



# **Chief Executive's Report on Draft Plan Consultation Volume II**

## **Draft Kiltiernan - Glenamuck Local Area Plan 2025**

### **Chief Executive's Report on Draft Plan Consultation**

**May 2025**

#### **Volume II**

#### **Summary and List of Submissions / Observations Received**

In accordance with section 20 (3) (c) (ii) (I) and 20 (3) (c) (ii)(II) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended), Volume II, Part 1 sets out a summary of all submissions / observations and Volume II, Part 2 includes a list of persons or bodies who made submissions or observations.



**Part 1: Summary of Submissions / Observations Received**

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B001</u></b>	<b>Person: Mark O'Connor</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers that there are no proposed improvements included in the Draft Plan for the lower half of Glenamuck Road - from the Brambledown Estate to the Carrickmines Great roundabout.</li> <li>• Submission questions why this is and what the Local Area Plan can do to provide improved road and pathway conditions for safety and amenity.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B002</u></b>	<b>Person: Noel Ross</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests that speed ramps be installed before the Suttonfield entrance on the road from Glencullen to improve safety with traffic-calming.</li> <li>• Cites recent traffic accidents by drivers speeding down Bishop's Lane/ R116 as an indicator for the necessity of these road design inclusions.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B003</u></b>	<b>Person: Kieran Fagan</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission states that the spelling of Kiltiernan with two letter I's is incorrect and shouldn't be used in a modern era.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 8		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B004</u></b>	<b>Person:</b>	<b>Organisation: Health and Safety Authority</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Authority has no observations to forward.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> N/A		

DLR Submission No: <b>B005</b>	Person: Ali Bazhban	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission objects to the proposed link between Chapel Hill and Bishops Gate estate (PY9) due to reasons such as security, and traffic.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <b>B006</b>	Person: Laura Griffen	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission is against the proposed link between Chapel Hill and Bishops Gate estate (PY9) due to several reasons such as security, and safety challenges for drivers.</li> <li>Cites private insurance and maintenance fees currently paid by residents via management fees as an influencing factor in their submission.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <b>B007</b>	Person: Sean Reeves	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission is against the proposed link between the Chapel Hill and Bishops Gate estates (PY9) due to several reasons such as security, and traffic.</li> <li>Submission notes that private insurance and maintenance fees are currently paid by residents via management fees and indicates that any accident in Chapel Hill by outside residents will cause insurance fees to increase which are influencing factors for their submission.</li> <li>Submission is also of the opinion that an increase in access for residents from Bishops Gate to Chapel Hill will generate issues with noise pollution, restriction of access to the Chapel Hill playground due to over-capacity and increased rubbish.</li> <li>Potential for teenagers using the playground causing anti-social behaviour is also referenced as a further cause for concern.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		



DLR Submission No: <u>B008</u>	Person: Roisin Jordan	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission is strongly in favour of the proposed connection link between the Bishops Gate and Chapel Hill estates citing improved child safety and quality of movement between residential area and the school/church at Kiltarnan Church of Ireland rather than via the Enniskerry Road route.</li> <li>Cites easier access to the lawn tennis club at Kiltarnan Church as a supporting factor also.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <u>B009</u>	Person: Karl Murray	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission is against the proposed connective link between Bishops Gate and Chapel Hill saying the link would cause a significant increase in foot traffic from additional families and children from Bishops Gate, raising safety concerns due to narrow roads and footpaths.</li> <li>Opinion is that additional users will also overburden the tiny playground in the private estate.</li> <li>The Submission suggests that a better option would be to route the proposed link through the Glebe House sheltered accommodation development.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <u>B010</u>	Person: Edel McDermott	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission objects to the introduction of a pedestrian link between the Chapel Hill and Bishops Gate estates (PY9) citing concerns such as security and potential for anti-social behaviour.</li> <li>Believes that private insurance and maintenance fees currently paid by residents could be increased for residents should accidents occur with non-residents of Chapel Hill.</li> <li>The Submission is also of the opinion that an increase in access for residents from Bishops Gate could cause an increase in anti-social behaviour in Chapel Hill.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <u>B011</u>	Person: Chris Mueller	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission objects to the introduction of a pedestrian link between the Chapel Hill and Bishops Gate estates (PY9) due to several reasons such as security and anti-social behaviour.</li> </ul>		

- Private insurance and maintenance fees currently paid by residents could be increased for residents should accidents occur with non-residents of Chapel Hill.
- Believes that a connection to Bishops Gate would impact on privacy and potentially affect house prices.
- The Submission is also of the opinion that an increase in access for residents from Bishops Gate could cause an increase in anti-social behaviour in Chapel Hill.
- Submission's opinion is that when the Glenamuck road scheme is complete, traffic on the Enniskerry Rd should be far less and undermines the need for a walk-through between Bishops Gate and Chapel Hill.
- The Submission concludes that there will be no reduction of distance travelled from Bishops Gate to the Church of Ireland school rather than via Enniskerry Road.

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

Chapter 5

DLR Submission No: <u>B012</u>	Person: Rory Griffen	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission objects to the introduction of a pedestrian link between the Chapel Hill and Bishops Gate estates (PY9) as the private insurance and maintenance fees currently paid by residents could be increased for residents should accidents occur with non-residents of Chapel Hill.</li> <li>• The Submission is also of the opinion that an increase in access for residents from Bishops Gate could be a security threat to residents of Chapel Hill.</li> <li>• The Submission concludes that there will be no reduction of distance travelled from Bishops Gate to the Church of Ireland school rather than via Enniskerry Road.</li> <li>• Submission includes a comparative map image with walking distances with and without the proposed PY9 linkage indicated.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <u>B013</u>	Person: Ruth McIntyre	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission objects to the proposed connective link between Bishops Gate and Chapel Hill citing safety concerns and potential increase in lack of privacy.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 5		



DLR Submission No: <u>B014</u>	Person: Michael Dalton	Organisation: Chapel Hill Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission objects to the proposed connective link between Bishops Gate and Chapel Hill citing security concerns and the opinion that there is a lack of need for this link.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <u>B015</u>	Person: Gbemisola Oni	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission objects to the proposed PY9 connective link between Bishops Gate and Chapel Hill citing security concerns, preference to retain the private nature of the estate, and the opinion that there is a lack of need for this link.</li> <li>Submission includes a map image with distance to the Kiltiernan NS from Bishops Gate indicator included.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <u>B016</u>	Person: Jessica McEvoy	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission objects to the proposed PY9 connective link between Bishops Gate and Chapel Hill.</li> <li>Submission believes the link would cause a significant increase in foot traffic from additional families and children from Bishops Gate, raising safety concerns due to narrow roads and footpaths.</li> <li>Submission considers that additional users will overburden the playground in the Chapel Hill private estate.</li> <li>The Submission suggests that a better option would be to route the proposed link through the Glebe House sheltered accommodation development.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <u>B017</u>	Person:	Organisation: Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII)
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission acknowledges notice of the display of the Draft Kiltiernan / Glenamuck Local Area Plan (LAP).</li> <li>Submission notes:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TII's mission is to deliver transport infrastructure and services, which contribute to the quality of life for the people of Ireland and support the country's economic growth.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ TII safeguards the strategic function of Luas and National Roads to promote the safe and efficient operation of both the light rail and national roads networks.</li> <li>○ Future Luas, Metro and Bus Connects alignments are a matter for the National Transport Authority (NTA).</li> <li>• Submission states that TII made a submission at pre-draft stage.</li> <li>• Submission states that TII advocates for an evidence-based area transport assessment in accordance with the requirements of official national road policy in the DoECLG Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2012) and the Greater Dublin Area Transport Strategy.</li> <li>• TII acknowledges stakeholder consultation in the preparation of the Area Base Transport Assessment (ABTA).</li> <li>• Submission notes the inclusion of TII (2023) National Roads 2040 in Appendix 2, however, the DoECLG Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2012) does not appear to be referenced and references that "TII (2023) National Roads 2040" is not a statutory document.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Appendix 2</p>

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B018</u></b>	<b>Person: Susan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission requests the provision of a dog area in a park in the area preferably in 'pylon park'.</li> <li>• Considers that the plan needs to provide for more trees to be planted.</li> <li>• Submission requests that the trees along the Enniskerry Road between Kilternan and the Scalp be preserved.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 7</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B019</u></b>	<b>Person: Gabriela/Jason Keating</b>	<b>Organisation: Ardagh Group</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission objects to the introduction of the proposed PY9 link between Chapel Hill and Bishops Glen estates for the following reasons:</li> <li>• Safety of children - considers that new access will increase risk of high pedestrian traffic from non-residents/ unfamiliar individuals into the area.</li> <li>• Increased security risks and uncontrolled access posing a direct threat to property security, increasing likelihood of vandalism, burglary and anti-social behaviour.</li> <li>• Liability and insurance concerns due to heightened risk of accidents leading to legal and financial liability issues including increases of insurance premiums.</li> <li>• Increase in noise level, particularly during evenings and weekends.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5</p>		



<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B020</u></b>	<b>Person: Dale Crammond</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly objects to the proposed PY9 pathway.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B021</u></b>	<b>Person: Colm Connolly</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to reduction of speed limits on main roads within Kiltiernan-Glenamuck and would prefer the speed limit to remain at 50kph.</li> <li>Considers the switch to new Bus Connect routes to be inefficient as buses on routes L26, L27 and 1128 are infrequent and irregularly timed.</li> <li>Welcomes most new development in the area but would like interconnectedness for pedestrians between the estates to be mandated as part of any planning approval.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B022</u></b>	<b>Person: Arnaud Bruwer</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission objects to proposed PY9 linkage between Chapel Hill and Bishops Gate on grounds of issues regarding child safety, reduced security and privacy.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B023</u></b>	<b>Person: Vinashree Bruwer</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission objects to the proposed PY9 pathway on grounds of reduced privacy and security in the Chapel Hill estate.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <u>B024</u>	Person: Richard de Zeeuw	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission compliments the Draft Plan and appreciates its content.</li> <li>Has serious concerns regarding the new L26 bus route now operating from Kiltiernan as the route no longer goes to the secondary school in Ballyogan (SETSS) only stopping at Carrickmines retail park before continuing on. Submitter states that this will be an even bigger issue as Kiltiernan's population increases.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <u>B025</u>	Person: Sarah O'Connell	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to the proposed PY9 walkway on safety issue of children moving freely from one estate to the next.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <u>B026</u>	Person: Emma Masterson	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission objects to proposed PY9 linkage between Chapel Hill and Bishops Gate on grounds of issues regarding child safety, reduced security and privacy.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <u>B027</u>	Person: Gillian Garvin	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission objects to the proposed PY9 linkage to Chapel Hill based on greater access opening residents up to the possibility of more accidents and issues from non-residents.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		



DLR Submission No: <u>B028</u>	Person: Ciaran O'Connell	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission commends the level of detail and research put into the Draft KGLAP and appreciates the plans and ideas contained within.</li> <li>Submission disagrees that the provision of the proposed PY9 linkage to Our Lady of the Wayside NS will be a safer route than along Enniskerry road due to children having to walk through a number of housing estates past many driveways increasing possibility of accidents.</li> <li>Questions the benefits to residents of Bishops Gate or elsewhere of the PY9 permeability link through Chapel Hill to Kilternan Church of Ireland National School and whether the link would improve walking times.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <u>B029</u>	Person: Leah Brennan	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission strongly objects to the proposed PY9 linkage between Chapel Hill and Bishops Gate on grounds of issues regarding potential for increased dog fouling, child safety, reduced security and privacy.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <u>B030</u>	Person: Pascal Cesari	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission believes there is no benefit to the proposed PY9 linkage between Chapel Hill and Bishops Gate.</li> <li>Would prefer that a secure footpath from Chapel Hill to Stepside Village be provided instead.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <u>B031</u>	Person: Inland Fisheries Ireland (IFI)	Organisation: Statutory Body
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Carefully control development and prioritise maintenance of wastewater and drainage infrastructure to protect water quality and fisheries habitat/aquatic environment and to safeguard protected sites.</li> <li>Welcome for recognition of provisions of dlr Biodiversity Action Plan 2021-2025 which focuses on the Fernhill to Bride's Glen ecological corridor which traverses the KGLAP lands from future Jamestown Park through to Dingle Glen pNHA.</li> <li>To protect the aquatic environment and prevent or minimise future flooding events submission recommends that:</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ LAP recognises importance of maintenance of all existing and future drainage infrastructure.</li> <li>○ Uisce Éireann confirms that foul wastewater from future development within the LAP can be conveyed to the wastewater treatment plant.</li> <li>○ Local Authority should audit drainage assets. Resource to maintenance and servicing of the drainage network and associated infrastructure.</li> <li>○ At design stage take account of the zone of influence associated with Greenway's/Blueway's to protect wildlife/riparian corridor systems from damage because of proximity and overengineering of pathways and cycleways.</li> <li>○ Consider the EU Nature Restoration Law and Regulation (Regulation (EU) 2024/1991) before adoption of Plan.</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 3, Chapter 7

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B032</u></b>	<b>Person: John Moga</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission objects to the proposed PY9 pathway on the grounds that a new access route would impact residents with the introduction of strangers, affect child safety, reduce privacy and security in the Chapel Hill estate.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B033</u></b>	<b>Person: Dawn Kelly</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission objects to the PY9 permeability proposal because of safety concerns regarding people walking through Chapel Hill, teenage drinking, hanging out on green area, causing antisocial behaviour on green area.</li> <li>• Residents all know each other and pay insurance and management fees for green area and playground (which is safe place to play) and it should not have public access.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: B034</b>	<b>Person: Peter Kelly</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission objects to the PY9 permeability proposal because of safety concerns from non-residents walking through Chapel Hill.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: B035</b>	<b>Person: Sarah Jane Grufferty</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission raises concerns regarding Draft LAP aims relating to Heritage and Biodiversity citing example of changes to the Enniskerry Road approach to the village given removal of the low granite wall and mature trees at the Shaldon Grange development.</li> <li>Considers that efforts should be made to ensure that developers protect heritage features such as existing stone walls and, if mature planting has to be removed, that it is replaced with suitable alternatives.</li> <li>Submits that developments positioned too close to a road with no bordering landscaping will impact the heritage feel of Kiltiernan and reduce existing biodiversity &amp; air quality.</li> <li>Submission has concerns regarding any introduction of a pedestrian link between the Chapel Hill and Bishops Gate estates (PY9) as the private insurance and maintenance fees currently paid by residents could be increased for residents should accidents occur with non-residents of Chapel Hill.</li> <li>Considers that the link route will facilitate more access to non-residents meaning that any criminal activity is harder to police.</li> <li>Submission cites taking in charge status of the roads into and within Chapel Hill has not been completed and that the Chapel Hill OMC is fully against the PY9 proposal.</li> <li>Submission includes a comparative map image with walking distances with and without the proposed PY9 linkage indicated.</li> <li>The Submission concludes that there will be no reduction of distance travelled from Bishops Gate to the Church of Ireland school rather than via Enniskerry Road.</li> <li>Submission states that provision should be made for a medical facility, retail outlets and café in the new village centre.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5, 6, 8		

<b>DLR Submission No: B036</b>	<b>Person: Thornton O'Connor Planning</b>	<b>Organisation: Pinnacle Consulting Engineers on behalf of Durkan Carrickmines Ltd</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission regarding, 'Movement Objective SDF3-1', which states that "Vehicular access to the land parcel will be via one access from the Kiltiernan Road" in respect of lands identified in Draft Plan as SDF3.</li> <li>In LRD pre planning discussions with dlr and as part of the GDRS detailed design it was intended that SDF3 would be accessed primarily via the GDRS with additional permeability links to the south and west for SDF3.</li> </ul>		

- Figure 2 of the submission shows the lands in the context of the GDRS, being located to the north of the Glenamuck District Distributor Road (GDDR) and Glenamuck Link Distributor Road (GLDR).
- Submission indicates the intention to provide primary access to SDF3 on its southern boundary via the GDDR to the south.
- Submission acknowledges and welcomes objective SDF3-1 in the Draft Plan and final LAP.

*(Note: The identified in Figure 1 of the submission are incorrectly labelled as SDF4. In the interests of clarity, it should be noted that the lands which are the subject of this submission are identified as SDF3 in the Draft LAP).*

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

Chapter 2

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B037</u></b>	<b>Person: Thornton O'Connor Planning</b>	<b>Organisation: Pinnacle Consulting Engineers on behalf of Durkan Carrickmines Ltd</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission/Observations:</b></p> <p>Submission regarding, 'Movement Objective SDF4-1', in respect of lands identified in Draft Plan as SDF4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In LRD pre planning discussions with dlr and as part of the GDRS detailed design it was intended that SDF4 would be accessed primarily via the GDRS with additional permeability links to the south and west for SDF4.</li> <li>• Figure 2 of the submission shows the lands in the context of the GDRS. They are located to the south of the Glenamuck District Distributor Road (GDDR) and west of the Glenamuck Link Distributor Road (GLDR).</li> <li>• Landowner has engaged with Dun Laoghaire Capital Roads Project Team regarding their land's interaction with the GDRS including vehicular, pedestrian/cyclist and utility connections and has agreed the location of the new vehicular access onto the GDDR.</li> <li>• Opinion expressed that vehicular access to SDF4 should be via the GGDR and this will reduce though traffic on adjoining developments. Limiting access to their lands via adjoining developments would delay development as they have no legal right of access nor control of timing or delivery of access points outside their ownership.</li> <li>• GDRS was purpose built to accommodate SDF4, and two access point should be provided for larger developments to facilitate traffic flow, ensure emergency access and improve permeability with adjoining sites. This strategy would align with the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines 2024.</li> <li>• Figure 4 of the submission illustrates a primary access via the GDDR and two secondary access points via Glenamuck Manor to the south.</li> <li>• Access to SDF4 via Glenamuck Road would result in a longer vehicular journey time onto the GDRS and would result in greater carbon emissions.</li> <li>• Requirement for SDF4 (which is currently landlocked) to be accessed from Glenamuck Road via third party lands would not be possible as Glenamuck Manor has not been taken in charge by dlr. SDF4 will be subject to a planning application in Q2 2025 and if successful would not have right of way over third-party lands.</li> <li>• Submission welcomes the permeability that SDF4 may deliver to residents in LAP area, but this should be in addition to primary access to GDRS.</li> <li>• Requests following wording of SDF4-1, "Vehicular access to the site will primarily be via the Glenamuck District Roads Scheme, with permeability links to schemes to the south and to the west".</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b></p>		
<p>Chapter 2</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B038</u></b>	<b>Person: Aileen Eglington</b>	<b>Organisation: KG Residents' Association</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission welcomes the Draft LAP in general, including the extension of the draft LAP boundary to the east to the pNHA of the Dingle Glen, the proposed new parklands, walking and nature corridors.</li> <li>• Submission also welcomes proposed areas for new schools while noting there is a need for secondary schools and safe active travel links to same.</li> <li>• States concern regarding provision of parkland or walkways beneath pylons as irresponsible.</li> <li>• Thinks that the proposed new park should have most investment while land under pylons is used for attenuation ponds.</li> <li>• Raises concerns in relation to the policy of interconnecting estates etc. as many parents feel that cul-de-sacs add safety for childrens' play and that there is a risk of anti-social behaviour also in these dark laneways in the future, if all is opened up. The policy needs to be re-examined.</li> <li>• Considers that traffic-calming, including bus gates, is not necessary for Enniskerry Road as they will unduly restrict local vehicular movement.</li> <li>• Suggests that a tree-planting policy is needed for the KGLAP reflective of that in the CDP.</li> <li>• Considers that a zoning density policy for lands west of Enniskerry Road should be included within the KGLAP.</li> <li>• Welcomes the proposed public transport hub to be located opposite The Blue Church and suggests that a hub for e-bike recharging is required in this location also.</li> <li>• States that public transport provision is still inadequate even with new routes.</li> <li>• Considers that biodiversity is an important consideration especially to use native planting, particularly in relation to hedgerows, must be incorporated in all plans and new developments and monitored.</li> <li>• States that the name 'Kilternan' must be used for the area as requested during previous LAP public submissions.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4,5,7,8, other issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B039</u></b>	<b>Person: Paul and Aileen Eglington</b>	<b>Organisation: Residents</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes process of the LAP in protecting integrity of KG as well as housing provision.</li> <li>• Believes that the boundary of the LAP should have gone up to the county boundary to include land protection and green corridors.</li> <li>• Cites concerns regarding recent incidents of anti-social behaviour in KG and believes there should be clear guidelines and responsibilities for same between DLRCC, housing bodies and the Gardai to protect the local area.</li> <li>• Thinks that a hedgerow and tree policy is needed to protect remaining planted areas.</li> <li>• States that the name 'Kilternan' must be used for the area as requested during previous LAP public submissions</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1, 7, 8, Other issues		



