lifestyle trends, notably people moving to more suburban locations.
- Also need to acknowledge reducing car ownership and the move towards cycling and walking.
- Submission provides commentary on changing household occupation and composition and contends that the housing mix requirement to seek 40% of any apartment scheme to be 3 bedroom is not credible.
- Commentary is set out in relation to changing housing markets demands.
- Submission then moves onto comments on the draft Plan, which it invites the Council to consider structured against a policy background of the NPF. Various Strategic outcomes and National Policy Objectives are noted. The tiered approach to zoning is set out.
- It is considered that the new Plan should fully articulate and express NPO 33 which is to prioritise the provision of new homes at locations that can support sustainable development and at an appropriate scale of provision relative to location.
- Concern expressed in relation to the level of detail provided in the Draft Plan in relation to the tiered approach to zoning. It is considered that Draft Plan is unclear as to what is required for land to be serviced.
- Commentary is set out in relation to the EMRA RSES and MASP, and the Sustainable urban Housing; Design Standards for Apartments, (2018), including details of carparking and different urban locations.
- Considers that dlr falls into central and/or Accessible Urban Locations and Intermediate Locations.

Car parking
• Approach to car parking that is set out in 2018 Apartment Guidelines should be applied. Applicants should be allowed to demonstrate that the approach set out in the guidelines can be justified. This approach should also be applied in Cherrywood as recent amendment still exceeds apartment guidelines.

Building Heights
• Commentary is set out in relation the Building heights Guidelines.
• Concern that Council are continuing to apply a Building Height Strategy that was introduced under variation 5 of the County Development Plan 2010 – 2016.
• Request that Cherrywood be covered by Policy Objective BHS 1
• Much of the County is limited to 2-4 storeys which runs contrary to the Guidelines. Council is invited to expand objective so as to allow additional building height on a case by case basis.
• Council may not apply a blanket limit of building height.

Core Strategy
• Commentary set out in relation to the 2010 Core Strategy Guidance note and also the new 2020 Housing Supply Target Methodology for Development Planning, Section 28 Guidelines.
• Submission states that “section of Working Paper on ‘Housing Demand’ (page 94) envisages an increase in new housing output to up to 35,000 homes per annum in the years to 2027, to address the deficit that had built up in the preceding years, and that this would be subject to monitoring and review. On that basis a housing supply in 2020 of just 20,676 dwellings is a shortfall of 14,324 dwellings, or approximately 40% of the required supply. This ‘boost’ in supply will apply in the period of the new Development Plan and needs to be taken into account.”
• Invite Planning Authority when carrying out new HST methodology that they take into account headroom.

Dwelling Mix
• Oppose table 12.1 (mix). Finding of HNDA are refuted.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapters 2, 12, Appendices 1, 2, 5

DLR Submission No: B1121  Person: Karl Kinch  Organisation: N/A  Map Nos: 7
Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen Collage to SNI
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

DLR Submission No: B1122  Person: Sean Maguire  Organisation: N/A  Map Nos: 5
Summary of Submission and Observation:
• The submission highlights the need to need to protect the area and wildlife corridors of Woodside Road/Slatecabin lane and Blackglen Road and the wildlife corridors between Three Rock mountain to Fitzsimons wood.
• There is a strong presence of flora and fauna in the area, which must be safeguarded under the County Development Plan
• The Council must prevent large housing developments and toll roads which are not in keeping with the area and impacts on amenity value for walkers, wildlife historical and Dublin local amenity reasons.
• The submission acknowledges Fernhill and the work of the Council in this regard.
• The Council should ensure that development must be upheld on the lands on Woodside and Blackglen.
• The Countess Markievicz cottage is already in ruins and unprotected, which is a disgrace.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 8

DLR Submission No: B1123  Person: Ann Flaherty  Organisation: Truegain Ltd  Map Nos: 4
Summary of Submission and Observation:
The submission requests that the County Development Plan include a policy and concrete plans to upgrade the sea swimming facilities at the existing sea swimming locations and to ensure there is ongoing maintenance to support safe use of these areas.

The submission highlights that the number and state of repair of the ladder(s) at the Forty Foot is currently a serious safety issue, additionally extra ladders would facilitate the extra numbers now availing of these important outdoor facilities.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 9

## DLR Submission No: B1124
Person: Muireann O’Higgins
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 1

### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission highlights serious concerns with respect to the imminent redevelopment in Dundrum Village (including on the old shopping centre lands), especially in light of the extremely insensitive 2009 plan for Dundrum.
- The County Development Plan should recognise and respect the old vernacular character and streetscape of the old Main Street and maintain and incorporate where possible the existing buildings and/or facades in the new development. Furthermore, the design of any new building should sensitively blend in with the older surroundings.
- The submission welcomes the Candidate Architectural Conservation Area status for the Main Street but proposes that it be extended to include as much of the older buildings on the street as possible and suggests that the candidate ACAs in Dundrum be moved to full ACA status as a matter of urgency.
- A Local Area Plan for Dundrum be completed as soon as possible, to ensure protection of the character of the area and to manage development.
- As ‘Major Town Centre’, ‘Dundrum should be considered for increased height in line with the requirements of the Guidelines’, however the main bulk of MTC land falls within the boundaries of Dundrum village, including the main street. Therefore, to maintain Dundrum’s village atmosphere, all buildings on main street including any new structures should maintain the original low-rise scale. Building heights in the proposed new development further back from the street can be built to a higher scale but with a stepped back approach so as not to overwhelm the atmosphere of the main street, density does not have to be high rise.
- The submission welcomes a number of developments along Main Street in recent months such as to a one-way traffic system, the provision of a cycle lane, the widening of footpaths, the opening up of areas around main street, and the refurbishment of the old red brick terrace near the cross roads.
- In any future development of Dundrum, the Council should continue to improve on the old village atmosphere and sense of community while not compromising on density.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 7,14, Appendix 4

## DLR Submission No: B1125
Person: Catherine Egan
Organisation: Annville/Dundrum Road Residents Association
Map Nos: 1

### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The Annville/Dundrum Rd Residents’ Association (ADRRA) represents almost 100 households located on the Dundrum Road, adjacent to Central Mental Hospital (CMH) site. The submission provides a figure highlighting the relevant area.
- ADRRA conducted a survey of households in April 2021 with a response rate of 50% which informed the submission. The top concerns identified by the survey were building height, public transport, traffic management and cultural and civic amenities.

### Chapter 4: Neighbourhood – People, Homes and Place
- Concerned that new development, particularly at the Central Mental Hospital (CMH) site, be carried out in accordance with zoning Objective A – To protect and/or improve residential amenity.
- Request that the CDP be amended so that Policy Objective BHS 1 – Building Height does not apply to land zoned Objective A.
The CMH site includes significant protected structures. To ensure that these are not compromised by proposed development, density and height needs to be sympathetic to the existing Victorian buildings and not overshadow them.

The highest-ranking concern of respondents to the survey was building height with residents generally supporting height of no more than 4 storeys within 100m of their homes. Concern relates particularly to the CMH site.

Request that Policy Objective PHP20: Protection of Existing Residential Amenity should be updated to state that new buildings in excess of 2 storeys above the surrounding buildings should not be permitted within 100 metres of existing buildings.

Note the content of Policy Objective PHP21: Development on Institutional Land. The current LDA proposals for the CMH site are for a density of c. 118 units p/ha. This is excluding the existing historical buildings and commercial space proposed. This density is significantly higher than what is proposed in the CDP and will have an adverse impact of the existing neighbourhood and infrastructure.

Note Policy Objective PHP29: Housing for All and suggest that the provision of suitable housing to facilitate downsizing in existing older/established neighbourhoods should be pursued. Smaller, single storey, owner occupied developments would enable residents continue independent living, in familiar neighbourhoods, while freeing up larger homes for growing families.

Note Policy Objective PHP7: Schools. There is concern regarding the availability of schools, both primary and secondary, in the area. The survey indicated that people’s satisfaction in relation to the availability of both Primary and Secondary Schools is low, particularly in view of development at the CMH site.

Chapter 5: Transport and Mobility

Public transport infrastructure was highlighted as the second most important issue in the survey, with people’s satisfaction being low. There was also little confidence in the ability of busconnects and the luas upgrade to meet future demand.

While there are numerous references to developments within 10-minute walk of Luas/DART, high density housing along the Luas Green line is rendering it unusable north of Dundrum during peak times due to crowding. Overall, the plan is over-reliant on the extension and development of the LUAS Green line.

Policy objective T7: Green Line Capacity Enhancement (GLCE) Project needs to be updated with, at the very least, the current status of the Luas development proposals.

Note Policy Objective T8: Luas Extension and MetroLink. Many aspects of the referenced plans are exceptionally long term. The CDP needs to focus on the provision of existing and interim services.

Note Policy Objective T3: Development of Sustainable Travel and Transport. While the objective is fully supported, it should also take into consideration the requirement for residents to travel further afield. For many, particularly families, this will require the use of a car.

Parking is a key concern for residents. The LDA’s current proposed CMH development is for 450 parking spaces for 1,300 families/units. Concern that the area will become congested with parked cars.

The roads in the area aren’t wide enough to accommodate significant additional traffic/parking.

Chapter 8: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity

Note Policy Objective GIB18: Protection of Natural Heritage and the Environment. Request that an objective be added to reflect the importance of the River Slang as an ecological habitat and connection for numerous species of flora and fauna. The objective “To protect and preserve Trees and Woodland” should also be assigned.

Chapter 9: Open Space, Parks and Recreation

Note Policy Objective OSR4: Public Open Space Standards. In the survey, when asked what amenities are lacking in the area, the results could be summarised as follows:

- Green space e.g. parkland, playgrounds, quiet walks, picnic area, jogging routes,
- Sports facilities e.g. swimming pool, GAA pitches, Community Sports Centre, Healthy Aging facilities, skate park
- Infrastructural facilities e.g. GP Practice, Crèche, After School facility, cafes
- The limited green space in the area is located in the CMH site. While it is understood that there are proposals for some ‘green’ space to be allocated, residents are concerned that this will not necessarily be the type of space required to address the amenities described above.
• Note Policy Objective OSR7: Trees, Woodland and Forestry. It is important that the mature woodland at the entrance to the Central Mental Hospital and specimen trees within the complex have the objective “To protect and preserve Trees and Woodland”.

• Note Policy Objective OSR9 – Sports and Recreational Facilities. As noted from the survey results, adequate sports facilities are seen to be lacking in the area. While it is understood that there are limited opportunities to develop sporting infrastructure, each significant development, whether it be a new school or civic amenity (Old Dundrum Shopping Centre) should include sporting facilities so that they cover a broad range of sports and physical activities.

Chapter 10: Environmental Infrastructure and Flood Risk
• Note Policy Objective EI22: Catchment Flood Risk Assessment and Management (CFRAM). Concern that new development will increase run off into the River Slang. It is important that all developments within the pluvial run off area of the river be assessed to ensure that existing threats of flooding are not exasperated. In addition, bridges on the River Slang should be assessed for potential of blockage and remedial works undertaken to manage such a risk.

Chapter 14: Specific Local Objectives
• SLO 6: To complete a Local Area Plan for Dundrum - Encourage the speedy development of the Local Development Plan for Dundrum which will be critical in light of the number of significant residential and commercial development proposals for the area.

• SLO 113: Support SLO 113 as detailed on the map. The survey indicated that there is a high level of support to facilitate the provision of amenities that have been identified as lacking in the area.

• Oppose the creation of a break/gateway in the existing wall at the end of Annville Park which has been highlighted as a particular issue in the survey. There is a very low level of support for direct public pedestrian access via Annville Park to the proposed enhanced sporting facilities/infrastructure on the Central Mental Hospital land.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>B1126</th>
<th>Person: Aileen Eglington</th>
<th>Organisation: Kilternan Glenamuck Residents Association</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the Council’s vision in relation to the policy on sustainable communities, active aging, affordable housing, Economy, and the protection of heritage within the built environment.

• Consider that the unique landscape and character of Kilternan-Glenamuck should be protected.

• Agree that sufficient land is zoned for residential development and consider that any further rezoning should not be developer led.

• Consider that there is a lack of open space and play areas in the Kilternan-Glenamuck area, and to consider private amenity spaces as public open spaces is a misrepresentation.

• Considers that proposed Glenamuck Park does not address long term needs. Safety concerns are also expressed.

• All new developments, must include community space, and play areas but the needs of the new community should not be ignored.

• Submission expresses disappointment with implementation of the Kilternan Glenamuck LAP in relation to the Village Centre and provides commentary on strengthening the Local Area Plan, future vision for the area, use of granite in developments.

• Concern expressed in relation to SHD process which allows material contravention of the County Development Plan.

• Considers that affordable build to buy units for families are required in the County.

• Request that something is done to ensure and enhance access to the Kilternan Dolmen and request that the existing right of way of mapped in the Draft Plan (no map submitted).

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 2, 4, 9, Miscellaneous, Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>B1127</th>
<th>Person: Shane Colclough</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- **DLR has a strong track record in low energy retrofits and new builds to Passive House Standard.** Initial data indicates that recorded energy performance exceeds that required of the current nZEB standard and consistently good indoor air quality which is more important now with Covid 19; DLR should lead the way among the Councils in demonstrating the potential afforded by low energy housing.
- **Recommends that the Council provides supports/incentives to build dwellings to Passive house or similar standards.**
- **The County could inform the next iteration of building regulations in line with the EU’s Energy Performance of Buildings Directive, and the requirement for Member States to further reduce building energy consumption to hit the carbon emissions targets for 2030 and 2050.**

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 3

### DLR Submission No: B1128  
**Person:** William Quigley  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 4

#### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The submission fully agrees and supports the attached submission document and comments made by the residents at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace, Sandycove, Co. Dublin for the 2022-2028 Development Plan.
- The congestion could be resolved by allowing off-street parking.
- Furthermore, the restrictions on off-street parking for these Protected Structures are too onerous and sensitive off-street parking should be allowed at this location. They should be given the same leniency by the planning authority as the off-street parking granted at the nearby 1,2,3,6 Elton Park, which are also Protected Structures.
- The submission acknowledges the volume of traffic related issues submitted by other residents within Sandycove.
- The submission also acknowledges the CRM, however, the traffic congestion fallout in Sandycove needs to be resolved by the Council.
- A copy of the submission to amend the Plan is included with the submission which notes the planning history for the Terrace, the case for off-street parking at Breffni Terrace, including the positive interventions of same and requested that the Plan is amended to reset the parameters on off-street parking at this location, to sensitively incorporate off-street parking and to adopt a commensurate higher level of tolerance for future planning applications for off-street parking at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 12

### DLR Submission No: B1129  
**Person:** Muireann O’Higgins  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 1

#### Summary of Submission and Observation:

It is noted that this submission is a duplicate of B1124 which is summarised in full above.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Refer to issues raised under B1124.

### DLR Submission No: B1130  
**Person:** Patrick Redmond  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 3

#### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission notes the limited outdoor space serving the Dún Laoghaire Educate Together School.
- Submission seeks the development of the green space between Tivoli Terrace South and North for use for school children noting that this would benefit a number of local schools and would help achieve a number of the Strategic County Outcomes.
• Submission requests that the green space in the Harbour beside Irish Lights could also be developed for the benefit of school children.
• Submission requests that Dunedin Park is used for some outdoor activities of the DETS.
• Submission notes the benefits of green space, particularly for children.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 4, Chapter 9

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Decisions taken at the planning stage with regard to building design can significantly impact on a building’s ability to both help to mitigate and adapt to climate change and hence the Plan has a role to plan in ensuring that sustainability considerations are integrated into the new developments at the earliest stage avoiding wasting energy etc.
• Quotes 10(2)(N) of the Planning and Development Act regarding the content of development plans and states that this empowers local authorities to set ambitious requirements to reduce the energy consumption, carbon emissions and environmental impacts of buildings, and to ensure that buildings are designed to adapt to climate change.
• Refers to the requirements of buildings to meet NZEB standard in accordance with the building regulations but points out the inadequacies of this as they do not set any requirements regarding building orientation, form or layout nor primary energy usage, overhearing. Problems with maximising passive solar gain can be lethal to building occupants. This overheating concern is likely to increase with more frequent heat waves.
• Submission recommends a new requirement for the Plan so that new buildings are designed to minimise energy consumption, ensure thermal comfort and minimise the risk of both overheating and condensation and suggests a wording for this.
• As an alternative to this a link to incentives to the passive house standard or equivalent could be used, and for projects designed to overarching sustainability rating systems such as the Hope Performance Index. This could be done through the development contribution scheme being preferentially set to the sustainability standards.
• Whole life carbon – the plan should specify a requirement to calculate whole life carbon emissions for new buildings, and for proposals to demolish and replace existing buildings. Contributions could be linked to this.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 3

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Welcome the design, attention to detail and general vision of the planners for DLR region. Also welcome the layout and virtual room options.
• Found it difficult to read through the full document as each chapter seemed to be a separate PDF which made it difficult to do a search for elements within the overall plan.
• PHP21 - Institutional land use - these include retaining open character and recreational amenity incl. eg 25% be retained as accessible open public space. This Objective is punitive on the institutions and promotes inequality between institutional owners and other landowners/developers. Eg Dun Laoire Golf Club lands were subject to normal planning rules - why should a religious order which are usually registered charities be denied the same rights. Why do the public gain rights to INST spaces when there are usually lots of Council parks and sports club facilities in the vicinity? Should DLR CoCo not purchase or lease the land at market rates if they are essential for public facilities? It seems to me to be a conflicting objective to the 10-minute rule and to DLR housing needs (including density levels) as well as depriving and/or reducing the in many cases charities of much needed funds for 'downsizing ' and other charitable purposes. Indeed, the funds generated may also help with funding 'Institutional Redress Schemes'.

402
• Welcome the overall housing policy objective to provide more housing as at 4.3.1.2 including infill and right sizing, as well as the proposal for permission to be granted for some changes of use of vacant commercial property to residential use.

• PHP 30 Social Housing – supportive of the role of Approved Housing Bodies (AHB) in the delivery and management of Social housing stock. Disappointed to see that only 2 of the 62 AHBs made submissions as part of the consultation process but it may be that there was a short deadline, or they were too busy with their housing work to respond. Disappointed that their umbrella body the ICSH were not consulted as this could have helped in developing the plan.

• One of the historic problems with DLRCOCO owned social housing is that much of it was sold off, under various tenant purchase schemes with substantial discount on market values, to the purchasers. These houses were sold on - in some cases within a very short period - to other private purchasers- with profit gains to the tenant purchasers but not to DLRCOCO. The social housing stock was reduced, and resultant funds generated for DLRCOCO could not fund new build or purchases at anything like the rate of the losses. There are at least 2 fairly large local authority-built estates that I am aware of - one off Newtownpark Avenue and another off Stradbrook Road - which have only between 10 to 20% of social housing stock still. I’m sure that that is replicated throughout the County.

• Agrees that it would be good to retain the Bakers Corner pub building on the streetscape as a protected structure but the remainder of the site is not very attractive nor in need of preservation.

• Appendix 12 Public ROWs - only 2 pages with a commitment to retain established listed ROWs and recreation access. It says the list does not include all ROWs, but difficult to see others on the zoomed in maps of each area. In view of the overall commitment to improve the convenience of pedestrians in DLR area, the Plan should have a sub map identifying all pedestrian routes/pathways between/across estates and roadways. There should be a commitment to preserving those routes and taking them in charge and/or agreeing to maintain the surface areas to facilitate all route users - this has a good potential to make the 10-minute neighbourhood concept a reality in some areas.

• In relation to sustainable travel and shared space on roadways, the aim of urban road design is to discourage speed and give priority to safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Unfortunately, the redesign of Frascati Road from shopping centre to bottom of Temple Hill goes against those principles by widening the median substantially. The 2 lanes in each direction have been narrowed and the potential for putting in bumpers to protect the cycle lanes is reduced . In addition the trees are deciduous and will shed their leaves onto the roadway and cycle lanes reducing their overall safety. The Plan should reconsider where inappropriate road design policies lead to less safety for all road users.

• Existing road design issues in relation to DLR roundabouts, particularly noticeable in Glenageary to Dalkey ones. There is a grey slightly raised perimeter and then a further raising inside it so that it is hard to see as you approach it that the grey raised area exists. Not sure how that relates to the Development plan but perhaps you could direct me to the part of the Council where I can follow it up.

• Good idea to include existing community and parish centres potential to contribute to local area plans as it can prevent double provision of amenities in areas.

• No mention in Plan of ‘community gardens’ in Council parks or lands but I would support their development.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapters 4, 5, 9,  Appendix 12

DLR Submission No:
B1133

Person:
Lisa O Hagan

Organisation:
N/A

Map Nos:
3, 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• The submission supports the removal of ‘Candidate ACA’ status from Adelaide Road and in particular at Adelaide House, and supports the upgrade of Marlborough Road to full ‘ACA’ status.
• The submission highlights as a property owner they continue to manage and maintain Adelaide House, preserving the character and heritage of both the buildings and grounds and notes that the removal of the ‘candidate ACA’ status from my property will not alter this, and will encourage the continued maintenance and upkeep of both buildings and grounds, boundaries, and landscape features.
• This reflects the Local Authority recognition that the existing owners have indeed managed and maintained the character and quality of Adelaide Road.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4
### DLR Submission No: B1134

**Person:** Emma Reilly  
**Organisation:** Parents Association of Our Lady’s Grove Primary School, Goatstown, Dublin 14  
**Map Nos:** 1

#### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission welcomes the new SNI zoning and its application at Our Lady’s Grove campus and request that this is extended to cover the access road.
- Submission welcomes the continuing presence of the INST Objective and that it applies to the entire site.
- Submission welcomes the application of the F zoning to part of the site.
- Submission requests that ‘INST’ is recognised as a standalone zoning objective.
- Submission requests that the open space requirement for ‘INST’ in Section 12.3.8.11 is amended to 25%.
- Submission notes the removal of a tree symbol (SW corner) at Our Ladys Grove and requests that it be re-inserted.
- Submission requests that a method to determine density of student accommodation is made clear in the draft plan.
- Submission requests that population-based equivalent be reinstated as a method to determine open space requirements for high-rise development.
- Submission seeks clarification with regard to the usage of the terms “Open Space” and “Public Open Space” in the plan.
- Submission requests that Our Ladys Grove site is incorporated into the Goatstown LAP boundary.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 2, Chapter 4, Chapter 9, Chapter 12, Chapter 13, Map 1

### DLR Submission No: B1135

**Person:** Stephen Little & Associates  
**Organisation:** National Rehabilitation Hospital and Health Service Executive  
**Map Nos:** 7

#### Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission seeks to identify and address potential issues which may arise resulting from the addition of ‘The Cedars’ building (formerly ‘Belville’) at the National Rehabilitation Hospital (RPS No. 1969) to the RPS.
- The submission includes a Conservation Report prepared by Lindsay Conservation Architects.
- Submission refers to the configuration of the hospital and notes that due to its age and design that the original building are not fit for purpose and would be demolished as part of the long term strategy for upgrading the NRH.
- It is noted that permission was granted in 2008 for a 235-bed hospital that included the demolition of original buildings, including the surviving elements of the subject building. A subsequent SID permission was secured in 2015 for a phased redevelopment. This expands hospital facilities into a new wing under ‘phase 1’. It is noted that a masterplan for the redevelopment included in the SID application includes for the demolition of the original hospital buildings including ‘The Cedars’.
- Submission refers to 3 phases of the on-going redevelopment of the hospital and details each phase. Phases 2 and 3 have yet to secure planning permission.
- It is noted that the complete redevelopment would result in the demolition of the original hospital buildings. An indicative illustration of this redevelopment is set out in the submission.
- Submission sets out planning history for the site.
- Submission sets out the current planning context for the site including zoning objectives and SLO’s, noting that there are no protected structures on site. The zoning objectives of the Draft Plan are also set out noting the change to SNI and the addition of the protected structure and the addition of a letter box on Rochestown Ave to the Industrial Heritage record.
- Submission raises concerns with regard to the addition of ‘The Cedars’ to the RPS with regard to the future strategic improvement of the hospital.
- It is noted that this structure was recorded by the NIAH.
It is noted that there is no justification for the addition of the structure onto the RPS. It is considered that what remains of the original building fails to meet the relevant criteria for entry onto the RPS.

Submission notes that the listing of this structure raises serious difficulties for future planning applications for Phase 2 and Phase 3 of the NRH masterplan redevelopment project and requests that it be removed from the RPS.

Submission notes that the strategic redevelopment of the site is required to deliver a modern National Rehabilitation Hospital. Phases 2 and 3 would be sought as soon as adequate funding has been identified.

Submission notes that the planning authority have been supportive of the redevelopment of the NRH, including the demolition works required.

Submission states that it is not clear which elements of the house are proposed for protection.

Submission states that the conservation assessment carried out shows that there have been significant alterations, sub-divisions and removal of original fabric. The structure cannot be described as an exemplar of good architectural design and it does not satisfy the architectural criteria for inclusion on the Record of Protected Structures.

Summary of the Conservation Report submitted with the submission:

• Report notes the concern of the hospital authority in relation to the inclusion of the structure on the RPS given the planning history on the site that includes the demolition of the structure.

• Report notes the planning policy context of the site.

• Report sets out the NIAH description and appraisal.

• Report sets out a detailed history of the site – it is noted that research was inhibited by the Covid lockdown and the period of time to prepare the report. The historical context is supplemented by historical mapping dating from 1816 when a house – ‘Belleville’ – first appeared, but not in exactly the same location as the existing structure. It is noted that this may be due to mapping or it may be an earlier version of the house. Maps and valuation details illustrate alterations to the house / property from its initial appearance.

• A list and details of the occupiers of the house set out in the report.

• Report notes the changes to the function of the house following the acquisition of the property by the Sisters of Mercy in 196 (or earlier). Under this ownership, the property emerges as a Rehabilitation Centre. A list of Architects involved in building works from 1915 is provided. A 1937 map shows significant change to the property and its setting. The report states that “setting was slowly eroded until the Sisters of Charity obtained possession.”

• Report details the current house and setting, evaluating its external and internal fabric. Many changes to the building are detailed. A series of photos of the structure are provided in this regard. A number of non-original features are highlighted in the report.

