PART 8 SERVICE DEPARTMENT REPORTS

SITE: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AT LEOPARDSTOWN ROAD

PC/H/01/2025

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. 0.87 ha at Leopardstown Road, Dublin 18 (D18 X6N6).

The existing site consists of a two-storey dwelling surrounded by mature trees, the adjacent site to the east is a green field site. The site is bounded to the south by the Leopardstown Road and to the north by an embankment of mature trees sloping down towards an M50 a slip road.

Description of proposed Part 8 Development

The proposed development will comprise of:

- 80 no. residential units consisting of (a)31 no. one-bed, 18 no. two-bed (three-person), (b)21 no. two-bed (four-person) and (c)10 no. three-bed units in 2 no. blocks.
- Associated infrastructure includes open space and car/cycle parking and is a mixture of duplexes and apartments in 2 no. blocks ranging in height from three to six stories.
- This will include site clearance works and demolition of existing buildings, a construction phase to include new surface water drainage infrastructure and connection to electricity and wastewater networks.

2.0 ARCHITECTS DEPARTMENT

Comment 1: Site Layout significantly improved. Circulation route from parking to entrances to the Duplexes somewhat circuitous, particularly for wheelchair users Accessible Parking spaces. Ground floor private open spaces to the rear of duplexes need to be screened for privacy. Not convinced studies show that entrance to the duplexes from the north is not viable.

Response 1: The accessible parking spaces have been evenly distributed across the site to serve the blocks proportionally. Final locations can be agreed at detail design stage in collaboration with in DLR architecture section.

There are no private open spaces to the rear of the duplexes at ground floor. Instead, the ground floor private open spaces are located at the front of the blocks, adjacent to the entrance porches, and therefore do not require screening. The first-floor private open spaces are, however, screened for privacy.

Our submitted studies demonstrate that providing a south-facing private open space for the first-floor units is not viable within the constraints of the current design. These studies highlighted potential issues with Park K compliance, level access, and the need to increase the gross area while reducing habitable space.

Given that these are duplex houses (not apartments), with a dual aspect and floor to ceiling windows facing onto the public open space, it is not necessary to carry out a redesign to gain a south facing private open space.

Flipping the duplex blocks so that the entrances are to the rear would result in North-facing living spaces at ground floor that do not meet sunlight/daylight requirements.

Comment 2: Landscaping, defensible space and privacy screening needs to be carefully designed for private open space at main entrance. Privacy screening & secure boundary needs to be provided around private open space to the north accessed from the bedrooms.

The split between the duplex blocks remains very tight with no detail provided on landscaping or finishes. Might be better to have one terrace rather than splitting.

Due to site location, an Acoustic report would be required on mitigation of noise from the M50. By locating private open space at first floor level facing the M50, a significantly higher acoustic wall may be required than if the private open space was located on the southern elevation

Response 2: Final construction details around private open spaces will be agreed upon in collaboration with the DLR Architecture Section during the detailed design phase. There are no private open spaces to the north accessed from the bedrooms. Instead, the ground-floor private open spaces are located on the southern side, accessible off the main porch, while the first-floor private open spaces are located on the north, accessible off the kitchen/dining area.

Initially, the terrace was conceived as a single linear block. However, through collaboration with DLR, it was determined that such an extended mass would appear too imposing. Therefore, the design was revised to split the block into two distinct sections, effectively reducing the perceived massing. The current design features a 3-meter split between the duplex blocks, which benefits from passive surveillance off the end of terrace units. We believe this split is sufficient. Re-consolidating the blocks into one terrace would create an excessively long mass and extend the route between car parking spaces and the central units.

An acoustic report has been prepared, and we have incorporated the advice provided by our specialist consultant. This approach addresses noise mitigation from the M50, ensuring that the design is both functional and compliant with the required acoustic performance standards.

Comment 3: If main entrance remains on western elevation, own door access should be provided to all units on southern and western elevation, in the interest of providing active frontage and promoting street vibrancy.

What justification has been provided for ESB substation?

Response 3: We submit that the provision of green spaces along Leopardstown Road offers sufficient active frontage for the development, especially given the limited active frontage available along the remainder of Leopardstown Road.

Providing own door units with level access, in an area with a steep gradient, would necessitate significant engineering works and incur extra ordinary additional costs to the project. This approach would also lead to a stepped landscaping design that would not be easily passable.

The location and design of the ESB substation have been coordinated and agreed upon with ESB. Final construction details will be established in collaboration with the DLR Architecture Section during the detailed design stage.

Comment 4: Schedule of Accommodate P24-020D notes 16no 2-Bed (3P) UD units and 5no 2-Bed (4P) units. However, floor plans have not been labelled to identify which apartments are UD and UD+, so this cannot be assessed.

Applicant is required to provide dimensioned and annotated plans of the UD & UD+ unit-types for review.

The Applicant is to include a Universal Design Statement as recommended in the Compact Settlements Guideline as Supplemental Information for Planning Applications of 10 or more residential units.