<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B040</u></b>	<b>Person: Aileen Eglington</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission cites concerns regarding provision of laneway PY2.</li> <li>• Queries whether there will be 24hr CCTV provided to counter potential for anti-social behaviour should PY2 be implemented.</li> <li>• Notes there is a link already in place from Suttonfield to Ballybetagh Road which should be adequate for access to Our Lady of the Wayside School.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B041</u></b>	<b>Person: John Findlater</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that enforcement of LAP objectives will be necessary to ensure no more than the proposed 2500 units are built for a population of 6,310.</li> <li>• Considers that the absence of provision of a site for a secondary school is a considerable shortcoming of the LAP.</li> <li>• Submits that there is an urgent need for a subsidised shuttle bus to be provided between Kiltiernan to Stepside and then to the secondary school in Ballyogan.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4, 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B042</u></b>	<b>Person: Terence Hall</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission states concerns with lack of parking and states that consideration should be given to provide a short stay parking area close to the Enniskerry Road / Ballybetagh Road.</li> <li>• Requests adherence to density and build height of buildings west of the Kiltiernan-Glenamuck Link Road (GLDR) of no more than 40 dwellings per hectare and 2 – 3 storeys high (9.2 metres), in particular to section 4.3.6.1 Residential Development of the Draft KGLAP.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4, 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B043</u></b>	<b>Person: Paul McElwaine</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission is opposed to proposed link PY9 stating it is an unnecessary addition to the network.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <b>B044</b>	Person: <b>Environmental Health Office</b>	Organisation: <b>Health Service Executive</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission is supportive of an LAP that protects and promotes population health and fits the vision of the Healthy Ireland Framework “where everyone can enjoy physical and mental health wellbeing to their full potential, where wellbeing is valued and supported at every level of society and is everyone’s responsibility.”</li> <li>• The EHO recommends that the LAP should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ LAP vision should include reference to:</li> <li>◦ Delivering on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), (not specified).</li> <li>◦ Healthy Place Making.</li> <li>◦ ‘Healthy Ireland Framework’, vision for “a healthy Ireland where everyone can enjoy physical and mental health and well-being to their full potential, where well-being is valued and supported at every level of society and everyone’s responsibility”.</li> <li>◦ Metrics to measure a “healthy/healthier” Kiltiernan – Glenamuck.</li> <li>◦ Kiltiernan – Glenamuck being a resilient neighbourhood.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Climate Action and Infrastructure chapter should be informed by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ National Adaptation Framework of 2024, “planning for a climate resilient Ireland”.</li> <li>◦ Climate Change Risk Assessment as well as a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</li> <li>◦ Building community resilience.</li> <li>◦ Building the adaptive capacity of the community.</li> <li>◦ Reducing dependence on treated water.</li> <li>◦ Landscaping with greatest capacity to sequester carbon.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• People and Homes chapter should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Broaden the meaning of health beyond healthcare services.</li> <li>◦ A healthy place should be within the “WHO definition of Health”, which is physical and mental wellbeing and not merely absence of disease.</li> <li>◦ Address as many determinants of health e.g., active travel, access to healthcare services, access to green/blue spaces for mental health, good air quality and a noise environment suitable for residential living.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Welcomes reference to inclusion and being an age friendly plan.</li> <li>• Transport and Movement chapter should emphasise secure parking for bicycles and other forms of active travel and to include bike sharing /libraries to increase active travel.</li> <li>• Implementation and Monitoring chapter should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Chapter 3 Climate Action and Infrastructure in Table 9.1.</li> <li>◦ Monitoring and evaluation of “Healthy Place making” aspect of the Vision for the plan.</li> <li>◦ Monitoring of plan delivery during and at end of plan period using SMART objectives/indicators.</li> <li>◦ Health metrics in a “Monitoring and Evaluation Framework” for the plan.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The submission included a copy of the submission made during the pre-draft consultation period which is summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports LAP for KG that promotes population health and fits the vision of the Healthy Ireland Framework “where everyone can enjoy physical and mental health wellbeing to their full potential, where wellbeing is valued and supported at every level of society and is everyone’s responsibility.”</li> <li>• Climate action and low carbon development should be supported in by the LAP.</li> </ul>		

- Should develop a low carbon, climate-resilient, and environmentally sustainable Kiltiernan/Glenamuck by 2050 with interim targets for 2030 with actions such as:
  - Citizen engagement – contribute to climate literacy and enable citizens to take action.
  - Support a just transition to a climate neutral area.
  - Build to zero emission building (ZEB) standards and support retrofitting.
  - Delivery of healthier housing, workplaces and communities through effective urban planning, design and construction.
  - Suggests that the vision incorporate HI vision: "A healthy Ireland, where everyone can enjoy physical and mental health and well-being to their full potential, where well-being is valued and supported at every level of society and is everyone's responsibility."
  - Include the Shift-Avoid-Improve transport principles.
  - Facilitate large scale renewable energy technology developments.
  - Adapt to climate change and build resilience for residents – including flood resilience, protection from extreme heat events (avoid urban heat island effect, provide shade and water fountains) etc.
- Plan should support the Sustainable Development Goals as set out in Agenda 2030 – specifically SDG3 (healthy lives) and 11 (sustainable cities and communities) and align with the National Implementation Plan for the Sustainable Development Goals 2022 – 2024.
- Should adopt 4 priorities of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 – 2030.
- Should be as inclusive as possible taking account of:
  - Older persons
  - People with a disability
  - Youth/adolescents
  - Disadvantaged/marginalised groups
  - Ethnicity/cultural mix
  - All genders.
- Should enable/support all age groups to participate in active play/sport and active travel.
- Transport options should be prioritised with pedestrians first and private vehicles at the bottom of a hierarchy.
- Should consider physical separation of pedestrian and cycle paths to ensure safety for all.
- Rights of way should be prioritised.
- Secure bicycle parking should be provided.
- Issue of scooters needs to be considered in active travel and road safety.
- Should deliver high air quality and identify areas of poor air quality together with mitigation measures.
- Renewable energy should be supported including the storage of energy.
- Should include a noise map and apply thresholds.
- Should protect quality of existing and planned water bodies.
- Should align with the Circular Economy and Miscellaneous Provisions Act of July 2022 and work towards a circular economy.
- Support waste reduction and segregation.
- Support sustainable diets of residents.
- Assist in the delivery of a tobacco free Ireland.

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

Chapter 1,3,4,5,9

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B045</u></b>	<b>Person: Gay Wright</b>	<b>Organisation: KG Residents' Association</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers that greenways and parks should not follow under the path of the pylons and power lines due to medical threat to those with medical devices such as pacemakers.</li> <li>• States that native hedgerows and trees should be retained as far as possible.</li> <li>• Requests parking provision be ensured within the village for those who are not within walking distance of the village.</li> <li>• Submission states that public transport needs improving and should include a linking bus service to Luas, Dart and N11 quality Bus corridor.</li> <li>• Traffic-calming measures are needed on Enniskerry and Ballycorus Roads.</li> <li>• Submits that seating provision in strategic areas in the village are needed to enhance the town centre atmosphere.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2, 5, 7		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B046</u></b>	<b>Person: Sorchá Connolly</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has concerns with the new Bus Connects routes which are far less reliable and timely than the previous services they have replaced.</li> <li>• Suggests changes to route frequencies and timings to improve journeys to schools and Luas.</li> <li>• Supports Active Travel plans contained within the LAP while noting need for consideration of those who cannot drive or walk.</li> <li>• States that there is a need to provide safe drop-off zones at schools and creches in the area.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B047</u></b>	<b>Person: David Hyde</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to inclusion of Chapel Hill playground in the LAP and considers it an advertisement for a private space.</li> <li>• Objects to proposed PY9 link route on the grounds of increased footfall, privacy, traffic safety, insurance of the playground/estate, lack of travel time benefit to schools.</li> <li>• Considers the new bus route L26 to be inadequate for connective requirements between Kiltiernan and the nearest Luas stop at Ballyogan Wood.</li> <li>• Suggests that the Local Authority should engage with the NTA about having a regular bus that runs between Kiltiernan village and Dundrum or Ballaly Luas stop via the Enniskerry Road / Sandyford Road.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5, 7		

DLR Submission No: <u>B048</u>	Person: Nigel Start	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission regarding, 'Movement Objective SDF4-1', which states "Vehicular access to the site will be via existing schemes which access from Glenamuck Road", in respect of part of the lands identified in Draft Plan as SDF4.</li> <li>Submission indicates that the main access to Grange Oaks (Shaldon Grange) Phase 2 and land adjoining Glenamuck Manor is on the Enniskerry Road.</li> <li>Submission considers that objectives for SDF4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are inconsistent with the masterplan (including pedestrian linkages and road connections), agreed with Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council for land block 6b in Glenamuck North and submitted with three planning applications for Grange Oaks (Shaldon Grange), Dun Oir and Glenamuck Manor developments.</li> <li>Will separate access through the planned phases and restrict development north of the GDDR.</li> <li>Will delay delivery of housing because of requirement for access via third party lands.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Recommends following wording of Movement Objectives SDF4-1, "Vehicular access to the site will be via existing schemes".</li> <li>Submission asserts that separate development accesses and service provision has been provided as part of the GDDR for land parcel SDF3-1(which has two separate owners).</li> <li>Requirement to develop the entire SDF3 via one vehicular access would make the development of one of the landholdings dependent on the completion and taking in charge of the other, thereby delaying the delivery of housing.</li> <li>Access and service provision has been provided to Grange Oaks phase 3 as part of the GDDR construction works in addition to a separate entrance for the remaining lands to the east.</li> <li>Requests that Movement Objective SDF3-1 be reworded as follows, "Vehicular access to the land parcel will be via the Kiltiernan Road (GDDR)".</li> <li>Requests that reference to "Shaldon Grange" be changed to "Grange Oaks" in the final plan.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2		

DLR Submission No: <u>B049</u>	Person: Tara Scully	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to the proposed PY9 link route on the basis of security and potential crime facilitation.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		



<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B050</u></b>	<b>Person: Laura Pauley</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that SUDs in Kiltarnan Wood are being used for illegal dumping and needs clearing.</li> <li>• Suggests traffic-calming measures are needed on Enniskerry Road.</li> <li>• Requests consideration of better pathway provision for wheelchairs/prams on pathways along the Enniskerry Road as current paths are in poor condition, stop abruptly and do not allow for safe crossing for anyone between the Golden Ball junction to Stepside.</li> <li>• Considers that there is a need for more policing of the area due to recent increases in criminal activity.</li> <li>• Spelling of Kiltarnan/Kiltarnan needs to be addressed to prevent confusion and improve perception of the local area.</li> <li>• Submits that maintenance of public spaces and provision of bins needs to be improved especially around public social housing.</li> <li>• Submits that public transport routes and frequency need to be improved as the new route is inadequate.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 3, 5, 8, Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B051</u></b>	<b>Person: Akshay Oswal</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests an increase in the provision of buses for public transport as current schedule is inadequate for local and future need.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B052</u></b>	<b>Person: Priyanka Perera</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Draft LAP</li> <li>• Submits that the L26 schedule should be increased to run every 15 minutes and route 44 every half an hour.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1, 5		

DLR Submission No: <u>B053</u>	Person: Saurabh Pathak	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission notes that there is poor upkeep of area under the remit of the Local Authority noting a lack of bins leading to littering and dog fouling and a lack of planting between the pub and the council estate.</li> <li>Notes that SUDs in Kiltiernan Wood are being used for illegal dumping and needs clearing.</li> <li>Notes that the road serving Bishops Gate is in poor condition.</li> <li>Submits that the L26 schedule should be increased to run every 15 minutes and route 44 every half an hour.</li> <li>Requests that the L27 is brought back to provide a direct link to Dun Laoghaire.</li> <li>Requests increasing 118 service morning and evening to town (via Sandford Industrial Estate, N11, and UCD) and return service.</li> <li>Has concerns about 30 kmph speed limits on main roads being too slow and potentially causing congestion.</li> <li>Spelling of Kiltiernan/Kiltarnan needs to be agreed.</li> <li>There is a need for an increased Garda presence.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 3, 5, 8, Other Issues		

DLR Submission No: <u>B054</u>	Person: Cristina	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits that the L26 bus schedule should be increased to run every 15 minutes and route 44 every half an hour.</li> <li>Requests a direct bus link to Dun Laoghaire be reinstated.</li> <li>Increased Garda presence needed.</li> <li>Notes that public spaces maintenance needs to be improved as currently very poor.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5, Other Issues		

DLR Submission No: <u>B055</u>	Person: Daniel O'Sullivan	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests that village/rural/granite character of the area is preserved and enhanced.</li> <li>Supports the '10-minute neighbourhood' and considers that pedestrian/cyclist access between neighbourhoods needs to be a priority to reduce travel time.</li> <li>Submits that increasing public transport use would be encouraged by 15-minute frequency of bus services during peak times.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5, 8		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B056</u></b>	<b>Person: Shauna Kirke</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits that an expanded number of buses which operate more frequently is much needed for Kiltiernan.</li> <li>Considers supermarkets, shops, cafes and gyms are also very needed in the area.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5, 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B057</u></b>	<b>Person: Maria</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests road visibility and traffic management plan for Enniskerry Road to improve visibility and safety elements.</li> <li>Submits that the L26 schedule should be increased to run every 15 minutes and route 44 every half an hour.</li> <li>Requests that the L27 is brought back to provide a direct link to Dun Laoghaire.</li> <li>Requests increasing 118 service morning and evening to town (via Sandford Industrial Estate, N11, and UCD) and return service.</li> <li>Spelling of Kiltiernan/Kiltarnan needs to be agreed for consistency.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5, 8		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B058</u></b>	<b>Person: Emma Kate Lyons</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission objects to the proposed PY9 link to Bishops Gate on safety and privacy grounds.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B059</u></b>	<b>Person: Sarah Higgins</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the provision of safer cycle paths, both to Stepside and Carrickmines.</li> <li>Requests a safe crossing for the SETNS buss.</li> <li>Requests traffic-calming measures at the Bishops Gate road entrance and at bends.</li> <li>There is a need for a supermarket in area.</li> <li>There is need for a secondary school.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4, 5, 6		

DLR Submission No: <u>B060</u>	Person: Morrough Kavanagh	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits that the name of the village should be spelt Kilternan.</li> <li>Requests that adequate parking be provided within the Village Centre to support use by vehicle drivers for the local church, school and shopping users.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5, 8		

DLR Submission No: <u>B061</u>	Person: Hilary and Howard Knott	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission supports LAP focus on sustainable transport, walking and cycling.</li> <li>Requests that adequate parking is provided in the Village Centre to support public transport uses.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <u>B062</u>	Person: Jessica Kavanagh	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission states that the KGLAP does not take biodiversity seriously noting that recent planning decisions have decimated the traditional rural area and has failed to preserve hedgerows and native treelines.</li> <li>Submits that remaining hedgerows must be maintained as a priority.</li> <li>States that the plan fails to take into consideration that the Luas is already full at peak hours and questions how it will accommodate an increase in population.</li> <li>Considers that the LAP does not properly consider the transport needs of the elderly and less able members of the community due to a focus on walking and cycling, bus gates and limiting parking. It appears that the plan focuses on the needs of young families.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5 and 7		

DLR Submission No: <b>B063</b>	Person: <b>Des Cox, Lead Planning and Environment</b>	Organisation: <b>Eirgrid</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission considers increasing demand for domestic electricity leading to future major transmission infrastructure upgrades which will continue to make the KGLAP a strong node of electricity.</li> <li>Contends that the continuing strong demand for electricity indicates that the ongoing presence of pylons will continue into the future, making their presence a 'long-established context for any consideration of development in this area'.</li> <li>Suggests that the evolution of this development area with urban built form will continue to absorb existing overhead electricity infrastructure from a visual and social perspective.</li> <li>States that there is no imposition of any mandatory setback from this infrastructure as grid infrastructure is inherently designed and operated to be safe to human health.</li> <li>Acknowledges that previous discussions regarding undergrounding of power lines have occurred between the Council and Eirgrid but these may not be feasible.</li> <li>Welcomes any and all future opportunities to engage regarding the undergrounding and other issues with DLRCC.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 3		

DLR Submission No: <b>B064</b>	Person: <b>Tasneem Khadkiwala</b>	Organisation: <b>Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits that the L26 schedule should be increased to run every 15 minutes and route 44 every half an hour.</li> <li>Requests that the L27 is brought back to provide a direct link to Dun Laoghaire.</li> <li>Area around Golden Ball needs better maintenance, improved road surfaces and traffic light sequencing.</li> <li>Parked vehicles at Golden Ball can make walking difficult.</li> <li>Requests provision of rubbish bins on Enniskerry Road noting issues of broken glass and cleaning issues.</li> <li>States there is a need for safe and well-designed pedestrian crossings, cycling and walking routes along Enniskerry Road.</li> <li>Requests increased safety measures around new developments, including street lighting to be switched on.</li> <li>Notes that there is a noticeable absence of parks or designated tracks for walking, cycling, jogging, citing their importance for wellbeing.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5, 7, Other Issues		



<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B065</u></b>	<b>Person: Susan O Dwyer</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to provision of the PY9 link route.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B066</u></b>	<b>Person: Harry Simpson</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally supportive of development in the area.</li> <li>• Concerns about excessive level of construction work underway in last three years which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Makes living in the area miserable.</li> <li>○ Causes travel delays.</li> <li>○ Results in lack of water supply and power cuts.</li> <li>○ Has associated noise and dirt.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Submission suggests that building works should be staggered with no more than two or three construction projects underway at any one time.</li> <li>• Submission in relation to SDF8 suggests:</li> <li>• Density of 40dph and maximum 4 storeys is excessive relative to Cairnbrook and not necessary to meet housing targets and should be amended to 35dph and maximum 3 storeys.</li> <li>• Access to SDF8 should be via Springfield Lane on the basis that the previous LAP indicated that access via Cairnbrook (land parcel 30 in the 2013 LAP) would be curtailed by the capacity of the access roadway off the Glenamuck Road. It is also suggested that Cairnbrook is not a suitable access route as it already has road safety issues and increased traffic would lead to excessive and dangerous traffic through the estate.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2, 9, Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B067</u></b>	<b>Person: Jonathan Coen</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that public transport is poor from Kiltiernan down to Stepside village and Carrickmines.</li> <li>• Considers that there needs to be visible Garda patrols within the Kiltiernan Wood estate.</li> <li>• Does not recommend that through-roads between Kiltiernan Wood to Suttonfield are provided as this will cause issues for parking and anti-social behaviour.</li> <li>• Requests better upkeep of estates including the planting of trees and hedge rows between Kiltiernan Wood and Suttonfield.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5, 7, Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B068</u></b>	<b>Person: Seamus Gahan</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to the proposed PY9 link between Chapel Hill and Bishops Gate on the grounds of reduced safety and privacy.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B069</u></b>	<b>Person: Philip Mc Donnell</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission makes following observations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Public infrastructure in the vicinity of Kilternan Wood, and roads leading out of Kilternan Wood on to Bishops Gate, is in a poor state of repair.</li> <li>○ Lack of public bins leading to litter problems in the area.</li> <li>○ Lack of planting between Kilternan Wood and Kilternan Close.</li> <li>○ Storm drain at entrance to Kilternan Wood is not maintained and being used for illegal dumping.</li> <li>○ Money invested in homes to become members of community and being let down by surrounding infrastructure and Council not delivering on their duty of care.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Public domain around Golden Ball is in poor state of presentation and needs attention.</li> <li>• Refers to the growth of the area and a recent Garda operation in the area highlighting the need for additional Garda presence to enable the community to feel safe.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B070</u></b>	<b>Person: Sam Pauley</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request for a single approach to the spelling of "Kilternan".</li> <li>• Request for improvements to visual appearance, amenity and maintenance/cleaning of area between Bishops Gate and the Circle K.</li> <li>• Request for additional bins and tree planting.</li> <li>• Observation that "white apartment block next to the Golden Ball" is not in keeping with the aesthetics of the area and grass on green area is overgrown and unsightly.</li> <li>• Request for updated speed limits and ramps to improve road safety, at exit of Bishops Gate.</li> <li>• Submits that the new L26 does not allow for access to Ballyogan Road, Dunnes Stores and is unreliable and cancelled at short notice.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5, 8 , Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B071</u></b>	<b>Person: Lauryn Coleman</b>	<b>Organisation: Office of the Planning Regulator</b>
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> This submission is summarized in full in Volume 1 in accordance with section 20 (3) (c) (ii)(II) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended).		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 2 under the following heading(s):</b> Overview of the Submission, Main Issues Raised and Recommendations Made by the Office of the Planning Regulator		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B072</u></b>	<b>Person: Secretary, Wayside Celtic Football Club</b>	<b>Organisation: Wayside Celtic Football Club</b>
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission acknowledges the recognition of open space and recreation in Chapter 7 and requests specific objectives to facilitate the expansion of Wayside Celtics facilities at Jackson Park to address capacity issues and serve the growing population as follows:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of additional playing fields and training areas.</li> <li>Upgrade of existing facilities, including changing rooms and clubhouses.</li> <li>Enhanced access and connectivity within Jackson Park and to the surrounding areas.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Submission requests that boundary of SDF11 be expanded to incorporate lands to the south of Jackson Park because this vital community resource is landlocked in order to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide a comprehensive framework for future development of the park.</li> <li>Ensure that planning decisions consider the community's recreational needs.</li> <li>Facilitate the integration of Wayside Celtics facilities with broader recreational amenities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Welcome for engagement with the Department to ensure that any all-weather pitches on SDF9 would be adjacent to and link to the club if possible.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 7		