• The report notes that two important elements in the building’s interior, vaulted room in the basement and the staircase, are lost. It is noted that internal layout has been considerably altered with virtually all original joinery removed. A series of floor plans are provided in the report to illustrate changes and internal photography show the existing internal fitout. It is noted that the lobby is the most intact room to survive.

• The report assesses the structure with regard to the eight criteria of special interest set out in the Planning Act - architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, social or technical interest, and having regard to the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines.

• The assessment notes that the structure does not satisfy and of the criteria set out for inclusion on the RPS.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space
- Upgrades are needed on the Road markings and signage on the Upper Kilmacud road.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5, Map 2
### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Provides commentary on comment on the inclusion of Montpelier Lane, Monkstown as suitable for Mews Development in the Draft County Development Plan 2022-2028 – Land Use Zoning Maps 2 and 3.
- Considers that Montpelier Lane Monkstown which is in private ownership does not meet criteria 1, 2 and 3 of section 12.8.3.10 and that therefore the designation should be removed.
- Submission requests that that provision be allowed for the exercise of large dogs in green area behind the West Pier.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

- Chapter 12

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The submission fully agrees and supports the attached submission document and comments made by the residents at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace, Sandycove, Co. Dublin for the 2022-2028 Development Plan.
- The volume of traffic related issues and congestion could be resolved by allowing off-street parking.
- Furthermore, the restrictions on off-street parking for these Protected Structures are too onerous and sensitive off-street parking should be allowed at this location. They should be given the same leniency by the planning authority as the off-street parking granted at the nearby 1,2,3,6 Elton Park, which are also Protected Structures.
- The submission also acknowledges the volume of traffic related issues submitted by other residents in Sandycove.
- A copy of the submission to amend the Plan is included with the submission which notes the planning history for the Terrace, the case for off-street parking at Breffni Terrace, including the positive interventions of same and requested that the Plan is amended to reset the parameters on off-street parking at this location, to sensitively incorporate off-street parking and to adopt a commensurate higher level of tolerance for future planning applications for off-street parking at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

- Chapter 12

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission is in favour of resident permit parking on Sandycove Avenue East with effective enforcement of parking restrictions.
- Submission notes that if Sandycove Avenue North and East are made access only, it would be necessary to make Sandycove Avenue West a one way system from the junction of Otranto Place/Sandycove Ave. West heading south to the junction of Sandycove Ave. West/Sandycove Road.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

- Chapter 5

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The submission supports the removal of ‘Candidate ACA’ status from a section of Station Road and in particular at Westfield and supports the upgrade of Marlborough Road to full ‘ACA’ status.
- The submission highlights that ‘Westfield’, was built in the mid1950, needs complete modernisation and is not appropriate to have it included as a candidate ACA or full ACA status.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

- Appendix 4
### DLR Submission No: B1141
**Person:** Harish Kumar  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 2,6

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open space.
- Submission states that there are protected areas for bees in the green area. Also, many unique birds have been observed in the green area.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Map 2

### DLR Submission No: B1142
**Person:** Elaine Knierim  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 3, 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission welcomes the designation of Marlborough Road as an ACA.
- However, the submission supports other residents in their request that improvements to the rear of their homes and in particular upgrades to enhance energy performance, would not be impacted by the Council’s plans, as such works would in no way diminish the architectural heritage of the area.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Appendix 4

### DLR Submission No: B1143
**Person:** Trevor Sadler  
**Organisation:** On Behalf of Palemink  
**Map Nos:** 6

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission relates to the brownfield site of the former Siemens Building, located at Blackthorn Avenue and Ballymoss Road, in Sandyford Business District. Site context and details of the surrounding sites is set out along with the planning history of the site including details of a permission refused by ABP under D06A/0893 due to deficiencies in services (decision overturned a grant by dlr).
- Submission set out planning policy for the site as set out in the draft SUFP.

#### Land use zoning objective
- Submission considers that removal of residential from the MOC zoning objective is regressive and contrary to national policy. It is considered that the claim as set out in the Draft SUFP which states “the number of apartments permitted to date in the Mixed-Use Core Areas is sufficient to provide vitality to these areas” cannot reasonably be applied to the MOC zoned area as only 2 residential schemes have been permitted in the MOC area.
- Excluding residential from the MOC zone will impact on vitality.
- Request that residential be included as permissible in MOC zoning objective.

#### Building Height
- Maintaining a baseline height limit of 6 storeys for the Siemens site, as originally designated in the 2011 SUFP, is no longer appropriate and is contrary to the Building Heights Guidelines.
- Submission puts forward an argument for greater height on the site and requests a building height range of 8–17 storeys for the former Siemens site.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Chapter 13, Appendix 17

### DLR Submission No: B1144
**Person:** Trevor Sadler  
**Organisation:** On Behalf of Palemink  
**Map Nos:** 6

(Duplicate of B1143 above)

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission relates to the brownfield site of the former Siemens Building, located at Blackthorn Avenue and Ballymoss Road, in Sandyford Business District. Site context and details of the surrounding sites is set out along with the planning history of the site including details of a permission refused by ABP under D06A/0893 due to deficiencies in services (decision overturned a grant by dlr).
- Submission set out planning policy for the site as set out in the draft SUFP.

#### Land use zoning objective
Submission considers that removal of residential from the MOC zoning objective is regressive and contrary to national policy. It is considered that the claim as set out in the Draft SUFP which states “the number of apartments permitted to date in the Mixed-Use Core Areas is sufficient to provide vitality to these areas” cannot reasonably be applied to the MOC zoned area as only 2 residential schemes have been permitted in the MOC area.

- Excluding residential from the MOC zone will impact on vitality.
- Request that residential be included as permissible in MOC zoning objective.

**Building Height**

- Maintaining a baseline height limit of 6 storeys for the Siemens site, as originally designated in the 2011 SUFP, is no longer appropriate and is contrary to the Building Heights Guidelines.
- Submission puts forward an argument for greater height on the site and requests a building height range of 8–17 storeys for the former Siemens site.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

Chapter 13, Appendix 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1145</td>
<td>Stephen Little</td>
<td>On behalf of Quintain</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Introduction is provided which references the need for housing which is supported by government.
- An overview of Quintain Developments Ireland Ltd is provided including details of current projects both within dlr and elsewhere
- Request that Council ensure sufficient land is zoned plus headroom.
- Request that when determining extent of land to be zoned, that the desire for greater heights and densities is acknowledged as a means of addressing the housing crisis
- Request the Council take into account pent up demand which appears to be reflected in circular that accompanies the new Housing Supply Targets
- In terms of population growth, the submission states that a modelled assessment of housing needs indicates that there is a requirement for circa 65,000 units to be completed in Dublin over the next 5 years.
- A pent-up demand has been created by the fact that the residential development sector has not functioned correctly over last ten years.
- A shortfall in supply will persist and the submission requests that dlr be mindful of this shortfall before finalising the Plan.
- Research conducted by a consultant on behalf of the submittee suggests that the supply of housing being delivered will be in sufficient to meet housing demand from 2019 – 2024.
- Development management standards should allow flexibility
- Request that the Plan address the recent pandemic and changing lifestyle trends, notably people moving to more suburban locations.
- Also need to acknowledge reducing car ownership and the move towards cycling and walking.
- Submission provides commentary on changing household occupation and composition and contends that the housing mix requirement to seek 40% of any apartment scheme to be 3 bedroom is not credible.
- Commentary is set out in relation to changing housing markets demands.
- Submission then moves onto comments on the draft Plan, which it invites the Council to consider structured against a policy background of the NPF. Various Strategic outcomes and National Policy Objectives are noted. The tiered approach to zoning is set out.
- It is considered that the new Plan should fully articulate and express NPO 33 which is to prioritise the provision of new homes at locations that can support sustainable development and at an appropriate scale of provision relative to location.
- Concern expressed in relation to the level of detail provided in the Draft Plan in relation to the tiered approach to zoning. It is considered that Draft Plan is unclear as to what is required for land to be serviced.
- Commentary is set out in relation to the EMRA RSES and MASP, and the Sustainable urban Housing; Design Standards for Apartments, (2018), including details of carparking and different urban locations.
- Considers that dlr falls into central and/or Accessible Urban Locations and Intermediate Locations.

**Car parking**
Approach to car parking that is set out in 2018 Apartment Guidelines should be applied. Applicants should be allowed to demonstrate that the approach set out in the guidelines can be justified. This approach should also be applied in Cherrywood as recent amendment still exceeds apartment guidelines.

**Building Heights**
- Commentary is set out in relation the Building heights Guidelines.
- Concern that Council are continuing to apply a Building Height Strategy that was introduced under variation 5 of the County Development Plan 2010 – 2016.
- Request that Cherrywood be covered by Policy Objective BHS 1
- Much of the County is limited to 2-4 storeys which runs contrary to the Guidelines. Council is invited to expand objective so as to allow additional building height on a case by case basis.
- Council may not apply a blanket limit of building height.

**Core Strategy**
- Commentary set out in relation to the 2010 Core Strategy Guidance note and also the new 2020 Housing Supply Target Methodology for Development Planning, Section 28 Guidelines.
- Submission states that “section of Working Paper on ‘Housing Demand’ (page 94) envisages an increase in new housing output to up to 35,000 homes per annum in the years to 2027, to address the deficit that had built up in the preceding years, and that this would be subject to monitoring and review. On that basis a housing supply in 2020 of just 20,676 dwellings is a shortfall of 14,324 dwellings, or approximately 40% of the required supply. This ‘boost’ in supply will apply in the period of the new Development Plan and needs to be taken in to account.”
- Invite Planning Authority when carrying out new HST methodology that they take into account headroom.

**Dwelling Mix**
- Oppose table 12.1 (mix). Finding of HNDA are refuted.

---

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Chapter 1,2,4,5,12**

---

**DLR Submission No:** B1146  |  **Person:** David Houlton  |  **Organisation:** DLR Skate Park Youth submission  |  **Map Nos:** 3

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The submission from DLR Skate Park Youth is made on behalf of a large but dispersed group of young people ranging in age from 7-20.
- Request that the Council makes provision for a world class skate facility in Dún Laoghaire for current and future generations of skaters and stunt bike riders.
- Skateboarding will be at the Olympic games for the first time in its history at Tokyo 2021.
- Monkstown Blue Pool facility is the only specifically designated facility within walking, cycling or skating distance of Dún Laoghaire. However, this is a chargeable amenity while also being inadequate in terms of facilities.
- Stunt bike riders and skateboarders currently skate/ride at various locations around Dún Laoghaire (e.g. the Lexicon), which creates conflict with other users.
- The submission provides a range of international examples of what is required to create a world class facility.
- The submission includes a petition consisting of c.1,590 people while an additional c.1000 persons have expressed support on social media.
- The submission also provides letters of support from the Christian Brothers’ College, Monkstown and Monkstown Park Junior School.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

**Appendix 8**

---

**DLR Submission No:** B1147  |  **Person:** Wilton Gallery  |  **Organisation:** Wilton Gallery  |  **Map Nos:** 3

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission requests that signage with regard to accessing Glasthule Village is improved as this would enhance the 10-minute neighbourhood concept and encourage tourism.
• Submission request that public light in the Glasthule area is improved by providing LED lighting and street lanterns.
• Submission requests that the temporary extended pathways are enhanced by improving accessibility and reducing clutter throughout the village to improve navigation for all users.
• Submission requests that there is a review of bins in the area.
• Submission states that cycle stations are provided in a haphazard manner – a comprehensive bike station should be provided in the car park in the village that provides a water station for cyclists and provide a stainless steel bike design at either end (example from Westport attached).
• Public toilet facilitates should be provided in the area – the entrance to Eden park or close to the DART station is suggested.
• Public seating should be provided at Eden park and the location of existing seating reviewed. Seating should include nearby bins.
• Provision of an open space area over the existing council carpark should be considered.
• Different coloured parking zones should be considered.
• Hot showers, changing facilitated and toilets should be considered at the forty foot.
• The forty foot areas should be wheelchair accessible.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Miscellaneous, Chapters 8, 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1148</td>
<td>Paul Coffey</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission requests that the field on Tivoli Terrace South is retained as zone objective F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1149</td>
<td>Muireann O’Higgins</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serious concerns about the South County Dublin’s greenbelt which is slowly being eroded by urban development. Despite the importance of these areas, urban sprawl climbs steadily onwards and upwards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Welcome DLR’s development of the new County Tree Strategy and support its the ‘urban forest’ plans, however, these relate to urban housing developments only.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Dublin mountains, our ‘rural forests’, require protection and it is suggested that DLR should resist rezonings and provide as much protection as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many Rights of Way in the DLR area are being lost e.g. the access laneway to Countess Markieviez cottage on the Blackglen Rd. A formal review of public rights of ways should be undertaken as a matter of urgency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 9, Appendix 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1150</td>
<td>Lee Russell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The submission request that a protection/preservation objective be included to Map 3 of the Draft County Development Plan for large mature Sycamore trees in the fenced field between St. Joseph’s School Dún Laoghaire and Fairway Drive, Cualanor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The submission requested the Council renew the Dún Laoghaire baths for local amenity value.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The submission requests the Council to reprise the proposals for a water sport centre and 50m saltwater swimming pool in the old Dún Laoghaire Ferry building which would be a wonderful resource.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 8 and Appendix 8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1151</td>
<td>Priscilla Markey</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Dogs should be allowed off lead on West Pier in Dun Laoghaire at all times or else at designated times.
- Comments regarding the benefits to dogs being off leash.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1152</td>
<td>Caitríona McGuire</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission fully agrees and supports the attached submission document and comments made by the residents at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace, Sandy Cove, Co. Dublin for the 2022-2028 Development Plan.
- The volume of traffic related issues and congestion could be resolved by allowing off-street parking.
- Furthermore, the restrictions on off-street parking for these Protected Structures are too onerous and sensitive off-street parking should be allowed at this location. They should be given the same leniency by the planning authority as the off-street parking granted at the nearby 1,2,3,6 Elton Park, which are also Protected Structures.
- The submission also acknowledges the volume of traffic related issues submitted by other residents in Sandy Cove.
- A copy of the submission to amend the Plan is included with the submission which notes the planning history for the Terrace, the case for off-street parking at Breffni Terrace, including the positive interventions of same and requested that the Plan is amended to reset the parameters on off-street parking at this location, to sensitively incorporate off-street parking and to adopt a commensurate higher level of tolerance for future planning applications for off-street parking at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapter 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1153</td>
<td>Sarah McDonagh</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen Collage to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1154</td>
<td>Mary Convery</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission fully agrees and supports the attached submission document and comments made by the residents at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace, Sandy Cove, Co. Dublin for the 2022-2028 Development Plan.
- The volume of traffic related issues and congestion could be resolved by allowing off-street parking.
- Furthermore, the restrictions on off-street parking for these Protected Structures are too onerous and sensitive off-street parking should be allowed at this location. They should be given the same leniency by the planning authority as the off-street parking granted at the nearby 1,2,3,6 Elton Park, which are also Protected Structures.
- The submission also notes the traffic congestion along Sandy Cove Road.
- A copy of the submission to amend the Plan is included with the submission which notes the planning history for the Terrace, the case for off-street parking at Breffni Terrace, including the positive interventions of same and requested that the Plan is amended to reset the parameters on off-street parking at this location, to sensitively incorporate off-street parking and to adopt a commensurate...
higher level of tolerance for future planning applications for off-street parking at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 12

| DLR Submission No: B1155 | Person: Eoin McBennett | Organisation: Shankill Shankill Tidy Towns, SAGE - Shankill Action for a Green Earth and the Shankill Biodiversity Project | Map Nos: 10, 14 |

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- With respect to Conservation and Enhancement of Biodiversity the submission welcomes the proposed biodiversity policies in the Draft Plan however the Plan should:
  - Specify and implement a policy that there must be no net loss of biodiverse ecosystems in the County or in its communities.
  - Make more explicit provision for the preservation, protection, and enhancement of biodiverse ecosystems. In this regard developers should be required to leave as many existing hedgerows and trees as possible rather than felling them all and then planting new ones.
  - Ensure, where possible, preservation of existing woodlands, hedgerows, meadows, and wetlands and encourage the creation of new such features.
  - Provide improved protection of rivers and other biodiverse corridors and encourage small areas of biodiversity.
  - Encourage widespread tree planting, to connect areas of woodland and new developments should be required to provide a minimum of 25% tree cover and encouraged to exceed this level.
  - Ensure that the impact of infill developments in residential areas on biodiverse ecosystems is given due consideration in granting planning approval.
  - Make a clear and unequivocal commitment to the preservation of the green belt between Shankill and Bray.
  - Comply with the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals
  - Reflect the most up to date science and research including Inland Fisheries Ireland’s 2020 guidelines “Planning for Watercourses in the Urban Environment”, The Biodiversity Climate Change Sectoral Adaptation Plan, the National Biodiversity Plan and relevant EU and other directives.

- The submission welcomes Specific Local Objective (SLO) 18 and SLO 177.
- The submission requests that consideration be given to appropriate designation of the Shanganagh Cliffs, which are subject to serious coastal erosion, particularly in the area from Corbawn to Woodbrook.
- A cycle route on the coast would limit the impact on local residents and protect the country lane aspect of Quinn’s Road as it approaches the beach. This rural lane needs to be protected.
- With respect to SLO 68 the submission requests that this should explicitly refer to protection, restoration, and enhancement of biodiversity in this important ecosystem and, should also include the Bride’s Glen Stream.
- With respect to SLO 118 the submission requests that a future extension of Shanganagh Park on the western side of the R119 will be linked to Carrickgollogan and Rathmichael Wood in time.
- The submission highlights the need for litter control along the rivers, sadly a significant amount of litter is often visible along these waterways.
- The submission welcomes the inclusion, in the Land Use Zoning Maps, of trees and woodlands to be protected and preserved and highlights that a similar designation should also be considered for meadows, wetlands, and other areas of importance to biodiversity.

Shankill as a Community:
- The submission highlights the Plans failure to recognise Shankill as a unique community with character and history which conflicts with the aspirations of Chapter 4 of the Plan, ‘Neighbourhood, Home and Place’.
- The proposed BusConnects Bus Corridor 13 poses a very real threat to the character of Shankill without any clear benefit to the locality but a significant cost in financial, environmental, and social perspective.
The Development Plan proposes an additional 4,429 new residential units in the community of Shankill at Woodbrook, Shanganagh Castle and Rathmichael. This, together with a number of other pending developments, has the potential to more than double its population during the lifetime of the Plan. Despite this, no consideration appears to be given to ensuring that Shankill evolves facilities to support a population in excess of 20,000.

- Safe cycling and walking routes in the Shankill area should be prioritised.
- Suitable sites in the Shankill area should be identified for outdoor activities such as Nature-Based Play (in line with the DLR philosophy), biking trails, opportunities for hide and seek, climbing and ziplines.
- Specific plans should be evolved for the Shankill area, in consultation with the community, to ensure the provision of facilities required to support the planned growth, building on its character and heritage.
- Transport Corridors in Shankill and Rathmichael Transport Corridor:
  - The Development Plan proposes very significant increases in population, particularly in the southeast coast strip of the County without any clear plan for corresponding employment and commuting, raising questions where new residents will work and how they will get there.
  - Appendix 1 to the Draft Development Plan references the Bray and Environs Transport Study (2019) but its proposals, while listed in Table 5.3, are not carried through to the Land Use Zoning Maps. Specific concerns arise in respect of the impact of:
    1. The Cherrywood to Rathmichael Link Road on Bride’s Glen and Heronford Lane.
    2. The upgrade of Ferndale Road on the rural nature of the green belt area between Carrickgollogan and Shanganagh Park.

The Green Belt between Shankill and Bray:
- The submission notes the continual incremental erosion of the green belt between Shankill and Bray as a result of actual or proposed developments i.e. Shanganagh Castle, Woodbrook.
- The Rural/Urban Boundary Line (Figure 2.9 Core Strategy Map) should show the preservation of the green belt and the important biodiversity corridor linking Carrickgollogan to the coast at Shanganagh Park and Woodbrook.
- There is a concern that the designation of lands zoned as “GB - To protect and enhance the open nature of lands between urban areas” as a Strategic Land Reserve may lead to further erosion over time, a clear commitment to the preservation of the remaining green belt should be given.
- It is suggested that any further developments in between Shankill, Bray, the mountains, and the sea, including any infill development in areas along Ferndale Road be restricted in terms of height and density to preserve the biodiversity corridor and rustic aspect.

Shanganagh River:
- The submission notes that the Loughlinstown and Shanganagh rivers are specifically identified as ‘important corridors needing further protection’.
- The new linear park should include the fields bounded by the Shanganagh River (which have been identified on a map submitted with the submission), the Deansgrange stream, the railway, and the dunes. It is the southern tip of the Dalkey Coastal Zone and Killiney Hill pNHA and may have potential to be planted as a wet woodland.
- The Council should identify sites of different sizes, like this suggestion, for biodiversity restoration and enhancement, including by developing woodlands, wetlands, and wildflower meadows.
- With respect to Council policy on to the protection and ecological value of rivers the submission suggests that for biodiverse waterways, a wider corridor is needed; at least 30m each side if possible, with public access discouraged within the inner band of at least 10m on each side.

The submission highlights the following:
- The negative impact of street and park lighting on biodiversity.
- With respect to the 10-minute neighbourhoods with a potential population of 20,000, Shankill should be an appropriate location for evolution as a 10-minute neighbourhood, defined in Section 4.2.1.3, with Cherrywood and Bray the most appropriate work locations.
- The plan should commit to the creation of required transport solutions before any large-scale development is commenced.
- The Plan needs to consider appropriate intercity, commuter and local transport solutions, such as LUAS extension, the length of the core Bus Corridor, the number of traffic lights on the N11 route, and no direct regular public transport links from Shankill to adjoining employment zones. Consideration should also be given to a local bus service within Shankill linking it with local transport hubs.
The submission states that proposals for protection of the Crinken Stream should be developed.

Other Biodiversity Corridors such as M11, DART Line, Harcourt Street Line, Local Hedgerows in the Shankill area need to be considered.

Plans should be evolved to provide pedestrian links between parks and other open spaces in the Shankill area and throughout the County and along the coast to Bray.

It is envisaged that that Core Bus Corridor 13 will be terminated at Loughlinstown Roundabout. This will allow an opportunity to provide segregated cycle routes through Shankill, providing direct links to Bray, Killiney, Deansgrange and Blackrock.

Shankill has the potential to evolve as a centre for walking and other outdoor activities, clear signage and road markings should indicate the potential presence of walkers and pedestrian safety improved.

Shankill has several country roads and lanes which may be threatened by proposals in the draft Development Plan, including Quinn’s Road (east of the railway), Heronford Lane, Rathmichael Road, Bride’s Glen Road, Ballybride Road and Ferndale Road. Where possible, every effort should be made to preserve the rural character of these roads.

The following prospects should be preserved:

- Carrickgollogan, Great Sugarloaf and surrounding mountains from numerous locations including Shanganagh Cliffs, Main Street, Quinn’s Road, Shanganagh Park, St Anne’s Church, New Vale, St Anne’s School and Stonebridge Road.
- Great Sugarloaf from the Old Harcourt Street Line Bridge and St Anne’s Church.
- Bray Head from Library Road.
- Kish Lighthouse from Stonebridge Road,
- Three Rock Mountain from Stonebridge Road.
- The Irish Sea from Rathmichael Road.

All new developments should to be fitted with plug in electric points as standard and to consider solar panel car parks. In addition, future building plans should use green energy and be discouraged from incorporating fossil-fuel based infrastructure.

The Development Plan should review the Council’s policies on littering and graffiti, particularly in respect of litter bin placement and bins suitable for dog excrement. The practice of painting street furniture appears to be effective in combating graffiti and should be encouraged.

The submission also includes a draft, Shankill - A Vision for a Biosecure Future, develops the concept of Shankill as a community, which builds on Shankill’s unique location, character and heritage in a way which confirms Shankill’s future as a biosecure community with both urban and rural aspects.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 1, Chapter 5, Chapter 8, Chapter 10, Chapter 14

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Due to notable increase of dog ownership over pandemic period, would like to propose an extension of the existing ‘off-lease’ area at Seapoint.
- Proposed area should include the West Pier (or at least the lower level path) with access from the car park at the pumping stations at Seapoint and relevant signage in place.
- Comments regarding the benefits of being “off lead” to dogs.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 9

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Include spaces to grow food in the Plan.
- Prioritise building and retrofitting of local authority houses as part of a just transition.
- A new ferry service from Dún Laoghaire for non-commercial traffic is required.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 3, 5, 9
DLR Submission No: B1158  
Person: Caroline Maguire  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 1

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission strongly supports the provision of a Dundrum Community, Cultural and Civic centre as proposed in SLO 114.
- The submission also supports the public realm improvements and development criteria for Dundrum mains street set out in the County Development Plan and suggests that these are incorporated into the Local Area Plan for Dundrum.
- The submission indicates that the needs of children should be considered in all aspects of the County Development Plan.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14

DLR Submission No: B1159  
Person: Mary McCaughey  
Organisation: N/A  
Map Nos: 9, 13

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Seek to maintain the Ballybetagh ROW.
- Seek to maintain the ROW (mass pathway) from Barnaslingan through to Enniskerry road opposite the Dublin sports hotel and then up through the ‘Fairy village’ alongside the ski school.
- Seek access to the Dolmen site.
- Seek to ensure that the potential transport upgrades indicated for Ballycorus road do not include widening of the road nor an increase of the speed limit nor any potential increase in volume of traffic due to the new link road from Glenamuck. Speed retarders should be considered at certain stages on the road.
- Request the introduction of a pathway/pavement on at least one side of the Ballycorus road between Lonsdale through to the start of Rathmichael road.
- Welcome the objectives included to ensure the views to the Lead mines and Carrickgollagan are maintained along Ballycorus Road.
- Would welcome easier access to the Bride’s Glen Luas station from Ballycorus road.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 12

DLR Submission No: B1160  
Person: Stephen Little  
Organisation: On behalf of Health Service Executive  
Map Nos: 7

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission relates to lands at the National Rehabilitation Hospital (NRH), Rochestown Avenue,
- Submission sets out phased plans for development of the NRH.
- References 10 year permission granted on 12 August 2020 under Reg. Ref. D19A/0904 for the expansion of the neighbouring pharmaceutical manufacturing facility and ancillary infrastructure, including car parking area.
- In current Plan hospital site is subject to 2 land use zoning objectives – MH and A
- Commentary provided on SLOs in current and Draft Plan.
- Draft Plan shows a small portion of formally zoned E at NRH owned lands which are to be used by Amgen zoned SNI which does not support the expansion of economic/employment uses or the expansion of pharmaceutical manufacturing and ancillary facilities as currently permitted.
- Request rezoning of permitted car parking area back to E
- Request the following SLO - “It is the objective of Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council to actively support and facilitate the redevelopment and expansion of strategic medical-hospital uses, services and ancillary facilities at the National Rehabilitation Hospital lands.”

