

PART 8 SERVICE DEPARTMENT REPORTS

SITE: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AT MOUNT ST. MARYS, DUNDRUM, CO. DUBLIN

PC/H/02/2025

1.0 HOUSING DEPARTMENT

Context for the proposed Part 8

Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council, Housing Department are applying for planning permission under Part 8 for a residential development at a site of approx. 0.98 ha at Mount Saint Mary's and Saint Joseph's, Dundrum Road, Dublin 14.

The site is situated between the Catholic University School Rugby Grounds (CUS) on Bird Avenue and the Robert Emmet House, a protected structure (RPS No. 18) located next to the main development area. Additionally, the former Middle House is also adjacent to the main site, together with the Small Hall; the Gate Lodge Bungalow; the former Residence Wing building; former Chapel, Oratory and Side Chapels; and associated ancillary outbuildings (Stables/Lockups and Workshops).

Description of proposed Part 8 Development

The development comprises 129 new living units arranged in 3 blocks, a central public park, and associated resident facilities and amenities.

- Block A (5-6 storeys) comprising 65 no. apartments
- Block B (5-6 storeys) comprising 56 no. apartments
- Block C (2 storeys) comprising 8 no. apartments

Ancillary Structures are proposed, close to Blocks A and C, and include covered bicycle stores, waste management and plant areas.

The site will be accessed by a new vehicular access point from Dundrum Road. New pedestrian and cyclist access points will be provided via Dundrum Road and Churchfields.

A total of 65 no. car parking spaces including 12 EV charging spaces and 3 accessible spaces and 180 no. Bicycle spaces are proposed.

2.0 ARCHITECTS DEPARTMENT

Comment 1: No defensible space provided between some balconies/private open space and communal circulation areas

Response 1: The proposed layout has been carefully designed in collaboration with the landscape and civil teams to optimise the apartment areas and car parking layout while ensuring a considered approach to privacy within the private open space provided. We believe that the design incorporates appropriate defensive space for the majority of the ground-floor units that are facing the main circulation routes, balancing urban frontage with resident privacy. Defensible Spaces will be incorporated as soft landscape verges as part of the detailed design stage by the landscape architects, including planting solutions, which will be specified and agreed upon prior to construction to further enhance privacy and address any remaining concerns.

Comment 2: Is the one-way road encircling Block B necessary? It is accessing 6 spaces on the southern side of the site, but there are opportunities to improve the residential amenity by removing these spaces and replacing them with usable landscaped areas. There appears to be a pedestrian access point to the west of this area which would be positively reinforced by the removal of this section of road.

Response 2: We carefully considered to omit the one-way road network. However, coordination with the transportation and landscape team to optimise the overall site layout navigability while prioritising high-quality and centralised public open space led to maintaining this circulation route. We considered this the most effective solution for both site accessibility and maximising the central public park, since converting the existing one-way road to two-ways road would require an increase of area designated for the roads and vehicular navigability to the north of Block B, and also between Blocks B & C, which could affect the car parking numbers provided. Taking into account a well-integrated public realm still maintains the one-way road, we reduced the dominance of hard-surfaced roads within the scheme and included a homezone shared surface around Block B building footprint.

Comment 3: Difficult to see entrance details on Block 1 & 2 Elevations MSM-02-BA-ZZZ-DR-RAU-AR-2101 and MSM-02-BB-ZZZ-DR-RAU-AR-2201.

No details provided on entrance canopy/covering, signage, lighting, or street furniture. Entrance 3D views MSM-02-SW-ZZZ-DR-RAU-AR-9999 show no canopy, lighting, or street furniture. Surface mounted sign shown is not sufficient to for wayfinding.

Response 3: The cores of blocks A & B were rearranged for each block to feature a defined primary covered entrance facing both the public park and the car parking. The entrances are aligned with the circulation core for ease of access. Illuminated signage to clearly identify its location is proposed for both blocks.

The main entrances have been recessed in both Blocks A and B to provide shelter while minimising disruption to adjacent bedroom windows while also providing privacy to those adjacent windows. Additionally, further wayfinding improvements will include the addition of site signage, low-level lighting, and street furniture to ensure clear navigation throughout the site.

Comment 4: No pedestrian link between Blocks 1 & 2.