DLR Submission No: <b><u>B073</u></b>	Person: <b>Belinda O'Byrne</b>	Organisation: <b>Resident</b>
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to PY10 via private lane and private land on Dixon Lane.</li> <li>• Submission asserts that there is a right of way (RoW) for residents of Dixon Lane but the Right of Way through private land to "The Dingle" does not exist and should be removed.</li> <li>• Submission asserts that when this was contested in Court and because only the landowner was present the right of way was removed from all future LAP.</li> <li>• RoW is no longer in use as it has farm buildings and farm animals on private land.</li> <li>• Submission includes a copy of a letter from dlr dated 9<sup>th</sup> May 2003 setting out that the Planning Authority had resolved to include a Right of Way described as "Glenamuck South: Ballycorus Road to Dingle Glen in the Dun Laoghaire County Development Plan 2004-2010 and that a right of appeal exists to the Circuit Court.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <b><u>B074</u></b>	Person: <b>Dermot O'Byrne</b>	Organisation: <b>Resident</b>
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission asserts that no general right of way, as shown in Figure 1.3 of LAP exists along Dixon Lane across lands to the dingle except for residents and farmland owners to access lands for farming purposes.</li> <li>• Submission understands that the courts decided in 2004 that no right of way exists to the Dingle Glen from the top of Dixon Lane.</li> <li>• Objection to PY10 across private lands from Jackson Park to Dixon Lane on general grounds and property security.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <b><u>B075</u></b>	Person: <b>Hughes Planning and Development Consultants</b>	Organisation: <b>Droimsi Developments Limited</b>
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission welcomes and commends the Draft LAP and sets out that Droimsi are active landowners and are keen for prompt adoption of LAP to unlock the full potential of the area and deliver much needed homes and infrastructure within the settlement boundary of Kiltiernan – Glenamuck.</li> <li>• Notes that Kiltiernan – Glenamuck has undergone significant population growth, and that continued population growth will put pressure on existing residential zoned lands.</li> <li>• Request to extend boundary to the northwest along the Enniskerry Road to provide adequate land within the LAP boundary for residential development and recreational facilities.</li> <li>• Considers that expanding the LAP boundary to the northwest would allow for continued growth of Kiltiernan and Enniskerry which will be able to facilitate higher populations on completion of the GDRS.</li> </ul>		

- Considers that proposed extension of LAP boundary would allow for the delivery of new and affordable homes and community services in accordance with the NPF and the RSES.
- Submission notes the importance of good urban design in achieving a balance between densification of built environment and providing well designed public realm, open spaces and neighbourhoods while preserving and safeguarding the areas important heritage to achieve successful place making and create a strong identity.
- Request for an objective to provide a football pitch to serve the growing population in the area.
- Request that this submission be considered in preparation of forthcoming County Development Plan.
- Site which is the subject of the submission is described as being greenfield and as a prime location for a football pitch given its proximity to existing sporting facilities, schools, church, proposed village centre and its service in terms of infrastructure, public transport, and utilities.
- Notes growth of the county and need to provide adequate supply and variety of housing to meet the needs of existing and future residents.
- Notes zoned lands within the LAP already being developed or have planning applications pending.
- Notes reduced capacity of zoned lands for residential development due to the overhead pylons traversing the LAP.
- Considers the expansion of the boundary would futureproof the LAP and delivery of housing.
- References the National Planning Framework, compact growth with higher densities along transport corridors and forecast of population growth in dlr. Extended boundary would safeguard future growth predicted by NPF, would not contravene NDP mission to growth within built-up footprint of KG.
- Notes the location of the subject lands adjacent to an existing school and 700m from proposed neighbourhood centre in Kiltiernan Village supporting goal of achieving a walkable neighbourhood.
- Lands are within walking distance of schools and services.
- Submission sets out a strategic justification for LAP boundary expansion based on:
  - Alignment with National and Regional Planning Policy; NPF - compact transport-oriented growth, RSES - higher residential density near transport hubs and dlr CDP - projected growth reinforcing need for additional residential lands.
  - Transport Infrastructure Enhancements; GDRS will improve accessibility of lands, BusConnects will enhance public transport frequency, ensuring sustainable mobility and LUAS stop within 1.5km supporting active travel policies.
  - Efficient Use of Services Lands; lands within the LAP are already being developed or have planning applications pending, provision of additional lands to ensure pipeline of housing and proximity of lands to infrastructure.
  - Integration of Community and Recreational Amenities; by provision of social and recreational infrastructure.
  - Future Proofing Against Population Growth and Housing Shortages in an area with an increasing population; by designation of subject lands as a long-term development reserve to avoid future zoning shortfalls and ensure a balanced, phased approach to development in line with national and regional policy.
- Submission sets out the current planning context:
  - References the NPF, compact growth with higher densities along transport corridors and forecast of population growth in dlr.
  - Extended boundary would safeguard future growth predicted by NPF, would not contravene NDP mission to growth within built-up footprint of Kiltiernan - Glenamuck.
  - NPF encourages the consolidation of existing urban footprints – this should be facilitated in the LAP to allow for future growth.



- Would ensure adequate land is set aside for residential development in the event of the CDP being reviewed to take account of recent census data.
- RSES refers to LAP as being within the Metrolink / Luas corridor and close to Cherrywood.
- RSES promotes sustainable growth of Dublin City and Suburbs and Kiltiernan – Glenamuck is referred to as being within the Dublin Metropolitan Area.
- Notes employment locations close by.
- Considers additional lands in LAP would be compliant with the RSES in terms of population growth, delivery of strategic development, promotion of active land management and compact growth.
- Refers to Core Strategy and that Census 2022 shows an increase in population of 15,482 since 2016 and further average population growth of 2,594 to 3177 persons per annum is anticipated between 2016 and 2028 – there should therefore be headroom provided for this, and additional lands zoned for residential use.
- Expansion of the LAP boundary would allow for sustainable growth in Kiltiernan – Glenamuck and would be in accordance with Objectives CS1 (accord with Housing Strategy and Housing Needs Demand Assessment), SS02 (support delivery of Core Strategy) and SS03 (zone sufficient land for housing) of the CDP settlement strategy
- Notes that the lands may not be suited to re-zoning now, as it conflicts with the objectives and policies of the CDP but that an extension of the boundary would future proof the LAP area and ensure adequate land exists within the boundary should the need arise in the future. Also suggests that inclusion of the lands would be considered consistent with the objectives of the CDP.
- Extension of LAP boundary would facilitate the sustainable growth of KGLAP into the future.
- Section 5 of the submission sets out the 'Submission Request' as follows:
  - Notes that the lands are located next to water and road infrastructure with 3 potential access points – submission sets out that this is detailed in an engineering report in Appendix A of the submission. In the interests of clarity, it should be noted that the submission does not include this Appendix.
  - Notes new GDRS – the lands in question are close to the junction of this new road and would provide quick and easy access for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists to the village centre and jobs in Carrickmines and Leopardstown.
  - Lands are served by existing bus routes 44 and 118 into the city centre and are proximate to the Luas.
  - Bus services will be enhanced with the delivery of BusConnects to the area.
  - Suggest that subject lands have potential for residential development, pitch and open space, resulting in a high-quality development. Submission sets out that a draft masterplan is included in Appendix B of the submission to illustrate a potential layout and suitability of subject lands for residential development. In the interests of clarity, it should be noted that the submission does not include this Appendix.
  - Lands could accommodate new recreational amenities for the community in the form of a football pitch, and public park.
  - Notes that 'Sporting Facility' is permitted in principle within the site zoning objective.
  - Request that an objective is included on the lands to provide for community/recreational facilities.
- Request for phasing flexibility in line with proposed boundary extension as follows:
  - Notes that development in the KGLAP is no longer subject to phasing and not tied to the delivery of the GDRS and requests this phasing flexibility be extended to the subject lands allowing them to be brought forward for development in tandem with infrastructure improvements.
  - The Suggests that because the LAPS's phasing is aligned with the delivery of the GDRS and given that the subject lands are located adjacent to a junction

<p>within the GDRS their exclusion from the LAP boundary contradicts the LAP's infrastructure led phasing approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ LAP should include a specific implementation mechanism for newly incorporated lands to ensure that they are not disadvantaged by their late inclusion in the LAP ensuring that the lands can align with planned infrastructure, public transport upgrades and essential services.</li> <li>○ Subject lands should be included within LAP boundary, ensuring their designation for future housing and community infrastructure.</li> <li>○ Integrate proposed masterplan into the LAP framework allowing for the timely and coordinated development of residential units, open spaces and community/recreation amenities.</li> <li>○ Designate areas within the subject lands for social and recreational amenities as part of the masterplan for local clubs and the broader community.</li> <li>○ Include a Site Development Framework similar to those in the Plan for the subject lands to ensure their future development is aligned with the overarching policies of the Plan to for a coordinated approach to the delivery of housing, public transport access, community infrastructure provision.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, Other issues</p>

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B076</u></b>	<b>Person: Ian Hughes</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<p><b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to PY9 link between Bishops Gate and Chapel Hill because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Main road from Bishops Gate already provides a safe route to the school.</li> <li>○ Will increase probability of anti-social behaviour in safe quiet cul de sac by allowing access to users who most likely won't be using it for school journeys.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B077</u></b>	<b>Person: Nessa Mc Carthy</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<p><b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to PY9 'quietway' between Bishops Gate and Chapel Hill because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It has no advantage to residents of Chapel Hill or Bishops Gate.</li> <li>○ Main road should have safe space for pedestrians.</li> <li>○ Will result in increase in security issues and antisocial behaviour.</li> <li>○ Parents and children mostly know each other and are comfortable with children playing in a cul de sac. Loss of cul de sac would create a safety concern for local children playing.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5</p>		

DLR Submission No: <b>B078</b>	Person: <b>John Spain Associates</b>	Organisation: <b>Grafton Issuer DAC</b>
<p><b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission is made in respect of a 3.12 ha parcel of land within the LAP boundary immediately east of Cairnbrook, south and west of Springfield Lane and north of Rockville Drive / Glenamuck Cottages, identified as SDF8 in Glenamuck East Character Area and is described in terms of its location and context relative to surrounding residential developments and roads.</li> <li>The lands are subject to zoning objective A in the CDP and were identified for medium / higher density development in the KGLAP 2013-2018 and the LAP notes that Kiltiernan – Glenamuck residential community is identified under MASP as being within the LUAS Green Line Strategic Corridor.</li> <li>Notes that the LAP recognises the role that height plays in achieving compact cities and densification and that CDP policy seeks to increase the supply of houses and apartments by setting a minimum default net density in the County of 35 dph.</li> <li>Notes that a general density range of 40 – 80 dph applies within the LAP and that the LAP lands fall within the 'Peripheral Urban Extension' area classification of the Compact Settlement Guidelines and that lands within 1 km of Ballyogan Luas Station also need to be considered under the 50 -250 dph category of the Guidelines given proximity to high frequency public transport.</li> <li>In noting that Policy KGLAP 30 – Building Heights supports increased building heights to the east of the Kiltiernan – Glenamuck Link Road, subject to compliance with the performance based criteria of the Building Height Strategy in the CDP, considers that the LAP proposes to restrict building height on the subject lands to a maximum of 4 storeys and density to 40 dph and this is not consistent with the permitted LRD nor previous LAP.</li> <li>On 6 March 2025, permission was granted by dlr for an LRD proposal on the lands for 157 residential units and childcare facility resulting in a density of 52 uph. Heights ranged from 2 and 3 storey houses up to 5 storey apartment buildings.</li> <li>Purpose of submission is to ensure that SDF8, including policies, and / or objectives and supporting text and maps that are aligned with the permitted development on site at 52 uph and 5 storeys in height.</li> <li>Submission requests 8 amendments to the LAP. The submission requests are shown with the proposed text in green, and the text proposed to be deleted / revised in <del>red with a strikethrough</del>.</li> <li>Submission requests the amendments to the text relating to overall site development framework urban design policies to provide a greater degree of flexibility in terms of design response, having regard to site context and topography within SDF8, thereby having regard to the LRD permission. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy KGLAP 4 - Site Development Frameworks: It is policy that future development shall generally accord with the objectives set out in the site development framework section for each development site (see section 2.7). Planning applications shall include a consistency statement setting out how each of the objectives in the Site Development Framework will be delivered.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Submission requests amendments to text relating to building height policies and objectives, and Appendix 3 to provide for a building height of up to 5 storeys on the subject lands to better reflect the LRD permission which had regard to the topography of the site, separation distance, site size and the Building Heights Strategy of the CDP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heights Objectives SDF 8-4 Maximum 4 5 storeys, <del>however heights of buildings located in the eastern portion of the site to be restricted because of the elevated nature of the site.</del> with heights of buildings located in the eastern portion of the site to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

have regard to the topography of the site in the context of the transition to the 'B' zoned lands to the east.

- Policy KGLAP30 – Building Height:

It is policy that building heights in the Draft KGLAP shall generally be 2-~~4~~ 5 storeys and generally accord with the height guidance for each site development framework set out in Chapter 2, subject to policy objectives BHS1 and BHS2 of the Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 (SPPR 3 of the 'Urban Development and Building Height; Guidelines for Planning Authorities' 2018), or policy objectives in any subsequent County Development Plan.

Having regard to SPPR3 in the Building Height Guidelines, a building height of up to 5 storeys will be supported on lands located to the east of the Kiltiernan – Glenamuck Link Road, and there may be instances where an argument can be made for increased height and/or taller buildings on lands located to the east of the Kiltiernan – Glenamuck Link Road, or at certain locations along the Kiltiernan Road. In circumstances where compliance with Policy Objective BHS1 and BHS2 of the County Development Plan (see Appendix 5) can be demonstrated additional height may be appropriate, subject to complying with; the safeguards outlined in the CDP, the policies and objectives of this Draft Local Area Plan and the performance based criteria as set out in Table 5.1 of the BH Strategy (See Appendix 5) or as set out in any subsequent County Development Plan.

- Submission requests amendments to text relating to density policies and objectives, and Appendix 3 to provide for a density range of 45-55 on SDF8, thereby having regard to the previous LAP and the recent LRD decision which considered that balancing national and local policy provisions (in particular the Compact Settlement Guidelines) that a density of 52 uph was acceptable on the site.
  - Density Objectives  
SDF8-5 Generally, ~~40~~ 45-55 dph.
  - Policy KGLAP28 – Overall Residential Density: It is policy to promote and support residential densities in line with Policy Objective PHP18 of the County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 (or any subsequent Plan) and the 'Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines', 2024. In this regard, residential density shall generally accord with site development frameworks in Chapter 2 or where density is not provided for in Chapter 2:
    - Lands located to the east of the Kiltiernan - Glenamuck Link Road shall achieve a residential density of 50-80 dwellings per hectare.
    - Lands to the west of the Kiltiernan Glenamuck Link Road shall achieve a residential density of 40-50 dwellings per hectare.

Smaller infill sites that are not of sufficient scale will be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Such sites may define their own density (as agreed by the planning authority) in response to the scale and form of surrounding development.
- Submission requests amendments to text relating to environment (hedgerows) objectives and Appendix 3 for SDF8 to provide for alteration of hedgerows along the eastern boundary of SDF8 where necessary to facilitate future development, including to provide access to the land to the east as supported/indicated on drawings in the LRD application.
  - Environment Objectives  
SDF8-6
    - Retain hedgerow to the east as shown on Fig 7.1, chapter 7, where practicable and avoid private gardens bounding onto hedges to be retained. Alteration of hedgerows to provide for connectivity / access is permitted.

- Sensitive lighting along transitional boundaries.
- Submission requests amendments to text relating to Housing for All objective and Appendix 3 (as it is considered to be an overly onerous blanket requirement that is not evidence based) so that it is more closely aligned with Section 12.3.3.1 of the CDP which already provides for an appropriate mix of residential units, including a proportion of larger units designed for the needs of older people and / or persons with a disability and / or lifetime homes.
  - Objective H1 – Housing for All:  
It is an objective to ensure the provision of a range of housing options within the Draft KGLAP area, that take account of all ages and abilities as residents progress through different stages of life, **in accordance with Section 12.3.3.1 and Table 12.1 of the County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 (or any subsequent Plan)** that all new residential developments of **10+ 50+** units shall include **a minimum of 25% of the total** housing stock to be designed to facilitate an ageing population / people with a disability. **In this regard, the following provisions should be taken into account in the design and location of such units:**
    - ~~Units should be designed having regard to the universal design homes principles.~~
    - ~~Insofar as possible, units should be located at ground floor level with own door access.~~
    - ~~Units should contain a minimum of 2 bedrooms.~~
    - ~~Ideally, units should be located where residents have a short walk to site entrances that adjoin public transport links and amenities within or adjacent to the proposed development.~~
    - ~~To assist with ease of access to public transport links and amenities, landscaping within any new development shall be designed having regard to ease of movement and legibility for all users.~~
- Submission requests amendments to text relating to Housing for All – communal facilities objective and Appendix (as it is again considered overly onerous), so that it is more closely aligned with, Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for new apartments, 2023, and the CDP which already adequately provide the opportunity for accessible communal facilities for residents of all ages and abilities if required for a particular development.
- Objective H2 Communal facilities:  
In line with the section 28 Guidelines "Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for new apartments" the Planning Authority will encourage provision of accessible communal rooms and/or facilities for the use of future residents in new residential apartment developments of 50+ units. **Such communal facilities should have regard to the needs of all future residents of all ages and abilities.** Where such facilities are to be provided details of the management shall be submitted and agreed by the planning authority at application stage."

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

Chapter 2,4

DLR Submission No: <u>B079</u>	Person: Robbie Burns	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to PY9 link between Bishops Gate and Chapel Hill.</li> <li>• Submission notes that this private estate has not been taken in charge by dlr and residents pay for insurance and maintenance fees via management fees for roads, pathways, green areas and playground.</li> </ul>		

- Bishops Gate, Kiltiernan Wood, Suttonfield and Kiltiernan Close would have access via PY9 to Chapel Hill and this would result in hundreds of children using the small playground and green area adding to costs for maintenance and insurance.
- Existing outdoor shelter and firepit for Kiltiernan Scouts located to north of Chapel Hill would be accessible over a low wooden fence and would be attractive to children and teenagers risking additional antisocial behaviour.
- Refers to reports to Gardai regarding thefts and late night/early morning antisocial issues within and surrounding Chapel Hill.