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 14, Map 7
Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The submission fully agrees and supports the attached submission document and comments made by the residents at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace, Sandycove, Co. Dublin for the 2022-2028 Development Plan.
- The volume of traffic related issues and congestion could be resolved by allowing off-street parking.
- Furthermore, the restrictions on off-street parking for these Protected Structures are too onerous and sensitive off-street parking should be allowed at this location. They should be given the same leniency by the planning authority as the off-street parking granted at the nearby 1,2,3,6 Elton Park, which are also Protected Structures.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 12

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Retain the Ballybetagh ROW.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 12

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Request that identification & protection of public rights of way (PROW) is prioritised in the new development plan. Note over 40 PROWs in the draft plan, which includes the addition of 2 new PROWs, which is to be welcomed.
- Request that the council provides a full status on any legal/court actions currently under way, with respect to existing, disputed or extinguished PROWs. This may be provided to councillors - the last update appears to be from June 2013 item C/471 where a table was provided of resolved and not resolved proceedings.
- Request that the council validates access to existing PROWs which appear to have been restricted as follows:
  - ROW24 - Map 13: Enniskerry Road (opposite Kiltiernan Grange) to Ballybetagh Road via Ballybetagh Wood
  - Map 9 - Glenamuck South; Ballycorus Road to Dingle Glen
  - Map 10 - Brides Glen Road to Rathmichael Road via Rathmichael Cemetery to Rathmichael Wood
- Request that the council considers creation of new PROWs or restoring extinguished PROWs in the following locations:
  - Map 10 - establish a PROW to access the Glendruid Dolmen, from Brennanstown Road to Glenamuck Road North (Carrickmines LUAS station), and/or to Lehaunstown Lane.
  - Map 10 - establish a PROW from Glenamuck Road South to Dingle Glen (via Wayside Celtic Football Club or Glenamuck Cottages)
  - Map 10 - re-establish a PROW from Spur west of Herenford Lane to Ticknick
  - Map 13 - re-establish a PROW from Bishop’s Lane/Druid’s Altar to Kilternan
  - Establish a PROW to access Larch Hill Dolmen, from Mutton Lane to Kilmashogue Lane
  - Define additional PROWs from Barnacullia road (near The Blue Light) onto the mountain, ultimately connecting on the far side to Ticknock Road.
- Request that the council considers erection of signage to identify PROWs. At present, signage is limited and most PROWs are not marked at entry/exit points. This would aid walkers, as well as ensuring that private property and other entrances were not used erroneously. The submission provides examples of suggested suitable ROW signage.
- Request that the council considers as part of the Heritage Plan to maintain historic and cultural sites on private land, or attempt to make those sites accessible to the public. Examples include Kilgobbin Castle, Calbeck’s Castle, Puck’s Castle, etc. If access is not possible, request that the council consider erecting
• Need to reduce car priority in DLR in favour of more sustainable modes, need to provide a connected segregated cycle network (dutch style) and green ways with good connections to public transport. Should also have a pedestrianisation plan along with a greening plan to promote walking and cycling.
• Plant more trees to improve the quality of the environment and make the county a better place to be.
• Development should respect local, streetscape, villages character in terms of style and building heights and balance development with the need for public spaces.

• Given the focus on housing in recent years, the Council appears determined to deliver an increase in housing stock in the area. Inevitably, this will result in some new developments on vacant land. This is a good idea in places near adequate infrastructure (i.e., public transport, good quality roads, shopping facilities, etc.). Higher-density development is generally accepted as a sustainable and efficient way of delivering more housing. However, there is no sense in building large developments in remote parts of the county which have no such infrastructure.
• The south of the county, particularly the Dublin mountains/foothills (i.e., Kiltearnan, Rathmichael, parts of Shankill, Glencullen, Stepaside, etc.) is a “green belt” that guards against excessive urban or suburban sprawl, and must retain its status as land use zoning B and/or G as appropriate.
• To the extent that the proposed Kilternan village (as such is contained in the relevant local area plan) is allowed to proceed, the density of any proposed development must be limited to accord with the character of the area.
• In order to retain local heritage and character, the following must be retained:
  • The Dingle Glen between Glenamuck Road and Ballycorus Road. It is welcomed that this is proposed to be retained as a Natural Heritage Area.
  • All local “mass paths” must be retained.
  • Retain all rights of way including those on the Comer Brothers' lands west of the Enniskerry Road, from the old Kilternan Hotel northwards.
  • In particular, the right of way directly opposite Grange Growers on the Enniskerry Road (otherwise known as the "Ballybetagh right of way" and the right of way running along the Dublin-Wicklow border (at the Hotel/Ski Slope) must be retained.
  • The orchid fields off the Ballycorus Road must be retained.
  • Access to the Kilternan dolmen must be retained.

• Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen Collage to SNI
• Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.
Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Comments regarding Ireland’s and Dublin’s population growth.
- Housing sector has not functioned correctly over last 10 years and just 12,596 units completed between 2010-2015.
- Outlook is positive from a housing supply capacity perspective – comments re number of units permitted/commenced. Apartments are the dominant unit type – this is in line with national planning policy.
- Permissions will need to continue at a similar pace to ensure a constant supply of residential units. Unit delivery needs to increase dramatically (or population restructured) to prevent a shortfall in supply in Dublin. DLRCC should have specific regard to this challenge.
- DLRCC should ensure that the correct amount of land is zoned for the plan period (and headroom).
- Focus on flexibility and high standards.
- Requirement for 40% 3 bedroom units in all apartment schemes of 50 units of more as set out in Table 12.1 is entirely inconsistent with falling household sizes nationwide and in the Dublin area generally, is unjustifiable, unsustainable and completely contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. Strongly opposed to the introduction of Table 12.1 on the basis of an Interim HDNA and refute the findings that lead to any suggestion that 40% of apartments in all schemes over 50 units should be 3 bedroom in scale.
- It is an inherent outcome of these medium to higher densities being sought by the Council in these New Residential Communities that will deliver a wide range of dwelling typologies in themselves and will not simply be a 100% apartment scheme. Submission questions therefore the need to be any more prescriptive than the mix provided for under SPPR 1 of the Apartment Guidelines (2020).
- Example of mix in Woodbrook development given.
- Invite the Council to consider the fact that the existing housing stock across the County remains heavily skewed towards 3-Beds + and it is new apartment schemes in particular that are suitable to meet the needs of falling household sizes going forward when re-assessing this aspect of the Draft Plan.
- Discussion regarding NPF - signifies a fundamental shift away from allowing urban sprawl, and advocates more compact urban growth focused on public transport that will deliver a far more dense compact urban environment. This is intended to provide for significantly reduced commuting times and lead to a greater quality of life for residents / worker over time.
- Strategic outcomes of NPF are worth noting – compact growth, sustainable mobility, strong economy supported by enterprise, innovation and skills, enhanced amenities and heritage.
- Emphasis on National Policy Objectives – NPO 3a, NPO13, NPO33, NPO35.
- NPO35:
  
  “While apartments made up 12% of all occupied households in Ireland and 35% of occupied households in the Dublin City Council area in 2016 (Census data), we are a long way behind European averages in terms of the numbers and proportion of households living in apartments, especially in our cities and larger towns. In many European countries, it is normal to see 40%-60% of households living in apartments. To more effectively address the challenge of meeting the housing needs of a growing population in our key urban areas, it is clear that we need to build inwards and upwards, rather than outwards. This means that apartments will need to become a more prevalent form of housing, particularly in Ireland’s cities. This is underpinned by on-going population growth, a long-term move towards smaller average household size, an ageing and more diverse population, greater mobility in the labour market and a higher proportion of households in the rented sector. The economics of apartment construction can be more challenging than that of conventional housing. However, through more effective land management, regeneration and development initiatives, and new planning, regulatory and funding approaches to apartment development, meeting the housing requirements arising in major urban areas for people on a range of incomes a will be a major priority for this Framework and the actions flowing from it.”

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 12
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1168</td>
<td>Owen Keogh</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- It is considered that the policy with respect to Trees/Woodland and Forestry, does not reflect the private ownership of forestry in the Dublin Mountains and the commercial basis of these forests.
- Any Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) must be made with close communication and full agreement with any private landowner in the County.
- Requests that maps in Appendix 15 Green Infrastructure Strategy - Map A2 be updated to show the ownership of lands.
- Chapter 13 Land Use Zoning - Table 13.1.4 and Table 13.1.5 – Request that Agricultural Tourism and Residential are noted.
- The Council should engage more stakeholders in the development of this Plan, namely the Irish Farmers Association, private landowners in the Dublin Mountains, business owners in the Dublin Mountains and other stakeholders in the Dublin Mountains.

*Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 9, Chapter 13 and Appendix 15*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1169</td>
<td>Cllr Jim Gildea &amp; Cllr Frank McNamara</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Request rezoning from SNI to F of area at Loughlinstown Hospital

*Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 10*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1170</td>
<td>Martin Quinless</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Dogs should be allowed off lead on West Pier in Dun Laoghaire at all times or else at designated times.
- Comments regarding the benefits to dogs being off leash.

*Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 9*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1171</td>
<td>Gina Haug</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission notes that the rezoned Kilternan/Glenamuck area does not provide the opportunity for proper green space and play areas for both existing and new residents to integrate.
- Concern is expressed in relation to the new park proposed in Kilternan.
- Submission expresses concern in relation to reports submitted on applications.
- Quality of life for the children and communities should be at the centre of the Plan providing safe recreational green space, for all ages.
- The submission highlights the struggle for crèche places and school places, and a lack of local amenities to support the additional homes in the Glenamuck area.
- Historical right of ways and walks should be maintained and promoted.
- The lands west of the Enniskerry Road, The Dingle, and Ballycorus Valley must be protected for future generations to also enjoy.
- Natural habitats of protected wildlife, and native wooded areas should be taken into consideration.

*Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 4, Chapter 8 and Appendix 12*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1172</td>
<td>Pauline Brooks</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests that Mullen’s Field, currently zoned F, is retained as public open

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1173</th>
<th>Person: M. McElree</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3, 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission in support of the proposal in the Draft County Development Plan to Remove 'Candidate ACA' status from a section of Station Road and in particular my property Two Trees, Station Road, Glenageary and the proposal to upgrade the area of Marlborough Road to full 'ACA' status.
- ‘Two Trees’ was built in the late 1990’s and it is not considered that the property should be included as a candidate ACA or full ACA status.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1174</th>
<th>Person: Martin Anderson</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission states that there is a lack of large open spaces and native tree plantations in Dublin 18. Large native woodland areas and green spaces need to be integrated into all plans for the Glenamuck distributor road and surrounding area development, to encourage biodiversity and secure natural habitat for animals such as long eared owls, bats, kestrels and other species.
- The submission considers that too much of south county Dublin lands have been over developed without consideration for the natural environment.
- The County Development Plan should manage any loss of habitat and ensure it has a minimal impact on our beautiful countryside.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 8 and Chapter 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1175</th>
<th>Person: Paul Byrne</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen Collage to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1176</th>
<th>Person: Rachel Caviston</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Due to the notable dog increase over the pandemic period, proposal of an extension of the existing off-lead area at Seapoint (Beach Bye-Laws 2012, Section 3 (k)(i)) to include:
  - The West pier either in its entirety or the lower path with access from the car park at the pumping stations at Seapoint.
  - Relevant signage is required.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1177</th>
<th>Person: Saava Cooney</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Concerns regarding road safety both on the Monkstown Road & Seapoint Avenue. Concerned with vehicles breaking the pedestrian lights on Monkstown Road, request additional measures such as traffic cams.
Seapoint Ave cycle track is a great success would like a similar track (fully segregated) on Monkstown Road.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1178</th>
<th>Person: Tom Kivlehan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 1,2,5, 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DLR is committed to 50% reductions in its carbon emissions (CO2) by 2030 or 7% per year under the 2021 Climate Change Bill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Eastern Bypass is contrary to the commitments and vision of Chapters 3 and 5 of the Plan. As a County we have started to make a positive modal shift in favour of public transport and active modes supporting a reservation is contrary to this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Requests that the Eastern Bypass SLO 4 removed from maps 1,2,5,6 of the Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1179</th>
<th>Person: Paul Saunders</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The submission fully agrees and supports the attached submission document and comments made by the residents at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace, Sandycove, Co. Dublin for the 2022-2028 Development Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The volume of traffic related issues and congestion could be resolved by allowing off-street parking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Furthermore, the restrictions on off-street parking for these Protected Structures are too onerous and sensitive off-street parking should be allowed at this location. They should be given the same leniency by the planning authority as the off-street parking granted at the nearby 1,2,3,6 Elton Park, which are also Protected Structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The CMR is supported but the traffic congestion fallout in Sandycove now needs to be resolved by the council and this off-street parking would be part of the wider solution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A copy of the submission to amend the Plan is included with the submission which notes the planning history for the Terrace, the case for off-street parking at Breffni Terrace, including the positive interventions of same and requested that the Plan is amended to reset the parameters on off-street parking at this location, to sensitively incorporate off-street parking and to adopt a commensurate higher level of tolerance for future planning applications for off-street parking at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1180</th>
<th>Person: Alice Rooney</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The submission fully agrees and supports the attached submission document and comments made by the residents at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace, Sandycove, Co. Dublin for the 2022-2028 Development Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The volume of traffic related issues and congestion could be resolved by allowing off-street parking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Furthermore, the restrictions on off-street parking for these Protected Structures are too onerous and sensitive off-street parking should be allowed at this location. They should be given the same leniency by the planning authority as the off-street parking granted at the nearby 1,2,3,6 Elton Park, which are also Protected Structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The CMR is supported but the traffic congestion fallout in Sandycove now needs to be resolved by the council and this off-street parking would be part of the wider solution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A copy of the submission to amend the Plan is included with the submission which notes the planning history for the Terrace, the case for off-street parking at Breffni Terrace, including the positive interventions of same and requested that the Plan is amended to reset the parameters on off-street parking at this location, to sensitively incorporate off-street parking and to adopt a commensurate higher level of tolerance for future planning applications for off-street parking at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
higher level of tolerance for future planning applications for off-street parking at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1181</td>
<td>Gerard Cooke</td>
<td>Greenville Road Residents Association</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission states that the Greenville Road residents would like to see the reinstatement of trees on the road which have been systematically removed over the years and have never been replaced.
- The County Development Plan provides the perfect opportunity to “Green Up” the road again.
- The submission includes details of the history of Greenville Road and details with respect to the removal of trees along Greenville Road.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1182</td>
<td>Brian Flynn</td>
<td>Dún Laoghaire Tidy Towns Group</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission is focussed on the town centre and the harbour area.
- DLTT are actively participating in the ongoing harbour study and fully recognise the importance of our maritime heritage and potential.
- Support the proposal to create a national maritime centre in Dún Laoghaire, but this is a national rather than county policy matter.
- The town centre should be the vibrant beating heart of our county with national and international recognition. Main street and its environs are generally in a very dilapidated state; derelict buildings, empty commercial premises, general lack of specialist retailers (fish shop, delicatessen, wine shop, boutiques, etc.), ill-maintained and littered laneways and streets, fast food outlets s, lack of outdoor seating and landscaping when compared to our neighbouring towns, etc.
- Seek the following:
  - A quantitative and qualitative assessment of achievements and shortcomings of the previous plan.
  - A clear set of short, medium and longer term objectives.
  - A clear prioritisation among the different projects in each of the above categories.
  - An indication of the potential requirements and potential availability of funding.
  - A proposed mechanism for tracking progress on the implementation.
- Understand that final decisions on many of the above issues may be in the remit of local and national government authorities, but the plan should make proposals in this regard.
- Section 8.2 provides an “appraisal” on progress since the 2016-2022 plan. This section is less than satisfactory and appears to indicate that improved cycle access has been provided between Cualanor and the seafront. Not aware that this has been accomplished.
- Even without the latest delay on the Baths due to COVID-19 the project appeared to be well behind schedule.
- What is the current state of the improved pedestrian access routes between George’s street and the sea front? What has been completed?
- “Significant evolution in terms of the residential offer in Dún Laoghaire”. Are any statistics available on this?
- DLTT is not opposed to any of the proposals in Appendix 8, but request that the following priorities are addressed.
  - Facades – Incentives and sanctions to improve shop facades.
  - Priority street scaping for George’s Street – such as has been carried out in neighbouring towns
  - Dún Laoghaire shopping centre is an outdated, inefficient and ugly eyesore.
  - Signage – Town entrances are anonymous – most if not all of our neighbouring towns have “Welcome to xxx signs”.
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• **Sunday markets** – An imaginative solution could easily be found to locate the Sunday market in Georges street and its environs.

• **Music and Arts** – Simple solutions such as a buskers corner could be explored. Street art should be encouraged/funded in laneways.

• **Cleansing** – Streets in the commercial heart of Dublin city are cleaned several times each day. While the early morning cleaning by the cleansing department is admirable, we then suffer almost 24 hours of littering. The Peoples park is kept spotlessly clean, yet our town centre is a disgrace on many occasions. Many of the proposals in Appendix 8 are aimed to promote increased footfall in the town centre. Yet at no stage is there any reference to the need for increased cleansing activities and facilities (e.g. bins).

• **Anti-social behaviour** – Needs to be addressed in the context of the Dún Laoghaire Urban Framework Plan. Providing improved access between Georges Street and the seafront via Sussex Street is meaningless unless the issues around illegal drinking and drug taking around the Boylan centre are addressed in tandem.

• **Greening** - There are frequent mentions of increased “greening” and bio-diversity initiatives, but these appear to be linked to longer term projects. There are many quick wins that DLTT is willing take on with DLRCCO support and ensure delivery of real immediate improvements. Would like to see a planned incremental stepped approach (e.g. Georges place, hospital and Boylan centre).

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

**Appendix 8**

---

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Recognises Sandycove as a unique place but considers that it is broken.
- Concerned with congestion, traffic movements, inadequate infrastructure, emergency vehicles and bin lorries getting stuck.
- Welcomes cycle path.
- Includes an Specific Local Objective recommendation for a plan to resolve the needs of the Sandycove Loop in a way that will facilitate visitors whilst also respecting its status as an Architectural Conservation Area and as well as the needs of local residents.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

**Chapter 5**

---

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Submission from a tenant of Ardmeen House, Newtownpark Avenue (RPS No. 2058) objecting to its addition to the RPS.
- Submission notes the composition of the structure noting that the property consists of three structures / households.
- Submission raises concerns in relation to the affordable maintenance of the property and future affordability of rental accommodation therein.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

**Appendix 4**

---

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The submission fully agrees and supports the attached submission document and comments made by the residents at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace, Sandycove, Co. Dublin for the 2022-2028 Development Plan.
- The volume of traffic related issues, safety, and congestion could be resolved by allowing off-street parking.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):

**Appendix 4**
- Furthermore, the restrictions on off-street parking for these Protected Structures are too onerous and sensitive off-street parking should be allowed at this location. They should be given the same leniency by the planning authority as the off-street parking granted at the nearby 1,2,3,6 Elton Park, which are also Protected Structures.
- The submission also acknowledges the volume of traffic related issues submitted by other residents within Sandycove.
- The CMR is supported but the traffic congestion fallout in Sandycove now needs to be resolved by the council.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1186</th>
<th>Person: Caitríona Flynn</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The submission fully agrees and supports the attached submission document and comments made by the residents at Nos. 10-15 Breffni Terrace, Sandycove, Co. Dublin for the 2022-2028 Development Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The volume of traffic related issues, safety, and congestion could be resolved by allowing off-street parking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Furthermore, the restrictions on off-street parking for these Protected Structures are too onerous and sensitive off-street parking should be allowed at this location. They should be given the same leniency by the planning authority as the off-street parking granted at the nearby 1,2,3,6 Elton Park, which are also Protected Structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The submission also acknowledges the volume of traffic related issues submitted by other residents within Sandycove.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The CMR is supported but the traffic congestion fallout in Sandycove now needs to be resolved by the council.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1187</th>
<th>Person: Amy Burgess</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Submission considers there is not enough parking in the area, making it a problem for residents and access for emergency services noting cars are often blocking lane ways to parked on double yellow lines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Submission notes the installation of toilet facilities should be permanent and not temporary so as not to threaten the beauty of the area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1188</th>
<th>Person: Maire O’Brien</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Requests for more improved signage which include old Irish script.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Advantages of more signs include attracting more tourists and more businesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Miscellaneous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1189</th>
<th>Person: Michael Crowe</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2, 3, 4, 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Submission and Observation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The submission requests that Policy Objective CA11: Onshore and Offshore Wind Energy and Wave Energy (Section 3.4.2.2) is expanded to be consistent with other objectives in the plan to protect sensitive coastal environments and views.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Ireland must meet its Climate commitments and how this is achieved needs to be considered. There are currently proposals for a continuous series of wind farms from the Kish lighthouse to the Arklow bank. The County Development Plan needs to have a voice to mediate in these proposals.

• The submission requests that Policy Objective HER14: Demolition within an ACA (Section 11.4.2.2) requires a more robust policy to protect the County’s historic fabric and compensatory energy solutions should be sought in the form of heat pumps, solar energy, and smart technology.

• MAP 3 should show an objective for cycle link between Blackrock Park and Blackrock Dart station.

• MAP 4 should show a symbol to protect views from Sorrento Park summit.

• The Council should extend 0/0 designation to include all of the Vico Road ACA.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 3, Chapter 8, Chapter 11 and Chapter 12, Maps

DLR Submission No: B1190

Person: Paula O’Connell

Organisation: N/A

Map Nos: 1

Summary of Submission and Observation:

• The submitter notes that a large proportion of their property is designated as an Area of Flood Risk Concern - Flood Zone B on Flood Zone Map 1.

• The property has been in the ownership of the submitter’s family for approximately 55 years and no part of the property has ever flooded from the River Slang.

• Understand that works were completed upstream of Dundrum Town Centre following the flooding that occurred there in late 2011 to preclude the possibility of same recurring and would presume this would also preclude the possibility of any flooding downstream of the Town Centre.

• Concerned at the designation which has significant and adverse implications particularly from a property insurance and land use perspective and request that it be reconsidered.

• The submitter attached a map of their property for identification purposes.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 10, Appendix 16

DLR Submission No: B1191

Person: Eamon Regan

Organisation: N/A

Map Nos: 1

Summary of Submission and Observation:

• Expresses dismay with SHD process and high rise development.

• Considers that Plan should continue pattern of elegant squares that make up Dublin and suggest a return to 19th century low rise higher density model achieving densities of 100 units per hectare with 3 or 4 storeys. Also suggest using the city block as utilised in Berlin, Barcelona and other cities

• Suburban development of the 1950’s and 60s is unsustainable

• Considers that zoning mitigates against multiple uses and has very little spatial or architectural content.

• Submission provides commentary on working with the Imagine Dundrum group which was a positive experience

• Considers that there is a reluctance to formulate a new vision for the County and that the post Covid era provides an opportunity to provide a strong urban design Plan at much more granular level than zoning.

• Submission includes sketches of Dundrum

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 1, 4, 13, Miscellaneous

DLR Submission No: B1192

Person: Y

Organisation: N/A

Map Nos: 4

Summary of Submission and Observation:

• Complementary to all the work DLR have done along the coastal towns for pedestrians and cyclists.

• Request that improvements are rolled out to Barnhill Road to redesign it to make it safer for cyclists.

• More cycle parking requested near AIB in Dalkey and also traffic restrictions around Loreto Dalkey to improve pedestrian and cycle safety.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5
### DLR Submission No: B1193
- **Person:** Niall Burgess
- **Organisation:** N/A
- **Map Nos:** 4

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission notes the Plan must balance development of Sandycove Harbour as a public good with the needs of residents and notes the need for a traffic management plan for the area.
- Submission notes bottlenecks and delays are a growing concern for all, impacting on air quality and impeding access for emergency services.
- Submission considers a long term plan for Joyce’s Tower, with appropriate capital investment, should be developed.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5.

### DLR Submission No: B1194
- **Person:** Anne-Marie Healy
- **Organisation:** N/A
- **Map Nos:** 9

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The summary requests that the wood at the top of Dixon lane remains on private land and is not destroyed.
- That the orchids in Ballycorus valley are saved and that there is no dumping.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 9

### DLR Submission No: B1195
- **Person:** D. O’ Connor
- **Organisation:** Dublin Friends of the Earth
- **Map Nos:** N/A

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- **Climate Action:**
  - Sets out context of development in DLR in terms of reducing carbon emissions in line with the Paris Agreement and recent Climate Bill. Recommend that DLR ensures rapid phasing out of fossil fuels. This includes gas and fracked gas (as part of its energy mix). Advocate that data centres are powered on site with renewable energy and also utilising heat recovery.
  - Request Dublin CARO office, Codema and the Env/Climate Change section of dlr to improve communications with the public possibly with SEAI.
  - dlr Climate Change Action Plan (2019 to 2024) is an excellent document; need to maintain ambition and exceeding targets to achieve zero emissions by 2050.

- **Neighbourhood - People, Homes and Place:**
  - Quality housing and sustainable neighbourhoods are very important and how they are constructed is also important. Sets out the issue with embodied carbon and how this should be addressed. Reuse of building stock is very important and most sustainable. DLR has a lot of existing stock which could be transformed into housing.
  - Embodied carbon needs to be mentioned in the Plan.
  - Welcomes the 10 minute neighbourhood and suggests that permeability is improved to encourage this.