Footpaths appear under 1.8m in width in many locations and under 1.2m in some places

Response 4: Final coordination with the landscape team to be developed and agreed in collaboration with DLRcc architects dept at construction stage. Movement strategy will be included.

Comment 5: The core arrangement is unusual. There is an opportunity to provide direct core access which is not being taken, and would improve the navigability and wayfinding of the site massively. The applicant should reexamine the circulation core and look at providing provide a more conventional core arrangement with access from the footpath and demarcate this as the main access to the building as described above in the interests of orderly design and proper site wayfinding.

Response 5: A fire strategy exercise has been undertaken in collaboration with Maurice Johnson and Partners to assess and refine the core entrance arrangement before incorporating DLR comments. This exercise was to confirm whether there would be any fire safety concerns regarding the main entrance door being positioned at the stair core, and it was confirmed to proceed with the cores rearrangement given no fire concerns as the final exit of the stair cores now exits direct to the exterior to meet TGD-B requirements.

As a result, the core layouts have been revised to enhance accessibility and wayfinding, ensuring a more efficient and legible circulation strategy. The main building entrances for Blocks A and B have been repositioned at their respective stair cores, reinforcing their role as the principal access points and enhancing the accessibility within the building itself.

Comment 6: The elevations are unremarkable and generally present as monotonous and monolithic. All facades require a review to provide any architectural articulation or propose building elements which could provide some interest on the façade. The rigorous repetition of building elements, especially the lack of variation in window treatments means that the elevations are presenting poorly due to the lack of visual interest. Some additional stepping of the building line, especially on the west elevations and making a feature of the balconies would be encouraged to improve the elevations as they are currently not demonstrating a high quality of design.

Response 6: The CGIs produced by 3DDB demonstrate the high-quality and visually engaging façade. The combination of three distinct materials (brick, render, metal cladding) adds texture, contrast, and interest, preventing monotony while ensuring a cohesive design.

Recessed Balconies and walls in Block C, the recessed floor layout at the top level of blocks A & B, and the recessed core entrances provide depth and variation across the façades.

Further refinements to enhance architectural detail, particularly around key frontages and wayfinding, can be considered in collaboration with DLR at the detailed design stage.

Comment 7: If typologies and end users have already been agreed, the ground floor unit of the Maisonettes are a good candidate for a Universally designed unit. It looks like attempts have been made to provide this, but some critical UD features have been missed, such as the “L” or “U” shaped Kitchen & the “soft spot” for a door to the bathroom adjacent to the main bedroom. Review of this to be carried out. Considering there is no lift provided, the 1st floor of the units are not suitable for housing older persons.

Response 7: Most UD units typologies revised, and included in the following drawings:

MSM-02-SW-ZZZ-DR-RAU-AR-1220 - Proposed Apartment Types 01

MSM-02-SW-ZZZ-DR-RAU-AR-1221 - Proposed Apartment Types 02

The additional changes on the Ground Floor of Block C (2B4P Type 4D) required to comply with the Universal Design Guidelines for Homes in Ireland will be addressed at the Detailed Design Stage. It is also relevant to note that all the 25% UD units indicated in the scheme are 10% over than the minimum required area for each apartment.

The Housing Quality Assessment indicates the units that are UD+, they are located at the top floor of both blocks A & B.

3.0 COMMUNITY & CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

Community and Cultural Services have no objections to the proposed development circulated for round one Part 8 comments.

4.0 FORWARD PLANNING INFRASTRUCTURE

I can confirm that Forward Planning Infrastructure Department have no comments to make.

5.0 INFRASTRUCTURE & CLIMATE CHANGE

5.1 CAPITAL PROJECTS

Capital Projects have no comments on this Mount Saint Mary's, Dundrum Road proposed development of 129 no residential units.

5.2 ENVIRONMENTAL ENFORCEMENT

No comments received from department

5.3 ESTATES OFFICER

No objection from Property Management to the proposed development.

5.4 TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

No objection to the proposed development.

5.5 ACTIVE TRAVEL

No objection to the proposed development

5.6 CLIMATE ACTION OFFICIER

No comments received from department

6.0 MUNICIPAL SERVICES

6.1 BIODIVERSITY OFFICER

Comment 8: NPWS have confirmed that a derogation license must be in place before planning permission can be granted.