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

Chapter 5

DLR Submission No: <u>B080</u>	Person: Charlie Kelly	Organisation: Explorium, National Sport Science Centre
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission describes Explorium as a major tourism resource, educational and recreational facility with over 270.00 visitors since fully reopening in 2024.</li> <li>• Submission sets out Explorium's mission which aligns closely with the LAP's objectives for sustainable development, education and recreation in the Kiltiernan – Glenamuck area.</li> <li>• Request for dlr to advocate for a high frequency public bus service that serves Explorium.</li> <li>• Submission welcomes the recently completed Blackglen Road Improvement Scheme but notes that sections of Hillcrest Road and Enniskerry Road need to be upgraded. Requests that dlr prioritises the upgrade of the local road network to improve accessibility and road safety.</li> <li>• Given its high visitor numbers, the submission requests that Explorium is included in plans for sustainable travel corridors from Kiltiernan – Glenamuck to recreational locations, including Jamestown Park, Ticknick Park and Fernhill.</li> <li>• With thoughtful planning and investment Explorium could become a premier national resource for sport, education and recreation and would welcome opportunity to collaborate with dlr to maximise this potential and contribute to the regions long term development strategy.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <u>B081</u>	Person: Department of Education	Organisation: Department of Education
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Submission welcomes the continued engagement between the Department of Education and the Council regarding the development of both new and existing schools and emphasizes the importance of ongoing work in ensuring that sufficient land is zoned for education.</li> <li>• The submission notes the potential of population trends on school place requirements and notes the population growth set out in the Draft Plan.</li> <li>• The submission refers to previous submissions made by the Department of Education to the County Development Plan with regard to population growth within the Draft Plan area.</li> <li>• Submission refers to the average household size of 2.5 persons per household used in population calculation within the Draft LAP and states that the Department uses an average household size of 2.7 persons per household per Census data.</li> </ul>		

- Submission notes that using 2.7 persons per household based on the Draft Plan residential yield of 2,524, the potential population could grow to c.6,815.
- Submission states that the projected population growth would see demand for primary school places increase substantially which could place significant pressure on existing schools.
- Submission noted that communications between the Department and the Council identified that there is a potential future requirement for two additional primary schools and a potential future requirement for a post primary school. The Department notes that these requirements are conditional on the projected population materialising.
- The submission requests that text sets out in Section 4.2.3.4 of the Draft Plan reads as follows:
  - "The Department of Education has advised that subject to the projected population growth materialising, 2 no. 24 classroom primary schools are required to serve the Draft Plan area."
- The submission welcomes the reservation of a 3.5-hectare Education site (Figure 2.3, SDF9).
- The submission notes that the current land use zoning objective of SDF9 is 'Objective B' – 'To protect and improve rural amenity and to provide for the development of agriculture'. The Department requests that these lands be rezoned to 'Objective SNI – To protect, improve and encourage the provision of sustainable neighbourhood infrastructure.'
- The submission notes that schools are generally considered to be enabling infrastructure for housing and that schools should be positioned in the heart of new and expanding sustainable communities. Other community facilities and amenities should also be positioned close to schools as they are complementary to each other and benefit the whole community. The Department requests that the education site fits this criterion and seek confirmation of same.
- The submission requests that all enabling infrastructure required to develop and operate school facilities (such as SDF9) be provided in advance of schools as it is not the Departments remit to provide same. This includes:
  - roads, road safety measures and safe routes to school facilities,
  - electricity,
  - water infrastructure,
  - sustainable transport links,
  - active travel networks.
- The submission notes reference within the Draft Plan that a post primary school may not be required given its proximity to the Ballyogan and Environs LAP (BELAP) which makes provision for primary and post primary schools. While the Department understands this rationale, the submission points out that the provision for schools within BELAP is to serve that plan area and that Council needs to be mindful of the potential and substantial population growth within the relevant areas of both LAPs. It is noted that the growth projected for the KGLAP would in itself see a sizable school place requirement for post-primary level. The growth of the two plan areas would further add to this requirement.
- The submission states that in considering the provision of a school to serve both LAP's it is important that any site reservation (either within BELAP or KGLAP) is of a sufficient size, suitably located and appropriately zoned.
- The submission states that further consideration is required by both organisations on the matter of schools and, in this regard, welcomes Policy KGLAP20 – 'Future School Provision'; the Department looks forward to further engagement with the council on school provision as set out within Policy KGLAP20.
- The submission welcomes Policy KGLAP 19 'School Facilities' and Objective SNI3 – 'Education Facilities' noting reference to the education site reservation, promotion of urban typologies and linkages into green spaces and across education lands.
- The submission notes that the Department anticipates additional Special Education Needs provision at both primary and post primary level throughout the



country. In this regard, the Department work with the National Council for Special Education (NCSE) in relation to forward planning of new special classes and special school places. The NCSE coordinate the provision of special education including identifying where there is a need for same.

- The Department and NCSE work with schools to make provision for special education. It is advised that at primary level there is an average of 4 special classes with a focus on provision in all schools of 8 or more classes. This provision may be within existing accommodation or an extension to existing facilities.
- The submission notes that the Department will continue to consult with the Council with regard to a need for additional special needs education accommodation or site for special schools within specific locations as they arise.
- The submission states that the Department would welcome explicit support within the KGLAP for the provision of school accommodation for special education.
- The submission notes that the Department needs to be mindful of potential unforeseen circumstances, such as the Ukrainian crisis, which have the ability to place undue pressure on school places. The Department will engage with the Council were school provision in specific locations might change.

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

Chapter 4

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B082</u></b>	<b>Person: Marston planning Consultancy Ltd.</b>	<b>Organisation: Carrickmines Preservation Society CLG</b>
<p><b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission made in respect of SDF8.</li> <li>• Submission is concerned that the decision in respect of any planning appeal on a site to the east of Cairnbrook (LRD24A/0870/WEB – decision to grant permission made by dlr on 12<sup>th</sup> March 2025), would have to uphold policies and objectives of an adopted KGLAP.</li> <li>• Submission notes the zoning and objectives of the County Development Plan as they relate to SDF8 and surrounding lands.</li> <li>• Submission suggests that development should be phased in the LAP because of lack of public transport and schools, impact on national roads and absence of timeline in the LAP for the delivery of the GDRS</li> <li>• Submission recommends that Objective G17 should include a 30m setback from adjoining and more sensitive zonings because the LAP area forms a transition to the Dublin and Wicklow mountains.</li> <li>• Policies and Objectives needed to facilitate new school and expansion of existing schools.</li> <li>• Submission recommends the following objectives for SDF8-1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Vehicular access to SDF8 should be from Glenamuck Road or from the access road to the north of Cranbrook and access through Cairnbrook should be for pedestrians and cyclists only.</li> <li>○ Springfield Lane should be main vehicular access into SDF8 on the basis that the development of SDF8 will not remove vehicular traffic from the Lane.</li> <li>○ Omit PY14 (pedestrian/cycle link into Rockville Drive as it will not improve permeability for Cairnbrook, Glenamuck Cottages or SDF8.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Submission supports SDF8-2 and recommends a 15m setback from eastern boundary and maximum 2 storey height for any development to achieve a wildlife corridor and soft transition to B zoned lands.</li> <li>• Submission supports SDF8-3 but suggests that it lacks clarity as to the meaning of “responds” where it states, “Ensure development responds to the form of existing properties in Cairnbrook and adjoining rural character to the east”.</li> </ul>		

- Submission suggests that the heights objectives set out in SDF8-4 are at odds with the heights in the concurrent application on SDF8 and recommends that the height be restricted to two storeys on the eastern boundary, with a general maximum height of three storeys, and with a four-storey set back level permitted at one location/exceptional circumstances.
- Submission suggests that the density for SDF8-5 should be defined at a net level of 40 dph and this would be in line with the Sustainable and Compact Settlement Guidelines.
- Submission suggests that SDF8-6 be reworded to retain the hedgerow along the entire east and south boundary of the site.
- dlr should have undertaken a bat survey of all new development areas particularly at edge of proposed built up area.
- Archaeological assessment under licence required to inform future development of SDF8.

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

Chapter 2, 4, 5, 7 and 9

DLR Submission No: <b>B083</b>	Person: Hazel de Barra	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission sets out concerns about visual amenity and maintenance of public areas, footpaths, electricity supply pole and open spaces throughout Kiltiernan and specifically at junction of Glenamuck Road and Enniskerry Road, and in the vicinity of the Golden Ball.</li> <li>• Submission requests that the visual amenity and maintenance of the general area at the entry point to Kiltiernan Village, which is identified as an emerging neighbourhood centre in the LAP, should be improved to a standard similar to Foxrock, Cabinteely and Stepside.</li> <li>• Submission contends that the privacy, security and residential visual amenity of dwellings in Kiltiernan Wood and Kiltiernan Close is diminished because their private open spaces have not been provided with screening and can be viewed from the Enniskerry Road.</li> <li>• Submission asserts that the permitted planting along the boundary of Kiltiernan Wood on Enniskerry Road, which was to be consistent with that outside Bishops Gate has not been carried out, and that this noncompliance goes unchecked.</li> <li>• Submission includes 2 photographs of green spaces along Enniskerry Road and a computer-generated image of Bishops Gate facing Enniskerry Road.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Other Issues		

DLR Submission No: <b>B084</b>	Person: Barbara Roe	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission outlines environmental concerns as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The removal of trees and hedgerows is detrimental to the environment and disturbs natural habitats and dlr should have plans to replace these trees and hedgerows.</li> <li>○ Greater attention should be paid to waterways and rivers which have been badly affected by ongoing road works and Inland Fisheries should be testing the waters for pollution.</li> <li>○ Attention should be paid to protected views.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of green space improves quality of life for everyone, and our “very precious environment” should not be lost in pursuit of the built environment.</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 3 and 7

DLR Submission No: <b>B085</b>	Person:	Organisation: Uisce Éireann (UE)
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current status of GDA water supply is Amber indicating that it is constrained.</li> <li>Submission recommends that LAP should strive for water efficient and water neutral housing through planning conditions for new developments such as the integration of rainwater harvesting with SuDS.</li> <li>Water supply capacity changes regularly and details on capacity for new developments is available through UE's Connections/Developer Services teams.</li> <li>Wastewater treatment at the Bray/Shanganagh Plant has capacity for Kiltiernan – Glenamuck based on County Development Plan targets.</li> <li>Constraints in the sewer network are being progressed by UE's Infrastructure Delivery Department in consultation with dlr and individual sites will need to connect to this new trunk sewer.</li> <li>Submission welcomes SuDS objectives and initiatives in the LAP and recommends that the LAP should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encourage SuDS and green and blue infrastructure in new developments including public realm and retrofit existing developed areas.</li> <li>Remove surface water from combined sewers to increase capacity of foul drainage system for new development.</li> <li>Introduce Nature based SuDS in areas contributing to combined drainage systems where streetscape enhancement or resurfacing programmes are planned.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Submitter willing to engage with dlr in relation to nature-based rainwater management initiatives.</li> <li>Localised network upgrades may be needed to service some sites.</li> <li>Submission encourages phased, sequential development in areas with existing water infrastructure and capacity in order to maximise use of existing water services.</li> <li>UE assets on development sites to be protected and/or diverted and third-party agreement to connect obtained if necessary.</li> <li>UE to be consulted at early stage for planned public realm, active travel and road projects in the vicinity of UE assets and in accordance with Standard Details and Codes of Practice.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 3		

DLR Submission No: <b>B086</b>	Person: OPW	Organisation: Office of Public Works
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission is in respect of flood risk management.</li> <li>Submission welcomes acknowledgment of the Guidelines and preparation of a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</li> <li>Submission welcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy KGLAP9 - Sustainable Water Management.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policy KGLAP10 – SuDS.</li> <li>○ Policy KGLAP14 – Flood Risk Assessment.</li> <li>○ Policy KGLAP15 Flood Risk Considerations.</li> <li>○ SuDS discussion in Section 15.8 of the LTP.</li> <li>• Submission notes Section 1.8 of the SFRA relating to vulnerable development within flood zone A or B requiring same to be located in a less vulnerable area. Submission further notes that there are undeveloped lands that are within Flood Zones A and B which are zoned Objective A which is considered to be a highly vulnerable land use zoning objective. Accepts that zoning has been determined by CDP and was commented upon by the OPW.</li> <li>• Submission recommends that Section 15.8 of the Local Transport Plan is referenced in the SFRA to avoid reliance on site by site solutions.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 3, Appendix 1 – SFRA, Draft LTP</p>

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B087</u></b>	<b>Person: Ed O’Fearthail</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<p><b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to Permeability Route PY9, Chapel Hill to Bishops Gate for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The private playground at Chapel Hill is not a justification for increasing connectivity between estates.</li> <li>○ The increased pedestrians through estates with private driveways could lead to accidents because of increased interactions between pedestrians/cyclists and cars exiting driveways over the footpath.</li> <li>○ It would be safer for walkers and cyclists to use the Enniskerry Road which will have reduced speed limits and traffic calming associated with the GDRS rather than through a private estate.</li> <li>○ No benefit to residents of Chapel Hill as currently the one entry and exit point maintains a safe environment for children.</li> <li>○ Limited benefits for other estates, including Bishops Gate as there would be minimal time savings.</li> <li>○ The potential risks, safety and privacy concerns of PY9 outweigh perceived benefits.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B088</u></b>	<b>Person: Linda O’Farrell</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<p><b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to Permeability Route PY9, Chapel Hill to Bishops Gate for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The private playground at Chapel Hill is not a justification for increasing connectivity between estates.</li> <li>○ The increased number of pedestrians through estates with private driveways could lead to accidents because of increased interactions between pedestrians/cyclists (particularly young children) and cars exiting driveways over the footpath.</li> <li>○ It would be safer for walkers and cyclists to use the Enniskerry Road which will have reduced speed limits and traffic calming associated with the GDRS rather than through a private estate.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

- No benefit to residents of Chapel Hill as currently the one entry and exit point maintains a safe environment for children.
- Limited benefits for other estates, including Bishops Gate as there would not benefit commute time or safety.
- The potential risks, safety and privacy concerns of PY9 outweigh perceived benefits.

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

Chapter 5

DLR Submission No: <u>B089</u>	Person: <b>McCutcheon Halley Planning</b>	Organisation: <b>Cairn Homes Properties Ltd.</b>
<p><b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that Cairn homes is Ireland's largest residential builder and is uniquely positioned to address the chronic housing shortage by delivering large-scale, high-quality developments in an expedient manner.</li> <li>• Submission relates to a 2.8 ha landholding, subject to land use zoning A, which comprises approximately one fifth of the overall area of SDF10 located north of Glenamuck Road South and known as Ashwood Farm.</li> <li>• Submission requests a more flexible merit-based approach to building height and density guidance for lands in SDF10 informed by Cairn Homes experience, permissions on site and desire to commence development on the lands.</li> <li>• Submission includes an Architectural Study to support requested amendment.</li> <li>• Submission outlines the site opportunities and constraints for height and density as they relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Topography/Gradients and orientation of the site.</li> <li>○ Focal point/landmark feature building potential at junction of GDDR and GLDR.</li> <li>○ Impact of requirement for activation of GDDR and GLDR on design and location of development on site.</li> <li>○ Influence of lower density, 2 storey existing residential development on layout, building height and density of submitters lands.</li> <li>○ Access to the site will be via Glenamuck Road South and the requirement to provide access to adjoining residential properties and lands from the internal access roads will influence form of development along access road.</li> <li>○ Impact of proposals for activation and linkages onto the greenway/GLDR on biodiversity including existing trees and hedgerows.</li> <li>○ Requirements of the CDP.</li> <li>○ Previous planning decisions.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Submission includes a planning history of the lands from 2008 to 2023.</li> <li>• Submission includes extracts from the Draft LAP in relation to Building Heights and Density policies and objectives with the submitters emphasis indicated on the Draft LAP text.</li> <li>• Submission includes extracts from the Draft LAP for Glenamuck East Site Development Framework – SDF10 in relation to zoning objectives, Movement Objectives, Placemaking Objectives, Built Form Objectives, Heights Objectives and Density Objectives with the submitter's emphasis indicated on Draft LAP text.</li> <li>• Submission requests the following amendments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Building Height Adjust Heights Objectives SDF10-4 to align with Policy KGLAP 30 – Building Heights providing for <i>"increased height and/or taller buildings on lands located to the east of the Kiltiernan – Glenamuck Link Road"</i> by inserting the text in red:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2-4 storeys with potential for 5 storeys at appropriate locations along Kiltiernan Road. <b>Additional height may be considered where performance criteria, as set out in section 5 of the Building Heights</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

Strategy in the County Development Plan, can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority.

- Ensure proposed heights achieve a balance between height and scale, contribute to variety in design and avoid against monolithic and monotonous buildings.

○ Density

Adjust Density Objectives SDF10-5 to support compact dense urban form by inserting the text in red:-

Density generally 50-80 dwellings per hectare. Higher densities may be considered at locations where it can be demonstrated that a 1km or less walking distance to a Luas stop can be achieved by the provision of a route through 'The Park', Carrickmines. Lower densities may be appropriate in some locations, having regard to local amenity and character.

Submission includes its "Reasoned Justification to Support Amendments" as follows:

- Flexibility on Building Heights is requested to respond to site characteristics/constraints and opportunities, because density and height are important interrelated parameters, and taller buildings may be required to fulfil density requirements.
- Submits that a 5 plus storeys landmark building, where the design, scale, massing and height will align with the performance criteria of the Building Heights Strategy / SPPR 3 of the Building Heights Guidelines could be provided at the local landmark/focal point location (identified at the northwestern corner of the site where the GDDR and GLDR meet) and that the LAP should be amended to require that any planning application for a landmark building demonstrates compliance these requirements.
- Submission considers that a mix of heights, densities and typologies is potentially required for the majority of the northern part of the subject site. This will be a transitional zone, stepping down from heights of potentially 5 plus storeys at the landmark building to the 2 storeys of neighbouring properties to the south and southeast. Submits further that KGLAP30 does not allow for increased height and/or taller buildings east of the Kiltiernan - Glenamuck Link Rad and requests that LAP include flexibility on building height parameters which would be considered during the development management process having regard to CDP objectives and SPPR3.
- Submission requests that flexibility be applied in SDF10 at development management stage to determine where higher or lower densities are appropriate having regard to site constraints along the southern part of the site from Glenamuck Road South to the centre of the site.
- Submission requests a merit-based approach to building height on accessible suburban locations such as the LAP lands to accommodate additional height and flexibility for consideration in the development management process. LAP should incorporate flexibility in relation to heights policy to align with potential outcomes of the review of the Building Heights Strategy in the new CDP.
- Submission requests flexibility on density to reflect extensive change in the LAP area and because density and height are interrelated parameters.
- Submits that increased height should be acceptable in principle where topography, existing and emerging urban scale, orientation, transport infrastructure and land values make them sustainable.
- Submission suggests a design led approach to optimise density based on site attributes, context and capacity for growth and most appropriate form of development.
- Submits that flexibility should be applied to the subject lands because, higher densities in accordance with the Compact Settlement Guidelines, at suitable locations such as SDF10, should be balanced with a lower density,



<p>as appropriate, because of site constraints such as on part of the subject lands.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A copy of the Henry J Lyons submission to the Issues Paper pre-draft public consultation is included as an Appendix to the submission. This included an architectural opinion with regard to design, density, and height. Noting a similar approach to the N11 should be considered along the GDRS with a variation in height along the road with a vertical focal point at the road junction.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2</p>

DLR Submission No: <u>B090</u>	Person: John Spain Associates	Organisation: Kiltarnan Cemetery Park Limited
<p><b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission sets out the planning history for Kiltarnan Cemetery Park (KCP) the only purpose built, cemetery in the county since 2000 which is multi denominational within a scenic parkland setting and has c. 6,200 burial sites and 2,000 ash plots located on a 10.8 ha landholding.</li> <li>• Submission notes the contents and two planning permissions for the cemetery, D13A/0193 and D21A/0502 and that a planning application is being finalised for the construction of a non-denominational place of worship within the area of the extended Cemetery Park.</li> <li>• Requests that the cemetery should be recognised in the LAP (which has an extended boundary that includes part of Ballycorus Road) because it is substantial and is an important piece of the area's social and community infrastructure.</li> <li>• Submission notes that the current LAP boundary is extended towards the east and south to Ballycorus Road when compared with the CDP land use zoning map, and the previous LAP, and now includes additional agriculture and high amenity zoned lands.</li> <li>• Submission notes that the eastern portion of the extended KCP is now included in the southeastern section of the extended boundary for the LAP.</li> <li>• Submission suggests that a clear rationale for the boundary extension has not been provided but considers that it is to provide improved transport connections to the rugby playing facilities on Ballycorus Road and that given the extended LAP boundary that KCP (existing and extended) be referenced in the LAP as an important social and community amenity in the area.</li> <li>• Submission requests that Section 4 – People and Homes should reference that KCP is located within the LAP area and provides an important social and community function for the area. Plans to provide a Place of Worship building within the grounds of the KCP to enhance the range of burial services should also be referenced.</li> <li>• Support for AT5 objective and proposed road upgrades along Ballycorus Road, including footpaths as far as the LAP boundary and notes that the permitted development for KCP is consistent with the 'Long Term Road Objective' in the CDP.</li> <li>• Requests that Objective AT4 -AT5 Ballycorus Road includes the provision of footpaths on both sides of the road, as far as KCP (as extended), thereby extending past Old Wesley RFC and Lansdowne RFC and that maps for transport objectives on Ballycorus Road of the extended LAP annotates the location of KCP, as extended, as an important piece of local, social and community infrastructure.</li> <li>• Concern that the biodiversity and wildlife corridor designations on Figure 7.1 of the LAP includes the lands associated with KCP and does not reflect the extant permission for the extension to KCP and potentially other lands and request that the mapping be amended to reflect existing and permitted land use in the area.</li> </ul>		



- Notes that similar concerns are raised in other submissions that the wildlife corridors were indicatively included in the Biodiversity Action Plan 2021-2025 and are now being carried into a statutory plan and that these illustrations could become constraints to future development and should only be included if based on accurate ecological surveys.
- Requests that the extent of the 'Brides Glen' wildlife corridor be amended on biodiversity maps in the LAP to exclude the southern portion of the KCP extension lands and illustrated on Figure 3.7 of the submission.
- Submits that LAP may wish to acknowledge KCP, as extended, as part of the amenity/green infrastructure provision of the area as it includes walkways, trees, hedgerows etc that contribute the biodiversity of the area.

