1		South Dublin County Council Local Government (Planning & Development) Acts 1963 to 1993 Planning Register (Part 1)		Plan Register No S00A/0138	
1.	Location	Collegeland, Rathcoole, Co. Dublin.			
2.	Development	House and puraflow treatment system.			
3.	Date of Application	03/03/00 Date Further Particulars (a) Requested (b) Received			
3a.	Type of Application	Permission	2.	1.	
4.	Submitted by	Name: Robert J. Goff, Dip.Arch., MRIAI, Architect Address: 44 Meadow View Grove, Hillcrest,			
5.	Applicant	Name: Paul Dunbar, Address: c/o Thomas & Marie Dunbar, Bellamar, Newcastle South, Co.Dublin.			
6.	Decision	O.C.M. No. 0910 Date 02/05/2000	Effect RP REFUSE PI		
7.	Grant	O.C.M. No. Date	Effect RP REFUSE PI		
8.	Appeal Lodged	÷	13 12		
9.	Appeal Decision	- William C			
10.	Material Contra	avention			
11.	Enforcement	Compensation	Purchase	Purchase Notice	
12,	Revocation or Ar	mendment :	- 12 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14	N. AN	
13.	E.I.S. Requested	E.I.S. Received	E.I.S. Ap	peal	
14.	Registrar	145133 0 0 0 0	Receipt N	7	

COMHAIRLE CHONTAE ÁTHA CLIATH THEAS

Bosca 4122, Lár an Bhaile, Tamhlacht, Baile Átha Cliath 24.

Teleton: 01-414 9000 Facs: 01-414 9104



PLANNING
DEPARTMENT
P.O. Box 4122,
Town Centre, Tallaght,
Dublin 24.

Telephone: 01-414 9000

Fax: 01-414 9104

NOTIFICATION OF DECISION TO REFUSE PERMISSION LOCAL GOVERNMENT (PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT) ACTS, 1963 TO 1993

Decision Order Number 0910	Date of Decision 02/05/2000
	l-14
Register Reference S00A/0138	Date 03/03/00

Applicant

Paul Dunbar,

Development

House and puraflow treatment system.

Location

Collegeland, Rathcoole, Co. Dublin.

Floor Area

Sq Metres

Time extension(s) up to and including

Additional Information Requested/Received

Clarification of Additional Information Requested/Received

In pursuance of its functions under the above mentioned Acts, the South Dublin County Council, being the Planning Authority for the County Health District of Dublin, did by Order dated as above make a decision to REFUSE PERMISSION in respect of the above proposal.

for the (4) Reasons on the attached Numbered Pages.

Signed on behalf of the South Dublin County Council

02/05/00

for SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

Robert J. Goff, Dip.Arch., MRIAI, Architect 44 Meadow View Grove, Hillcrest, Lucan, Co. Dublin.

CUMHAIRLE CHONTAE ATHA CLIAIH I HEAS

Bosca 4122, Lár an Bhaile, Tamhlacht, Baile Átha Cliath 24.

Telefon: 01-414 9000 Facs: 01-414 9104



PLANNING
DEPARTMENT
P.O. Box 4122,
Town Centre, Tallaght,
Dublin 24.

Telephone: 01-414 9000 Fax: 01-414 9104

REG REF. S00A/0138

Reasons

- The proposed development would contravene the policies of the South Dublin County Development Plan, 1998, regarding dwellings in rural areas as set out in Paragraph 2.3,1(ii) in that the applicant has not established a genuine need to reside in the area due to proximity to employment which is related to the rural community or by reason of close family ties with the rural community. The proposed development would thus be contrary to the proper planning and development of the area.
- The proposed development would contravene materially a development objective indicated in the South Dublin County Development Plan, 1998, for the use solely or primarily of particular areas for particular purposes i.e. zoning objective 'B' "to protect and improve rural amenity and to provide for the development of agriculture". The proposed development would thus be contrary to the provisions of the South Dublin County Development Plan, 1998 and the proper planning and development of the area.
- The proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard, due to the generation of additional traffic turning movements on a regional route which experiences high traffic volumes and speeds. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and development of the area.
- The proposed development would give rise to undesirable ribbon development in a rural area which would lead to uneconomic demands for the provision of services and would set an undesirable precedent for further similar development in the area. The proposed development would thus be contrary to the proper planning and development of the area.

Page 2 of 2