- **Transport and Mobility:**
  - Welcomes recent improvements to public transport and active modes. Concern with predominance of car traffic which has a negative impact on air quality and health. Further villages and towns could be pedestrianised further while allowing cycle and disability access.
  - Recommend the following:
    - Introduction 30km speed limit.
    - More cycle parking for bikes and cargo bike.
    - Access to parks should be improved for active modes and public transport, remove kissing gates.
    - Cycling and pedestrian infrastructure development should be accompanied by planting especially along busy streets to filter the air pollution.
    - Mount public awareness campaigns against engines idling.

- **Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity**
  - Commends the approach to wilding our parks and green spaces.
  - Should also include plans to increase litter management and recycling in parks.
Requests a range of amenities including more wildlife areas, seating, picnic tables, water refill stations, outdoor classrooms and natural play.

- Facilitate the use of open/underutilised space for food growing

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 3, 4, 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1196</th>
<th>Person: Elizabeth Clooney and Colman Curran</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- Refers DLRCC’s Climate Change Action Plan 2019-2024 (CCAP) and the development planning process and the core value of Climate Action in the Council’s corporate Plan.

**Transport:**

- Refers to transport being the highest source of CO2 related emissions in Ireland. Refers to Kiltiernan-Glenamuck being described as a new residential population with a large increase in population and the majority of it dependent on the Glenamuck District Roads Scheme (GDRS). Refers to the Planning Inspector’s view of the scheme as outdated and unreflective of sustainable movement and placemaking ABP-303945-19.
- Requests that the Council reviews the Glenamuck District Roads Scheme (GDRS) in the interest of Climate Action, impact on biodiversity in terms of hedgerow loss (identified by HCLA as mature).

**Biodiversity**

- Refers to the importance of saving nature making economic sense. Considers that it is not possible for the Council to promote biodiversity while at the same time granting permissions which results in the indiscriminate loss of ditches and mature trees.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 5 and 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1197</th>
<th>Person: Rosemary Kevany</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7, 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The submission relates to the Special Area of Conservation indicated on Map B1 of the Ecological Network and requests that the boundary of this map be extended southward, to cover the area of Killiney Bay.
- The submission also notes in the light of the importance of Killiney Beach there is a consequent obligation to protect the ecological territory within and surrounding Killiney Bay.
- The submission includes a link to Map B1 of the Draft County Development Plan.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 8, Appendix 10 and SEA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1198</th>
<th>Person: Nicola Stapleton Jones</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

- The submission acknowledges the breadth of issues dealt with by the current Draft County Development Plan and the complexity associated with its preparation.
- A review of the plan should be undertaken to confirm that the plan is compatible with the Government’s carbon reduction trajectory and to also take account of COVID 19.
- The submission notes that some ambiguity or misalignment has arisen between the current Ballyogan and Environs Local Area Plan (LAP) and the Draft County Development Plan regarding the existing tree line on the eastern boundary of Kilgobbin Heights which forms the boundary between the Stepaside Central and Kilgobbin South areas as defined in the LAP. Cross reference will no longer be as clear due to the renumbering of the Plan and the lack of a directly analogous piece of text.
- In this regard, it is requested that the Council confirm the ongoing applicability of the LAP and update any cross reference.
- The submission considers that the tree symbols on the Draft Plan maps do not provide adequate illustration with respect to the extent of mature trees and hedgerows at Kilgobbin Heights.
- Submission details the role of mature trees and hedgerows in Kilgobbin heights.
- An area of sufficient width to protect the trees, their root structure and hedgerow running the entire length of this boundary at Kilgobbin Heights/South should be bounded/shaded on all relevant maps and designated as Objective F.
- The specific requirement to retain the trees and hedgerow in this area for the dual purpose of residential amenity and ecological value should be noted in the Development Plan, in addition to the current LAP.
- A Tree Preservation Order should be put in place for these trees and the intent to do this should be reflected as a specific objective for this location.
- To preserve the ecological corridor along this stand of trees the area around the trees should remain in the common area of any future development in Kilgobbin South.
- Several photographs of existing trees and hedgerows in the area and map extracts accompany the submission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1199</td>
<td>Dervla O’Leary</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Considers that no further zoning is required on map 9 for development.
- Densities and heights need to be managed along with transition from urban to rural.
- Important to manage the transition from residential to rural within Map 9 and ensure that building heights are lower (2 to 3 storeys) in areas adjacent to agricultural and high amenity land.
- Need to ensure sufficient land is zoned for recreational purposes on map 9
- The design and form of buildings should be in keeping with the rural environment. The County Development Plan should specify building finishes, which should include local granite finishes. This should be stipulated for all building finishes in the Map 9 area.
- Support for retention of trees and hedgerows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1200</td>
<td>Cormac Devlin TD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Acknowledges the extent of the achievements of the 2016 Plan.
- Supports the S2S project and its delivery during the lifetime of the proposed Plan 2022-2028. Important in terms of tourism, health, safe and scenic routes and could incorporate the coastal defenses which Dublin City and County will need. Requests that it is shown on each of the relevant plan maps.
- SLO 160 from the current Plan should be reinserted into the Plan (safeguarding Killiney and Glenageary roundabouts to prevent traffic gridlock)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1201</td>
<td>Gareth Craig</td>
<td>Silchester Park Residents Association</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission seeks a change to the zoning of the sports field situated at the centre of Silchester Park from A to F.
- Submission notes that the field is held in trust under a long sporting lease on behalf of the residents of Silchester Park and Silchester Crescent and is available to approx.170 households.
- Submission notes that it is the only significant block of recreational land in the local area which has not been zoned as ‘Objective F’.
- Submission notes a number of recreational uses of the site for local residents and states that it is maintained by the residents as a recreational amenity.
Submission notes that mature trees / areas of shrubbery around the boundary and a cultivated section as a wildflower meadow promotes biodiversity.
Submission considers that the community use of the field helps contribute to the SCO’s 1, 2 and 4.
Maps showing the location and current zoning are attached to the submission.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1202</td>
<td>Muireann O'Higgins</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Anger at SHDs – resulted in the granting of several, obtrusive, high rise, overpriced apartment blocks.
- These apartments are often sold to overseas hedge funds who then charge high rents for them. Young people can no longer afford homes as competing against these.
- Some apartments are empty as rents being charged are too high.
- SHD schemes bypass local objections and allows no input from locals into the development of their area.
- Only way to object is via JR – very costly.
- Purpose of submission is to alert DRCC of the unease of the SHD strategy in the locality (Dublin 16) and it will do nothing to ease the housing situation but instead will destabilise society.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Miscellaneous at end of Vol 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1203</td>
<td>Gareth Craig</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission seeks a change to the zoning of the sports field situated at the centre of Silchester Park from A to F.
- Submission notes that the field is held in trust under a long sporting lease on behalf of the residents of Silchester Park and Silchester Crescent and is available to approx. 170 households.
- Submission notes that it is the only significant block of recreational land in the local area which has not been zoned as ‘Objective F’.
- Submission notes a number of recreational uses of the site for local residents and states that it is maintained by the residents as a recreational amenity.
- Submission notes that mature trees / areas of shrubbery around the boundary and a cultivated section as a wildflower meadow promotes biodiversity.
- Submission considers that the community use of the field helps contribute to the SCO’s 1, 2 and 4.
- Maps showing the location and current zoning are attached to the submission.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1204</td>
<td>Paula O’Connell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Half of their property in Dundrum is zoned Objective MTC on Land Use Zoning Map 1 of the in line with adjoining properties while the remainder is zoned Objective A
- Request a rezoning to MTC as current zoning may be an anomaly.
- Welcome opportunity to meet planning official on site to discuss.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1205</td>
<td>Ossian Smyth TD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Refers to Section 12.4.5 setting minimum ratios of car parking and how this results in an unsustainable outcome in terms of cost, car ownership, travel patterns and carbon. Proposes removal of car parking minimums and replacement with maximums. 3 bed units should have 1 space and instead move towards membership of a car club.
- The renting of car parking spaces should not be restricted in planning permissions as this results in the under use of these spaces.
- It is unclear if the East Coast Trail is inland or coastal and whether it includes walking and cycling. The S2S, coastal promenade and cycle path, should be included as per previous plans.
- New schools should be designed as traffic free zones without drop off points except for children with disabilities.
- Plan should clarify that permeability objective refers to sustainable transport means and not private cars.
- Residential streets which are used for rat runs should be installed with filtered permeability subject to a plebiscite.
- If off street car parking is being provided to charge EVs then the practise of charging for the removal of on-street parking should be ended.
- Council should allow estates to turn their green spaces into pollinator friendly meadows.
- Pastiche style developments should be allowed in ACAs.
- Remove SLO 37 Dunleary House (yellow brick house) and remove from the Register of Protected Structures; it has no architectural merit and might prevent housing being built that could accommodate many families in a dense urban location.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5, 8, 12, 14, Appendix 4

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Public consultation hub is very accessible, and the individual documents are really well laid out.
- However, the CDP is too wordy.
- ‘Impact upon’ is not defined – subjectively applied by Planners with a bias towards the least controversial, often mediocre, outcome.
- Policy Objective MFC3: Placemaking in our Towns and Villages – renovation of Frascati SC a shambles, however the renovation of Blackrock SC is exemplary.
- Be more aggressive with Hammerson and their development in Dundrum.
- Assignment of shop type to quarter is more restrictive than encouraging.
- Last-mile delivery hubs for distribution by cargo bike were not mentioned.
- Retail proposals - “Provide a detailed Retail Impact Assessment (RIA) and a Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) to accompany the application where appropriate, having regard to location, scale of development proposed and retail hierarchy.” – this should be funded by DLRCC initially and then reclaimed from shop in additional rates when they can pay for it.

Chapter 3 – Climate Action
- Embodied carbon and life cycle analysis needs to be included in CDP. Mentioned in current CDP was not adhered to. Needs to be strictly enforced.
- Lack of allotments needs to be addressed.
- Planting trees is one of the main methods to mitigate climate change.
- Why are there so many parks in DLCOCO but they are mostly barren from any carbon sequestering plants?
- A tree planting scheme is required and people should be encouraged to plant trees in their private gardens.

Chapter 4 – Neighbourhood – People, Homes and Place
- Dichotomy exists in CDP between ‘higher density’ new development and protecting the residential amenity of the existing.
- 50 uph near transport or town centre is too low. Should be 100.
- 35 uph as default is too low. Should be above 60.
Chief Executive’s Report on Draft Plan Consultation

Volume II – Summary of Submissions Received

- Pg.82 'in ACAs and cACAs' new residential development will be required to minimise any adverse effect in terms of height, scale, massing and proximity’ – this is a threat to sustainable development. This would mean that the most desirable locations continue to exist as rich-ghetto, museums of rusticity.
- Including even limited grounds for ‘the capacity of the local road network’ as an excuse to prevent development is a bad move. Roads can absorb new development if people are willing to get out of their cars and walk or cycle.
- Specifying Killiney and Dalkey as no-development zones is the result of NIMBY lobbying and will only serve to prolong these areas as rich ghettos.
- P.83: ‘Prevent any new development or change of use which would seriously reduce the amenity of nearby dwellings.’ – This is a risk, contra to enterprise and the 10-minute neighbourhood concept. What if someone wants to open a bar or nightclub? What about the night time economy?
- ‘Prevent the inappropriate change of use of existing residential properties to non-residential uses.’ – Risk against 10-minute neighbourhood concept / enterprise: Could this be used against someone trying to change the ground floor of a semi-d on an otherwise mundane suburban street into a vibrant local café?
- p.83: ‘On all developments with a units per hectare net density greater than 50, the applicant must provide an assessment of how the density, scale, size and proposed building form does not represent over development of the site.’ - Including this would be a threat to sustainable development; firstly by setting too low a density threshold and secondly by requiring extra work on behalf of the developer/architect. This should be scrapped or revised to 100uph.
- p.83: ‘On all developments with height proposals greater than 4 storeys the applicant should provide a height compliance report indicating how the proposal conforms to the relevant Building Height Performance Based Criteria’ - Scrap this for the same reason as above or revise to 6 stories.

Chapter 12 – Development Management

- Section 12.3.4.2: ‘glazing to all habitable rooms should not be less than 20% of the floor area of any habitable room’ - no simple rule of thumb for daylight in a room because orientation and context play such a big role. Should be excluded as it is an unreliable metric. Stick to proper daylight analysis as specified in the BRE report mentioned.
- Section 12.3.4.3 Naming of Residential Estates: DLRCC needs to pay more attention to names.
- 12.3.5.2 Separation Between Blocks: Needs to be seriously interrogated and not set as a default. Should be scrapped or based on successful case studies eg. Goldsmith Street Housing, England, 16m.
- 12.3.8.1: Extensions to dwellings: Too restrictive. Misses opportunity to add character. Eg. Extensions to front: ‘a significant break in the building line should be resisted unless the design can demonstrate to the Planning Authority that the proposal will not impact on the visual or residential amenities of directly adjoining dwellings.’ – balance is impossible to achieve – either allow it or don’t.
- Alterations at Roof/Attic Level - too prescriptive and ignores the potential variety and character that varying roof lines and building heights could bring to create a street identity and sense of place.
- 12.3.8.5: Sub-division of dwellings: DLRCC needs to focus on this. Many nice, bespoke developments permitted, but also many off-the-shelf houses that are mundane and detract from the character of areas which should not be permitted. Pg. 241 of CDP - one of those unsightly houses is shown as exemplar development - pastiche and at odds with the mid-century bungalows surrounding it.
- 12.3.8.8 0/0 Zone: Should be omitted. Goes against sustainable development and would exclude vast areas that are well served by public transport.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapters 3, 4, 5, 12, 14
Chief Executive’s Report on Draft Plan Consultation  
Volume II – Summary of Submissions Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1208</td>
<td>Dervla O’Leary</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes that the owners of Bellavista (RPS No. 2073) has done significant works to the property and while it is a nice house, there is nothing noteworthy, special of historical to warrant it being on the RPS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1209</td>
<td>JP Flynn</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider a cycle lane for Foster Avenue should be provided and submission refers to detailed design issue of same.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1210</td>
<td>Stephen O’Dea, O’Dea and Moore Architects on behalf of the Butler family</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes that the inclusion of ‘Rosefield’, Kerrymount Avenue (RPS No: 1965), in the RPS is unwarranted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes that the property has been extensively modified over the past 20 years with the original house being enveloped into a much larger contemporary building, original windows have been replaced and their proportions altered. It is noted that no remaining historic architectural character remains.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planning permissions have been cited in the submission including extant permissions that are due to commence (D18B/0565 and D19B/0197).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1211</td>
<td>Shane Naughton</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Submission and Observation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission objects to the addition of Heather Lodge, Kerrymount Avenue (RPS No. 2053) to the RPS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission notes that the special interest of the structure is external only and considers that the property is adequately protected as it is located within the Foxrock ACA – reference to Section 3.2.9 of the Architectural Heritage is noted, which warns local authorities against unnecessarily doubling-up on heritage designations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission considers that the designation is discriminatory as other similar properties on the road have not been added to the RPS – criteria for adding are not clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The interior of the property has been significantly refurbished and its of little merit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The listing of the property would impair its vale.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A conservation report prepared by John Cronin &amp; Associates is attached with the submission and is summarised below:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The report contains an opinion that the proposed addition of the property to the RPS is not warranted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The report notes that the property is adequately protected as it is located within the Foxrock ACA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The report sets out the details of the NIAH record for the property.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The report agrees with the ACA designation for the area, however, the extra layer of protection and burden on a property owner is considered to be wrong in this instance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The report notes that the interior does not display fabric or features that warrants special inclusion in the RPS.

The report refers to refurbishment works to the property and notes that the inclusion to the RPS would not benefit the owner in terms of funding for restoration works.

The report includes a number of photos of the interior of the structure.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1212</td>
<td>Kill O’ The Grange Church of Ireland</td>
<td>Kill O’ The Grange Church of Ireland</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission raises concerns in relation to the adding of Kill O’ The Grange Church (RPS No. 2039) to the RPS.
• Submission queries the extent of the protection and seek clarity that the wording and protection only refers to the church and not the parish centre as this was constructed c.1988 and has not architectural or heritage importance.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1213</td>
<td>Mrs Bridget Aylmer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the addition of Dunleary House as the building has significant characteristics of special interest.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1214</td>
<td>Denis Rice</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
Note: This is a double of submission B0437, except that this submission was uploaded with accompanying photos.

Pedestrians and Cyclists
• Congratulate the Council on the initiatives undertaken on behalf of pedestrians/cyclists over the past 6 months, however, there is still no sense that the village is pedestrianised. Ultimately, the village needs to be pedestrianised.
• Despite being well served by public transport, the car has priority in Dundrum. If it is to become a village that belongs to the people, then the car must be removed.
• Great work has gone into improving the environs of Dundrum, but the various Pedestrianised/cycle paths should be linked together.
• The completion of a pedestrianised/cycle Link joining Meadowbrook, Ballawley Park, the Town Centre, the Village Centre, Finsbury Park/ Weston, Super Valu Churchtown, and Nutgrove would be beneficial.

Transport
• Travel to Dundrum Village or Town Centre should be by foot, cycle or public transport. Travel by car should be a last resort and should be financially penalised.

Parking
• No parking should be allowed in the village. In neighbouring estates, there should be no parking between 11.30 am and 1.00 pm and 2.00pm and 3.30 pm (or similar), to reduce all day parking in residential areas.

Luas Bridge/ Taney Junction
• The Luas Bridge is unsightly and the undercroft area is not pedestrian friendly. The bridge divides lower Dundrum from the village. A possible solution is to create a walkway cum cycle route from the site of the current Central Mental Hospital, through Taney Green and Crescent with a pedestrian crossing to Taney Drive and an enlarged, upgraded, and very well-lit underpass of the Luas, linking the Luas station walkway to the Village.
Arrival in the village by Luas

- The first stop for many visitors to Dundrum will be the Luas Stations. Both have issues as follows:
  - **Dundrum Station** – dangerous steps lead down to a very steep and unpleasant laneway, between the two banks. With Ulster Bank going, could Bank of Ireland move into present Ulster Bank and demolish the BofI building, enabling a proper walkway to the Village and to the Council offices to be created, similar to the one at Dublin Airport with photos depicting the history of Dundrum?
  - **Balally Station** is worse, people wouldn’t use it even in the middle of the day. Getting to the Town Centre is a nightmare with traffic.

Dundrum Village/Old Shopping Centre

- Dundrum village is on life support. Whilst retaining some of its original character, it has more recently lost its way with hotchpotch development, e.g. the Credit Union which is situated at an angle and is not in keeping with the Village.
- The Village needs to be remodelled in the form of a landscaped park and primarily a place where people live.
- Any development of the village should minimise hard landscaping, as far as is possible (please no stark cold red brick). The street surface needs to have a finish that is pleasant to walk on with some give, not solid cement, which is exhausting.
- Major developers tend to ignore certain demographics when it comes to retail, particularly the older shopper.
- Whatever development emerges in the village, it is critical that the same excellent level of management is in place to that of the Town Centre.

Proposed Village Walkways

- The village requires walkways from the Kiosk entrance to the town Centre, through the Crossroads (with pedestrian right of way) past the Church down to the Luas Station.
- Where the current entrance is to the Car park [old shopping centre], there needs to be another walkway of about 20 feet in width, heading west towards where Matt Britton's is at present, and then turning left or heading south to a walkway at the back of the Church.
- The area to the city side of the new walkway could have a three/four storey building, hotel or the like with an overpass to the island where the buses turn, with its own underground parking.
- The walkways should be very comfortable to walk on with plenty of seating, and where practical have planting and green areas to give that sense of calm parkland, contrasting with the lively hubbub of the Town Centre.
- Lighting as used in the carpark in the Grange Golf Club or that used between the two banks as you get off the Dundrum Luas, would add to the character of Dundrum and if used on all the walkways, would create a magical atmosphere.
- The most comfortable type of walkway is probably the monastic cloister style (modern version of Stillorgan with character) where you are under cover and have a view of an area of mown lawn running down the centre of the walkways (perhaps artificial grass could be used).
- Another alternative is the laneways in Brighton a great example of how small laneways lend themselves to a very pleasurable and interesting shopping experience, with lovely small squares dotted around. Brighton’s Laneways are a bit on the narrow side, wider would be needed.
- The scale of Kildare Village is easy on the eye (not sure about the choice of outlets, but again no issues with traffic).

Proposed Village Walkways

- The village requires walkways from the Kiosk entrance to the town Centre, through the Crossroads (with pedestrian right of way) past the Church down to the Luas Station.
- Where the current entrance is to the Car park [old shopping centre], there needs to be another walkway of about 20 feet in width, heading west towards where Matt Britton's is at present, and then turning left or heading south to a walkway at the back of the Church.
- The area to the city side of the new walkway could have a three/four storey building, hotel or the like with an overpass to the island where the buses turn, with its own underground parking.
- The walkways should be very comfortable to walk on with plenty of seating, and where practical have planting and green areas to give that sense of calm parkland, contrasting with the lively hubbub of the Town Centre.
• Lighting as used in the carpark in the Grange Golf Club or that used between the two banks as you get off the Dundrum Luas, would add to the character of Dundrum and if used on all the walkways, would create a magical atmosphere.
• The most comfortable type of walkway is probably the monastic cloister style (modern version of Stillorgan with character) where you are under cover and have a view of an area of mown lawn running down the centre of the walkways (perhaps artificial grass could be used).
• Another alternative is the laneways in Brighton a great example of how small laneways lend themselves to a very pleasurable and interesting shopping experience, with lovely small squares dotted around. Brighton’s Laneways are a bit on the narrow side, wider would be needed.
• The scale of Kildare Village is easy on the eye (not sure about the choice of outlets, but again no issues with traffic).

Areas for Public Entertainment
• Areas could be designed to cater for entertainers that would give the village a reputation for quality street music etc. that would complement Village life and not destroy it. Links with the art council and performing arts colleges could be integral to the success of the project.

Retail
• The link between the Town Centre and the village needs to be seamless yet it is vital that we do not end up with a little Town Centre, as retail looks like it will continue to struggle.
• Artisan shops and homegrown single traders, is what the people want and will support, provided their produce is realistically priced. The likes of the English Food Market in Cork is a good example, where local businesses seem to survive and flourish.
• Rents in the Village will determine the success or otherwise of the area, they must be affordable to homegrown single traders.
• The upwards only rent act has to be scrapped. Clearly it is up to our TD’s to pass legislation to bring an end to the practice.
• The 2 years prior to 2020 showed that if the likes of House of Frazer, Coast, etc. can collapse because of astronomical rents then it is only a short time before Dundrum will die a death and the local residents are left to pick up the pieces.

Proposed Community Building
• Design - High ceilings and large glass windows seem to dominate Architect’s thinking. They may be aesthetically pleasing, and win awards, but they are not comfortable, and waste internal space. Use of light is about clever positioning and sizing of windows highlighting a tree/a view, etc. E.g. Taney Parish Centre meeting room 1, upstairs).
• ½ Day / Day Courses:- the building should be used as a centre for fun learning for all ages, having a Professor in residence (like Carlsburg in Copenhagen) charged with providing daily / ½ daily courses on a never ending range of subjects, throughout the year, (Australia have a similar concept), the only criteria is that they are open to everyone, for a nominal charge / free. School children, from time to time could attend courses, as part of their curriculum. This would comprise a number of small areas on one floor with partitions, but opening out to a central atrium capable of catering for up to 250 people (usual size ceiling).
• Food - might take up another floor. Kitchens could be accommodated where people could buy, and/or bring their food and learn to cook healthy food under the guidance of cooks. A place where you can go to pick up practical tips on all aspects of food /storage/ wastage/costing etc., even get meals supplied for those needing help with this area. Every effort needs to be made to address obesity.
• Performing arts:- A full storey of the building should be given over to the performing arts as there are a large number people with great creative talent but with few outlets to express themselves(unlike those who are sporty).
• Dundrum CFE could move into the building and resite the B of I branch on the present CFE site beside other banks if Ulster bank is not a solution.
• The library should be linked to the Community building by a covered walkway. Alternatively, look at resiting the library in the Community Building. Also, there are thousands of books sitting in homes owned by people who would be delighted to see them in a properly run library.
• Civic Square - Please avoid the call for a big open Civic Square in the development, as whatever benefit they have for odd events, they are for the most part a massive invitation to unruly behaviour, are invariably awful in bad weather, and will in no time lead to “a no go area”.

Civic outdoor space
The area to the back of the church has great potential to be used as a civic outdoor space. Tiered seating could be installed on a permanent basis with temporary cover as needed for events. There could be a walkway around the perimeter from Ballinteer Road, The Bypass sloping down to the village streetscape.

- Central Mental Hospital site
- 14 stories, not appropriate - the only winner is the developer. This would be totally at odds with probably 95% of those living in the Dundrum area. Heights should be four stories maximum.

**Signage**
- Dundrum Luas Station makes a fabulous starting point for the Wicklow way, and should be well signposted.

**Love 30**
- Love 30 is great for built up areas, but housing estates should be the priority.

**Pilot Pedestrian programme**
- A pilot programme to give the estate back to the pedestrian, should be undertaken and could consist of the following:
  - A speed limit of 30 km per hour for all vehicles (enforced by community / Traffic Gardai)
  - Footpaths for pedestrians only (enforced by community / Traffic Gardai)
  - Pedestrians and cyclists would have right of way in the estates.
  - A competition could be held to devise a new sign indicating that you are entering a pedestrianised zone.
- Possible trial locations include Larchfield, Mount Carmel, Rosemount, Farmhill, Taney, Holywell, Dromartin, Ardglass, Parkvale, Dun Emer, Balally, Woodpark, Broadford, Ludford, Hillview, Meadowbrook, Ailesbury, Sweetmount, Mountainview, Weston, Finsbury, Woodlawn, Landscape, Frankurt, Annville, Somerville.

### Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
- Chapter 7, Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1215</th>
<th>Person: Thomas and Pam Donlan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission has no objection in principle to the addition of the Gate Lodge at Dorney Court (RPS No. 2010) to the RPS, however, in the even that this designation prevented new double glazed windows from being added, then the addition to the RPS is objected to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1216</th>
<th>Person: Micheál McMullan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen Collage to SNI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1217</th>
<th>Person: Jack M. Kearney</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission relates to Waltham Terrace Candidate Architectural Conservation Area and includes a letter from the owner of No. 33 Waltham Terrace and a letter from the Royal Institute of Architects of Ireland with respect to the description of the use of the title ‘architect’ in Ireland as per the Building Control Act, 2007.
**DLR Submission No:** B1218  
**Person:** Mary C. O’Donohue  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen Collage to SNI  
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Map 7

---

**DLR Submission No:** B1219  
**Person:** Sinead Rehill  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 3, 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission welcomes the inclusion of Marlborough Road ACA in the Draft County Development Plan (CDP).  
- However, there is a concern that the boundaries of the proposed ACA have been too restrictive.  
- The large houses on Adelaide Road are of considerable heritage value and they constitute the link between the developments of Silchester Road and Marlborough Road.  
- The submission requests that the Council amend the Marlborough Road ACA to incorporate a wider area including the lands along Adelaide Road and Station.  
- It would also accord with the advice in the Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities, at par 3.2.5 that “The boundaries of a candidate ACA should make physical, visual and planning-control sense”.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Appendix 4

---

**DLR Submission No:** B1220  
**Person:** Cliona Buckley  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 10

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Planners should treat Rathmichael area as an area for architectural and environmental consideration – no reference to this in the CDP.  
- The character and rural nature of Rathmichael has remained unchanged since the 1960’s.  
- The trees and hedgerows in the area provide an essential habitat for biodiversity of plants, birds and animals. It provides a habitat corridor linking Ballybride Rd, Ferndale Rd to Rathmichael Woods and Carrickgollogan.  
- Roads are substandard, intermittent footpaths, poor lighting.  
- Problem with flooding and drainage in area. IW still have not completed their Drainage Area Plan for the area.  
- Density of 36 houses should be reduced in the areas as none of the essential services exist.  
- DLRCC should concentrate on housing developments in areas where there is the necessary infrastructure such as Cherrywood, Kilternan, Woodbrook.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 4, 10, 11

---

**DLR Submission No:** B1221  
**Person:** Cliona Buckley  
**Organisation:** N/A  
**Map Nos:** 10

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests that Emerald, Ballybride Rd (RPS No. 1973) is removed from the RPS.  
- Submission considers that the property does not has sufficient architectural merit – the exterior is of some note but the interior has been altered many times and is of no interest.  
- Submission states that the exterior will not be altered.  
- Submission notes that the listing of the property would result in additional financial burden in maintaining the property having to apply for planning permission for any works to the property.  
- Remedial works carried out to the property is listed in the submission and it is noted that the property is well maintained.
Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1222</th>
<th>Person: Senator Victor Boyhan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 1, 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission requests that two additional SLOs be included in the CDP as follows:

**Dún Laoghaire Greening Project**
- This proposal sets out a vision for Dún Laoghaire to become a low carbon, climate resilient and sustainable town.
- Key changes to the physical environment would be located at Myrtle Square & Covent Garden (area in front of Bloomfields), St. Michael’s Church and Environs, and at Carnegie Library and Library Road.
- The proposal previously formed the basis of a grant application by the Council under the URDF fund.

**Dundrum Civic and Community Centre**
- This proposal is for a Civic and Cultural Hub in Dundrum, based on a recommendation made in the Community, Cultural and Civic Action Plan.
- Funding was previously sought and part granted through the Urban Regeneration and Development Fund.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 14, Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1223</th>
<th>Person: Gerard Lardner</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission considers there to be a missing SLO (98) north of Bray Harbour.
- Submission considers that the listing of The Ochra (House), Thornhill Rd (RPS No. 1982) to be inappropriate.
- Submission notes that the property was built 19900-1903 by William H. Byrne Architects, however, considers there to be better examples of such properties in Co. Dublin.
- Submission notes that the interior is not original and sets out changes that have occurred including, fitting, plumbing, lighting / electoral changes.
- Submission notes that the property is not of great architectural or cultural significance.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 14, Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1224</th>
<th>Person: Ken Casey and Emma Casey</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission considers that Corners, Knocksinna (RPS No. 2015) does not satisfy the criteria for adding to the RPS.
- Submission considered that the Ministers recommendation is incorrect, erroneous and flawed as a matter of planning law and decision making. Additionally, any report from the local authority or decision by the Elected Members that follows the Ministers decision is also flawed.
- Submission notes that the owner did not seek the addition of the property to the RPS and states that no inspection was carried out of the property.
- Submission notes that the Ministers recommendation is not based on actual knowledge of the present state of the property.
- A copy of the Ministers recommendation has not been provided to the property owner and no reference or reason for its addition can be found online.
- Submission notes that covid restrictions have prevent them from viewing the physical display of the draft plan.
- Due to the obligations of listing the property, it is submitted that a failure to provide reasons for listing is flawed as a matter of law.
• Submission notes that the property has been modified over the past 80 years and sets out works that have been carried out including changes to the curtilage and entrance gates.

• Submission notes significant financial and other liabilities that the inclusion on the RPS would entail.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1225</td>
<td>David Dunne</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10, 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Remove the inhibitions created by SLO93 regarding new builds in Rathmichael due to 2021 Wastewater Code of Practice, providing that their concerns are fully met by future planning applications in the area.
• A blanket ban on housing is not appropriate in the middle of a housing crisis given that there are now the technological and systems solutions for the problems that need to be addressed.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapters 10, 14 (maps 10 and 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1226</td>
<td>Mairead Mehigan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission supports the addition of Dunleary House as the building has significant characteristics of special interest.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1227</td>
<td>Peter and Joan McCann</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Welcomes Policy Objective T22: Roads and Streets and requests that Falls Road is included in Table 5.3 6 year Road Objectives and shown on Map no 10 as there is presently no footpath and lighting is inadequate.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1228</td>
<td>Joe Sorohan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Welcomes Policy Objective T22: Roads and Streets and requests that Falls Road is included in Table 5.3 6 year Road Objectives and shown on Map no 10 as there is presently no footpath and lighting is inadequate.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1229</td>
<td>Keogh Contracting Ltd</td>
<td>Local business</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Welcomes Policy Objective T22: Roads and Streets and requests that Falls Road is included in Table 5.3 6 year Road Objectives and shown on Map no 10 as there is presently no footpath and lighting is inadequate.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1230</td>
<td>John Keogh</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Welcomes Policy Objective T22: Roads and Streets and requests that Falls Road is included in Table 5.3 6 year Road Objectives and shown on Map no 10 as there is presently no footpath and lighting is inadequate.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1231</td>
<td>William Huggard</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1232</td>
<td>Colette and John McDonald</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1233</td>
<td>Jane Robinson and Mani Ramaswami</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1234</td>
<td>Kieran O‘Malley and Co. Ltd on behalf of Jackson Way Properties Ltd. (James Kennedy and Antoinette Kennedy)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9, 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission requests that Glentanar, Torquay Road (RPS No. 2009) is removed from the RPS.
- Submission notes that no rationale for its addition to the RPS was provided.
- Submission notes that the property is no a grand example of architectural style and has no historically important structures. The property has also been modified in a number of ways.
- Submission notes that there was no inspection of the property.
- Submission notes difficulties in obtaining information with regard to the addition of the property to the RPS from the council and obtaining expert advise from a professional.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**

Appendix 4

### Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Submission requests the re-zoning of lands at Carrickmines Great from Objective ‘B’ (and a comparatively smaller area of land zoned Objective ‘G’), to Objective ‘E’, in order to facilitate a mixed use development comprising a hospital campus, hotel and non-retail employment. It is also requested that the road objective that runs through the lands is upgraded to a six-year road objective.
- An overview of the location, the landowner’s wider landholding, the existing land use zoning and the roads objective that runs through the subject lands, is provided.
- Submits that all necessary infrastructure including transportation, drainage and municipal services, is in place to service an urban development. Highlights that, notwithstanding the provisions of the...
Cherrywood SDZ Planning Scheme that include the Kilternan Link Road and Priorsland Bridge, the landowners have an independent written agreement with the NRA to link their lands north and south of the M50 by providing an overbridge over the M50.

- An overview of development in the area is provided out and it is contended that this confirms the suitability and attractiveness of the area for living, working and recreation. Submits that the Council will require additional zoned land for urban development to provide for sustainable employment opportunities for the future resident population.

- Submission provides an analysis of the Employment Strategy of the Draft CDP, and in particular the quantum of Objective ‘E’ zoned land. Submits that the Draft CDP does not provide sufficient employment zoned land to meet the projected demand over the plan period and that additional employment zoning is required.

- Submits that the re-zoning of the subject lands would be compliant with the Guiding Principles to identify locations for strategic employment as set out in the RSES. Reasons are set out, and include: it would address the limited provision of zoned employment land in the County; it would utilise and provide a greater return on public investment in the area; it would enable other urban land to be developed for more efficient purposes; it would respond to the emerging pattern of planning and development in the area; it would boost the County jobs ratio; and, it would support compact and sustainable growth.

- Submits the re-zoning would be consistent with national policy to identify locations for strategic employment and regional policy by addressing an identified need for new hospitals.

- An indicative masterplan layout is included which sets out the anticipated future employment development of the lands. Submits that the implementation of the Masterplan would enable the construction of the Kilternan Link Road and Priorsland Bridge. This would deliver strategic access to the Cherrywood SDZ lands and also address electricity capacity issues at Cherrywood.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Map 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1235</td>
<td>Justin and Lynda Burke</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The submission welcomes the inclusion of Marlborough Road ACA in the Draft County Development Plan (CDP).
- However, there is a concern that the boundaries of the proposed ACA have been too restrictive.
- The large houses on Adelaide Road are of considerable heritage value and they constitute the link between the developments of Silchester Road and Marlborough Road.
- The submission, therefore, requests that the Council amend the Marlborough Road ACA to incorporate a wider area including the lands along Adelaide Road and Station.
- It would also accord with the advice in the Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities, at par 3.2.5 that “The boundaries of a candidate ACA should make physical, visual and planning-control sense”.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1236</td>
<td>Justin and Lynda Burke</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- The submission notes that Marlborough Road was developed from 1870 onwards, in three phases. The dwelling in the ownership of the observer is one of the 20th century dwellings, which are smaller than those of 19th century with a simpler finish.
- The dwelling contributes to the architectural heritage of the area by virtue of its location, its design and finishes being generally consistent with other houses and its site layout and boundary treatment.
- The dwelling needs to be upgraded including its energy performance, and possibly extended in the near future. The proposed ACA designation may prove unduly restrictive in this respect.
• The submission requests that the character appraisal report for the ACA is amended stating that proposals for extensions to the houses within the ACA, particularly those of 20th century, will be treated favourably provided that such are visually subservient to the original and employ materials which are in keeping with the existing.

• The submission welcomes the inclusion of Marlborough Road ACA in the Development Plan, save for this caveat.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------|----------|

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• This is a duplicate of the submission received and summarised in full under B0935 above.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Refer to issue raised under B0935.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1238</th>
<th>Person: Edmund Rice School Trust</th>
<th>Organisation: Edmund Rice School Trust</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Playing grounds at CBC Monkstown are owned by the Christian Brothers and the Edmund Rice Schools Trust (ERST) only have a license. The Brothers are currently in the process of transferring this over to the ERST.
• A portion of the land can be excluded from the licensed area at any time. This is a long term arrangement.
• Consider SNI rezoning appropriate for the school and ancillary playing pitches but not for the .34 hectares which is suited to infill development. Request reinstatement of the A zoning.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 3

|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------|

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission requests rezoning of lands at Corrig Avenue from F so that the owners has their commercial use rights reinstated.
• Considers that the Council have not pursued the provision of the public park at this location.
• Considers that the location is well removed from any demand for open space.
• Current uses are non conforming.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1240</th>
<th>Person: Carol English and Liam English</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
• Submission does not support any proposed development at Clonkeen College and notes development would have negative impact on surrounding residents.
• Notes development would result in increased traffic, noise and pollution. In particular it would add to current stress on the entrance to Meadowvale Estate.
• Notes current issues around traffic in the area of the school when students are arriving and departing.
• It is unclear where any entrance would be to new buildings.
• Notes the playing fields at Clonkeen had a number of users in the community until recently and continue to be an asset to the area.
- Submission notes particular impact from a new development at this site as the privilege of green space to the rear of the property would be denied.
- Submission notes there was no mention of additional building in the area when they purchased their house in 1969.
- Residents have no control over the fast-tracked SHD system.
- Submission supports the rezoning of lands at Clonkeen College to SNI
- Requests that residential is neither permitted in principle nor open for consideration on SNI lands.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1241</td>
<td>Jacobs Engineering</td>
<td>Amgen</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Consider Plan is impressive and inspiring
- Amgen is strategic site employing 700 people in a specific industrial area.
- Current permission for a car park to serve Amgen. SNI is a direct contravention of this permission.
- Request retention of the E zoning on lands at Amgen.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1242</td>
<td>John Burke</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- The submission welcomes the inclusion of Marlborough Road ACA in the Draft County Development Plan (CDP).
- However, there is a concern that the boundaries of the proposed ACA have been too restrictive.
- The large houses on Adelaide Road are of considerable heritage value and they constitute the link between the developments of Silchester Road and Marlborough Road.
- The submission, therefore, requests that the Council amend the Marlborough Road ACA to incorporate a wider area including the lands along Adelaide Road and Station.
- It would also accord with the advice in the Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities, at par 3.2.5 that “The boundaries of a candidate ACA should make physical, visual and planning-control sense”.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1243</td>
<td>RPS</td>
<td>Our Lady of Perpetual Succour, Foxrock</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Object to SNI zoning on the presbytery associated with Foxrock Church. Request rezoning to A as it is in residential use.
- It is considered that permitted in principle uses for the SNI zoning objective would not be suitable for the presbytery due to its location close to a busy road.
- Notes that the church at Foxrock is now on the RPS but the presbytery is not nor is it within the curtilage. Minor works to presbytery can be carried out without planning permission or a section 57 declaration.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Map 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No:</th>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Map Nos:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1244</td>
<td>RPS</td>
<td>Osbourne &amp; Co</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission relates to the Legionaries of Christ site in the SUFP area.
- Welcome SNI zoning
• Request reduction of open space standard on SNI sites not currently used for recreational purposes and with good access to public transport.
• Request increase of plot ratios on the site from 1:0.5 to 1:2

**SLOs**

• Request that SLO51 and 64 are amended to ensure the long term future of St Michael’s House School.
• Amend 51 as follows: To provide for primary and post primary education facilities at Legionaries of Christ lands (which in this case involves the replacement of St Michael’s House School which provides for both primary and post primary cycles) and at Stillorgan Industrial Estate/Benildus Avenue.
• Amend 64 as follows: To provide for office-based employment uses in accordance with the zoning objective and a masterplan, outside of the campus required the replacement of St Michael’s House School which provides for both primary and post primary cycles for primary and post primary school(s), on the lands known as the Legionaries of Christ.

**Height**

• Commentary is set out in relation building heights policies contained in the plan, the height guidelines, SPPRs, OPR submission at pre-draft stage in relation to blanket restrictions,
• Considers that inclusion of MAP 3 is contrary to SPPR1 of the Height Guidelines and request it’s omission.
• Notwithstanding it is considered that the permissible height on the site reflect the existing uses and the does not reflect emerging context of the site.
• Request permissible heights of 6 – 8 storeys for the Legionaries site if Map 3 not removed.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Chapters 12, 14, Appendix 5, 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1245</th>
<th>Person: Gibbons &amp; Associates</th>
<th>Organisation: Garnish Investments</th>
<th>Map Nos: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

• Submission relates to 35/37 Glasthule Road
• Request that the NC zoning which does not extend across entire site is rectified.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 3

|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------|

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

• Letters from TJ O’Connor and Kiaran O’Malley are duplicates of that submitted and summarised under B0829 above.
• Note 1: page 2 of Kiaran O'Malley & Co Ltd. letter was not received.
• Note 2: Enclosure #2 A3. plan from Reg. Reg.: D07A/0619 was not received
• Submission also includes a map from the 2011 variation

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
Map 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1247</th>
<th>Person: Sinéad O’Brien</th>
<th>Organisation: Department of Tourism, Culture, Arts, Gaeltacht, Sport and Media - DAU</th>
<th>Map Nos: 5,9,10,14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**

• The submission considers that adequate provisions have been made in the section on Heritage in respect of safeguarding and works to protected structures and the implementation of legislation.
• The submission recommends that in the review of the Draft County Development Plan that built heritage is considered as an integral part of the wider built environment and should be dealt with holistically throughout the plan.
• New policy areas of Heritage Ireland 2030, the National Policy on Architecture are both pending and the importance of the historic maritime towns and villages and their infrastructure to the evolving national maritime strategy.
With respect to Climate Change the submission considers that the approach of making built heritage integral to other areas of the plan is not evident in particular the built heritage as part of the climate change mitigation, particularly in the context of the Green Deal funding programme and the maritime strategy.

Consideration of historic port infrastructure survey and upgrade/renewal, vacancy and condition surveys of historic town and village centres are vital. A focus should be on reuse, repair, and adaptation to underpin sustainable development goals and climate action.

With respect to Economic Development the submission considers that sufficient mention of built heritage as part of the town centre renewal frameworks has not been made and the opportunities of heritage – led regeneration in identifying core built heritage assets and new uses for vacant buildings, trans-generational housing and community resources within existing structures needs to be prioritised.

The connection between Architectural Conservation Areas (ACA’s) policies and town centre revitalisation has not been adequately made. The inclusion of policy regarding ACA’s and archaeology should be considered and implementation of key funding streams or town programmes such as the Heritage Council’s Irish Walled Towns Network (IWTN), the Historic Towns Initiative (HTI) and the Collaborative Town Centre Health Check Programme (CTHCP), with objectives for community engagement in place making and cultural tourism opportunities.

With respect to Promoting Compact Growth the submission considers that the Plan requires objectives for the protection of built heritage character, reuse of urban buildings and their historical context with appropriate infill to their character and scale as part of the future revitalisation of urban centres.

The sustainable development of towns and villages requires the consolidation of urban fabric, sensitive infill of under-utilised backlands and reuse of vacant buildings, and the importance of historical places, their evolution and surviving significance and characteristics need to be referenced and considered as part of new development proposals.

The cultural significance and clustering of built and archaeological heritage of key towns and villages and cultural landscape define the character of the remit of Dún Laoghaire – Rathdown County Council. Their long-term survival is key and is supported by the completion of the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage and the consideration of the Minister’s recommendations on completion of the Interim survey.

A specific policy is required around the identification of archaeological and built heritage and its role in urban regeneration may be supported by the setting up of multi-disciplinary Local Authority teams to assist the planning process. Additionally, design criteria for the design of tall or large-scale buildings within historic towns or villages set to Dublin Bay is required to off-set the negative impact of overly high development proposals on the wider amenity and context.

With respect to Cultural Heritage the submission notes the interconnection between built and natural heritage and the importance of the resource of the National Inventory of Architecture (NIAH) and the NIAH Garden Survey as the basis for assessment and interconnection of culturally significant sites as part of blue and green infrastructure projects and regional parks.

The Department recommends that the Development Plan has within it a stand-alone dedicated ‘Archaeological Heritage’ chapter/section.

As noted in the SEA Environmental Report, with respect to Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Heritage, fifteen Monuments in State Care are listed including Howth Church. This monument is clearly located in Fingal County Council and should not be included in the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown CDP.

In addition, for Table 10.1 Indicators, Targets, Sources and Remedial Action there is a section covering Cultural Heritage. The column that covers remedial action has the following entry:

Where monitoring reveals visitor pressure is causing negative effects on key tourist features along these routes, the Council will work with the Regional Assembly, Fáilte Ireland and other stakeholders to address the pressures through additional mitigation tailored to the plans.

Conservation management plans should be considered to include protection from damage caused by too many visitors. All sites included in the Record of Monuments and Places and their context within the landscape should clearly be protected, where possible, from adverse effects resulting from development granted under the Plan.

The Appendices are also relevant with Appendix 4 Heritage Lists having a useful listing of Recorded Monuments for the County, particularly for developers.

With respect to Nature Conservation:
• The Department welcomes and commends the general approach taken in the draft Plan in Chapter 8 ‘Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity’, but also in Chapter 3 ‘Climate Action’, Chapter 9 ‘Open space, Parks and Recreation’, and Chapter 10 ‘Environmental Infrastructure and Flood Risk’.

• Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Appropriate Assessment (AA) (and their associated reports) appear to have been successfully integrated to inform the objectives and policies incorporated in the draft Plan and minimize its effects on biodiversity.

• Consideration should be given to utilising The Natura Impact Report and SEA Environmental Report in this introductory chapter to assist in placing the Plans role in conserving the County’s natural heritage in context.

• The Department of Tourism, Culture, Arts, Gaeltacht, Sport and Media - DAU welcomes that there is no requirement to zone any additional land for residential development in the draft Plan as this should limit the encroachment of urbanisation onto the undeveloped lands of the County and will aid the conservation of these undeveloped areas’ relatively rich wildlife habitats.

• The integration of the Ecosystems Services Approach into the Draft Plan, is also welcomed.

With respect to Chapter 3:

• The implementation of Policy Objective CA 17 Urban Greening involving biodiverse landscaping, including the planting of trees, and the employment of nature based solutions to SuDS, will have direct beneficial impacts on biodiversity as well as resulting in positive effects on climate.

With respect to Chapter 5 Transport and Mobility:

• With regards to Policy Objective T2 Delivery of Enabling Transport Infrastructure states that the Council will collaborate with Wicklow County Council, the National Transport Authority (NTA) and Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII) to deliver enabling transport infrastructure to facilitate the expansion of Bray, including a busway from Fassaroe to Old Connaught over the County Brook at Ballyman Glen. Extreme care will have to be taken in the design and construction of this proposed bridge so as to avoid any detrimental impacts on this SAC and particularly on the hydrology of the petrifying springs it is designated to protect.

• The submission noted the Dublin Bay Trail, “Policy Objective T12 Coastal Cycling: Infrastructure Objective: It is a Policy of the Council to promote the development of the Dublin Bay Trail from the boundary with Dublin City to Wicklow County as a component part of the National East Coast Trail Cycle Route.”

• This section goes on to state in relation to this coastal route that “Any development proposals shall be subject to Appropriate Assessment Screening in accordance with the requirements of the EU Habitats Directive to ensure the protection and preservation of all designated SACs, SPAs and pNHAs in Dublin Bay and the surrounding area.”

• It is recommended that this sentence should be replaced by the sentence ‘Any development proposals shall be subject to Ecological Impact Assessment and Appropriate Assessment Screening to ensure the protection and preservation of all designated SACs, SPAs and pNHAs in Dublin Bay and the surrounding area.’, as Appropriate Assessment is not obliged to consider the effects of a proposed project on pNHAs, but only any impacts on European sites.

With respect to Chapter 8 Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity:

• The submission welcomes and strongly supports the policies and objectives set out with regards to green infrastructure and biodiversity particularly the proposed integration of environmental considerations into Development Plan policies as a whole.

• The implementation of the forthcoming Wildlife Corridor and Biodiversity Action Plans for the County are looked forward to by the Department of Tourism, Culture, Arts, Gaeltacht, Sport and Media - DAU.

• The Department of Tourism, Culture, Arts, Gaeltacht, Sport and Media – DAU also look forward to the intention of the Council to renew and update the existing Green Infrastructure Strategy for the County in the course of the lifetime of the 2022-2028 CDP.

• In Section 8.5.4 of this chapter dealing with Policy Objective GI10: Dublin Bay Biosphere it is recommended that the sentence “The biosphere is managed by the Dublin Bay Biosphere Partnership which includes Fingal County Council, Dublin City Council, DLR County Council, Dublin Port Company and the National Parks and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht.”, is replaced with ‘The biosphere reserve is managed by the Dublin Bay Biosphere Partnership which includes Fingal County Council, Dublin City Council, DLR County Council, Dublin Port Company and the National Parks and Wildlife Service of the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage.’ To reflect both the official UNESCO designation accorded to Dublin Bay and the recent change of parent Department for the NPWS.
• In Section 8.6 of this chapter the Council’s policy concerning access to the Dublin Mountains within the Council area is set out, but it is considered that this section fails to highlight the mountain area’s intrinsic natural heritage value including their biodiversity significance. It is recommended that, while the objectives of maintaining and enhancing access to the mountains should be retained in this section, it should first highlight the mountains’ importance as natural and scenic amenities and the Council’s commitment to conserving them.

• The presence of EU Habitats Directive annex habitats, such as dry and wet heaths and blanket bog, and bird species such as red grouse and merlin should be referred to, and their occurrence both within those parts of the Wicklow Mountains National Park, the Wicklow Mountains SAC and the Wicklow Mountains SPA which extend into Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown, and outside these protected areas in Kilmashogue, Tibradden and Ballybrack in Glencullen.

• The linkages between the presence of these habitats and traditional land usages, could in addition be mentioned. The importance of the conifer plantations in the mountains for red squirrels should also be set out and the roll of Coillte’s new subsidiary, Coillte Nature, in managing them.

• The title of this section might be switched around as well to ‘The Mountains and Access to Them’ to reflect this proposed change in emphasis.

With respect to SLOs:

• In relation to SLO 18 on Maps 2, 4,7,10 and 18, concerning promoting the development of the Dublin Bay Trail, please see comments in relation to Section 5.5.4 in Chapter 5 above.

• In relation to SLO 26 on Map 4, concerning the retention and redevelopment of the Carlisle Pier, it is recommended that there should be an addendum to this SLO to read as follows: ‘The black guillemot colony nesting in the under-structure of the pier will be preserved.’

• In relation to SLO 117 on Maps 10 and 18, concerning the feasibility of incorporating the East Coast Cycle Trail into any coastal protection works required between Corbawn Lane and the proposed DART station at Woodbrook, please see comments in relation to Section 5.5.4 in Chapter 5 above.

• On Maps 9, 10 and 14: in the areas zoned for mainly residential development in the Shankill-Rathmichael, Old Connaught and Kiltiernan areas, old tree lines and hedgerows of some biodiversity value occur, and should be retained in line with Council policy when these lands are developed.

• On Map 10: in the Shankill-Rathmichael area the County Council owned lands zoned residential astride the M50 include areas, particularly along the Kiltiernan branch of the Loughlinstown River in the Bride’s Glen, of considerable biodiversity value as has been identified in Council commissioned surveys. These lands will require sensitive development to conserve as much of their ecological value as possible.