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

Chapter 4, 5, 7, Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <u>B091</u>	Person: Stephen Little & Associates	Organisation: Adroit Operations Limited
<p><b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sets out that a submission was made in 2021 to rezone lands immediately west of the LAP boundary adjoining Bishops Gate and Kiltiernan Wood from zoning objective B to zoning objective A in the County Development Plan review process and that this LAP submission is to request the rezoning of these lands (in the townland of Kiltiernan Domain) as a logical and sequential extension of the built up area of Kiltiernan delivering a more compact urban form.</li> <li>• Submission considers that the housing crisis referred to in their CDP submission is now a housing emergency and that insufficient land is zoned to meet the Revised National Planning Framework targets of 303,000 new homes by 2030, approximately 50,000 per annum which is double that provided for under the NPF 2018. Sets out that the Housing Commission has in addition to this revised target identified that there are 235,000 units that are the deficit of what has been required up to this date.</li> <li>• Understands that the Revised NPF will identify targets, that will include the provision of 303,000 new homes required up to 2030, for yet further new homes between 2030 and 2040 and that an arbitrary cap on quantum of zoned lands including additional provision must be adjusted in the LAP to ensure that demand for new housing stock is met and even exceeded even if it were considered necessary to restart the Draft LAP process to have regard to the new NPF targets.</li> <li>• The LAP must take account of the revised planning context as outlined in the submission and make provision for additional residential land use zonings of a scale commensurate with the settlement.</li> <li>• Notes that the Plan-led approach to planning would result in the requirement for a Variation to the CDP if the LAP were to include additional zonings for the plans to be materially consistent.</li> <li>• Submission outlines the track record of Adroit Operations Ltd (Adroit) in the delivery of high quality, large scale, sustainable housing over a period in excess of 40 years, and suggests that their ownership of the subject lands, availability of access and services from their development at Kiltiernan Wood makes the lands a strong prospect for development if rezoned.</li> <li>• The subject lands are zoned Objective B in the CDP and are described as being partly in woodland and open rough / disturbed ground, located at the immediate edge of the built-up area of Kiltiernan, where there has been construction activity which has changed the site context.</li> </ul>		

- Notes that the LAP boundary has been extended from that shown on Map 9 of the CDP and that, in principle, the boundary could be extended to include the Adroit lands within the LAP.
- The immediate planning context and history for Kiltiernan Wood is described and a copy of the Masterplan showing the permitted SHD scheme and potential linkages and services to the subject lands to the southwest. Submission considers that the lands are capable of being considered as Tier 1 lands for purposes of consideration for land use zoning having regard to Development Plan: Guidelines for Planning Authorities and should be zoned residential.
- Submission includes a Site Feasibility prepared by Davey Smith Architects for the 4 ha lands (2.1 ha residential, 1.9 ha public park and playground) to show their potential for 138 units (111 apartments, 27 houses), retention of the woodland area (resulting in woodland management) at the north of the lands as part of a new public park and playground to ensure biodiversity and landscape benefit to the area, and provision for car parking or bike parking in the public park.
- Request is for 2.1 ha to be rezoned for Objective A – “to provide residential development and improve residential amenities while protecting the existing residential amenities” and for the 1.9 ha proposed park and playground to be rezoned Objective F – “to preserve and provide for open space and ancillary active recreation amenities”.
- Submits that the public open space requirement of the Objective A lands would be met entirely on the Objective F lands.
- Considers that the Background Paper – Demographic and Housing Analysis that accompanies the draft LAP is based on already outdated statistics and refers to the HNDA prepared under the CDP and the residential Development Capacity Audit (RDCA) and that the housing targets published in November 2024 are not acknowledged nor is the wealth of other official publications on the matter, including from the Housing Commission.
- Welcomes the inclusion of Map 5 in the Background Paper indicating the extent of housing developments in the area since 2013 which shows that there is no other land available for development west of the Enniskerry Road other than small infill sites.
- Considers that rezoning of the subject lands is a logical ‘sequential step’ in the development of Kiltiernan with no impediment to development except the zoning.
- Submission sets out the strategic context of the submission and subject lands as follows:
  - NPF Strategic outcomes - advocates compact urban growth, sustainable mobility, a strong economy, supported by enterprise, innovation and skills and enhanced amenities and heritage.
  - NPF National Policy Objectives (NPO) 7,8,9, 43 and 44 which relate to compact growth, sequential patterns of growth, housing targets and sustainable development.
- Sets out that the submission is not seeking a zoning of lands but to respond to the Council’s question of where population and housing growth should go. Having regard to the requirement of the NPF ‘A Methodology for a Tiered Approach to Land Zoning’ submission suggests that the subject lands can be considered ‘Tier 1 serviced zoned land’ as they are able to connect to existing development services, are contiguous to existing developed lands and within the footprint or spatially sequential within the identified settlement.
- Submission considers that development of the subject lands for housing would comply with the RSES strategic plan and investment framework as they are beside a built-up area, are discrete in nature, are fully serviced, not adversely influenced by any environmental designation and capable of being developed in short term once zoned.
- The zoning of the lands as requested would facilitate a more compact form of development in Kiltiernan in line with the Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines – Compact Urban Form.

- The subject lands are not liable to flooding as per SFRA in draft plan and objectives 'to protect and preserve trees and woodlands' on the lands would not preclude the zoning or development of the lands.
- Submission includes a Development Site and Public Parkland Feasibility Document which comprises:
  - Site layout for 11 apartments, 27 houses, 65 dwelling per hectare density development, woodland walk, playground, car park, covered parking to apartments and single loop access road.
  - Plans, sections and elevations of Dwelling Type 1 – House and Dwelling Type 2 – Apartment (5 storey over parking level).
    - Public Park – Vision drawing.
    - Site Location Map.

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

Other issues

DLR Submission No: <u>B092</u>	Person: Sheena Gunning	Organisation: Resident
<p><b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission requests that:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Wellbeing and property of existing residents be prioritised before permission granted on adjoining lands.</li> <li>○ LAP acknowledges and considers rights and entitlements of private estates before considering what is best for those already committed to the locality.</li> <li>○ Record of Protected Structures be updated at the time items are located rather than Council carrying out independent investigations once notified of potential items of interest.</li> <li>○ Given the historic nature of the area and number of monuments already identified that those remaining should be preserved.</li> <li>○ Natural hedgerows, flora and fauna should be preserved, and hedgerows should be protected and have the same status as mature old trees. Open space should be located beside these natural features and habitats for them to thrive and benefit everyone.</li> <li>○ Overhead electricity wires and masts should be phased out from residential areas and located underground for human safety and existing services should be relocated underground before the provision of new housing.</li> <li>○ New bus routes and connections should be guaranteed for connection to local infrastructure in advance of granting planning permission because at present cars are needed to connect to Luas and DART.</li> <li>○ Footpath and cycle tracks be provided and connected to upgraded infrastructure prior to occupation of new units and temporary measures be provided along Glenamuck Road in the interim for the safety of users and the increased population in the area.</li> <li>○ Improved traffic management be provided locally for safety of users.</li> <li>○ 1-2 car parking spaces be provided per unit because of unreliable transport infrastructure and distance from services, schools, retail services etc which are not accessible for walkers. Provision of less than one space per unit results in illegal parking.</li> <li>○ Lighting and conditions of laneways be upgraded and taken in charge by dlr.</li> <li>○ Building height should be no higher than adjoining developments and additional units provided by building down.</li> <li>○ Density be a maximum of 40 uph because area not suitable for higher.</li> <li>○ Open space should be no less than 20% of site, half of which to be located centrally. Peripheral areas that do not have capacity for use by groups of 10 or more not to be considered in calculation of open space.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Schools in the area are at capacity and creches cannot be staffed. No development should take place until confirmation that places are available or new schools built.</li> <li>○ Local Shopping Centre to include cinema, swimming pool and recreational facilities to be provided to serve growing population in the area.</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B093</u></b>	<b>Person: Margaret Kelly</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to Permeability Route PY9, Chapel Hill to Bishops Gate because of safety issues, loss of privacy, potential increase in crime and that additional children using the green area would result in noise.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B094</u></b>	<b>Person: Melissa Mc Kenna</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While in favour of improving Kilternan for all, the submission outlines the following concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Significant loss of mature trees and hedgerows.</li> <li>○ Construction noise and dirt for many years without benefit to the area.</li> <li>○ Significant volume of traffic at peak time on Glenamuck Road even before planned new development takes place makes accessing Cairnbrook difficult.</li> <li>○ Public transport does not have capacity for new residents and 10-minute neighbourhood will not be achieved as children must be driven to school outside the area because there is no capacity locally.</li> <li>○ Submits that quality of life, safety, enjoyment and investment in home has been undermined by permission (granted after LAP) for access road to lands to the east of Cairnbrook.</li> <li>○ Existing road in quiet estate is single lane and small green is well used by residents.</li> <li>○ A public park at a distance is not suitable for use by children on their own.</li> <li>○ Traffic speeds are low, and antisocial behaviour is quickly recognised in their close-knit community. Children's safety when playing outside should not be lost to facilitate new houses that could be accessed via Springfield Lane.</li> <li>○ Estate road is too narrow with on street parking to accommodate construction traffic and additional traffic from new houses. Springfield Lane should be used as noted in previous LAP as it appears to be wider and would set a precedent for pedestrians to access it from their estates.</li> <li>○ How will hedgerows, mature trees, the birds and bats who enjoy dark skies in filed and existing view of horses on hills be protected?</li> <li>○ Submitter acknowledges that they are not entitled to a view.</li> <li>○ Notes that rural view will be removed by apartments higher in height and density that Cairnbrook.</li> <li>○ Request for assessment of Archaeological site, 'Fulacht fiadh' at boundary of Cairnbrook and site to east.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

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

Chapter 2,5,7

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B095</u></b>	<b>Person: NTA</b>	<b>Organisation: National Transport Authority</b>
<p><b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission states that the NTA is broadly supportive of the suite of objectives set out in Chapter 5 of the Draft Local Area Plan.</li> <li>Submission notes that the NTA liaised closely with the council and its consultants during the preparation of the Draft Local Transport Plan (LTP) and all stages of the Areas Based Transport Assessment (ABTA) process.</li> <li>The NTA acknowledges the level of engagement afforded by the council and are of the view that the Draft LTP provides a robust basis for the transport and movement related objectives in the Draft Local Area Plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>Bus Terminus:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submission notes that Section 5.6.5.1 in the Draft LAP addresses the requirements for bus terminus facilities to cater for the BusConnects network serving the plan area.</li> <li>The NTA confirms its support for Objective PT3a which provides for the delivery of an interim bus terminus at Enniskerry Road pending the delivery of a permanent terminus and layover facility elsewhere.</li> <li>Submission notes that a permanent terminus is addressed by Objective PT3b. The NTA is supportive in principle of this objective but notes that a suitable location has not yet been identified. Such a facility will be a key element of supporting infrastructure for the new BusConnects network and it is critically important that a location for this facility is identified.</li> <li>The NTA notes that the proposed implementation timeframe set out in Table 17-1 of the Draft LTP is medium term (between 2028 and 2035) which does not accord with the phasing programme for the BusConnects network implementation.</li> <li>The NTA recommends that the delivery of the terminus and layover should be brought forward as a Short-Term proposal in the implementation programme.</li> <li>In the event of a bus terminus not being delivered, alternative locations outside of the LAP area may be considered which would have significant implications for the plan area including the potential removal of some bus services.</li> <li>In the absence of a regular bus service, the household and population projections for the plan area would be called into question and require re-examination.</li> <li>The NTA recommends that proposed Objective PT3b should be included in the final LTP and LAP as a Short-Term measure and should be prioritised for delivery following the adoption of the LAP, in order to ensure that the ambitious growth targets for the area can be met.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 2, Section 2.2: Overview of the Main Issues Raised and Recommendations Made by the National Transport Authority (NTA)</b></p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B096</u></b>	<b>Person: John Spain and Associates on behalf of Park Developments</b>	<b>Organisation: Park Developments</b>
<p><b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission sets out that Park Development have a proven track record in housing delivery.</li> </ul>		

- Submission relates to landholding at Glenamuck, to the southeast of Glenamuck Road South and east of Springfield Lane which fall outside the Draft LAP boundary. Lands are accessed via Springfield Lane from Glenamuck Road and also have potential to be accessed from adjoining landowners' lands.
  - Submission expresses disappointed that LAP boundary was extended to allow for identification of an excessively sized school site, to provide for a park and the identification of a wildlife corridor with no regard to existing for future lands uses and with no new residential lands included in the Draft Plan.
  - Submission supports alternative urban design strategy put forward in B0104 and B0108.
  - Submission considers amendment are required to ensure it does not restrict future development potential.
  - Submission sets out the context for the need for new housing included the forthcoming revised NPF.
  - Considers Plan should be cognisant of future expansion and should not prejudice delivery of units.
  - Submission puts forward arguments for the suitability of their land holding for residential development of 60 – 800 units and argues that the lands are located spatially sequentially to the existing built-up area.
  - Submission requests that the extent of the Objective 'B' (Agriculture) zoned lands identified for education uses under SDF9 be reduced from the proposed 4.5 ha. to 1.4 ha. which will adequately provide for a secondary school or 2 no. primary schools, and potential long-term development of fully serviced Objective B zoned lands, as shown in Figure 3.1 of the submission.
  - Request that Objective A (residential) lands be removed from the area identified for Kiltiernan Park phase 2 (SDF11) and that the Park be relocated to the Objective G (High Amenity) lands to the east which are more suitable in terms of topography and zonings. This will require knock on amendments to the Draft LAP.
  - Request that Figure 2.3- Indicative Urban Design Strategy Map of the Draft KGLAP as set out under Section 2.5.1 Urban Design and Placemaking Strategy for the Kiltiernan Road and Kiltiernan – Glenamuck Link Road, be amended as per a submitted figure. The amended figure alters and relocates SDF11 and reduces the size of SDF9.
  - Considers that the ecological areas, wildlife corridors, and green infrastructure identified on Draft KGLAP Figure 7.1, are excessive in extent, and would jeopardise the future development potential of lands.
  - Consider that the Fernhill to Bride's Glen Wildlife Corridor does not reflect existing land uses, zoning, and is not based on survey information. Submitter is not aware of any particular ecological features which warrant such a significant corridor designation, i.e. there is no river present.
  - Concern that corridors are being carried through it a statutory Plan as they could constrain future development.
  - Submission notes wording in BAP which states that "some of the areas within the wildlife corridors are indicative and will be subject to further survey. Some of these areas are identified as future development lands in the County Development Plan 2022-2028' and consider that they should not be included in Draft LAP.
- Section 7.4.1 – Green Infrastructure – Climate Action and Biodiversity Conservation That the text of relating to Objective GI3 – Wildlife Corridor and Figure 7.1 should be amended as follows:  
Objective GI3 – Wildlife Corridor:  
It is an Objective to:
- ~~Allow the relevant wildlife corridors—Fernhill to Brides Glen corridor and Brides Glen corridor—as set out in the dlr County Biodiversity Action Plan 2021–2025 to inform decision making within the KGLAP area.~~
  - Identify opportunities to enhance and restore the Fernhill to Brides Glen corridor and Bride's Glen corridor within the LAP lands, using best practice under

the supervision of suitably competent professionals as deemed appropriate by the Planning Authority.

- Amend figure 7.1 to reduce SDF9 and relocate SDF 11.

#### Summary of submitted URBAN DESIGN AND GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE REPORT

- Report considers that Draft LAP blocks future access and uses. The report examines rearrangement of roads, an examination of the proposed school site, reorganization of open space and unlocking of future potential residential lands to provide up to 1500 units.
- The report investigates alternative urban framework layouts for SDF9 and SDF11.
- For SDF 9 urban typology school options are suggested along with synergies to Jackson Park. The report suggests reducing the school site to 1.4 hectares. Design of the school could include frontage over Kiltiernan Park phase 1. The report also explores layouts for residential development on a portion of SDF9 and also on lands currently subject to land use zoning objective B.
- For SDF 11 the site is shown as fully developed with residential units including on the portion currently zoned objective B. Kiltiernan Park phase 2 is relocated to higher lands closer to Dingle Glen. Access for the site is also shown to lands to the south.
- A number of diagrams are included as follows:
  - Proposed LAP drawing
  - Revised urban design strategy
  - Amended Figure 2.4 showing SDF11 relocated and SDF9 reduced.
  - Amended figure 4.3 showing SDF 9 reduced.
  - Amended figure 2.2 showing a differing amended parkland character area.

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

Chapters 2, 7, Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <u>B097</u>	Person: Aidan Garvin	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of submission / Observations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to Permeability Route PY9, Chapel Hill to Bishops Gate for the following reasons:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It would be safer for children to use the Enniskerry Road which will have reduced speed limits and traffic calming on completion of the bypass.</li> <li>○ There is no footpath at the end of Chapel Hill and the proposed link would result in children walking on the road at the end of the cul de sac.</li> <li>○ The proximity of the driveway at No. 10 to the proposed link would result in limited visibility of people using the link.</li> <li>○ Submission notes that private insurance and maintenance fees are currently paid by residents via management fees and indicates that any accident involving a child from another estate using the playground equipment would affect insurance and management fees.</li> <li>○ Proposed link would increase footfall to the detriment of the calmness of Chapel Hill and the safety of children in both estates.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		



DLR Submission No: <b>B098</b>	Person: <b>Cllr Kevin Daly</b>	Organisation: <b>Elected Member</b>
<p><b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission outlines concerns about parking congestion, parking provision and proposals to reduce parking on Ballybetagh Road.</li> <li>• Notes proposal in LAP to reduce parking on Ballybetagh Road outside Our Lady of the Wayside National School which has 300 pupils and 25 staff.</li> <li>• Notes permission granted for LRD24A/0597 on 7 March which reduced the width of Enniskerry Road from 8.2 m to 6 m from Ballybetagh Road to Glenamuck Road, resulting in the removal of exiting on streetcar parking for the primary school at drop off and pick up, on Enniskerry Road outside the Blue Church.</li> <li>• Objects to removal of parking given that the school has been extended most recently by permission in 2022 and dlr should acquire, by CPO if necessary, land for a car park to accommodate 100 cars.</li> <li>• Notes that the parking is required for the Blue Church for mass, wedding and funerals and for the destination weddings which take place there because of its unusual architecture, over and above local use and which helps fund the local parish.</li> <li>• Submitter has photographic and video evidence of traffic chaos and school drop off and pick up times which can be submitted if required.</li> <li>• Notes that dlr built a 50-bay car park in Foxrock which is not near a school or church and a 10-minute walk form 2 Luas Stations and buses but does not propose to do so in Kilternan which is poorly served by buses and 30-minute walk to the Luas,</li> <li>• To achieve the 10-minute neighbourhood concept parking is required for people from the hinterland/surrounding area to park and ride on buses or to shop/socialise in the village.</li> <li>• Dlr is aware of chaotic traffic situation and that the LAP and recent LRD permission which would remove existing on street parking would add to this situation.</li> <li>• Considers that Kilternan is being used as a "guinea pig" for the 10-minute neighbourhood concept and is unsuited because of distances to train/Luas and lack of a public car park. Also, because the majority of children in the schools live outside the area and are driven there, parking will take place in new estates causing congestion.</li> <li>• As a local resident submitter has firsthand experience of traffic/congestion at the school and church and considers that the LAP does not solve this problem and only a public car park will, and the proposal will lead to serious injury in the area by reducing parking and displacing it into surrounding housing estates.</li> <li>• Submission suggest that because the Circle K has installed 2 electric car chargers that valuable car spaces should not be dedicated for electric charging in the village.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5</p>		

DLR Submission No: <b>B099</b>	Person: <b>Fiona Cullinan</b>	Organisation: <b>Resident</b>
<p><b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission cites concerns regarding permeability routes PY2 and PY3 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Creation of two additional entrances/exits would increase the risk of unauthorised access, crime/theft, and would cause safety and security issues.</li> <li>◦ Would be difficult to monitor pedestrian movements and this could result in accidents and crime especially at night.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Increase in number of pedestrian entrances from two to four is unnecessary and would increase noise levels and become a hotspot for littering and loitering.</li> <li>○ Creates the need for maintenance of pathways, lighting and signage.</li> <li>○ Minimal gain to Suttonfield becoming a thoroughfare for population of Kiltiernan to access the school when there are available footpaths.</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B100</u></b>	<b>Person: Noel Ross</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission notes that the sports field behind the adult education centre on Ballybetagh Road is used once a year on loan from for the Our Lady of the Wayside school sports day.</li> <li>• Submission recommends that there has been a significant increase in population in the area without new public facilities and that the field should be used by the council to provide public facilities such as a park or public playing pitches rather than the only public facilities in the area being provided by private developers.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 7		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B101</u></b>	<b>Person: Ciara Hyde</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to Permeability Route PY9, Chapel Hill to Bishops Gate.</li> <li>• Notes that Chapel Hill is a quiet cul de sac where children can play safely in the private playground.</li> <li>• Notes that a few houses in Bishops Gate/Kiltiernan Wood/Suttonfield would benefit from a walkway to the small nearby school but that an increase in footfall/bikes/scooters though Chapel Hill could lead to an increase in near misses/accidents when exiting and entering driveways.</li> <li>• New Kiltiernan – Glenamuck link road will result in a traffic calmed Enniskerry Road with a reduced speed limit and gateways (as per LAP) making it safer for people to walk and cycle.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B102</u></b>	<b>Person: Linda Jane Kenny</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission outlines concerns about the loss of biodiversity and integrity of Kiltiernan village due to recent excessive development.</li> <li>• Recommends that the aims and objectives of the LAP be enforced by allocation of Council staff to liaise with developers/contractors to protect and conserve remaining built and living heritage.</li> </ul>		

- Submission is concerned about the lack of consistency and reference to traditional local materials for boundary walls such as granite, poor quality of materials, and piecemeal nature of development in the area and on Glenamuck Road.
- Recommends that native trees and hedgerows be retained and not replaced with non-native hedgerows such as the Portuguese Laurel planted along Glenamuck Road which does not support biodiversity.
- Recommends planting of trees
- Secondary school is required for the area as a majority of traffic is parents driving children to school and to extracurricular activities and sports.
- Submission requests more homes with gardens for families and not apartments which are for city living.
- Submission recommends that the planting of trees along road frontage not built out to the road mitigates for future climate change, cooling buildings and setting the building into the countryside, Kiltiernan area which is 'in the Dublin Mountains'.
- Suggests that the plan lacks parks, sports and training facilities and that reliance on existing club infrastructure is not sustainable.
- Recommends protection on the Loughlinstown River, riparian area and associated wetlands to protect these areas and to connect them to a future park amenity.