Response 8: A derogation license is currently being applied for via our consultant, Altemar. This is generally granted within c. 4 weeks so will be in place well in advance of the Part 8 Councillors vote on Planning.

Comment 9: Badger are a protected species. Incidental sightings rather than dedicated surveys were carried out. In season surveys are required to ensure compliance with legislation. Given that we are in the appropriate season, badger surveys can be carried out promptly.

Response 9: A Badger Trail Camera assessment was undertaken by Wildlife Surveys Ireland Ltd. On 10th - 14th of Feb 2025. No traces of badger activity were detected.

6.2 DRAINAGE PLANNING

Drainage Planning have no objection in principle to the proposed development subject to the following conditions.

1. Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant is requested to submit a drawing setting out the positively drained area of the site. In conjunction with this, this may require the allowable outflow to be reviewed, if so, a submission on the design demonstrating the discharge rate for the site has been limited to QBAR (calculated using site specific data) or 2l/s/ha, whichever is greater, subject to the orifice size of the flow control device not being less than 50mm in diameter. Note that in the interest of clarity where the calculated QBAR rate for the site is less than 2 l/s/ha then a minimum value of 2 l/s/ha should be applied, not a flat rate of 2 l/s, subject to the orifice size of the flow control device not being less than 50mm in diameter. The submission shall include detailed calculations of the proposed surface water management system, including hydraulic modeling results and attenuation volumes during all required rainfall return events.
2. Prior to commencement of development, the applicant is requested to maximise the SuDS measures on site, in particular along the impermeable access road area of the site.
3. Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Authority for its written agreement fully dimensioned site-specific construction stage details and communally accessible maintenance arrangements for the proposed:

Attenuation system
Blue/Green roofs/podiums
SuDS measures

4. The applicant shall implement a construction management plan and programme of works that amongst other items provides for interception, containment and treatment of construction runoff. No construction runoff should be diverted to proposed SuDS measures. Any surface water sewer pipes used to convey construction runoff should be thoroughly cleaned before subsequent connection to SuDS elements.

5. The Blue/Green roofs/podiums shall be designed, installed and maintained in accordance with the SUDS Manual (C753) and BS EN 12056-3:2000.
6. All SuDs measures shall be designed and constructed in accordance with The SUDS Manual (C753)
7. The applicant shall ensure that all drainage works are carried out in accordance with the agreed details and that a post-construction maintenance specification and schedule is implemented on site. Maintenance contractors with specialist training in SuDS care should be used. Thereafter, all elements of the surface water management system shall be maintained at all times in accordance the post-construction maintenance specification and schedule, which shall be included in the site Safety File.
8. The applicant shall ensure that the landscape proposals are compatible with the drainage proposals.
9. The applicant shall ensure that all underground attenuation systems within 5 metres of foundations or site boundaries have an impermeable liner and are offset sufficiently from the site boundary to provide sufficient space for future maintenance.
10. Prior to the surface water connection to the public system, the applicant shall make a submission to the Drainage Planning, showing that the attenuation system, including the flow control device, has been installed according to the planning application plans and conditions, and set to the maximum permitted discharge limit. This shall include photo documentation of the installation process, and certification from who installed the system. The applicant shall then facilitate an inspection from the Surface Water Operations and will proceed to connection if the inspection was deemed satisfactory.

6.3 PARKS

I am happy with the proposed replies and changes to the Mount Saint Mary's proposal.

6.4 ROAD MAINTENANCE

6.4.1 Public Lighting

Comment 10: If they can confirm that the tree canopy will be above 4m that should help light spread, but they should also be aware that in the future a tree will have to be removed to improve light spread in the future.

Response 10: Our team can confirm that the tree canopy will be maintained above 4m to support light spread. We acknowledge that, in the future, a tree may need to be removed to further improve light distribution if necessary and subject to agreement with the relevant departments

6.5 TRAFFIC

The Traffic and Road Safety Section has no objection to the proposed development, but the following should be brought to the attention of the applicant.

- The details of pedestrian priority across the entrance onto Dundrum Road should be clarified.
- The echelon car parking north of Block B would be difficult to manoeuvre into and out off.
- Pedestrian access to the car parking to the south and the east of Block B needs to be clarified.

7.0 PLANNING

Comment 11: The planning authority are generally supportive of the proposal subject to the matters raised in the planning departments Part 8 report being addressed at the detailed design stage.