• On Map 5: the development of the lands zoned for residential purposes immediately south of the Fitzsimons Wood proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA), and lying between the wood and the Blackglen Road is liable to put much pressure on the pNHA to which up to now these lands have formed a buffer. Combined with developments recently permitted or proposed along the Sandyford Road to the south east of the wood, such development would essentially isolate Fitzsimons Wood, which is managed by the Council’s Park’s Department, as an island in suburbia. If such development is contemplated, it is recommended that provision should at least be made for a wildlife corridor from Fitzsimons Wood towards the Woodside-Ticknock area, possibly requiring the installation of a ‘green bridge’ across the Blackglen Road when it is upgraded.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 1, Chapter 2, Chapter 3, Chapter 8, Chapter 14, and SEA.

Summary of Submission and Observation:

• Submission requests that a red brick and granite church building at Tivoli South Dun Laoghaire is added to the RPS as the building is considered to be significant and of special interest.

• A photo of the structure is attached with the submission.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4
- Submission requests that consideration is given to adding the Dún Laoghaire Harbour Management Plan, prepared by Shaffrey Associates, as an appendix.
- Submission states that this addresses concerns, challenges and vulnerabilities associated with the built structures of the Harbour, Heritage Management Policies and an Architectural Inventory.
- Submission states that this work needs to inform the future plans for the Harbour.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1250</th>
<th>Person: Caroline and Patrick Gray</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission requests that the addition of Herberton, Upper Kilmacud Road (RPS No. 2127) and welcomes the opportunity to secure the future of the structure.
- Submission states that there would be a preference to have the structure added to an ACA for the 4 no. adjacent/adjoining properties, however, if this isn’t feasible, the addition to the RPS is accepted.
- A S.57 is sought in relation to exemptions for interior improvements.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1251</th>
<th>Person: Andrew Hewat</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission requests protection of Woodford, Ballybride Road (RPS No. 1999) only applies to the original property and not later extensions.
- Submission requests that the mapping is amended to align with the older building.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1252</th>
<th>Person: Angela Lemass &amp; Derry O’Donovan</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission notes a preference to have 1 Sydenham Place (RPS No. 2129) designated as an ACA, however, the addition to the RPS is noted as being the best way to protect the property at the moment and S.57 would be sought for internal works.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1253</th>
<th>Person: Máire O’Brien</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- This submission from a tenant at Ardmeen House, Newtownpark Avenue (RPS No. 2058) is a duplicate of B1184 which is summarised in full above. It is noted that B1184 contains additional paragraphs at the end of the submission.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR Submission No: B1254</th>
<th>Person: Michael Liuzzi</th>
<th>Organisation: N/A</th>
<th>Map Nos: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Submission and Observation:
- Submission requests that the Gate Lodge at Beechlands (Ranville Lodge) (RPS No. 1978) is removed from the RPS.
- Submission notes that the property was originally the gate lodge to Beechlands.
 Submission noted that the property has been extensively modified and extended and there are no remaining significant features.

 Submission sets out works that have been carried out to the property in the 1980’s and 2013 and notes that permission was granted for works under D15A/0840. Works noted include extensions, new floors, new roof, new windows, new electrics, reconfigured interior and new fittings, insulation, dry lining and refurbishment of the garden.

 Photos of works and a ‘svg’ file have been attached to the submission. (Note: The ‘svg’ file has been converted to a readable PDF by dlr and added to the submission for third parties to view - no notable images were discovered in this file.)

 Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

### DLR Submission No: B1255
Person: David Litster
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 1

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission notes a preference to have 2 Sydenham Place (RPS No. 2130) designated as an ACA as that would be less onerous on the property owner.
- Submission notes that the house and its architecture should be protected - an ACA would ensure this and allow for modern adaptation.
- If an ACA is not possible, the submission request that the protected structure status along with a Section 57 exemption is considered where protection only covers the exterior.

 Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Appendix 4

### DLR Submission No: B1256
Person: Peter Sellers
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 4

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- The submission suggests that the Plan should:
  - Encourage people to connect with the sea and healing through balneotherapy.
  - Cherish and protect the unique visual sea landscape experience.
  - Encourage a land swap with the current owners of the former Western Marine building and provide a thalassotherapy pool (harnessing the healing energy of the ocean) and Marine Centre at this location.
  - Utilise the natural rock and landscape by creating a visual land sea rock at Bullock Harbour.
- There is a need for ‘W’ zoning primarily marine sea usage at Bullock Harbour.
- The submission includes a number of visual observations of the sea.
- The submission includes a copy of observations to An Bord Pleanála on the development at the Former Western Marine Building, Bullock Harbour.

 Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s): Chapter 9

### DLR Submission No: B1257
Person: James Keating
Organisation: N/A
Map Nos: 9

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission relates to a review of Kilternan LAP.
- Image submitted of proposal of Octagon Project - this is a community centre providing childcare facilities/adult workshops/indoor games and music room/conference room/WCs
- Proposal will be 90% carbon neutral by way of geothermal heat harvesting, recycling centre, rainwater harvesting,
- Centre will include retail and medical services. Could employ pensioners in adjoining houses.
- Around the Project, in an arch, houses for pensioners could be built – 2 bed semi-detached with state-of-the-art facilities.
- DLRCC could purchase existing pensioners homes at 25% discount. Pensioners could then rent the new 2-bed homes which cannot be passed on or rented or sublet.

 Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
### DLR Submission No: B1258

**Person:** Fitzgerald Kavanagh & Partners on behalf of Fr. Aquinas Duffy

**Organisation:** St. Laurence O'Toole Diocesan Trust of the Arch-Diocese of Dublin

**Map Nos:** 7

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission requests removal of the presbytery of Saint Brigid's Catholic Church (RPS No. 2064) from the RPS as the addition would place an undue restraint on the use of the building and the curtilage / attendant grounds.
- The historic value and interest is respected, however, the submission notes that the property has undergone substantial alterations resulting in a successful pastoral centre serving the community.
- Concern is raised the being on the RPS would limit the ability for any future change.
- The NIAH record does not appear to appreciate the extent of new works to the building.
- The submission raises concerns in relation to the system of blanket protection of buildings.
- The submission suggests that the unique character of the building and its setting may be better protected in the formation of an ACA.

(Note: a submission in relation to the Church was also received and is summarised above under B0058)

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Appendix 4

### DLR Submission No: B1259

**Person:** Mary Meagher

**Organisation:** Monkstown Tennis Club

**Map Nos:** 3

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Requests that Monkstown LTC club grounds, situate between St. John’s park and Glandore Park, notes that the club grounds are rezoned “residential”. Asks that its grounds be zoned “sport and recreational”.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Map 3

### DLR Submission No: B1260

**Person:** Mary Meagher

**Organisation:** Monkstown Tennis Club

**Map Nos:** 3

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Further earlier submission (B1260) map included for ease of reference.
- We ask that the club be rezoned from A to F -Preservation of recreational and amenity use.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Map 3

### DLR Submission No: B1261

**Person:** John Nugent

**Organisation:** N/A

**Map Nos:** 14

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
- Submission;
  - Provides commentary on the Strategic Land Reserve (SLR).
  - Queries the rationale for the boundary of the SLR.
  - Requests that the SLR be amended to include the lands within the boundary of the Old Connaught LAP
  - Arguments are put forward in relation to inclusion of the proposed lands within the SLR on the basis of future planned transport and water and wastewater infrastructure interventions.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**
- Map 14

### DLR Submission No: B1262

**Person:** Colin Duggan

**Organisation:** N/A

**Map Nos:** 14

**Summary of Submission and Observation:**
Submissions;

- Requests rezoning of lands from GB – Greenbelt to A - residential of 2 sites - one immediately east of Woodbrook Downs and one at Wilford House.
- Submission supports a separate submission No.267661151 made in the name of a different individual on 9th April.
- Details are set out in relation to the site immediately east of Woodbrook Downs including details of a vehicular wayleave agreement, details of BusConnects, proximity to the new Dart station and Shanganagh Park and that fact that there are no flooding issues on the site.
- Details are set out in relation to the Widiford House site much of which mirrors the detail set out on the site above but also references the fact that Wilford House is a protected structure and the challenges which that may present.
- Submission quotes NPO62 from the NPF which relates to the role of greenbelts for the long term strategic expansion of urban areas.
- Submission concludes by stating that it is considered that there is no rationale for the current GB zoning.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 14, Map 6

Summary of Submission and Observation:

- Requests rezoning of lands of 4.7 hectares at Analands, Ferndale Road from GB to A.
- Submission sets out commentary relating to the site including the fact that the site is bounded on 3 sides by low density housing and is located below the 90 metre contour.
- Submission considers that rezoning is appropriate having regard to existing and planned infrastructure interventions, relationship to public transport corridors and the commitment to preparing a Local Area Plan.
- Submission;
  - Sets out commentary on the green belt zoning and considers that it does not reflect the current reality.
  - Welcomes the commitment to preparing a LAP for Rathmichael
  - Sets out a history to the green belt zoning
  - Sets out details of and commentary on the various infrastructure interventions (relating to water, wastewater and transport) set out in Appendix 1 of the Draft Plan.
  - Notes Policy Objective EI11 regarding Rathmichael Groundwater and Surface Water Protection
  - Sets out commentary on the Bray Environs Transport Study and Bus Connects
  - Sets out commentary on social/community/educational/retail/commercial infrastructure.
  - Submission quotes NPO62 from the NPF which relates to the role of greenbelts for the long term strategic expansion of urban areas and considers that this NPO supports the proposed rezoning.
  - Submission concludes by reiterating the request for the rezoning of the site from GB to A and also request the inclusion of the Analands site on map 14 within the boundary of the proposed Rathmichael LAP.

Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume 1, Part 3 under the following heading(s):
Chapter 14, Map 6
### Part 2: List of persons or bodies who made submissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B0001</td>
<td>Adele Shankland</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0002</td>
<td>Ray Coleman</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0003</td>
<td>Joe Shinkwin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0004</td>
<td>D Houlihan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0005</td>
<td>Sean Finlay</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0006</td>
<td>Richard Barrett</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0007</td>
<td>Shane Regan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0008</td>
<td>Paul Colligan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0009</td>
<td>Niamh Bhreathnach</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0010</td>
<td>Patrick Fitzgerald</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0011</td>
<td>Fiona Bourke</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0012</td>
<td>Katie Kahn-Carl</td>
<td>Marsham Court Residents’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0013</td>
<td>Senator Victor Boyhan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0014</td>
<td>Julie Ascoop</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0015</td>
<td>Julie Ascoop</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0016</td>
<td>Department of Transport</td>
<td>Prescribed Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0017</td>
<td>Gregory R. Devlin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0018</td>
<td>Barry O’Neill</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0019</td>
<td>Dr. Pádraig Moran</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0020</td>
<td>Jane McLoughlin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0021</td>
<td>Aine Hyland</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0022</td>
<td>Mark and Briege George</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0023</td>
<td>Brian Miles</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0024</td>
<td>Paul Byrne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0025</td>
<td>Alan Keogh</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0026</td>
<td>Peadar Curran</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0027</td>
<td>Patricia Gaffney</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0028</td>
<td>Richard Leekin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0029</td>
<td>John Lennon</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0030</td>
<td>Niall Magee</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0031</td>
<td>Brendan Fitzsimons</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0032</td>
<td>Conor Clinch</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0033</td>
<td>Niamh O’Regan-Doyle</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0034</td>
<td>Kevin Cullen</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0035</td>
<td>Aaron Daly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0036</td>
<td>David Mc Williams</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0037</td>
<td>Denis O’Farrell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0038</td>
<td>David Galvin</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0039</td>
<td>Mark Clare</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0040</td>
<td>Nigel Brennan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0041</td>
<td>Aine O’Dwyer</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0042</td>
<td>John Lennon</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0043</td>
<td>Clare Kerrigan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0044</td>
<td>Conor Kelly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0045</td>
<td>Michael Classon</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0046</td>
<td>Joseph Long</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0047</td>
<td>Alison Kennedy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0048</td>
<td>Joe Sorohan</td>
<td>Sorohan Builders Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0049</td>
<td>Dara Larkin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0050</td>
<td>Deirdre NiChuileanain</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0051</td>
<td>Robert Casey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0052</td>
<td>Mary Kelly</td>
<td>Protect Marlay Park (PMP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0053</td>
<td>Diane Barker</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0054</td>
<td>Maryrose doorly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0055</td>
<td>Keith Brennan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0056</td>
<td>Denise Ryan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0057</td>
<td>Mr. Pat McCoy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0058</td>
<td>Fitzgerald Kavanagh and partners on behalf of Fr. Aquinas Duffy and the St. Laurence O’Toole Diocesan Trust of the Arch-Diocese of Dublin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0059</td>
<td>Anne and Vincent Daly</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0060</td>
<td>Pauline Riordan</td>
<td>Prescribed Authority (Eastern and Midland Regional Assembly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0061</td>
<td>Przemyslaw Martyniak</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0062</td>
<td>Liam Harris</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0063</td>
<td>Emma Linnane Colgan</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0064</td>
<td>Susan and Paraic O’Toole</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0065</td>
<td>Nick Baird</td>
<td>St Brigid’s Boys School Foxrock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0066</td>
<td>GF Irvine</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0067</td>
<td>Ann Lynch</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0068</td>
<td>Brendan Donohue FRICS FSCSI</td>
<td>St. Attracta’s National Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0069</td>
<td>Philip Lardner</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0070</td>
<td>Fitzgerald Kavanagh and partners Fr. Tom Dalzell P.P. and the Arch Diocese of Dublin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0071</td>
<td>Kieran O’Malley and Co. Ltd</td>
<td>Godfrey Doyle, 135 Ballyogan Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0072</td>
<td>Paul Meany</td>
<td>Old Conna Golf Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0073</td>
<td>Bowler Geraghty and Co. SF Trust Ltd./The Franciscan Order in Ireland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0074</td>
<td>Bro. Jesse O’Neill, SM</td>
<td>The Marianists of Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0075</td>
<td>Mary Kelly-Borgatta and Armando Borgatta</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0076</td>
<td>Patrick Donnelly</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0077</td>
<td>Mairead Tierney</td>
<td>An organisation (e.g. local business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0078</td>
<td>Michael Dunleavy</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0079</td>
<td>Shaun Tracey</td>
<td>An organisation (e.g. local business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0080</td>
<td>Catherine Darker</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0081</td>
<td>Dr. Hugh Daly</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0082</td>
<td>Richard N. Kean S.C.</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0083</td>
<td>Patricia Stewart</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0084</td>
<td>Stiofan Caomhanach</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0085</td>
<td>Georgina Roche</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0086</td>
<td>Deirdre NiChuilleannain</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0087</td>
<td>Conor Keeling</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0088</td>
<td>Gemma Finlay</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0089</td>
<td>David Hall</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0090</td>
<td>P. Lucas</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0091</td>
<td>Hilary Wardrop</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0092</td>
<td>Patrick Vivion Tarrant</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0093</td>
<td>Liam Egan</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0094</td>
<td>Nesta Butler</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0095</td>
<td>Le Chéile Schools Trust</td>
<td>Patron of St. Laurence College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0096</td>
<td>Shane Fitzgerald</td>
<td>Priomhoidé, St Laurence College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0097</td>
<td>Catherine Moynihan</td>
<td>St. Laurence College, Board of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0098</td>
<td>Claire Lenihan</td>
<td>Silchester Park Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0099</td>
<td>Valerie Griffey</td>
<td>Silchester Park Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0100</td>
<td>Eric Conroy</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0101</td>
<td>Seamus and Eleanor Noonan</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0102</td>
<td>John Hickey</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0103</td>
<td>Tim King</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0104</td>
<td>Ronan Woods</td>
<td>An organisation (e.g. local business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0105</td>
<td>john fitzsimons</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0106</td>
<td>Conor White</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0107</td>
<td>Marci Comerford</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0108</td>
<td>Alison Dunne</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0109</td>
<td>John and Aileen Regan</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0110</td>
<td>Connaughton</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0111</td>
<td>Kevin Cullen</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0112</td>
<td>David Lawlor</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0113</td>
<td>Louise Irwin</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0114</td>
<td>Rosalind Lunney</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0115</td>
<td>LAWRENCE CONNAUGHTON</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0116</td>
<td>Rachel Daly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0117</td>
<td>Tara Fernandes</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0118</td>
<td>Brian Gaughan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0119</td>
<td>Padraic Murray</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0120</td>
<td>Paul Barry</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0121</td>
<td>Emer Hunt</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0122</td>
<td>Al</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0123</td>
<td>Warren Blackburn</td>
<td>ticked 'An Individual' but also stated CARA Corbawn Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0124</td>
<td>Peter Minogue</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0125</td>
<td>Tony Bamford</td>
<td>on behalf of Dot Opportunity Nominees 3 Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0126</td>
<td>Willie Byrne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0127</td>
<td>Susanne Lalor</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0128</td>
<td>David Cotter</td>
<td>RMS Leinster Memorial Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0129</td>
<td>Ann Mayberry</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0130</td>
<td>Tiina and Martin Walsh</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0131</td>
<td>Roisin O’Callaghan</td>
<td>Prescribed Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0132</td>
<td>Gavin O’ Briain</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0133</td>
<td>Nicole Kinane</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0134</td>
<td>Noreen Brady</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0135</td>
<td>James Brady</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0136</td>
<td>George tuthill</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0137</td>
<td>Russell and Deirdre Higgs</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0138</td>
<td>Peadar McGovern</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0139</td>
<td>Brian Hagan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0140</td>
<td>Elizabeth and Pat O’Daly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0141</td>
<td>Michael Shiell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0142</td>
<td>Des Swords</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0143</td>
<td>Eoin Ferris</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0144</td>
<td>Grace O’Donnell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0145</td>
<td>Ken Ryan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0146</td>
<td>DEIRDRE HORLACHER</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0147</td>
<td>Kathleen O’Brien</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0148</td>
<td>Neal Boland</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0149</td>
<td>R K</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0150</td>
<td>joy poulse</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0151</td>
<td>Orla Blackburn</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0152</td>
<td>Grainne Springael</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0153</td>
<td>David Martin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0154</td>
<td>Gina Meagher</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0155</td>
<td>Peter Dempsey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0156</td>
<td>Andrew O’Kane</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0157</td>
<td>Naomi O’Kane</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0158</td>
<td>Barbara Dutton</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0159</td>
<td>Peter Dempsey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0160</td>
<td>Patrick Price</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0161</td>
<td>Brian Murphy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0162</td>
<td>Cathy Murphy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0163</td>
<td>Fergus Clune</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0164</td>
<td>Rita Byrne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0165</td>
<td>Robbie Byrne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0166</td>
<td>Jean Cantwell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0167</td>
<td>Paul Flannery</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0168</td>
<td>Fiona Fullam</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0169</td>
<td>Tony Dutton</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0170</td>
<td>Dermot and Elizabethe Jordan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0171</td>
<td>Matthew Murphy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0172</td>
<td>Daragh Lavelle</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0173</td>
<td>Harry McAlinden</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0174</td>
<td>Aisling Feeney</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0175</td>
<td>Conor Murphy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0176</td>
<td>Pat O’ Connell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0177</td>
<td>Alacoque McMenamin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0178</td>
<td>Jade Earle</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0179</td>
<td>Richard Earle</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0180</td>
<td>Rowena McCormack</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0181</td>
<td>John Murphy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0182</td>
<td>Barney McCormack</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0183</td>
<td>Maria Gibbons</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0184</td>
<td>Glynis Wilson-Moore</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0185</td>
<td>Glynis Wilson-Moore</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0186</td>
<td>Rebecca Lambert</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0187</td>
<td>Stuart Hynes</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0188</td>
<td>Rita McAlinden</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0189</td>
<td>Sandra Dutton</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0190</td>
<td>Anne Murphy</td>
<td>Monaloe Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0191</td>
<td>niall mc knight</td>
<td>monaloe residents association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0192</td>
<td>Tara Spain</td>
<td>Prescribed Authority TII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0193</td>
<td>Michael Duffy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0194</td>
<td>Colin Riordan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0195</td>
<td>Elizabeth Hurley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0196</td>
<td>Valerie Merriman</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0197</td>
<td>Joe &amp; Deirdre Duffy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0198</td>
<td>Deirdre MacEvilly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0199</td>
<td>Anne McCarthy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0200</td>
<td>Paul Deery</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0201</td>
<td>Edward Conmy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0202</td>
<td>Alan Kinane</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0203</td>
<td>Dr Beatriz Byrne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0204</td>
<td>Clare Lynch</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0205</td>
<td>Joe Williams</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0206</td>
<td>Byomakesh Parida</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0207</td>
<td>Noel Corcoran</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0208</td>
<td>Anne-Marie Keady</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0209</td>
<td>Euan Dempsey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0210</td>
<td>A gormley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0211</td>
<td>Daniel O Farrell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0212</td>
<td>CONOR RICHARDSON</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0213</td>
<td>Mr Roderick Aherne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0214</td>
<td>Niamh Duffy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0215</td>
<td>Victor Lynch</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0216</td>
<td>Edel Flannery</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0217</td>
<td>Dr. Selina Guinness</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0218</td>
<td>James Hedderman</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0219</td>
<td>Pat Smith</td>
<td>An Organisation (e.g. local business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0220</td>
<td>Michelle Dowling</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0221</td>
<td>Fergal MacCabe</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0222</td>
<td>Lorcan Aherne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0223</td>
<td>Noel Murphy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0224</td>
<td>Fiona Boland</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0225</td>
<td>Sam Donnelly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0226</td>
<td>Michelle Twomey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0227</td>
<td>Michael steward</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0228</td>
<td>Avril claffey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0229</td>
<td>Fran Murphy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0230</td>
<td>Shane Fitzgibbon</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0231</td>
<td>Melania Fedeli</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0232</td>
<td>James Lunney</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0233</td>
<td>Damien Mara</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0234</td>
<td>Nigel Bell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0235</td>
<td>John Purcell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0236</td>
<td>Brian Manners</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0237</td>
<td>Chanel Grant</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0238</td>
<td>Siva Ramalingam</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0239</td>
<td>Trish Morrison</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0240</td>
<td>Kevin McCarthy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0241</td>
<td>Elbhin Crowe</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0242</td>
<td>Anita Dowling</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0243</td>
<td>Ian McEnroe</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0244</td>
<td>Jennifer Conlon</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0245</td>
<td>Laura Nyhan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0246</td>
<td>Alan Deegan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0247</td>
<td>B &amp; C Fitzsimons</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0248</td>
<td>Sarah Freeman de Malavé</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0249</td>
<td>Corporate Support Unit on behalf of Geological Survey Ireland</td>
<td>Prescribed Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0250</td>
<td>Anne-Marie Healy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0251</td>
<td>Ian McFetridge</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0252</td>
<td>Orla Ryan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0253</td>
<td>Dan and Gill Buckley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0254</td>
<td>Blaine Cregan (John Spain Associates)</td>
<td>An Organisation (e.g. local business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0255</td>
<td>Barbara Scully</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0256</td>
<td>Barbara Scully</td>
<td>A Group (e.g. resident/community group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0257</td>
<td>Imelda Hennessy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0258</td>
<td>Gail Rossiter</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0259</td>
<td>Claire Gilnagh</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0260</td>
<td>Evelyn McMurray</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0261</td>
<td>Ruth Tracey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0262</td>
<td>Patrick Derivan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0263</td>
<td>Frances Derivan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0264</td>
<td>Joseph McMahon, Scalp Wood Nurseries</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0265</td>
<td>Wendy Tuthill (Mrs)</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0266</td>
<td>David and Alma Devlin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0267</td>
<td>Justin Lowry</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0268</td>
<td>Erika Fitzpatrick</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0269</td>
<td>Frank Hegarty</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0270</td>
<td>suzanne holmes</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0271</td>
<td>Christine Cosgrave</td>
<td>A Group (e.g. resident/community group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0272</td>
<td>Ian Moore</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0273</td>
<td>Kathryn Connaughton</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0274</td>
<td>Mareese Murphy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0275</td>
<td>Edel Bell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0276</td>
<td>Charles Williams</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0277</td>
<td>Eoin Collins</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0278</td>
<td>Conor Lavelle</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0279</td>
<td>David Byrne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0280</td>
<td>Lynda duggan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0281</td>
<td>Ruth Dunne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0282</td>
<td>John Owens</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0283</td>
<td>Briain Mo</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0284</td>
<td>Olga Maguire</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0285</td>
<td>Jackie long</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0286</td>
<td>Brian Doody</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0287</td>
<td>John Martin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0288</td>
<td>Carmen O’Donovan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0289</td>
<td>Susan and Ian Stuart</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0290</td>
<td>maura reynolds</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0291</td>
<td>Jolanta Jaworska</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0292</td>
<td>Senator Victor Boyhan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0293</td>
<td>Joanna Marsden</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0294</td>
<td>Clara McAlinden</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0295</td>
<td>Emma O'Mahony</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0296</td>
<td>Paul Duggan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0297</td>
<td>Mary O'arcy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0298</td>
<td>Denise Manning</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0299</td>
<td>Sinead O'Neill</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0300</td>
<td>D &amp; M Kennedy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0301</td>
<td>Colum Colbert</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0302</td>
<td>William Dolan on behalf of Dublin IFA County Executive</td>
<td>An Organisation (e.g. local business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0303</td>
<td>Olivier Mainardis</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0304</td>
<td>Kevin O'Hagan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0305</td>
<td>Harry Crowe</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0306</td>
<td>Lorna Whelan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0307</td>
<td>Lorna Whelan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0308</td>
<td>Eleanor Morton</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0309</td>
<td>Carrie Whelan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0310</td>
<td>Artur Jaworski</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0311</td>
<td>Darach Connolly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0312</td>
<td>Orla Fullam-Smith</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0313</td>
<td>Thomas O'Connor</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0314</td>
<td>Carol Scott</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0315</td>
<td>Kenneth Binley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0316</td>
<td>Fiona Burke</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0317</td>
<td>Miriam Fitzsimons</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0318</td>
<td>Gwen Thomas</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0319</td>
<td>Clara Clark</td>
<td>DLR Cycling Campaign - part of Dublin Cycling Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0320</td>
<td>Jane Coghlan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0321</td>
<td>Hughes Planning and Development Consultants</td>
<td>An Organisation (e.g. local business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0322</td>
<td>Niamh Gibbons</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0323</td>
<td>Philip Redmond</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0324</td>
<td>Dónal Crowe</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0325</td>
<td>Sarah Robertson</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0326</td>
<td>Dervla King</td>
<td>A Group (e.g. resident/community group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0327</td>
<td>Justin McKenna</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0328</td>
<td>MAURICE DOCKRELL</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0329</td>
<td>Keith Long</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0330</td>
<td>Robert English</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0331</td>
<td>Helen Burrows</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0332</td>
<td>Benjamin Halsall</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0333</td>
<td>Rebecca Smyth</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0334</td>
<td>Sorcha</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0335</td>
<td>David Fitzgerald</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0336</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>An Organisation (e.g. local business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0337</td>
<td>Louis Hemmings</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0338</td>
<td>Joanne Morrissey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0339</td>
<td>Michael F. Curley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0340</td>
<td>Joanne Morrissey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0341</td>
<td>Assie and Ursula Sattar</td>
<td>A Group (e.g. resident/community group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0342</td>
<td>Kevin Cullen</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0343</td>
<td>John Kerr</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0344</td>
<td>Michael Casey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0345</td>
<td>Helen Toner</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0346</td>
<td>John Ryan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0347</td>
<td>Jane Jenkinson</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0348</td>
<td>Judith Hally</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0349</td>
<td>Siobhan Dormian</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0350</td>
<td>Marian O’Shea</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0351</td>
<td>Paul Murphy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0352</td>
<td>Helen Griffin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0353</td>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0354</td>
<td>Malcolm Argyle</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0355</td>
<td>Ita Robinson</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0356</td>
<td>Grainne Byrden</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0357</td>
<td>Damian Loscher</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0358</td>
<td>Niall Tully</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0359</td>
<td>John Halligan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0360</td>
<td>His Excellency, The Honourable Gary Gray AO</td>
<td>His Excellency, The Honourable Gary Gray AO Australian Ambassador to Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
<td>Australian Ambassador to Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0361</td>
<td>Michael O’Shea</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0362</td>
<td>Nadia Jones</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0363</td>
<td>Sheila O’Malley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0364</td>
<td>Karl Jones</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0365</td>
<td>Giles Fox</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0366</td>
<td>Mary Kelly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0367</td>
<td>Stephanie Long</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0368</td>
<td>Barbara Elliott</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0369</td>
<td>Elaine Mooney</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0370</td>
<td>Emily Kavanagh</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0371</td>
<td>Mags Dalton</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0372</td>
<td>Martina Doyle</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0373</td>
<td>Caroline Fox</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0374</td>
<td>Eoin McDonnell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0375</td>
<td>Ray Mooney</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0376</td>
<td>Michael Bird</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0377</td>
<td>Anthony G Keane</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0378</td>
<td>Paul Mac Aree</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0379</td>
<td>Nicholas Headley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0380</td>
<td>Rory O’Hagan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0381</td>
<td>Rachel Freedman</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0382</td>
<td>Sabiu Ghiollain</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0383</td>
<td>David Cunningham</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0384</td>
<td>Margaret Cunningham</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0385</td>
<td>Amhaoine Mallon</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0386</td>
<td>Kate Sugrue</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0387</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs P. L Lawler of Capilano Construction Ltd</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0388</td>
<td>Ray and Laura Mangan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0389</td>
<td>Claire Carroll</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0390</td>
<td>Lorna Birrane</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0391</td>
<td>Anthony and Mary Collins</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0392</td>
<td>David Cunningham</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0393</td>
<td>Ian Murray</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0394</td>
<td>Rachel Joyce</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0395</td>
<td>John White</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0396</td>
<td>Mabel Fitzpatrick</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0397</td>
<td>Karen Beare</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0398</td>
<td>Michelle Hegarty</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0399</td>
<td>Barry McDonald</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0400</td>
<td>Gerard Kelly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0401</td>
<td>Patrick Kelly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0402</td>
<td>Deirdre Aherne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0403</td>
<td>Mr Roderick Aherne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0404</td>
<td>Ruairi O’Donnell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0405</td>
<td>Sally Anne Sloan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0406</td>
<td>Clara Clark</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0407</td>
<td>Ian Whitehouse</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0408</td>
<td>Gene Feighery</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0409</td>
<td>Conor Murphy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0410</td>
<td>Gene Feighery</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0411</td>
<td>Peter Sloan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0412</td>
<td>Ó Gráda and Associates, Planning Consultants</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0413</td>
<td>Gene Feighery</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0414</td>
<td>Jim Harding</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0415</td>
<td>Peadar McGing</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0416</td>
<td>Adam Roche</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0417</td>
<td>Liam Dodd</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0418</td>
<td>Anne McGrath</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0419</td>
<td>Morgan O’Connell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0420</td>
<td>Sarah McGuinness</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0421</td>
<td>Trish Morrison - Paul Morrison</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0422</td>
<td>Olivia Donnelly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0423</td>
<td>Ljiljana Adamovic</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0424</td>
<td>Christy Hughes</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0425</td>
<td>Rory O’Hagan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0426</td>
<td>Danielle Byrne (for Dr S McDonnell and Prof PJ Drudy)</td>
<td>Bullock Harbour Preservation Association, clg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0427</td>
<td>Colm Fallon</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0428</td>
<td>Tony O’Connor</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0429</td>
<td>Jerry Haughey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0430</td>
<td>Eoin Costello</td>
<td>DigitalHQ clg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0431</td>
<td>Adam Shanley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0432</td>
<td>Karen Donovan</td>
<td>Office of Public Works Prescribed Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0433</td>
<td>Niall Mullally</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0434</td>
<td>Pat Sweetman</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0435</td>
<td>A Timoney</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0436</td>
<td>HSE</td>
<td>An Organisation (e.g. local business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0437</td>
<td>Denis Rice</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0438</td>
<td>Aidan Masterson</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0439</td>
<td>Brian Gallagher</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0440</td>
<td>Lynda Kouidri</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0441</td>
<td>Mary Dunphy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0442</td>
<td>Mary Slattery</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0443</td>
<td>Mary Dunphy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0444</td>
<td>Moss Simington</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0445</td>
<td>Harry Cooney</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0446</td>
<td>Sallyanne Godson</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0447</td>
<td>Geraldine Mc Namara</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0448</td>
<td>Anne Fitzgerald</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0449</td>
<td>Amy Fitzgerald</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0450</td>
<td>Pat O’Loughlin</td>
<td>Old Connaught House Management Co. CLG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0451</td>
<td>Deirdre Moran</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0452</td>
<td>Shane Horan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0453</td>
<td>Ayse Doga Butler</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0454</td>
<td>Deirdre O’Beirne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0455</td>
<td>Sheila Vaughan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0456</td>
<td>Helen Concannon</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0457</td>
<td>Delia Clune</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0458</td>
<td>Fiadhnait O’Keeffe</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0459</td>
<td>Sorcha Ni Choncheanainn</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0460</td>
<td>Colm Ryder</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0461</td>
<td>Liam ó Riain</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0462</td>
<td>Jean dempsey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0463</td>
<td>Fiona Murray</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0464</td>
<td>Helen Cahill</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0465</td>
<td>John Whitty</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0466</td>
<td>Tony Hopkins</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0467</td>
<td>Maire O’Brien</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0468</td>
<td>Martha Donlon</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0469</td>
<td>John Tracey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0470</td>
<td>Barbara O’Connell &amp; Neil O'Donovan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0471</td>
<td>Donal Quinlan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0472</td>
<td>Hilary and Gilbert Carr</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0473</td>
<td>Ann Lehane</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0474</td>
<td>Terri Cullinane</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0475</td>
<td>Gay Wright</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0476</td>
<td>Roisin Peart</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0477</td>
<td>Sorcha Brady</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0478</td>
<td>Roger &amp; Emma Percival</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0479</td>
<td>Nicole tracey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0480</td>
<td>Johnny Kelly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0481</td>
<td>Eamon Kelly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0482</td>
<td>Angela Kelly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0483</td>
<td>Lorna Hempenstall</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0484</td>
<td>Anthony Murray</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0485</td>
<td>Glenn Naughton</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0486</td>
<td>Ciara Millar</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0487</td>
<td>Mary Frances Frances McKenna</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0488</td>
<td>Kevin Polley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0489</td>
<td>Eibhlin Dowley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0490</td>
<td>david mc gonigle</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0491</td>
<td>Cynthia O'Mahony</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0492</td>
<td>Barry mcgonigle</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0493</td>
<td>Gerard Stearn</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0494</td>
<td>Marie McGarvey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0495</td>
<td>Gerard stearn</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0496</td>
<td>Maura Walsh</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0497</td>
<td>Paul Kohlimann</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0498</td>
<td>Claire Kerr</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0499</td>
<td>Marian Shanley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0500</td>
<td>Brian O’Connell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0501</td>
<td>D McGovern</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0502</td>
<td>A &amp; S Casey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0503</td>
<td>Susanne Mahon</td>
<td>An Organisation (e.g. local business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0504</td>
<td>Feargal Geoghegan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0505</td>
<td>Mary O’Connell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0506</td>
<td>Robert Byrne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0507</td>
<td>JP Flynn</td>
<td>A Group (e.g. resident/community group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0508</td>
<td>Claire Maher</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0509</td>
<td>Owen Kelly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0510</td>
<td>Paul Price</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0511</td>
<td>Pola Finegan</td>
<td>A Group (e.g. resident/community group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0512</td>
<td>Reuben Whelan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0513</td>
<td>Liam Farrelly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0514</td>
<td>Fiona Bowman</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0515</td>
<td>Ian Chandler</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0516</td>
<td>Claire Cunningham</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0517</td>
<td>Saoirse Kavanagh</td>
<td>An Organisation (e.g. local business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0518</td>
<td>Francis J Moran</td>
<td>A Group (e.g. resident/community group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0519</td>
<td>PETER DONOHUE</td>
<td>MEADOW VALE RESIDENCE ASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0520</td>
<td>Michael Buckley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0521</td>
<td>Mary Haughton</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0522</td>
<td>Owen Cullen</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0523</td>
<td>Mary Haughton</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0524</td>
<td>Justin Tuite</td>
<td>Clarinda Park Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0525</td>
<td>Paul O’Connor</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0526</td>
<td>Brian McBryan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0527</td>
<td>Glen Powley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0528</td>
<td>Michael Donlon</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0529</td>
<td>Una O’Shea</td>
<td>Roebuck Residents’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0530</td>
<td>Joe McGill</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0531</td>
<td>Garrett Murtagh</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0532</td>
<td>Clodagh Donlon</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0533</td>
<td>Carmel Hanley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0534</td>
<td>Elizabeth Donlon</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0535</td>
<td>Donal O’Doherty</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0536</td>
<td>Catherine Leeney</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0537</td>
<td>Paddy Shanahan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0538</td>
<td>David Robinson</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0539</td>
<td>Fiona O’Reilly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0540</td>
<td>Alison Kay</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0541</td>
<td>Niamh McDonald</td>
<td>Irish Water - Prescribed Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0542</td>
<td>John Cross</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0543</td>
<td>Mary O’Brien</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0544</td>
<td>Paul Sreenan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0545</td>
<td>Niamh Moriarty</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0546</td>
<td>Paul Quinn</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0547</td>
<td>Mike Higgins</td>
<td>Cosgrave Property Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0548</td>
<td>tom fennessy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0549</td>
<td>Karen Graham</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0550</td>
<td>Veronica Daniels</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0551</td>
<td>Judy Durnin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0552</td>
<td>Vivienne Daniels</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0553</td>
<td>Ciarán Maher</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0554</td>
<td>Mr. Pat McCoy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0555</td>
<td>Michael Brennan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0556</td>
<td>helmut holfeld</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0557</td>
<td>Conor White</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0558</td>
<td>Rory White</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0559</td>
<td>Tara White</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0560</td>
<td>Raymond O’Malley</td>
<td>East Coast Property BVI Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0561</td>
<td>JOHN REDMILL</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0562</td>
<td>Cocora Holdings Limited</td>
<td>Cocora Holdings Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0563</td>
<td>Aoife McCarthy</td>
<td>Coillte CGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0564</td>
<td>Geraldine Rafferty</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0565</td>
<td>Mrs Patricia O’Farrell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0566</td>
<td>Joan Deegan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0567</td>
<td>Susie Cox</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0568</td>
<td>Conor Sheehan, Sheehan Planning on behalf of Ms Rose Ivory</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0569</td>
<td>Brian Reddy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0570</td>
<td>Brendan Carberry</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0571</td>
<td>Mary Brady</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0572</td>
<td>Noreen Walsh</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0573</td>
<td>Robert Simmons</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0574</td>
<td>Frank Kane</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0575</td>
<td>Shane Twomey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0576</td>
<td>Peter Dudley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0577</td>
<td>Hughes Planning and Development Consultants</td>
<td>The Marianists of Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0578</td>
<td>Joan O Mahony</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0579</td>
<td>Geoffrey Corry</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0580</td>
<td>Martha Vard</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0581</td>
<td>Blaine Cregan (John Spain Associates)</td>
<td>Kennedy Wilson Investment Funds ICAV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0582</td>
<td>Mr. Pat McCoy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0583</td>
<td>Bernadette Shanahan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0584</td>
<td>Tomás Bradley</td>
<td>EirGrid - Prescribed Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0585</td>
<td>Dudley Dolan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0586</td>
<td>Shane Moriarty</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0587</td>
<td>Zoe Thorp</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0588</td>
<td>Marie O’Riordan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0589</td>
<td>Tom Phillips + Associates on behalf of Bective Rangers Football Club and Tetrarch Capital Limited</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0590</td>
<td>Hughes Planning and Development Consultants</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0591</td>
<td>Denis Devane</td>
<td>Wind Energy Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0592</td>
<td>Westbrown (Sandyford Properties) Limited</td>
<td>An Organisation (e.g. local business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0593</td>
<td>Roslyn Nicholson</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0594</td>
<td>Keep Ireland Open</td>
<td>Keep Ireland Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0595</td>
<td>David Mulcahy</td>
<td>David Morris C/o David Mulcahy Planning Consultants Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0596</td>
<td>The Corrig Partnership</td>
<td>An Organisation (e.g. local business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0597</td>
<td>Margaret Kidney</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0598</td>
<td>Karen &amp; Max Stolberg</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0599</td>
<td>Eadaoin O’Keeffe</td>
<td>Watson Killiney Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0600</td>
<td>Codling Wind Park Limited</td>
<td>Codling Wind Park Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0601</td>
<td>Michael Collins</td>
<td>S2S - Sutton to Sandy Cove Promenade and Cycleway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0602</td>
<td>Marcus Crowe</td>
<td>An individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0603</td>
<td>Brenda Richardson</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0604</td>
<td>Catherine O’Kelly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0605</td>
<td>Paddy Boyd</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0606</td>
<td>Justin O’Halloran</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0607</td>
<td>Deirdre Fitzgerald</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0608</td>
<td>Lynn mckee</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0609</td>
<td>Elaine Egan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0610</td>
<td>Robert Cook</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0611</td>
<td>David Lee</td>
<td>Submission prepared by TPA on Behalf of Homeland Estates B Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0612</td>
<td>Stella Burke</td>
<td>EDF Renewables Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0613</td>
<td>De Vesi House Owner Management Company</td>
<td>De Vesi House OMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0614</td>
<td>Rebecca Egan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0615</td>
<td>Barry Egan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0616</td>
<td>Bronwyn Salmon</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0617</td>
<td>Barry Egan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0618</td>
<td>Jacqueline McGowan-Smyth</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0619</td>
<td>Roslyn Nicholson</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0620</td>
<td>JOCELYN ESPEY</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0621</td>
<td>David Espey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0622</td>
<td>Fergus Joyce</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0623</td>
<td>Patricia Stewart</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0624</td>
<td>Caroline Byrne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0625</td>
<td>Dylan Salmon</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0626</td>
<td>Noel Dillon</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0627</td>
<td>Lisa Maguire</td>
<td>Health Service Executive -Prescribed Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0628</td>
<td>Eamon Molloy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0629</td>
<td>Éilís McDonnell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0630</td>
<td>Roslyn Nicholson</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0631</td>
<td>Alan Roche</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0632</td>
<td>Alison Polley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0633</td>
<td>Mary O’Beirne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0634</td>
<td>Michael O’Connor</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0635</td>
<td>Christopher Raythorn</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0636</td>
<td>Sandra Russell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0637</td>
<td>Helen Shenton</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0638</td>
<td>Helen Shenton</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0639</td>
<td>Brian Moore</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0640</td>
<td>Sinead McCarthy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0641</td>
<td>Rita O’Reilly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0642</td>
<td>Debra McCurrie</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0643</td>
<td>Jacobs Engineering Ltd</td>
<td>Amgen Technology (Ireland) UC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0644</td>
<td>Geraldine Bransfield</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0645</td>
<td>Owen Duffy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0646</td>
<td>Niamh Flynn</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0647</td>
<td>Patrick Jackson</td>
<td>An Organisation (e.g. local business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0648</td>
<td>Alan Downer</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0649</td>
<td>Annemarie Conneely</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0650</td>
<td>Joan Conneely</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0651</td>
<td>Aiveen Byrne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0652</td>
<td>David Timoney</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0653</td>
<td>Suvi Harris</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0654</td>
<td>Cara O’Connell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0655</td>