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

Chapter 4, 7, 8, Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <b>B103</b>	Person: <b>John Spain and Associates on behalf of M&amp;M Grimes</b>	Organisation: <b>M&amp;M Grimes</b>
<p><b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission relates to lands zoned objective E – “To provide for economic development and employment” and Objective A which the submission states is “To protect and or improve residential amenity”.</li> <li>• Lands zoned Objective E are located in SDF1</li> <li>• Lands zoned objective A are located in SDF10</li> <li>• Submission welcomes the removal of phasing restrictions in relation to the progression of the Glenamuck District Distributor Road.</li> <li>• Considers requirements relating to SDF 1 and SDSF 10 are onerous.</li> <li>• Request updating SDF1 to allow for 2 accesses from Kiltiernan Road as outlined in 2013 LAP. Wording is suggested as follows: “In tandem with the adjoining land holder, access through the site form “The Park” Carrickmines to be provided, as identified in the CDP, in addition to <b>2 no.</b> accesses from Kiltiernan Road”</li> <li>• Retention of any hedgerows or trees within the SDF1 lands should be subject to a full Arboriculture Assessment. Greater flexibility should be allowed given footprint requirements of end user.</li> <li>• Building height objectives should be less prescriptive for SDF 1.</li> <li>• Noting BHS 1 and 2 of the CDP which reflect the Section 28 Building Height Guidelines and performance-based criteria, Building Height Objectives for the SDF10 should not predetermine the locations of where the increased height may be acceptable.</li> <li>• Request updating density parameters on SDF 10 to reflect the provisions of the Sustainable Residential and Compact Settlement Guidelines 2024 (which allow for up to 250 dph in City - Urban Neighbourhoods of Dublin and up to 150 dph in accessible locations for City – Suburban / Urban Extension).</li> <li>• Request a specific objective to undergrounding 110 and 220 KV lines.</li> <li>• Every effort should be made to underground the 110 KV line where it bisects SDF 1 and SDF10.</li> </ul>		

- Request that SDF1 allow for retail warehousing and residential uses so as to support mixed use development on the E zoned lands as standalone offices are no longer viable.
- The submission then sets out details in relation to the two land parcels referenced including an aerial photo and development Plan context.
- The submission then sets out more detail in relation to suggested amendments.
- Request that the text relating to the overall site development frameworks urban design policies, as set out under Policy KGLAP 4- Site Development Frameworks of the Draft KGLAP in Section 2.6 General Urban Design Policies, be amended to provide for a greater degree of flexibility within the identified SDF lands as follows:
- Policy KGLAP 4 - Site Development Frameworks: It is policy that future development shall **generally** accord with the objectives set out in the site development framework section for each development site (see section 2.7), **which provide an indicative framework for specific land parcels.** Planning applications shall include a consistency statement setting out how each of the objectives in the Site Development Framework will be delivered.
- Submission question rationale for SDF1 – 2 which requires that development is 'to incorporate a transition between large scale employment uses to the north and open space to the south' noting that the transition is to an open space area and therefore it is not directly adjoining residential development. Wording suggested as follows; SDF1-2 "Development ~~to incorporate a transition between large scale employment uses to the north and open space to the south~~ should take cognisance of adjacent land use in terms of mitigating adverse impacts particularly on residential amenity"
- Submission acknowledges that Policy KGLAP30 reflects instances where building height should be increased, however submission notes that this only relates to lands located to the east of the Kiltiernan – Glenamuck Link Road, or at certain locations along the Kiltiernan Road.
- Submission requests greater flexibility in height on SDF1 as a mixed-use employment scheme could not achieve height of 3 – 5 storeys.  
Amendments suggested as follows:
- "Heights ~~to be a maximum~~ of 5 storeys fronting onto Kiltiernan Road **if the proposed employment/mixed use class of development facilitates same.**"
- Heights on the remainder of the site to range from 3 storeys to 5 storeys, **if the proposed employment/mixed use class of development facilitates same,** having regard to topography, surrounding existing developments, any adjacent residential development and the retention of views to the Dublin Mountains.
- **Having regard to SPPR 3 in the Building Height Guidelines, there may be instances where an argument can be made for increased height and/or taller buildings. In circumstances where compliance with Policy Objective BHS1 and BHS2 of the County Development Plan (see appendix 5) can be demonstrated additional height may be appropriate, subject to complying with; the safeguards outlined in the CDP, and the performance-based criteria as set out in table 5.1 of the BH strategy (see appendix 5) or as set out in any subsequent County Development Plan.**
- Ensure proposed heights achieve a balance between height and scale, contribute to variety in design and avoid against monolithic and monotonous buildings.
- **Given the employment zoning of the subject lands, the Planning Authority acknowledge that flexibility may be required on the above requirements to facilitate different forms of employment generating use (such as warehousing, logistics, commercial retail or industrial type uses)"**
- Considers that development of SDF1 may result in removal of some trees and hedgerows and that this should be reflected in SDF1 – 4.
- Amendment suggested as follows:

- SDF1-4 "To retain the hedgerow (Where feasible) along the boundary of the "E" zoned lands with "The Park" to the north and along the boundary with the adjoining open space area to the northwest. To retain high quality trees or hedgerows within the lands where feasible, subject to arboricultural assessment, and where removed replacement planting or other landscaping appropriate to the character of the area will be provided"
- SDF10
- Suggests SDF10 – 4 should have regard to SPPR 3 of the Building Height Guidelines. The following addition is requested:
  - Having regard to SPPR 3 in the Building Height Guidelines, there may be instances where an argument can be made for increased height and/or taller buildings. In circumstances where compliance with Policy Objective BHS1 and BHS2 of the County Development Plan (see appendix 5) can be demonstrated additional height may be appropriate, subject to complying with; the safeguards outlined in the CDP, and the performance-based criteria as set out in table 5.1 of the BH strategy (see appendix 5) or as set out in any subsequent County Development Plan.
- Considers that SDF 10 – 5 is overly prescriptive in stating that the higher density will only be considered where it is demonstrated that a 1km or less walking distance to a to a Luas stop can be achieved by the provision of a route through 'The Park', Carrickmines. Submission references urban neighbourhood definition in guidelines. Requests amendment to SDF 10 – 5 – as follows:
- Density generally 50-80 dwellings per hectare. Higher densities up to 150 dwellings may be considered at 'accessible' suburban locations and up to 250 dwellings per hectare may be considered at locations around existing or planned high-capacity public transport nodes or interchanges (as defined in Table 3.8 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines 2024) where it can be demonstrated that a 1km or less walking distance to a to a Luas stop can be achieved by the provision of a route through 'The Park', Carrickmines
- Submission request amendment to Policy KGLAP30 – Building Height as follows: It is policy that building heights in the Draft KGLAP shall generally be 2-4 5 storeys and generally accord with the height guidance for each site development framework set out in Chapter 2, subject to policy objectives BHS1 and BHS2 of the Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 (SPPR 3 of the 'Urban Development and Building Height; Guidelines for Planning Authorities' 2018), or policy objectives in any subsequent County Development Plan. Having regard to SPPR3 in the Building Height Guidelines, there may be instances where an argument can be made for increased height and/or taller buildings on lands located to the east of the Kiltiernan – Glenamuck Link Road, or at certain locations along the Kiltiernan Road. In circumstances where compliance with Policy Objective BHS1 and BHS2 of the County Development Plan (see Appendix 5) can be demonstrated additional height may be appropriate, subject to complying with; the safeguards outlined in the CDP, the policies and objectives of this Draft Local Area Plan and the performance based criteria as set out in Table 5.1 of the BH Strategy (See Appendix 5) or as set out in any subsequent County Development Plan.
- Submission requests a new objective as follows:
 

**Policy KGLAPXX – Overhead Power Lines**  
It is Policy to: Encourage the undergrounding of the 110kv transmission lines where feasible
- Request amendment to section 2.5.1 Green Infrastructure Concept to ensure it is clear as to which 110KV line is referenced. Requests amendment as follows;
- Green Infrastructure Concept:
- This concept is based on a landscape focused approach with the following key components: ...

- Utilising the **southern** 110 KV and 220KV powerlines as an open space spine while recognising the challenges they present.
- Request a more flexible approach to uses in SDF1 employment zoned lands. Request amendment as follows:
- Objective E2 - Employment Zoned lands: It is an objective that the employment-zoned lands (SDF1) ~~to the north of the Draft Plan Lands~~ should be linked physically and contextually to development on the balance of 'The Park' at Carrickmines. ~~Further retail warehousing uses will be discouraged.~~ **Employment generating uses are encouraged as the desirable future development of these lands, however, other uses listed as permissible / open for consideration under the E zoning objective will be considered on their merits, particularly as part of a mixed-use development.**
- Submission requests significant amendments to objective H1 – Housing for all on the grounds that the request for 25% of total housing stock to be designed to facilitate an aging population/people with disability is an overly onerous blanket requirement that has no evidence base and does not accord with CDP.
- Amendment requested as follows:
- Objective H1 – Housing for All: It is an objective to ensure the provision of a range of housing options within the Draft KGLAP area, that take account of all ages and abilities as residents progress through different stages of life, in accordance with Section 12.3.3.1 and Table 12.1 of the County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 (or any subsequent Plan) that all new residential developments of ~~10+~~ 50+ units shall include ~~a minimum of 25% of the total~~ housing stock ~~to be~~ designed to facilitate an ageing population / people with a disability. ~~In this regard, the following provisions should be taken into account in the design and location of such units:~~
  - ~~Units should be designed having regard to the universal design homes principles.~~
  - ~~Insofar as possible, units should be located at ground floor level with own door access.~~
  - ~~Units should contain a minimum of 2 bedrooms.~~
  - ~~Ideally, units should be located where residents have a short walk to site entrances that adjoin public transport links and amenities within or adjacent to the proposed development.~~
  - ~~To assist with ease of access to public transport links and amenities, landscaping within any new development shall be designed having regard to ease of movement and legibility for all users.~~

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

Chapters 2, 3, 4, 9

DLR Submission No: <b>B104</b>	Person: John Spain on behalf of Goodrock Project Management Ltd.,	Organisation: Goodrock Project Management Ltd
<p><b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b></p> <p>Submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes opportunity to make submission relating to a.77 hectare plot of land subject to the "A" land use zoning objective with frontage to the Glenamuck Link Distributor Road (GLDR).</li> <li>• Submission references the fact that the land has been subject to recent preplanning for 19 units but that the site is designated in the Draft Local Area Plan as open space under SDF11. This designation is not supported, and it is considered that it exceeds the CDP Green Infrastructure strategy requirements for this area.</li> <li>• Submission request removal of designation so as to ensure delivery of housing and proposes an alternative 6.2-hectare open space to the east of Jackson Park.</li> <li>• Submission considers that SDF 11 is in effect a downzoning of land.</li> </ul>		



- Amendments suggested are based on a report prepared by O'Mahony Pike Architects (OMP) and Mitchell and Associates Landscaping Architects (MA).
- Submission provides detail of Goodrock Residential Limited, ownership of the site and also references the fact that detailed submissions have been made over the years on previous plans.
- Submission considers that the Draft LAP proposes a strategy which ignores the potential to deliver housing and that this needs to be addressed given the housing crisis.
- The submission includes aerial photography and maps showing the subject lands in various contexts.
- Submission reviews the Draft LAP and considers that:
  - The central parkland areas ignores the objective "A" land use zoning objective.
  - Section 2.6 General Urban Design Principles of the Draft KGLAP and Policy KGLAP 4 site development frameworks would preclude residential development on the subject lands.
  - Section 2.7 of Draft Plan effectively downzones SDF11
- Submission considers that the urban design strategy in the Draft LAP originates from the urban design strategy set out in in Appendix 12-4 Urban Design Report of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report for the Glenamuck District Roads Scheme (GDDR) prepared by BSM and further considers that this is a flawed approach as the report was prepared for GDDR planning application, was not subject to public consultation and did not consider the Draft LAP boundary change. The use of the report was also not flagged at pre-draft consultation stage.
- Submission suggests a number of amendments based on a submitted urban design report which considered the entire draft LAP lands. It is contended that the amendments could unlock potential for additional residential units on the submitters lands and on adjoining lands.
- Submission requests:
  - Removal of area identified as open space in SDF 11 from the submitters land holding which is subject to land use zoning objective "A"
  - Relocation of Kiltiernan Park phase 2 to provide a 6.2 hectare passive park
  - Access and preservation of fully serviced objective B lands to east of SDF9 for future residential development
- Request that section 2.7.12 Smaller Infill/Backland Site Development Objectives-(SDO) be amended to include specific reference to submitters land. Suggested amendment is as follows:
 

"2.7.12 Smaller Infill/Backland Site Development Objectives-(SDO)  
This section provides overall guidance for smaller infill/backland sites including any infill at Wayside Cottages and Glenamuck Cottages, **and infill lands adjoining the GLDR.**"

Heights Objectives SDO-3  
**2-3 storeys.** Heights in any infill proposal shall be sensitive to the surrounding built form.
- Request that Figure 2.3- Indicative Urban Design Strategy Map of the Draft KGLAP as set out under Section 2.5.1 Urban Design and Placemaking Strategy for the Kiltiernan Road and Kiltiernan – Glenamuck Link Road, be amended as per a submitted figure. The amended figure alters and relocates SDF11 and reduces the size of SDF9. The submitter sets out rationale for the change which includes:
  - The fact that the vision for the draft LAP is focused on growth.
  - In the EMRA MASP the Kiltiernan-Glenamuck residential community is identified as being within the LUAS Green Line Strategic Corridor,
  - LAP builds on ten-minute neighbourhood concept
  - Key component of the Draft KGLAP is to plan and provide for new and upgraded connections and infrastructure to facilitate ease of movement within, and to and from the Draft KGLAP area
  - Provisions set out in the current Development Plan, apply as appropriate to development.



- PHP18 of the Development Plan policy seeks to maximise the use of zoned and serviced residential land
- Request that figure 2.4 Site Development Frameworks be amended to alter and relocate SDF11 and reduces the size of SDF9
- Request that figure 2.2 Character Area be amended to alter central parkland area.
- Submission considers that the Draft LAP needs to consider the potential for the long term development of fully serviced Objective B zoned lands
- Proposed amendment will allow access to objective B zoned lands.
- Submission concludes that the key request of this submission is to protect the landowner as the Draft plan jeopardises their ability to develop their lands.
- Conclusion reiterates that the submitter considers that the plan is down zoning their land and that if amendments are not given sufficient consideration the submitter will consider all avenues to address the issue they have raised.

### **Summary of submitted URBAN DESIGN AND GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE REPORT**

- Report considers that Draft LAP blocks future access and uses. The report examines rearrangement of road, an examination of the proposed school site, reorganization of open space and unlocking of future potential residential lands to provide up to 1500 units.
- The report investigates alternative urban framework layouts for SDF9 and SDF11.
- For SDF 9 urban typology school options are suggested along with synergies to Jackson Park. The report suggests reducing the school site to 1.4 hectares. Design of the school could include frontage over Kiltiernan Park phase 1. The report also explores layouts for residential development on a portion of SDF9 and also on lands currently subject to land use zoning objective B.
- For SDF 11 the site is shown as fully developed with residential units including on the portion currently zoned objective B. Kiltiernan Park phase 2 is relocated to higher lands closer to Dingle Glen. Access for the site is also shown to lands to the south.
- A number of diagrams are included as follows;
  - Proposed LAP drawing
  - Revised urban design strategy
  - Amended Figure 2.4 showing SDF11 relocated and SDF9 reduced.
  - Amended figure 4.3 showing SDF 9 reduced.
  - Amended figure 2.2 showing a differing amended parkland character area.

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

Chapters 2

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B105</u></b>	<b>Person: Edmond Mullins</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission considers that there is lack of public green space in the area and that the green area opposite St Marys of the Wayside, at the Adult Education Centre should be made into a public area for children to play.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 7		

<b>DLR Submission No: B106</b>	<b>Person: Tom Phillips + Associates (TPA)</b>	<b>Organisation: Tom Phillips + Associates (TPA)</b>
<p><b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission requests that the LAP boundary is extended to include a 9.6 ha landholding, located at Kiltiernan Parish West (KPW), and to rezone the lands to Objective A, residential.</li> <li>• Notes that the local planning context has changed materially with the commencement of construction of the GDRS and that this major infrastructural constraint to progressing residential development in the area has been removed.</li> <li>• Notes changes to national planning framework since the review and adoption of the dlr CDP which was based on population projections in the NPF 2018 resulting in insufficient land zoned in Dublin. Considers that the addition of the subject lands within the LAP boundary together and their rezoning to residential would provide much needed opportunity for additional housing, having regard to the shortfall in residential zoned land identified in the NPF review.</li> <li>• Previous submission to zone subject lands as a Strategic Land Reserve in the CDP review was rejected by dlr based on population projections from the NPF and the Residential Development Capacity Audit which informed the Core Strategy. Considers that the review of the NPF will necessitate the zoning of additional lands in appropriate locations such as Kiltiernan and that the incorporation of the subject lands, contiguous to the current Kiltiernan development boundary, and their zoning for residential purposes is wholly in keeping with the revision necessary to residential land use zoning policy both locally and in the wider region.</li> <li>• Submits that the subject lands are suitable to be rezoned residential for the following reasons:</li> <li>• The landholding marks a suitable northern boundary/strong green buffer for Kiltiernan along Stepside Golf Centre &amp; Driving Range <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The Lands in question are currently not zoned residential however there are seven long-established existing residential units on the Lands, abutting new residential development.</li> <li>○ Kiltiernan – Glenamuck is designated a "New Residential Community" in the CDP, but no new land has been zoned rather that less was zoned "residential" in the CDP as some residential land was replaced with "SNI".</li> <li>○ "Sustainable Neighbourhood Infrastructure" (SNI) zoned land is located beside the subject lands which would benefit from being fully surrounded by residential development to form a logical and coherent neighbourhood and community.</li> <li>○ The proximity of the subject lands to the Jamestown/Ballyogan Greenway and the ongoing active delivery of the GDRS which has been designed to; operate as a distributor road (located beside the subject lands) to the M50, improve the connectivity of the area, improve access to public transport such as Dublin Bus Stops and Ballyogan Luas and to provide for active travel unlocks the full potential of Kiltiernan to deliver sustainable housing development.</li> <li>○ Rezoning would help deliver on the "10 Minute Neighbourhood Concept" being located close to SNI and Neighbourhood Centre zoned land which would provide future residents with commercial and social opportunities within proximate locations.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Other issues</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B107</u></b>	<b>Person: Mary Oneill</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission cites concerns around disability access and movement for wheelchair and scooter users along the footpaths and when navigating from road to pavement in all part of Kiltiernan because of pavement width and lack of safe road crossings.</li> <li>• Submission requests that width of footpaths and crossings, and ramps will be disability friendly, frequently provided and accessible throughout the Kiltiernan Village area.</li> <li>• Submission cites concerns regarding permeability routes PY2 and PY3 planned for Suttonfield as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ New routes are not required as new link road will result in a traffic calmed Enniskerry Road towards the Church of Ireland school and a direct route to Wayside School already exists.</li> <li>○ Additional access points could result in non-residents using privately managed and insured green area.</li> <li>○ PY3 would link estates that do not have many green areas to the Suttonfield green area which does not have capacity and was not designed for this purpose. This could result in accidents and increased insurance costs for residents.</li> <li>○ Additional access points could impact security, with little benefit to residents.</li> <li>○ Two existing access routes are adequate.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B108</u></b>	<b>Person: John Spain on behalf of Goodrock Project Management Ltd.</b>	<b>Organisation: Goodrock Project Management Ltd.</b>
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> Submission requests: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction of SDF9 to 1.4 hectares and promotion of urban typology school</li> <li>• Relocation of Kiltiernan Park Phase 2 to a larger 6.2 hectare site.</li> <li>• Access to and preservation of fully serviced B zoned lands.</li> <li>• A figure is submitted showing proposed alternative urban Design Strategy</li> <li>• Submission sets out detail in relation to the submitter, their track record in housing and infrastructure delivery along with community gain, their landholdings in the LAP area and references the fact that submission have been made on various statutory spatial plans outlining a masterplan approach for their lands.</li> <li>• Submission considers that LAP ignores the potential to deliver much needed housing in the area.</li> <li>• Submitter considers that they have accommodated the vast majority of community gain in the area including Wayside and Kiltiernan Glenamuck Park which exceeds the open space requirements in the dlr Green Infrastructure Strategy.</li> <li>• Submission sets out the zoning of various parcels of land in the Draft LAP.</li> <li>• Submission references the fact that a pre planning request has been submitted in relation to A zoned land in SDDF11 and that they intend to bring forward a development of 19 houses on the site.</li> <li>• Submission requests relocation of Kiltiernan Park Phase 2 so as not sterilise the imminent development of objective A lands and long-term development of</li> </ul>		

objective B lands. Submission considers that new location is more appropriate in terms of topography and zoning.