Response 4: The UD and UD+ units are identified within the Housing Quality Assessment. Their locations can be determined using the unit typology drawings included in the submission.

A Universal Design Statement was prepared and included in our drawing pack submission.

Comment 5: Sketch 'First Floor South Terrace | Stair Relocated and Porch Removed' seems close to working with further development.

- possible communal stairs shared between two units from the north

- further development of stair core

Response 5: Our submitted studies demonstrate that providing a south-facing private open space for the first-floor units is not viable within the constraints of the current design.

Flipping the duplex blocks so that the entrances are to the rear would result in North-facing living spaces at ground floor that do not meet sunlight/daylight requirements. Furthermore, it would reintroduce the necessity to have a private open space which is accessed off a bedroom or is north facing.

Comment 6: The main entrance to the apartment building remains poor from a navigation/ wayfinding perspective. It is not sufficient to simply render either side of the door and expect it to be apparent to visitors and visually impaired where the main entrance to the apartments is located.

Response 6: The main entrance is materially distinct from the rest of the ground floor. It is enhanced by surrounding louvers and illuminated signage that clearly mark its location. Additionally, the entrance is strategically positioned opposite the car parking spaces and along the primary pedestrian pathway into the site, thereby improving navigation and wayfinding for all users, including visually impaired visitors. Further changes to wayfinding can be agreed at detail design stage in collaboration with in DLR architecture section.

3.0 COMMUNITY & CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

No objection to the proposed development.

4.0 FORWARD PLANNING INFRASTRUCTURE

No objection to the proposed development.

5.0 INFRASTRUCTURE & CLIMATE CHANGE

5.1 CAPITAL PROJECTS

No comments received from department

5.2 ENVIRONMENTAL ENFORCEMENT

No comments received from department

5.3 ESTATES OFFICER

No objection 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 objection to the proposed development

6.0 MUNICIPAL SERVICES

6.1 BIODIVERSITY OFFICER

Comment 7: A Badger survey must be carried out (with the use of trail camera) at the optimal time (i.e. winter) in advance of planning permission being granted. Appropriate steps should be taken where a badger sett or activity is confirmed on site (i.e. derogation license and/or mitigation measures).

Response 7: Badger survey was completed. No badger activity was detected.

6.2 DRAINAGE PLANNING

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

Condition 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.

Condition 2: Prior to commencement of development, the applicant shall provide hydraulic analysis of the proposed network, for the various rainfall durations, as well as the 30 year and 100 year events. A climate change factor of 20% shall be included as well as an urban creep factor of 10% as required within Appendix 7.1 of the County Development Plan 2022-2028.

Condition 3: Prior to commencement of development, the applicant is requested to maximise the SuDS measures on site, in particular along the use of the proposed tree pits and the extensive area of road that has been proposed to discharge directly to the attenuation tank.

Condition 4: 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

Condition 5: Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit details of the Green/Blue Roof to the Planning Authority for its written agreement. The applicant is requested to provide a detailed cross section of the proposed build-up of the green roof, including dimensions and demonstrate that the green roof is designed in accordance with BS EN 12056-3:200 and The SUDS Manual (CIRIA C753). A construction plan and a post-construction maintenance specification and schedule should also be included.

Condition 6: The applicant shall ensure that trees shall not be planted in the area over the attenuation tank. Trees shall be placed at a minimum distance of 2m from the edge of attenuation tanks. Tree protection barriers may be required, depending on the tree species and the expected extent of root spread, to be advised by the landscape architect.

Condition 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.

Condition 8: Prior to the surface water connection to the public system, the applicant shall make a submission for the written agreement of the Planning Authority, 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 Planning Authority and will proceed to connection if the inspection was deemed satisfactory.

6.3 PARKS

No objection to the proposed development.

6.4 ROAD MAINTENANCE

6.4.1 Public Lighting

Comment 8: While the lighting design results look really good, there are a few issues with tree conflicts, trees block light. When the buildings and trees are taken into account, the light spread is a lot smaller than designed. There are some examples, where the light levels would be significantly darker then designed as it relies on the light from multiple lanterns reaching the surface, but only the light from two lantern can actually reach it.

Response 8: From speaking with our advisors in relation to the Public Lighting plan the feedback raised poses some challenges when balancing the requirements from an Ecology and Arboriculture perspective. Add another streetlamp and we are over lighting for Bats & Local ecology, remove trees and the landscape is suffering.

For the purposes of Publication, we propose to remain on course with the current proposal, and to work with the Road Maintenance department at detail design stage to establish an adequate solution. This may include for some locally placed additional low level lighting solutions to be installed, subject to agreement.

6.4.2 Road Maintenance

Comment 9; The vast majority of what is proposed appears to be permeable paving or permeable asphalt which we would not support, particularly for a development of this scale

Response 9:

As mentioned previously, in order to be compliant with road maintenance, the shared surface has been made impermeable

6.5 TRAFFIC

No objection to the proposed development.

7.0 PLANNING

No objection to the proposed development.