<td>Leanne Hill</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0656</td>
<td>Niamh Scott</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0657</td>
<td>Osín Kelly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0658</td>
<td>John &amp; Linda Leenane</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0659</td>
<td>Jennifer Pekaar</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0660</td>
<td>David O Keefe</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0661</td>
<td>Fiona McCann</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0662</td>
<td>Michala Kinska</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0663</td>
<td>Ursula Cloonan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0664</td>
<td>Clodagh Dunne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0665</td>
<td>Cliona O’Reilly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0666</td>
<td>Sally-ann Mitchell</td>
<td>A Group (e.g. resident/community group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0667</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0668</td>
<td>Joyce Richardson</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0669</td>
<td>I O’Mara</td>
<td>Old Connought Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0670</td>
<td>Emma Moran</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0671</td>
<td>Sara Leonard</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0672</td>
<td>Leah Coleman</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0673</td>
<td>Sarah O’Loughlin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0674</td>
<td>M Munro</td>
<td>Monkstown Village &amp; Longford Terrace Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0675</td>
<td>Cara Byrne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0676</td>
<td>Eric and Christelle Purmessur</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0677</td>
<td>Maria-Jose Gonzalez</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0678</td>
<td>Niamh Mangan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0679</td>
<td>Liam &amp; Jacinta Kenny</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0680</td>
<td>Margaret &amp; John Byrne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0681</td>
<td>Kevin Kheffache</td>
<td>Marina House Hostel Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0682</td>
<td>Aaron Moore</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0683</td>
<td>Breda Blatchford</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0684</td>
<td>Andrew Orr</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0685</td>
<td>Helena Cullen</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0686</td>
<td>Aine Doohan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0687</td>
<td>Alex O’Connor</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0688</td>
<td>David Roe</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0689</td>
<td>Jean Andrews</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0690</td>
<td>jennifer o dwyer</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0691</td>
<td>Duncan Kelly Lyth</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0692</td>
<td>Claire Golden</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0693</td>
<td>Liz Lawrence</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0694</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0695</td>
<td>Mags Keddy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0696</td>
<td>Stephen Roe</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0697</td>
<td>lan sutton</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0698</td>
<td>Craig Galligan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0699</td>
<td>Marie-Therese Walker</td>
<td>MTW Jewellery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0700</td>
<td>Scarlett Hughes</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0701</td>
<td>Shauna Galligan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0702</td>
<td>Brid Meehan</td>
<td>Old Connaught and District Community Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0703</td>
<td>Luke Walsh</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0704</td>
<td>Susan Watchorn</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0705</td>
<td>Linda Kenny</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0706</td>
<td>Kim Evans</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0707</td>
<td>Nicola McIntee</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0708</td>
<td>Liz Lawrence</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0709</td>
<td>Andrew Marshall</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0710</td>
<td>Gerard Ryan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0711</td>
<td>Mary Priestman</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0712</td>
<td>John Thompson</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0713</td>
<td>Antoinette Pim</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0714</td>
<td>Rebecca Wright</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0715</td>
<td>Rob Asher</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0716</td>
<td>Bernie Dwyer</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0717</td>
<td>JI McCarthy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0718</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0719</td>
<td>Suzanne Thompson</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0720</td>
<td>Peter Graham</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0721</td>
<td>Liz Lawrence</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0722</td>
<td>Aoife</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0723</td>
<td>Elizabeth Hickey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0724</td>
<td>Abigail Henderick</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0725</td>
<td>Eoin Edwards</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0726</td>
<td>Lauren Doherty</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0727</td>
<td>Neasa Murphy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0728</td>
<td>Sarah Byrnes</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0729</td>
<td>Finbarr Curtin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0730</td>
<td>K. Ó Cearbhaill</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0731</td>
<td>Stephen Igoe</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0732</td>
<td>Ruth Igoe</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0733</td>
<td>Stephen Kestell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0734</td>
<td>Marco Kraus</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0735</td>
<td>Dave Egan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0736</td>
<td>Tom Daly</td>
<td>Redesdale Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0737</td>
<td>Joanna Lowe</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0738</td>
<td>Rosemarie Budd</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0739</td>
<td>Ronan Lynch</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0740</td>
<td>John Power</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0741</td>
<td>Rory O’Connell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0742</td>
<td>Stewart Duffy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0743</td>
<td>Kerry McIverty</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0744</td>
<td>Dr Darren O’Beirne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0745</td>
<td>Emer McGillion</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0746</td>
<td>Simon Dobbin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0747</td>
<td>N Quinn</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0748</td>
<td>Ann Ronan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0749</td>
<td>Daragh Moore</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0750</td>
<td>Colette Butler</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0751</td>
<td>Ann Ronan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0752</td>
<td>Seamus Smyth</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0753</td>
<td>Fionnuala Hayes</td>
<td>Sandy Cove Avenues &amp; Lanes North East &amp; West (SAL NEW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0754</td>
<td>Clare Hilton</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0755</td>
<td>Tom Merriman</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0756</td>
<td>Johan keating</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0757</td>
<td>Paddy &amp; Margaret McCormack</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0758</td>
<td>Brian Cooney</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0759</td>
<td>Doyle Kent Ltd</td>
<td>An Organisation (e.g. local business) - Stephen Mannix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0760</td>
<td>Bernie Crean</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0761</td>
<td>Kate O’Carroll</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0762</td>
<td>Patricia McSparrn</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0763</td>
<td>Paul O’Connor</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0764</td>
<td>Helga Ryan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0765</td>
<td>Ciaran O Connor</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0766</td>
<td>Doyle Kent Ltd</td>
<td>An Organisation (e.g. local business) - Mr and Mrs M Kearns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0767</td>
<td>Vincent Colgan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0768</td>
<td>Peter Fry</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0769</td>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0770</td>
<td>Caroline Falkner</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0771</td>
<td>Simon Falkner</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0772</td>
<td>Jackie O’Shea</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0773</td>
<td>Karen Meagan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0774</td>
<td>Jill Marshall</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0775</td>
<td>Mathieu Boucher</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0776</td>
<td>Marguerite MacMahonMalone</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0777</td>
<td>Ken Regan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0778</td>
<td>John Wiles</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0779</td>
<td>Hanna isseyegh</td>
<td>Dun laoghaire educate together National School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0780</td>
<td>Eilis Kavanagh</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0781</td>
<td>Annette Martin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0782</td>
<td>Nicholas Koumarianos</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0783</td>
<td>Magda Stelmaszek</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0784</td>
<td>Niall O’Riordan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0785</td>
<td>Tom Phillips + Associates</td>
<td>Durkan Estates Clonskeagh Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0786</td>
<td>Niall O’Riordan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0787</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>Park Developments and Castlethorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0788</td>
<td>Orla Wood</td>
<td>Dimensional Fund Advisors Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0789</td>
<td>Kate O’Riordan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0790</td>
<td>Declan Grassil &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Airfield Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0791</td>
<td>Niall O’Riordan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0792</td>
<td>Claire Cassidy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0793</td>
<td>Karen Rigney</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0794</td>
<td>An Taisce</td>
<td>An Taisce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0795</td>
<td>Jean Dolan</td>
<td>Mountainside Preservation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0796</td>
<td>Margaret Keogh</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0797</td>
<td>Catherine Blay</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0798</td>
<td>Alex &amp; Caroline Fattaccini</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0799</td>
<td>Tony Byrne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0800</td>
<td>Linden Lee</td>
<td>Bellevue, Glenageary and Rochestown Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0801</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>Fitzwilliam Real Estate Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0802</td>
<td>John Harrington</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0803</td>
<td>Paul McElroy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0804</td>
<td>Gillian Hunt</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0805</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>Cairn PLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0806</td>
<td>Sinead O’Connor</td>
<td>Oceanscape Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0807</td>
<td>Mide Power</td>
<td>Not Here Not Anywhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0808</td>
<td>Dorota Witkowska</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0809</td>
<td>Elaine Fitzgerald</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0810</td>
<td>Colman O’Sullivan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0811</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>Cairn PLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0812</td>
<td>Sadhbh O’Connor</td>
<td>The Blackthorn Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0813</td>
<td>Patrick Cassidy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0814</td>
<td>Clare Burke</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0815</td>
<td>Eddie Fox, Ray Tilson and John Davey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0816</td>
<td>John O’Neill</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0817</td>
<td>Lisa Tierney-Keogh</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0818</td>
<td>Mary-Elizabeth Spain</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0819</td>
<td>Michael Parker</td>
<td>Insight Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0820</td>
<td>Marie Collins</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0821</td>
<td>Bridin Finn</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0822</td>
<td>Brigid Pike</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0823</td>
<td>Ravensbrook Ltd</td>
<td>Ravensbrook Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0824</td>
<td>Alice Lawless</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0825</td>
<td>Helen Smith</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0826</td>
<td>John Dowling</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0827</td>
<td>Stephen &amp; Triona Pattison</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0828</td>
<td>Donal Courtney</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0829</td>
<td>T. J. O’Connor &amp; Associates</td>
<td>T. J. O’Connor &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0830</td>
<td>Brendan Ferres</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0831</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>Cairn PLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0832</td>
<td>Tara Power</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0833</td>
<td>Ronald Barrington</td>
<td>Trustees of the Private Burial Ground, Brennanstown Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0834</td>
<td>John Dowling</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0835</td>
<td>R Mulry</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0836</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>Cairn PLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0837</td>
<td>Noreen O’Gorman</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0838</td>
<td>Cliona Corbett</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0839</td>
<td>Derek Reilly</td>
<td>Dublin EV Owners Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0840</td>
<td>Gabby Mallon CEO DLR Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>DLR Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0841</td>
<td>Tim O’Broin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0842</td>
<td>Brian Garvey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0843</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>Leopardstown Park Hospital Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0844</td>
<td>Derek Reilly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0845</td>
<td>Michalina Nyga</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0846</td>
<td>Al and Carmel Crowley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0847</td>
<td>Barbara Salsi</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0848</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>Cairn PLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0849</td>
<td>Downey Planning</td>
<td>Downey Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0850</td>
<td>Declan McSweeney</td>
<td>Archdiocese of Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0851</td>
<td>Caoimhe Fitzpatrick</td>
<td>Mountain side preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0852</td>
<td>Yolanda Gavin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0853</td>
<td>Sheelagh Collins</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0854</td>
<td>Mary Fitzpatrick</td>
<td>Mountain side preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0855</td>
<td>Deirdre Kearney</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0856</td>
<td>Gerard Harrington</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0857</td>
<td>Elaine Edmonds</td>
<td>IDA Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0858</td>
<td>Saava Cooney</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0859</td>
<td>Math meagher</td>
<td>Monkstown Tennis Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0860</td>
<td>Laura Creed</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0861</td>
<td>Cathy Hewitt</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture, Food and Marine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0862</td>
<td>Orna Mulcahy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0863</td>
<td>Emma-Jane Morrissey</td>
<td>Irish Wheelchair Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0864</td>
<td>Ciaran Byrne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0865</td>
<td>Daniel Plewman</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0866</td>
<td>Pamela Brennan</td>
<td>Mountainside Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0867</td>
<td>David Kerr</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0868</td>
<td>Sonya Nunan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0869</td>
<td>Iuan Cuffe</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0870</td>
<td>Donal Deegan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0871</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>The Congregation of Christian Brothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0872</td>
<td>Conor O’Toole</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0873</td>
<td>Luke Martin, RPS Group</td>
<td>Cosgrave Property Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0874</td>
<td>Suzanne McClure</td>
<td>Ted Living Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0875</td>
<td>Tony Manahan</td>
<td>Manahan Planners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0876</td>
<td>Paula O’Riordan</td>
<td>ArtNetdrl (Artist Network dun Laoghaire Rathdown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0877</td>
<td>Colm Cummins</td>
<td>Electricity Supply Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0878</td>
<td>Hughes Planning and Development Consultants</td>
<td>Blackline Capital Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0879</td>
<td>Natalia Garcia</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0880</td>
<td>Luke Martin, RPS Group</td>
<td>Cosgrave Developments Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0881</td>
<td>Mark Doggett</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0882</td>
<td>Tony Manahan</td>
<td>Manahan Planners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0883</td>
<td>James Devlin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0884</td>
<td>Michael Gilmartin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0885</td>
<td>Emma Cahill</td>
<td>APW 2650193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0886</td>
<td>Caelan Bristow</td>
<td>Architects Declare Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0887</td>
<td>Westleton Ltd</td>
<td>Westleton Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0888</td>
<td>Steph Watson</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0889</td>
<td>Blaine Cregan (John Spain Associates)</td>
<td>Ronan Group Real Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0890</td>
<td>Dr Susan McDonnell</td>
<td>Dalkey Community Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0891</td>
<td>CWTC Multifamily ICAV</td>
<td>CWTC Multifamily ICAV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0892</td>
<td>Matt Davy</td>
<td>Glencullen Adventure Park (The GAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0893</td>
<td>Carmel &amp; Don O’Brien</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0894</td>
<td>Mike McGuire</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0895</td>
<td>Martina Moran</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0896</td>
<td>Yvonne Jackson</td>
<td>Failte Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0897</td>
<td>The Comer Group</td>
<td>The Comer Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0898</td>
<td>Ruth Bowers</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0899</td>
<td>Lisa Wabel</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0900</td>
<td>Miguel Fitzgerald and Natacha Soto</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0901</td>
<td>Paul Clinch</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0902</td>
<td>Trevor Sadler</td>
<td>Lioncor Developments Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0903</td>
<td>Kathy Coakley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0904</td>
<td>Irish Water</td>
<td>Prescribed Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0905</td>
<td>DLCRA</td>
<td>Dún Laoghaire Central Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0906</td>
<td>Sadhbh O’Connor</td>
<td>Colbeam Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0907</td>
<td>Erica Magee</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0908</td>
<td>S &amp; F Cantrell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0909</td>
<td>Tony Manahan</td>
<td>Manahan Planners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0910</td>
<td>Tony Manahan</td>
<td>Manahan Planners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0911</td>
<td>Abigail Moore</td>
<td>Happteeth Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0912</td>
<td>Orlaith Fortune</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0913</td>
<td>Tony Manahan</td>
<td>Manahan Planners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0914</td>
<td>Dara Carroll</td>
<td>Joint submission Cabinteely Football Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0915</td>
<td>Teresa Sweetman</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0916</td>
<td>Karina LENNON</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0917</td>
<td>Dara MacCarthy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0918</td>
<td>Mary Martin</td>
<td>A Group (e.g. resident/community group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0919</td>
<td>Tony Manahan</td>
<td>Manahan Planners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0920</td>
<td>IMG Planning Limited</td>
<td>Hospitalier Order of St. John of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0921</td>
<td>John Lennon</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0922</td>
<td>Colin Shaw</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0923</td>
<td>Joan Cullen</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0924</td>
<td>John Forde</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0925</td>
<td>Paul Doyle (c/o Bannon)</td>
<td>Congregation of Christian Brothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0926</td>
<td>Downey Planning</td>
<td>Downey Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0927</td>
<td>Ronan O Flaherty</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0928</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>The Congregation of Christian Brothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0929</td>
<td>Alison Harvey</td>
<td>Heritage Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0930</td>
<td>Sabrina Boland</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0931</td>
<td>Glenveagh Homes Ltd</td>
<td>Glenveagh Homes Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0932</td>
<td>IMG Planning Limited</td>
<td>Forgebell Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0933</td>
<td>Sadhbh O’Connor</td>
<td>Mr James &amp; Mrs Ursula Dowling; Donohoe Property and Investment; and Grafton Group PLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0934</td>
<td>Jorge Handl</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0935</td>
<td>Edmund Rice School Trust CLG</td>
<td>Edmund rice Schools Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0936</td>
<td>Harriet Donnelly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0937</td>
<td>Alan Saunders</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0938</td>
<td>Ann Mulcrone</td>
<td>Reid Associates and as a resident of the town centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0939</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>Park Developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0940</td>
<td>Eoin O Connnaith</td>
<td>Kelly’s Avenue Residents Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0941</td>
<td>Sarah Jermy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0942</td>
<td>Josepha Madigan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0943</td>
<td>Edmund Rice Schools Trust CLG</td>
<td>Edmund Rice Schools Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0944</td>
<td>Trevor Sadler</td>
<td>1 Players Land Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0945</td>
<td>Lua Mcilraith</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0946</td>
<td>Mary Delahanty</td>
<td>Monkstown tennis club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0947</td>
<td>Susan Spain</td>
<td>National Yacht Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0948</td>
<td>Elliott Johns</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0949</td>
<td>Trevor King</td>
<td>Sandycove and Glasthule Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0950</td>
<td>Heather McMeel</td>
<td>An Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0951</td>
<td>Adrian Cassidy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0952</td>
<td>Shirley Finnegan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0953</td>
<td>Paddy Daly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0954</td>
<td>Tony Manahan</td>
<td>Manahan Planners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0955</td>
<td>Gavin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0956</td>
<td>Lisa MacNicholas</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0957</td>
<td>Ms C L Ryan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0958</td>
<td>Michael Cregan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0959</td>
<td>Tony Manahan</td>
<td>Manahan Planners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0960</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>Park Developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0961</td>
<td>Kate O’Riordan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0962</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>Park Developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0963</td>
<td>Peter Kerruish</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0964</td>
<td>Shirley Gleeson</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0965</td>
<td>William Hourie</td>
<td>Parish of Taney Select Vestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0966</td>
<td>Edward Lamb</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0967</td>
<td>Kieran Rush</td>
<td>Ballymore Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0968</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>Gena and Brendan Byron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0969</td>
<td>Marie Morgan-Burgess</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0970</td>
<td>John McGuire</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0971</td>
<td>Tony Manahan</td>
<td>Manahan Planners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0972</td>
<td>Michael Spellman</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0973</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>Emma and Edward Hollingsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0974</td>
<td>Tony Manahan</td>
<td>Manahan Planners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0975</td>
<td>Tony Manahan</td>
<td>Manahan Planners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0976</td>
<td>Ann Mulcrone</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0977</td>
<td>mike higgins</td>
<td>Shankill Property Investments Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0978</td>
<td>Gary Cooper</td>
<td>Landmarque Property Group Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0979</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>Viscount Securities Unlimited Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0980</td>
<td>Paula Galvin</td>
<td>Aultagh Construction Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0981</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>IPUT Plc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0982</td>
<td>John O’Keeffe</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0983</td>
<td>John Wilkinson</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0984</td>
<td>Dave Egan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0985</td>
<td>Morrough Kavanagh</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0986</td>
<td>Trevor Orr</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0987</td>
<td>Laura Brock</td>
<td>Kivoli Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0988</td>
<td>Alice O’Connell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0989</td>
<td>James Dunne</td>
<td>Iarnród Éireann / Irish Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0990</td>
<td>Ann Mulcrone</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0991</td>
<td>Ceri Dixon</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0992</td>
<td>Fergal Costello</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0993</td>
<td>Michael Casey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0994</td>
<td>David and Mieke McNamara</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0995</td>
<td>Laura Brock</td>
<td>Guestford Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0996</td>
<td>Tomas O’Leary</td>
<td>Passive House Asssociation of Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0997</td>
<td>Simon Clear</td>
<td>Deane Homes, BCDF Ltd, Maplewood Homes, Heatherbrook Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0998</td>
<td>Carl O’Sullivan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0999</td>
<td>Niall O’Byrne</td>
<td>Marlet Property Group Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1000</td>
<td>Paul Price</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1001</td>
<td>Marie Murphy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1002</td>
<td>Gavan Doherty</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1003</td>
<td>Sarah O'Connor</td>
<td>Rathmichael Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1004</td>
<td>Avison Young Planning and Regeneration Ltd.</td>
<td>Leopardstown Park Hospital &amp; the Health Service Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1005</td>
<td>Gavan Doherty</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1006</td>
<td>Peter O’Brien</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1007</td>
<td>Brendan &amp; Alice Rooney</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1008</td>
<td>Mary Byrne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1009</td>
<td>Margaret O’Reilly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1010</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>Park Developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1011</td>
<td>Hughes laning and Development Consultants</td>
<td>Bearcub Ltd and Spudmuckers Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1012</td>
<td>Jim Brogan Planning and Development Consultant</td>
<td>Cumann Luthclesa Gael Coiste Átha Cliath (Dublin G.A.A. County Board)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1013</td>
<td>Darina Tully</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1014</td>
<td>niall meagher</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1015</td>
<td>Maighread Ní Ghallchobhair, O.P.</td>
<td>Congregation of Dominican Sisters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1016</td>
<td>Anne Healy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1017</td>
<td>Clare Sheehan</td>
<td>St. Michael’s Rowing Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1018</td>
<td>Katrin and Paul O’Shea</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1019</td>
<td>Ciarán Callan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1020</td>
<td>Patrika Mani</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1021</td>
<td>Tracie James</td>
<td>Sweetmount and Laurels Residents’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1022</td>
<td>John Willoughby (Avison Young Planning and Regeneration Ltd)</td>
<td>Tesco Ireland Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1023</td>
<td>Tom Phillips + Associates</td>
<td>Bridgeclip (Developments) Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1024</td>
<td>Jack Quinn</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1025</td>
<td>Michelle Burke</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1026</td>
<td>Rosemary Seymour</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1027</td>
<td>Andrew Hewat</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1028</td>
<td>Tony Manahan</td>
<td>Manahan Planners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1029</td>
<td>Paul Kelly</td>
<td>RWE Renewables / Dublin Array</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1030</td>
<td>Ben Fitzgerald</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1031</td>
<td>Michael O’Neill</td>
<td>Gas Networks Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1032</td>
<td>Suzanne Docherty</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1033</td>
<td>Gavin Buckley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1034</td>
<td>Gary Cooper</td>
<td>Landmarque Property Group Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1035</td>
<td>chris Doorly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1036</td>
<td>Maureen Clarke</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1037</td>
<td>Suzanne McClure</td>
<td>Macenas Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1038</td>
<td>Ulric Kenny</td>
<td>Adelaide Road Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1039</td>
<td>Hazel Jones</td>
<td>Bartra Property Dublin Ltd (BDPL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1040</td>
<td>Michael FitzGerald</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1041</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>IMRF II Frascati Limited Partnership acting through its general partner Davy IMRF II GP Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1042</td>
<td>Ian Doyle</td>
<td>Ian Doyle Planning Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1043</td>
<td>James Donlon</td>
<td>Land Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1044</td>
<td>Amanda Healy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1045</td>
<td>Conor Auld (Stephen Little &amp; Associates)</td>
<td>Adroit Operations Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1046</td>
<td>John Cahill</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1047</td>
<td>Dublin Chamber</td>
<td>Dublin Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1048</td>
<td>Shane Lavelle</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1049</td>
<td>Barry Thornton</td>
<td>Blackrock Athletic Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1050</td>
<td>Martin O'Donnell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1051</td>
<td>Senator Barry Ward</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1052</td>
<td>Simon Clear</td>
<td>Explorium Limited and Dockfare Management Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1053</td>
<td>Mary Byrne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1054</td>
<td>Tom Phillips</td>
<td>Tom Phillips + Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1055</td>
<td>Brian Swan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1056</td>
<td>Aileen Eglington</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1057</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>The Jackson Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1058</td>
<td>Marie Murphy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1059</td>
<td>Gerard o Sullivan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1060</td>
<td>Brendan Hudson</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1061</td>
<td>Kilternan Cemetary Park Limited</td>
<td>Kilternan Cemetary Park Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1062</td>
<td>Maire O Meara</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1063</td>
<td>Barry Cullen</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1064</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1065</td>
<td>Rita O'Reilly,</td>
<td>Dunleary Lifeboat Restoration Project Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1066</td>
<td>Alan Hanlon</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1067</td>
<td>BMA Planning</td>
<td>Hines Cherrywood Restoration Fund ICAV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1068</td>
<td>John Spain Associates</td>
<td>Philip J Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1069</td>
<td>Canon Properties</td>
<td>Canon Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1070</td>
<td>Catherine Reid</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1071</td>
<td>Ciara Timmons</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1072</td>
<td>BMA Planning</td>
<td>Dundrum Retail Limited Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1073</td>
<td>Trevor Sadler</td>
<td>Aldgate Developments Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1074</td>
<td>Sean O'Neill</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1075</td>
<td>Simone Sav - DLR PPN</td>
<td>Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Public Participation Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1076</td>
<td>Simon Butler</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1077</td>
<td>Patrick Molloy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1078</td>
<td>Ruth Colbert</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1079</td>
<td>Billy Wallace</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1080</td>
<td>Declan Gibbons</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1081</td>
<td>Michael cullen</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1082</td>
<td>Killian O’Higgins</td>
<td>Lawless Family (residents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1083</td>
<td>Sean Colbert</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1084</td>
<td>Kieran Brissil</td>
<td>University College Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1085</td>
<td>Ruth Barry</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1086</td>
<td>JOHN REDMILL</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1087</td>
<td>Tom Phillips</td>
<td>Tom Phillips + Associates on behalf of Droimsi Developments Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1088</td>
<td>Deirdre Joyce</td>
<td>Irish Green Building Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1089</td>
<td>Niall Mulqueen</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1090</td>
<td>Mgt Hynes</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1091</td>
<td>Kate Healy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1092</td>
<td>Mary Scaggs</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1093</td>
<td>Yvonne Lynch</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1094</td>
<td>Joyce Richardson</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1095</td>
<td>Sinead O’Reilly</td>
<td>The Arts Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1096</td>
<td>Heather Mac Donald</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1097</td>
<td>Lotus Dequina</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1098</td>
<td>H Burke</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1099</td>
<td>Ciaran Moulton</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1100</td>
<td>Conor Hurley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1101</td>
<td>Mary Cook</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1102</td>
<td>Séan Woods</td>
<td>Office of the Planning Regulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1103</td>
<td>Trevor Sadler</td>
<td>Aldgate Developments Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1104</td>
<td>Eugene and Anne Gribbin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1105</td>
<td>Derek Jago</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1106</td>
<td>Jacqueline Ni Fhearghusa</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1107</td>
<td>H Burke</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1108</td>
<td>David Myers</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1109</td>
<td>Miriam Ryan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1110</td>
<td>Deirdre McGing</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1111</td>
<td>Siobhan Graham</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1112</td>
<td>Brian Espey</td>
<td>Dark Sky Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1113</td>
<td>Leslie Wrenn</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1114</td>
<td>Bill Robinson</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1115</td>
<td>National Transport Authority</td>
<td>National Transport Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1116</td>
<td>Martin Murray</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1117</td>
<td>Tim Carey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1118</td>
<td>Sam Carthy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1119</td>
<td>Tom Phillips</td>
<td>Tom Phillips + Associates on behalf of The Executors of the Estate of the late Nora Tallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1120</td>
<td>Conor Auld (Stephen Little &amp; Associates)</td>
<td>Quintain Developments Ireland Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1121</td>
<td>Karl Kinch</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1122</td>
<td>Sean maguire</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1123</td>
<td>Ann Flaherty</td>
<td>Truegain Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1124</td>
<td>Muireann O’Higgins</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1125</td>
<td>Catherine Egan</td>
<td>Annville/Dundrum Road Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1126</td>
<td>Aileen Eglinton</td>
<td>Kilternan/Glenamuck Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1127</td>
<td>Shane Colclough</td>
<td>School of Architecture, Planning and Environmental Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1128</td>
<td>William Quigley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1129</td>
<td>Muireann O’Higgins</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1130</td>
<td>patrick redmond</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1131</td>
<td>Jeff Colley</td>
<td>Passive House Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1132</td>
<td>Mary Tully</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1133</td>
<td>Lisa O Hagan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1134</td>
<td>Emma Reilly</td>
<td>Parents Association of Our Lady’s Grove Primary School, Goatstown, Dublin 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1135</td>
<td>Stephen Little &amp; Associates</td>
<td>National Rehabilitation Hospital and Health Service Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1136</td>
<td>Catherine Donoghue</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1137</td>
<td>David Regan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1138</td>
<td>Anne Cooke</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1139</td>
<td>Nicholas Donnelly</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1140</td>
<td>Brendan O Hagan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1141</td>
<td>Harish Kumar</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1142</td>
<td>Elaine Knierim</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1143</td>
<td>Trevor Sadler</td>
<td>Palemink Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1144</td>
<td>Trevor Sadler</td>
<td>Palemink Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1145</td>
<td>Conor Auld (Stephen Little &amp; Associates)</td>
<td>Quintain Developments Ireland Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1146</td>
<td>David Houlton</td>
<td>DLR Skate Park Youth submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1147</td>
<td>Wilton Gallery</td>
<td>An Organisation (e.g. local business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1148</td>
<td>Paul Coffey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1149</td>
<td>Muireann O’Higgins</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1150</td>
<td>Lee Russell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1151</td>
<td>Pricilla Markey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1152</td>
<td>Caitriona McGuire</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1153</td>
<td>Sarah McDonagh</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81154</td>
<td>Mary Convery</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81155</td>
<td>Eoin McBennett of behalf of Shankill Tidy Towns, SAGE - Shankill Action for a Green Earth and the Shankill Biodiversity Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81156</td>
<td>Céline Ovaere</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81157</td>
<td>Orlagh O’Farrell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81158</td>
<td>Caroline Maguire</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81159</td>
<td>Mary mccaughey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81160</td>
<td>Stephen Little &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Health Service Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81161</td>
<td>Hugh McGuire</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81162</td>
<td>Valerie Cassidy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81163</td>
<td>David Power</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81164</td>
<td>Sean Parkes</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81165</td>
<td>Eoin Ó Cuileánáin</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81166</td>
<td>Mary-Fat Dillon</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81167</td>
<td>Stephen Little</td>
<td>Aeval Unlimited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81168</td>
<td>Owen Keogh</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81169</td>
<td>Jim Gildea</td>
<td>Cllr Jim Gildea, Cllr Frank McNamara,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81170</td>
<td>Martin Quinless</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81171</td>
<td>Gina Haug</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81172</td>
<td>Pauline Brooks</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81173</td>
<td>M. McElree</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81174</td>
<td>Martin Anderson</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81175</td>
<td>Paul Byrne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81176</td>
<td>Rachel Caviston</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81177</td>
<td>Saava Cooney</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81178</td>
<td>TOM KIVLEHAN</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81179</td>
<td>Paul Saunders</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81180</td>
<td>Alice Rooney</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81181</td>
<td>Gerard Cooke</td>
<td>Greenville Road Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81182</td>
<td>Brian Flynn</td>
<td>Dún Laoghaire Tidy Towns Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81183</td>
<td>Fionnuala Hayes &amp; James Howley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81184</td>
<td>Maire O’Brien</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81185</td>
<td>Caitriona Flynn</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81186</td>
<td>Caitriona Flynn</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81187</td>
<td>Amy Burgess</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81188</td>
<td>Maire O’Brien</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81189</td>
<td>Michael crowe</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81190</td>
<td>Paula O’Connell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81191</td>
<td>Eamon Regan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81192</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81193</td>
<td>Niall Burgess</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81194</td>
<td>Anne-Marie Healy</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81195</td>
<td>D. O’Connor</td>
<td>Dublin Friends of the Earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81196</td>
<td>Elizabeth Clooney and Colman Curran</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81197</td>
<td>Rosemary Kevany</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81198</td>
<td>Nicola Stapleton Jones</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81199</td>
<td>Dervla O’Leary</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81200</td>
<td>Cormac Devlin T.D.</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81201</td>
<td>Gareth Craig</td>
<td>Silchester Park Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81202</td>
<td>Muireann O’Higgins</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81203</td>
<td>Gareth Craig</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81204</td>
<td>Paula O’Connell</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81205</td>
<td>Ossian Smyth</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81206</td>
<td>Gian McKenna</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81207</td>
<td>John Tuite</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81208</td>
<td>Dervla O’Leary</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81209</td>
<td>JP Flynn</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81210</td>
<td>Stephen O’Dea, O’Dea and Moore Architects</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1211</td>
<td>Shane Naughton</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1212</td>
<td>Kill O' The Grange Church of Ireland</td>
<td>An Organisation (e.g. local business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1213</td>
<td>Mrs Bridget Aylmer</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1214</td>
<td>Denis Rice</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1215</td>
<td>Thomas and Pam Donlan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1216</td>
<td>Micheál McMullan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1217</td>
<td>Jack M. Kearney</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1218</td>
<td>Mary C. O'Donohue</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1219</td>
<td>Sinead Rehill</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1220</td>
<td>Cliona Buckley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1221</td>
<td>Cliona Buckley</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1222</td>
<td>Senator Victor Boyhan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1223</td>
<td>Gerard Lardner</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1224</td>
<td>Ken Casey and Emma Casey</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1225</td>
<td>David Dunne</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1226</td>
<td>Mairead Mehigan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1227</td>
<td>Peter and Joan McCann</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1228</td>
<td>Joe Sorohan</td>
<td>An Organisation (e.g. local business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1229</td>
<td>Keogh Contracting Ltd.</td>
<td>An Organisation (e.g. local business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1230</td>
<td>John Keogh</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1231</td>
<td>William Huggard</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1232</td>
<td>Colette and John McDonald</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1233</td>
<td>Jane Robinson and Mani Ramaswami</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1234</td>
<td>Kieran O’Malley and Co. Ltd.</td>
<td>Directors of Jackson Way Properties Ltd. James Kennedy and Antoinette Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1235</td>
<td>Justin and Lynda Burke</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1236</td>
<td>Justin and Lynda Burke</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1237</td>
<td>Louise Callaghan</td>
<td>Edmund Rice Schools Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1238</td>
<td>Edmund Rice Schools Trust</td>
<td>Edmund rice Schools Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1239</td>
<td>Patrick Cassidy and Michael O’Connor</td>
<td>Raymond Estates Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1240</td>
<td>Carol English and Liam English</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1241</td>
<td>Jacobs Engineering</td>
<td>Amgen, Potter Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1242</td>
<td>John Burke</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1243</td>
<td>RPS</td>
<td>Our Lady of Perpetual Succour, Foxrock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1244</td>
<td>RPS</td>
<td>Osborne + Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1245</td>
<td>Gibbons &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Garnish Investment Holdings Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1246</td>
<td>T J O’Connor &amp; Associates</td>
<td>T J O’Connor &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1247</td>
<td>Sinéad O’Brien</td>
<td>Dept. of Tourism, Culture, Arts, Gaeltacht, Sport and Media - DAU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1248</td>
<td>Senator Victor Boyhan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1249</td>
<td>Senator Victor Boyhan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1250</td>
<td>Caroline and Patrick Gray</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1251</td>
<td>Andrew Hewat</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1252</td>
<td>Angela Lemass &amp; Derry O’Donovan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1253</td>
<td>Máire O’Brien</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1254</td>
<td>Michael Liuzzi</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1255</td>
<td>David Litster</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1256</td>
<td>Peter Sellers</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1257</td>
<td>James Keating</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1258</td>
<td>Fitzgerald Kavanagh and partners on behalf Fr. Aquinas Duffy and the St. Laurence O'Toole Diocesan Trust</td>
<td>Fr. Aquinas Duffy and the St. Laurence O'Toole Diocesan Trust of the Arch-Diocese of Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1259</td>
<td>Mary Meagher</td>
<td>Monkstown tennis club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1260</td>
<td>Mary meagher</td>
<td>Monkstown tennis club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1261</td>
<td>John Nugent</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1262</td>
<td>Colin Duggan</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1263</td>
<td>J Brown</td>
<td>An Individual (private citizen)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>