- Amended Site Development Frameworks map and an amended Character Area map are submitted.
- In relation to SFD9 submission considers that the area indicated for the school site (4.5hecatres) is 3.75 times that required to provide 2 primary schools.
- The school site will also sterilise fully serviced land with clear residential development potential for 150 units and indirect sterilisation of potential for a further 1000 units.
- Submission considers that KGLAP should take long term view for next 6 – 10 years and should provide for future development potential for residential development.
- Submission considers that Draft LAP is downzoning land and that submitter will consider other options to remedy the situation if the amendments requested in this submission are not given sufficient consideration.
- Submission considers that the Draft KGLAP background papers, particularly the Community Audit and Sustainable Neighbourhood Infrastructure Review, fail to recognise the open space already delivered in the area (i.e. Kiltiernan Park 3.5 ha) and also do not identify a need for any additional open space.
- Submission considers that the urban design strategy in the Draft LAP originates from the urban design strategy set out in in Appendix 12-4 Urban Design Report of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report for the Glenamuck District Roads Scheme (GDDR) prepared by BSM and further considers that this is a flawed approach as the report was prepared for GDDR planning application, was not subject to public consultation and did not consider the Draft LAP boundary change. The use of the report was also not flagged at pre-draft consultation stage.
- The submission sets out requests for amendments which it is considered will still deliver on the overall planning Framework for the area.
- Request that the extent of the Objective 'B' (Agriculture) zoned lands identified for education uses under SDF9 be reduced from the proposed 4.5 ha. to 1.4 ha. which will adequately provide for a secondary school or 2 no. primary schools, and potential long-term development of fully serviced Objective B zoned lands, as shown in Figure 3.2 and Figure 1.2 of the submission.
- 
- Request that the area identified for Kiltiernan Park Phase 2 under SFD11 be removed from the fully serviced Objective 'A' (Residential) lands and Objective 'B' (Agricultural) lands so as not to sterilise the imminent development of the Objective A lands and potential long term development of the Objective B zoned lands, and that Kiltiernan Park Phase 2 be relocated to the Objective G (high amenity) zoned lands to the east which are larger, more appropriate in terms of topography and zonings, and which have direct connections to the wider green networks, as shown in Figure 3.5, and Figure 1.2 and Figure 1.3 of the submission.
- Request that section 2.7.12 Smaller Infill/Backland Site Development Objectives-(SDO) be amended to include specific reference to submitters land. Suggested amendment is as follows;  
 "2.7.12 Smaller Infill/Backland Site Development Objectives-(SDO)  
 This section provides overall guidance for smaller infill/backland sites including any infill at Wayside Cottages and Glenamuck Cottages, and infill lands adjoining the GLDR."  
 Heights Objectives SDO-3
- 2-3 storeys. Heights in any infill proposal shall be sensitive to the surrounding built form.
- Request that Figure 2.3- Indicative Urban Design Strategy Map of the Draft KGLAP as set out under Section 2.5.1 Urban Design and Placemaking Strategy for the Kiltiernan Road and Kiltiernan – Glenamuck Link Road, be amended as shown in

Figure 3.6, and Figure 1.4 of the submission. Section 2.6- General Urban Design Principles

- That the text relating to the overall site development frameworks urban design policies, as set out under Policy KGLAP 4- Site Development Frameworks of the Draft KGLAP in Section 2.6 General Urban Design Policies, be amended to provide for a degree of flexibility within the identified SDF lands, as follows:

Policy KGLAP 4 - Site Development Frameworks:

It is policy that future development shall **generally** accord with the objectives set out in the site development framework section for each development site (see section 2.7). Planning applications shall include a consistency statement setting out how each of the objectives in the Site Development Framework will be delivered.

- Section 2.7- Site Development Frameworks

That the text relating to the overall site development frameworks, as set out under Policy in the Draft KGLAP in 2.7 Kiltiernan - Glenamuck Site Development Frameworks (SDF), be amended to provide for residential development on the submitters lands as follows (removal shown in strikethrough)

2.7 Kiltiernan - Glenamuck Site Development Frameworks (SDF)

This section sets out site development frameworks to provide guidance for future planning applications. The former Bective lands which are identified in this Draft LAP for active recreational use and the lands identified as a new phase of Kiltiernan Park are also included in this section.

This section also sets out objectives for smaller infill/backland sites (see 2.7.11). Development of sites not specifically identified in this section will be assessed ~~against the overall policy and objectives set out in this Draft Plan~~ in addition to the relevant policy objectives in the County Development Plan.

Section 7.4.1 – Green Infrastructure – Climate Action and Biodiversity Conservation That the text of relating to Objective GI3 – Wildlife Corridor and Figure 7.1 should be amended to as follows:

Objective GI3 – Wildlife Corridor:

It is an Objective to:

- ~~Allow the relevant wildlife corridors—Fernhill to Brides Glen corridor and Brides Glen corridor—as set out in the dlr County Biodiversity Action Plan 2021—2025 to inform decision making within the KGLAP area.~~
- Identify opportunities to enhance and restore the Fernhill to Brides Glen corridor and Bride's Glen corridor within the LAP lands, using best practice under the supervision of suitably competent professionals as deemed appropriate by the Planning Authority.

An aerial photo of the submitters landholding in the area is included along with details of various planning permissions that have been secured. The submission refers to various phases of development.

The submission states that the submitter is the largest and most affected landowner in the Draft LAP area and argues that their lands subject to the appropriate zoning objectives have potential to provide for housing.

The submission sets out detail from the MASP with regard to Kiltiernan being identified as within the LUAS Green Line Strategic Corridor. The submission also details policy objectives from the dlr County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 including PHP18 which relates to increasing housing supply.

Submission considers that draft Plan needs to look at long term development of fully serviced B zoned lands to capitalise on investment and also to integrate land use and transport policy.

Submission considers that proposed amendment will meet policies as outlined in the draft LAP.

Submission considers that the site development frameworks for SDF9 and SDF11 conflict with land use zoning map 9 of the dlr County Development Plan as it relates to the inclusion of our client's Objective A zoned lands within the proposed

Kiltiernan Park- New Phase (SDF11) and the designation of Objective 'B' (Agriculture) lands as education lands (SDF9).

Submission considers that as no new residential zonings are proposed under the Draft LAP, there is no basis for the scale of school site proposed.

Submission notes that in relation to Built Form Built Form Objectives SDF9-3 the reuse of granite walls has already been contracted by DLR under the GLDR contract.

Considers that the LAP boundary is being extended not for the purposes of delivering or identifying additional residential lands or parklands , but to allow for the identification of a wildlife corridor which has no regard to existing or future land uses in the area.

Considers that the Draft LAP fails to optimise land use and landform in the area. Submission considers that the ecological areas, wildlife corridors, and green infrastructure identified on Draft KGLAP Figure 7.1, are excessive in extent, and go significantly beyond that required under the green infrastructure strategy for the County, and would jeopardize the future development potential of lands currently subject to High Amenity and Agriculturally Land use zoning objectives. Submission request removal of text in GI3 – Wildlife Corridor.

### **Summary of submitted URBAN DESIGN AND GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE REPORT**

Report considers that Draft LAP blocks future access and uses. The report examines rearrangement of road, an examination of the proposed school site, reorganization of open space and unlocking of future potential residential lands to provide up to 1500 units.

The report investigates alternative urban framework layouts for SDF9 and SDF11. For SDF 9 urban typology school options are suggested along with synergies to Jackson Park. The report suggests reducing the school site to 1.4 hectares.

Design of the school could include frontage over Kiltiernan Park phase 1. The report also explores layouts for residential development on a portion of SDF9 and also on lands currently subject to land use zoning objective B.

For SDF 11 the site is shown as fully developed with residential units including on the portion currently zoned objective B. Kiltiernan Park phase 2 is relocated to higher lands closer to Dingle Glen. Access for the site is also shown to lands to the south.

A number of diagrams are included as follows;

- Proposed LAP drawing
- Revised urban design strategy
- Amended Figure 2.4 showing SDF11 relocated and SDF9 reduced.
- Amended figure 4.3 showing SDF 9 reduced.
- Amended figure 2.2 showing a differing amended parkland character area.

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

Chapters 1, 2, 7

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B109</u></b>	<b>Person: Suzanne Grufferty</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission cites concerns around disability access and movement for wheelchair and scooter users along the footpaths and when navigating from road to pavement in all part of Kiltiernan because of pavement width and lack of safe road crossings.</li> </ul>		



- Submission requests that width of footpaths and crossings, and ramps will be disability friendly, frequently provided and accessible throughout the Kiltiernan Village area.
  - Submission cites concerns regarding permeability routes PY2 and PY3 planned for Suttonfield as follows:
    - New routes are not required as new link road will result in a traffic calmed Enniskerry Road towards the Church of Ireland school and a direct route to Wayside School already exists.
    - Additional access points could result in non-residents using privately managed and insured green area.
    - PY3 would link estates that do not have many green areas to the Suttonfield green area which does not have capacity and was not designed for this purpose. This could result in accidents and increased insurance costs for residents.
    - Additional access points could impact security, with little benefit to residents.
    - Two existing access routes are adequate.
  - Submission requests provision to address an acute need for a GP in the area given the number of people and the range of ages living locally.
- Also cites need for additional retail outlets including supermarket outlet and indoor spaces serving coffee.

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

Chapter 5, 6

DLR Submission No: <b>B110</b>	Person: <b>Kerrie Jolley</b>	Organisation: <b>Resident</b>
<p><b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request for substantial sized supermarket to adequately serve the area and its future residents. The supermarket should be similar to Dunnes Cabinteely/Leopardstown or Tesco Dundrum/Stillorgan for the area to be sustainable and ensure that residents do not have to travel by car for basic food needs.</li> <li>• Submission cites concerns regarding permeability routes PY2 and PY3 planned for Suttonfield as follows:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ New routes are not required as completion of the distributor road will result in a traffic calmed Enniskerry Road.</li> <li>○ Access to PY2 is already available on Ballybetagh Road.</li> <li>○ PY3 will result in increased footfall in Suttonfield by creating a 'walk through' route for residents of Kiltiernan Wood, Bishops Gate and Kiltiernan Close towards the Wayside School area.</li> <li>○ PY3 would increase access to Suttonfield's private green space for non-residents.</li> <li>○ PY3 poses a security risk with the creation of multiple exist/entry points for planned robberies.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b></p> <p>Chapter 5, 6</p>		



DLR Submission No: <u>B111</u>	Person: Aine Mak	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission cites concerns regarding permeability route PY3 planned for Suttonfield as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New route is not required as new link road will result in a traffic calming for pedestrians on Enniskerry Road.</li> <li>Additional access points could result in non-residents using the green area in Suttonfield affecting its usage and security of the estate by creating more entry and exit routes.</li> <li>While acknowledging the benefit of improved permeability to the Enniskerry Road a shortcut through to Wayside School already exists.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <u>B112</u>	Person: Eoin Feeney	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission cites concerns regarding permeability routes PY2 and PY3 planned for Suttonfield as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PY3 would not benefit access to the creche because PY2 begins directly opposite the creche allowing access from the main road.</li> <li>Four separate entrance/exit points to Suttonfield is considered excessive.</li> <li>Considers that effectively joining estates from Suttonfield to Chapel Hill could result in antisocial behaviour without consideration or mitigation.</li> <li>Queries responsibility for lighting proposed footpaths and maintenance of roads and considers that the Council should focus on improvements to footpaths and access from main road.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <u>B113</u>	Person: Simon Rattigan	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objection to Permeability Route PY9, Chapel Hill to Bishops Gate for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter was unaware when purchasing house that there would be a link between Chapel Hill and Bishops Gate.</li> <li>Submission believes there is no benefit to the proposed PY9 linkage between Chapel Hill and Bishops Gate.</li> <li>Increased use of privately insured playground, which was designed for a specific number of users, by non-resident children would increase the risk of accidents and raise insurance premiums for residents.</li> <li>Additional access for non-residents would be difficult to monitor and could create a security risk for crime/break ins.</li> <li>Roads in Bishops Gate are taken in charge, but Chapel Hill has not been taken in charge. The boundary wall between the estates is owned and managed by Chapel Hill Management Company and would require their approval to remove the wall and this would not be given.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

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

Chapter 5

**DLR Submission  
No: B114****Person: Peter Verjans****Organisation: Resident****Summary of submission / Observations:**

- Submission objects to permeability route PY3 planned for Suttonfield for the following reasons:
  - Having a pedestrian access from Ballybetagh Road, PY2 and PY3 is considered excessive and would result in increased footfall into Suttonfield across private green space which is located to the front of and integrated with private homes.
  - Lack of green space in adjoining estates will make the Suttonfield private green space attractive to those residents.
  - Additional access points could result in crime, antisocial behaviour, loitering and littering and non-residents using privately managed and insured green area.

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

Chapter 5

**DLR Submission  
No: B115****Person: Nicole****Organisation: Resident****Summary of submission / Observations:**

- Submission strongly opposes PY3 and connection of estates in Kilternan generally and particularly Suttonfield and Kilternan Wood as it is proven elsewhere in Dublin to increase antisocial behaviour, noise pollution and crime rates.
- Considers that throughways and multiple exists into estates are more problematic than useful.

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

Chapter 5

**DLR Submission  
No: B116****Person: Fabien Zucchini****Organisation: Resident****Summary of submission / Observations:**

- Submission objects to permeability routes PY2 and PY3 planned for Suttonfield because of safety concerns as there are no safeguards proposed or in place.
- Considers that 'daily incidents' would increase with planned access routes.
- Suggests improvements to Ballybetagh Road with provision of speed bumps near entrance to Suttonfield, cycle path in both directions and galvanised metal barrier both ways between Suttonfield and Enniskerry Road cross to prevent serious accident.
- Proposes SNI/community centre in Kilternan Village for health and wellness facilities e.g. yoga, gym, beauty salon, barber/hairdresser and cafes.
- Public transport improvements are needed in terms of bus frequency, shelters, real time information and suggests introduction of new routes to serve second and third level education destinations.

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

Chapter 2, 5, 6

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B117</u></b>	<b>Person: Aimee OConnor</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission objects to permeability route PY3 planned for Suttonfield for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional footfall could create a security risk and result in access to the privately maintained and insured green area.</li> <li>Additional use and potential accidents would result in increased insurance costs to residents.</li> <li>It is unacceptable that Suttonfield private green space would be relied upon by dlr in lieu of provision of sufficient public spaces, parks, playgrounds and facilities.</li> <li>Multiple entrances create a security risk and threat of crime/break ins.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Requests provision of a substantial and significant supermarket is needed for the area and not a token convenience store included in Kiltiernan Village.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5, 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B118</u></b>	<b>Person: Gaurav Tyagi</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission objects to permeability routes PY3 planned for Suttonfield as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inclusion of multiple pedestrian points (PY2 and PY3) from Ballybetagh Road, is unnecessary and would result in increased footfall into Suttonfield across private green space in front of homes.</li> <li>Lack of green space in adjoining estates will make the Suttonfield private green space (which was not intended for public use) attractive to those residents.</li> <li>Additional access points could result in crime, antisocial behaviour, loitering and littering and would encourage non-residents to use privately managed and insured green area.</li> <li>Additional access points could result in non-residents using privately managed and insured green area.</li> <li>Enniskerry Road will be quitter when distributor road is completed.</li> <li>PY3 is not required because of the existing pedestrian connections PY2, and another one onto Ballybetagh Road.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B119</u></b>	<b>Person: Michael Priaulx</b>	<b>Organisation: House Martin Conservation UK and Ireland</b>
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission welcomes biodiversity policies.</li> <li>Request to consider building-dependent wildlife such as red listed bird species which inhabit buildings in Kiltiernan – Glenamuck, which is significant in the LAP area given the number of unmodernised older buildings which have a greater tendency to host these species.</li> <li>Request to add the following:</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Swift bricks are a universal nest brick for small bird species and should be installed in new developments including extensions in accordance with best-practice guidance. Artificial next (sic) cups for house martins may be installed instead of swift bricks where recommended by an ecologist.</li> <li>○ Existing nest sites for building-dependent species such as swifts and house martins should be protected, as these endangered, red-listed species which are present but declining in Kiltiernan – Glenamuck, return annually to traditional nest sites. Mitigation should be provided if these nest sites cannot be protected.</li> <li>• Submission refers to further information being available from House Martin Conservation UK &amp; Ireland.</li> <li>• Submission refers to sources of information for swift bricks and integral nest sites for swifts – NHBC Foundation: Biodiversity in New Housing Developments (April 2021).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 7</p>

<b>DLR Submission No: B120</b>	<b>Person: Dervla O'Leary</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<p><b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission welcomes LAP and focus on planned and structured development in a consistent way in keeping with the characteristics of the Kiltiernan – Glenamuck area and that planning applications should reflect the LAP and only be granted if consistent with it.</li> <li>• Welcome for the following provisions of the LAP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Height Objectives – welcomes maximum of 4 storeys and up to 5 at some locations adjacent to transport infrastructure.</li> <li>○ Built Form Objectives – welcomes that development should respond to form of existing development and reflect rural character of the area.</li> <li>○ Building Materials – welcomes use of native materials sensitive to the area. Request to use original granite in walls and development to ensure they reflect the character of the area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Submission notes and requests: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Building Mix – While noting the significant number and scale of apartments constructed and the need for additional housing, they do not have sufficient amenities. Request for house units with gardens for families to create a sense of community.</li> <li>○ Footpaths – Notes Objectives, AT6 and AT7, to provide footpaths on Glenamuck Road East, where footpaths are too narrow and unsafe for pedestrians and requests they should be wide enough for cyclists and pedestrians.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Submission makes the following observations and recommendations in respect of Glenamuck East, SDF8: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ SDF8-1 – Springfield Lane is a private, narrow country lane and is not suitable for additional vehicular traffic. If the lane is to be used a pedestrian/cycle link, then paths and lighting should be provided.</li> <li>○ SDF8-2 - Recent permission was granted in contravention of requirement of LAP to have regard to the rural character and transition to the objective 'B' zoning lands rising to the east and as a result will now be characterised by a 5-storey bland (in building form) apartment block. Permission should be granted in line with LAP.</li> <li>○ SDF8-3 - Recent permission was granted for a 5-storey bland (in building form) apartment block in contravention of requirement of LAP to respond to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<p>the form of existing properties in Cairnbrook and adjoining rural character to the east.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ SDF8-4 - Recent permission was granted for 5 storeys on the eastern elevated part of the site in contravention of requirement of LAP for maximum 4 storeys. Permission should be granted in line with LAP.</li> <li>○ SDF8-5 - Recent permission was granted in contravention of LAP objective for a maximum of 40 dph.</li> <li>○ SDF8-6 – Imperative that hedgerows to the east as shown on Figure 7.1 are retained.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1, 2, 4, 5, 8</p>

DLR Submission No: <u>B121</u>	Person: D. De Barra	Organisation: Resident
<p><b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission in relation to Permeability Route PY9, Chapel Hill to Bishops Gate.</li> <li>• Submission notes the reference in condition of permission D16A/0586 to the link 'in order to provide for possible future access/permeability links to the adjacent site' and sees no positives in its provision, that it would not in the interest of Chapel Hill nor that it adds to the "proper planning and sustainable development of the area".</li> <li>• Submission notes that Chapel Hill is a private estate, and common areas and playground are privately insured, with ongoing landscaping and maintenance paid for by residents.</li> <li>• Submission is concerned that increased footfall will result in the children of Chapel Hill competing with others for use of their own playground, which is not a local amenity, as it has not been taken in charge, and not proposed to be, and it is not the Council's place to open privately owned amenities to non-residents.</li> <li>• Notes that Chapel Hill is a quiet cul de sac with no through access where children can play safely at end of cul de sac with no traffic.</li> <li>• Creation of link will encourage burglaries, thefts vandalism, antisocial behaviour etc. because there will be two routes out of Chapel Hill rather than one at Glebe Road.</li> <li>• Submits that residents on both sides of the wall in both estates do not want to live beside an open walkway/footpath.</li> <li>• Considers that there is no benefit in allowing footfall from Chapel Hill or Bishops Gate and would create health and safety issues for young children walking through estates to schools/playgrounds on path in front driveways putting them at risk of being knocked down.</li> <li>• Considers that Enniskerry Road would be a safer route for walking.</li> <li>• Submits that given the extent of local opposition that the Council should consider all submissions/observations in great detail and ensure there is further public consultation and consent from the residents of Chapel Hill and Bishops Gate.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B122</u>	Person: Richard Veale	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission considers that PY9 would not reduce distance or time for pedestrians to access local amenities.</li> <li>Traffic on Enniskerry Road will be reduced resulting in lower risk to pedestrians.</li> <li>Traffic safety concerns for pedestrians and children from drivers exiting driveways.</li> <li>Considers that link would increase antisocial behaviour and create a security risk.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5		

DLR Submission No: <u>B123</u>	Person: Elizabeth Clooney	Organisation: Resident
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given the biodiversity crisis, the remaining hedgerows, ditches and trees must be protected.</li> <li>Native plants promoting biodiversity should be grown in the new housing developments.</li> <li>The rural character of Ballycorus, where farming is very important should also be respected.</li> <li>Public transport is totally inadequate for the current and future population of the area, for example a shuttle bus service to the Luas would be very beneficial.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5 and 7		

DLR Submission No: <u>B124</u>	Person: Simon Dolan	Organisation: Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage.
<b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome for provisions in the LAP to conserve biodiversity in the context of catering for large scale residential and other development which will take place over the lifespan of the plan and in particular:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The objective G zoning 'To protect and improve high amenity area' of the Dingle Glen pNHA and the smaller wooded Glenamuck Valley glacio-fluvial channel to the west of it should result in the preservation of these ecologically rich areas.</li> <li>Inclusion of Objectives GI1- hedgerows, GI3 – maintenance of wildlife corridors and GI8 – protection of the Glenamuck River riparian corridor.</li> </ul> </li> <li>While noting the Inclusion of Objective GI6 – Lighting, which states "It is an objective that the design of lighting within the LAP area should seek to minimise light pollution and adverse effects on bat species", submission considers that this objective should be expanded as follows, "including giving consideration to the installation of movement activated lighting to operate between the hours of 8PM and 6AM on greenways and footpaths through park and open space areas".</li> <li>Raises concern with the inclusion of a 'Wildflower Meadow at Glenamuck Manor', page 71 of draft LAP because planting of commercial seed mixture such as those in the image is not good conservation practice and may threaten local biodiversity by cross pollination of commercial seed mix with plants of the same species in the LAP area. The All Ireland Pollinator Plan advises against planting wildflower</li> </ul>		

<p>nonlocal origin seed outside a garden setting because; it may displace or compromise local, natural occurring flora, local; native plants colonise and do not need to be sown; and commercially produced seeds are not wild and do not contribute to addressing biodiversity loss.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission recommends replacing the Glenamuck Manor photograph with one of an area or a feature supporting high biodiversity within the LAP area, such as the Bride's Glen/Shanganagh River or Glenamuck Stream.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 7</p>

DLR Submission No: <b>B125</b>	Person: <b>Planning Advisory Division</b>	Organisation: <b>Department of the Environment, Climate and Communications (DECC)</b>
<p><b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission sets out commitment of Government to achieve a climate neutrality no later than 2050 with a 51% reduction in GHG emissions by 2030 as set out in the Climate Act 2021. Which establishes a legally binding framework with clear targets and commitments.</li> <li>The DECC will drive climate change by engaging with local authorities to build resilience in citizens, communities and business to overcome climate adaptation challenges and maximise mitigation and adaptation opportunities and facilitating a Circular Economy.</li> <li>Government is committed to delivering a 'whole of society' approach for implementation of Strategic Development Goals (SDGs) of the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.</li> <li>Requests that the LAP is aligned with the Dept Statement of Strategy for 2024-2025, Le Chéile 25 and considers the framework of Agenda 2030, SDGs and their respective targets.</li> <li>Submission notes the positive objectives of the dlr County Development Plan which set out appropriate policy objectives to create a climate resilient County and that county level objectives for climate action, renewable energy infrastructure and communications infrastructure should be reflected by objective and actions in the LAP.</li> <li>Submission includes eight recommendations and the rationale for them to further strengthen objectives of the LAP.</li> <li>Submits that having regard to the Climate Action Plan 2024 (CAP24), the Local Authority should ensure that the LAP "includes reference to, supports the implementation of and is consistent with CAP24, in accordance with Section 15(1) of the Climate Action and Low Carbon Development Act, 2015 (as amended)".</li> <li><b>Recommendation 1:</b> Include an objective and/or policy to support the implementation of CAP24 (and annual revision thereof, noting that CAP 2025 is likely to be in effect prior to the final LAP adoption process).</li> <li>Notes that the new National Adaptation Framework was approved by Government in June 2024.</li> <li><b>Recommendation 2:</b> Include an objective and/or policy to support the implementation of the National Adaptation Framework, NAF, 2024 and update the reference to the previous National Climate Change Adaptation Framework 2018 with the new NAF.</li> <li>Submission notes the adoption of the dlr LACAP 2024-2029 and recommends that the LACAP and related actions are appropriately reflected in the LAP, thereby ensuring consistency and alignment between the plans</li> <li><b>Recommendation 3:</b></li> </ul>		



While the Department welcomes the Councils support of relevant provisions contained in the dlr Local Authority Climate action Plan, 2024-2029, LACAP (3.3 Policy Context) and the integration and implementation of policies and provisions of the CDP and LACAP, where relevant (3.1 Introduction), it is recommended that the LAP includes further objectives and/or policies to ensure implementation of the dlr LACAP and related actions thereby ensuring consistency and alignment between the plans.

- Submission outlines national policy context for renewable energy as the National Development Plan 2021-2024, CAP24, Renewable Electricity Support Scheme (RESS), the Small Scale Renewable Electricity Support Scheme and the Micro Generation Scheme (MSS) and that the Local Authority should note the updates to the national policy context.
- Submission notes positive objectives in the dlr CDP which support and promote renewable energy, Policy Objective CA10, CA12 and CA13 and that the relevant Policy Objectives relating to energy efficiency and renewable energy in the CDP apply to development in the LAP and have not been duplicated.
- Welcome for inclusion of policies, including Policy KGLAP16 which generally align with CDP objectives.
- **Recommendation 4:**  
LAP should include reference to:
  - Shaping Our Electricity Future 1.1, EirGrid's updated roadmap for the development of the transmission grid to 2030 to deliver on the 80% renewal energy targets.
  - ESB's Network Strategy: 'Networks for Net Zero', which sets out ESB Networks role in enabling the delivery of the Governments CAP 2023 and supports decarbonisation of the electricity system by 2040.
- Submission notes that CAP24 includes measures to support electrification of heating by strengthening building regulations and implementing a National Retrofit Plan and that the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES) 2022-2032 sets out requirements for local authorities to include policies in statutory land use plans in relation to energy conservation, energy efficiency, renewable energy sources in new and existing buildings and requirement for retrofitting and reuse of existing buildings rather than their demolition and reconstruction.
- **Recommendation 5:**  
Include a policy to support the ambitions of the National Residential Retrofit Plan, in particular the electrification of heating, having regard to the CAP 24, dlr CDP and the RSES.
- Submission notes that when preparing the draft LAP that due regard should be given to the NPF and RSES requirement to achieve compact growth and the potential for such growth to facilitate the development of low carbon district heating.
- Submission welcomes policy in the draft LAP which supports the development of district heating networks and notes and supports Section 3.7 – Climate mitigation Energy Efficiency in Buildings.
- **Recommendation 6:**  
Local Authority to examine the potential of district heating, including district heating derived from waste heat, where available, technically feasible and cost effective and commit to carrying out a feasibility exercise and the use of heat mapping in support of same in LAP policies, having regard to dlr CDP, RSES, NPF and the National Heat Study.
- Submission notes dlr CDP Policy Objectives EI11 and EI12 which support the circular economy principles, the 'Best practice guidelines for the preparation of resource and waste management plans for construction and demolition projects', (EPA, 2021) and that the implementation of this best practice is consistent with Government policy under the National Waste Management Plan for a Circular Economy 2024-2030 and 'The Circular Economy Programme 2021-2027', (EPA).
- **Recommendation 7:**

<p>Include objectives and/or policies to support circular economy principles and reference the EPA's Best Practice Guidelines for the preparation of resource and waste management plans for construction and demolition projects, 2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission advises the Local Authority to consult with their respective Regional Waste Management Planning Office regarding development of the LAP, particularly in relation to any policies which may preclude the continued use of existing waste management infrastructure or development of new waste management infrastructure.</li> <li>• Submission requests the Council to have regard to the targets set out in the SDGs, in particular in relation to SDG12 – Responsible Consumption and Production.</li> <li>• <b>Recommendation 8:</b> Include further objectives and/or policies to support and facilitate the development of telecommunications infrastructure in line with Government policy, including the rollout of 5G.</li> <li>• Submission notes that National Strategic Objective 6 of the National Development Plan 2021-2023 and 'Harnessing Digital – the Digital Ireland Framework' (Dept of the Taoiseach, 2022) recognises the significant strategic importance of reliable connectivity to global telecommunications and of supporting the rollout of 5G across all populated areas of Ireland by 2030.</li> <li>• Submission encourages the Local Authority to have regard to the 'Clean Air Strategy for Ireland', having regard to the impact of measures adopted in the draft LAP on current and future air quality.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 3</p>

DLR Submission No: <b>B126</b>	Person: Department of Transport	Organisation: Department of Transport
<p><b>Summary of submission / Observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommends key policies and requirements relevant to accessible, integrated and sustainable transport, for dlr to consider reflecting in the LAP, noting that some of these are referenced in Appendix 2, Statutory Planning Context, and are set out as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The "whole of Government", 'National Disability Inclusion Strategy (NDIS) 2017-2022' which assigned specific actions to local authorities relating to accessible infrastructure including dishing of footpaths (lack of dishing is often cited as a major concern for wheelchair users), and accessible bus stops.</li> <li>○ The 'United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCPRD)' which obliges the State to ensure access for persons with a disability – including within the physical environment and transportation. Welcome for the text of Objective SM2 – Accessibility, "It is an objective to ensure that future developments within Kiltiernan/Glenamuck area, including its public realm and Active travel networks are accessible to all".</li> <li>○ Fully accessible transport requires a 'whole journey approach', which is all elements that constitute a journey from start to finish. Local Authorities as a key stakeholder to ensure universal design approach to the built environment including – tactile paving, cycle paths, roads, pedestrian crossings, greenways and bus stops/shelters.</li> <li>○ 'The Sustainable Mobility Policy' sets out a strategic framework to 2030 for active travel (walking and cycling) and public transport journeys and is accompanied by an action plan to 2025 which contains actions to improve and expand sustainable mobility options by providing safe, green, accessible, and efficient alternative to car journeys. It also includes demand management and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<p>behavioural change measures to manage daily travel more efficiently and reduce journeys taken by private car.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ DMURS Interim Advice Note Covid-19 Pandemic Response which 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.</li><li>○ 'The Connecting Ireland Rural Mobility Plan (2022-2025)' which is a major national public transport initiative which aims to increase public transport connectivity, particularly for people living outside of major cities and towns.</li></ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b></p> <p>Chapter 5</p>

**Part 2: List of persons who made a submission / observation.**

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
<b>B001</b>	Mark O'Connor	Resident
<b>B002</b>	Noel Ross	Resident
<b>B003</b>	Kieran Fagan	Resident
<b>B004</b>	Health and Safety Authority	HAS – Health and Safety Authority
<b>B005</b>	Ali Bazhban	Resident
<b>B006</b>	Laura Griffin	Resident
<b>B007</b>	Sean Reeves	Resident
<b>B008</b>	Roisin Jordan	Resident
<b>B009</b>	Karl Murray	Resident
<b>B010</b>	Edel McDermott	Resident
<b>B011</b>	Chris Mueller	Resident
<b>B012</b>	Rory Griffin	Resident
<b>B013</b>	Ruth McIntyre	Resident
<b>B014</b>	Michael Dalton	Resident
<b>B015</b>	Gbemisola Oni	Resident
<b>B016</b>	Jessica McEvoy	Resident
<b>B017</b>	TII	Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII)
<b>B018</b>	Susan	Resident
<b>B019</b>	Gabriela/Jason Keating	Resident
<b>B020</b>	Dale Crammond	Resident
<b>B021</b>	Colm Connolly	Resident
<b>B022</b>	Arnaud Bruwer	Resident
<b>B023</b>	Vinashree Bruwer	Resident
<b>B024</b>	Richard de Zeeuw	Resident
<b>B025</b>	Sarah O Connell	Resident
<b>B026</b>	Emma Masterson	Resident
<b>B027</b>	Gillian Garvin	Resident
<b>B028</b>	Ciaran O'Connell	Resident
<b>B029</b>	Leah Brennan	Resident
<b>B030</b>	Pascal Cesari	Resident
<b>B031</b>	Inland Fisheries Ireland	Statutory Body
<b>B032</b>	John Moga	Resident
<b>B033</b>	Dawn Kelly	Resident
<b>B034</b>	Peter Kelly	Resident
<b>B035</b>	Sarah Jane Grufferty	Resident
<b>B036</b>	Thornton O'Connor Town Planning	Organisation
<b>B037</b>	Thornton O'Connor Town Planning	Organisation
<b>B038</b>	Aileen Eglington	KG Residents Assoc
<b>B039</b>	Paul and Aileen Eglington	Residents
<b>B040</b>	Aileen Eglington	Resident
<b>B041</b>	John Findlater	Local Resident
<b>B042</b>	Terence Hall	Resident
<b>B043</b>	Paul McElwaine	Resident
<b>B044</b>	HSE	Organisation
<b>B045</b>	Gay Wright	KG Residents Assoc
<b>B046</b>	Sorcha Connolly	Private Individual
<b>B047</b>	David Hyde	Resident
<b>B048</b>	Nigel Start	Organisation

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
<b><u>B049</u></b>	Tara Scully	Resident
<b><u>B050</u></b>	Laura Pauley	Resident
<b><u>B051</u></b>	Akshay Oswal	Local Resident
<b><u>B052</u></b>	Priyanka Perera	Local Resident
<b><u>B053</u></b>	Saurabh Pathak	Resident
<b><u>B054</u></b>	Cristina	Resident
<b><u>B055</u></b>	Daniel O'Sullivan	Resident
<b><u>B056</u></b>	Shauna Kirke	Local Resident
<b><u>B057</u></b>	Maria	Local Resident
<b><u>B058</u></b>	Emma Kate Lyons	Resident
<b><u>B059</u></b>	Sara Higgins	Local Resident
<b><u>B060</u></b>	Morrough Kavanagh	Local Resident
<b><u>B061</u></b>	Hilary and Howard Knott	Residents
<b><u>B062</u></b>	Jessica Kavanagh	Local Resident
<b><u>B063</u></b>	Des Cox, Lead Planning and Environment	Eirgrid
<b><u>B064</u></b>	Tasneem Khadkiwala	Local Resident
<b><u>B065</u></b>	Susan O Dwyer	Resident
<b><u>B066</u></b>	Harry Simpson	Resident
<b><u>B067</u></b>	Jonathan Coen	Resident
<b><u>B068</u></b>	Seamus Gahan	Resident
<b><u>B069</u></b>	Philip McDonnell	Resident
<b><u>B070</u></b>	Sam Pauley	Resident
<b><u>B071</u></b>	OPR	Organisation
<b><u>B072</u></b>	Wayside Celtic Football Club	Organisation
<b><u>B073</u></b>	Belinda O'Byrne	Resident
<b><u>B074</u></b>	Dermot O'Byrne	Resident
<b><u>B075</u></b>	Christopher Browne	Organisation
<b><u>B076</u></b>	Ian Hughes	Resident
<b><u>B077</u></b>	Nessa McCarthy	Resident
<b><u>B078</u></b>	John Spain Associates on behalf of Grafton Issuer DAC	Organisation
<b><u>B079</u></b>	Robbie Burns	Resident
<b><u>B080</u></b>	Mr. Charlie Kelly	Organisation
<b><u>B081</u></b>	Department of Education	Department of Education
<b><u>B082</u></b>	Marston Planning Consultancy	Carrickmines Preservation Association
<b><u>B083</u></b>	Hazel de Barra	Resident
<b><u>B084</u></b>	Barbara Roe	Resident
<b><u>B085</u></b>	Uisce Eireann	Uisce Eireann
<b><u>B086</u></b>	OPW	OPW
<b><u>B087</u></b>	Ed O'Fearghail	Resident
<b><u>B088</u></b>	Linda O'Farrell	Resident
<b><u>B089</u></b>	McCutcheon Halley Planning	Cairn Homes Properties Ltd
<b><u>B090</u></b>	John Spain Associates	Kilternan Cemetery Park Ltd
<b><u>B091</u></b>	Stephen Little & Associates	Adroit Operations
<b><u>B092</u></b>	Sheena Gunning	Local Resident
<b><u>B093</u></b>	Margaret Kelly	Resident
<b><u>B094</u></b>	Melissa McKenna	Local Resident
<b><u>B095</u></b>	NTA Planning	NTA
<b><u>B096</u></b>	John Spain Associates on behalf of Park Developments	John Spain Associates on behalf of Park Developments
<b><u>B097</u></b>	Aidan Garvin	Resident

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
<b><u>B098</u></b>	Councillor Kevin Daly	Councillor
<b><u>B099</u></b>	Fiona Cullinan	Resident
<b><u>B100</u></b>	Noel Ross	Resident
<b><u>B101</u></b>	Ciara Hyde	Resident
<b><u>B102</u></b>	Linda Jane Kenny	Resident
<b><u>B103</u></b>	John Spain Associates	M&M Grimes
<b><u>B104</u></b>	John Spain Associates	Goodrock Project Management Ltd
<b><u>B105</u></b>	Edmond Mullins	Resident
<b><u>B106</u></b>	Tom Phillips	Tom Phillips + Associates
<b><u>B107</u></b>	Mary Oneill	Local Resident
<b><u>B108</u></b>	John Spain Associates on behalf of the Jackson family and Goodrock Residential Limited, c/o Goodrock Project Management Limited	John Spain Associates on behalf of the Jackson family and Goodrock Residential Limited, c/o Goodrock Project Management Limited
<b><u>B109</u></b>	Suzanne Grufferty	Resident
<b><u>B110</u></b>	Kerrie Jolley	Local Resident
<b><u>B111</u></b>	Aine Mak	Local Resident
<b><u>B112</u></b>	Eoin Feeney	Local Resident
<b><u>B113</u></b>	Simon Rattigan	Resident
<b><u>B114</u></b>	Peter Verjans	Local Resident
<b><u>B115</u></b>	Nicole	Local Resident
<b><u>B116</u></b>	Fabien Zucchini	Resident
<b><u>B117</u></b>	Aimee OConnor	Local Resident
<b><u>B118</u></b>	Gaurav Tyagi	Local Resident
<b><u>B119</u></b>	Michael Priaulx	House Martin Conservation UK & Ireland
<b><u>B120</u></b>	Dervla O'Leary	Local Resident
<b><u>B121</u></b>	D De Barra	Resident
<b><u>B122</u></b>	Richard Veale	Resident
<b><u>B123</u></b>	Elizabeth Clooney	Local Resident
<b><u>B124</u></b>	Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage (DHLGH) - NPWS	DHLGH
<b><u>B125</u></b>	Department of the Environment, Climate and Communications (DECC)	DECC
<b><u>B126</u></b>	Department of Transport	Department of Transport