## COMHAIRLE CHONTAE ATHA CLIATH

File Reference	LOCAL GOVERNMENT (PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT) ACT 1963	REGISTER REFERENCE G.818	
P.C. 16236	PLANNING REGISTER		
I. LOCATION	Coldcut, Palmerstown.		
2. PROPOSAL	Warehouse,		
3. TYPE & DATE OF APPLICATION	TYPE Date Received  [a) Requested  [a] Requested	her Particulars (b) Received  1. 2	
4. SUBMITTED BY	Name Kiaran O'Malley, Esq., Address 33, Fitzwilliam Place, Dubli	n , 2.	
5. APPLICANT	Name Do. Address		
6. DECISION		4/6/74 ermission Refused	
7. GRANT	O.C.M. No. Notified  Date Effect		
8. APPEAL	Notified 16/7/74 Decision  Type Effect		
9. APPLICATION SECTION 26 (3)	Date of Decision application Effect		
10. COMPENSATION	Ref. in Compensation Register		
II. ENFORCEMENT	Ref. in Enforcement Register		
12. PURCHASE NOTICE			
13. REVOCATION or AMENDMENT			
14.			
15.			
16.			
Prepared by		***************************************	

## DUBLIN COUNTY COUNCIL

TELEPHONE: 42951 (EXT. 131)

Planning Department, 46-49 Dame Street, Dublin 2.

## NOTIFICATION OF A DECISION TO REFUSE: OUTEME PERMISSION: APPROVALE: LOCAL GOVERNMENT (PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT) ACT. 1963

To:		& DEVELOPMENT) ACT, 1963.
www.	Kieran O'Malley, Esq.,	Register Reference No:
	33 Fitzwilliem Place,	
HENERAL BRIDGE	Dublin 2.	Planning Control No: 16236
BORRER AND REPAIRE	FARESTERNICA CHIMES CONTRACTOR OF THE STATE	Application received 16/4/74
APPLICAN	Tanana Las and Co.	
7	en a constituir e en e	และ กรีกักกระที่เกลาะสมพระสมพระสมพระสมพระสมพระสมพระสมพระสมพร
in pursuran the Plannin	ice of its functions under the above ment g Authority for the County Health Distric	ioned Act the Dublin County Council being ot of Dublin, did by order
dated	TATH June, 1974 deci	de to refuse:
V 555571144	PERMISSION;	AND CONDE
for	Proposed warehouse at Coldcut,	Bally Fermoto Palmentoun
் ச <i>ால் அத்த வ</i> ழ்த்துத்தித்தி		E BOSE OF AN ARCHITECTURE OF A PARTY OF A PA
or the follo	wing reasons:	্ত সংগ্ৰহণ কৰি প্ৰতিষ্ঠান কৰি প্ৰতিষ্ঠান কৰি প্ৰতিষ্ঠান কৰি প্ৰতিষ্ঠান কৰি প্ৰতিষ্ঠান কৰি কৰি প্ৰতিষ্ঠান কৰি কৰি ক সংগ্ৰহণ কৰি স্থানিক স
	*) = ==================================	
	1. The proposal will be contra; development of the area in the	ry to the proper planning and
	development of the area in the	t it is proposed on land which
	has been zoned in the Development Space amenity". A major warehouse	ent Plan "to preserve open
	contrary to the Development Pla	ousing proposal would be totally
	to serve the annual sawage f	acilities available be planned
	to serve the proposed developme	acilities available on planned nt. A septic tank and scak amov
	type of drainage for such a lar	ge development is unacceptable
	type of drainage for such a lar from a public health point of v the soil is suitable for the se	ge development is unacceptable iew and there is no evidence that tisfactory dispersions
	type of drainage for such a lar from a public health point of v the soil is suitable for the se effluent.  3. The development is a committee of the second o	ge development is unacceptable iew and there is no evidence that tisfactory disposed of sewage
	type of drainage for such a lar from a public health point of v the soil is suitable for the se effluent.  3. The development is a committee of the second o	ge development is unacceptable iew and there is no evidence that tisfactory disposed of sewage
	type of drainage for such a lar from a public health point of v the soil is suitable for the se	ge development is unacceptable iew and there is no evidence that tisfactory disposed of sewage
	type of drainage for such a lar from a public health point of v the soil is suitable for the se effluent.  3. The development is a committee of the second o	ge development is unacceptable iew and there is no evidence that tisfactory disposed of sewage
	type of drainage for such a lar from a public health point of v the soil is suitable for the se effluent.  3. The development is a committee of the second o	ge development is unacceptable iew and there is no evidence that tisfactory disposed of sewage
	type of drainage for such a lar from a public health point of v the soil is suitable for the se effluent.  3. The development is a committee of the second o	ge development is unacceptable iew and there is no evidence that tisfactory disposed of sewage
	type of drainage for such a lar from a public health point of v the soil is suitable for the se effluent.  3. The development is a committee of the second o	ge development is unacceptable iew and there is no evidence that tisfactory disposed of sewage
	type of drainage for such a lar from a public health point of v the soil is suitable for the se effluent.  3. The development is a committee of the second o	ge development is unacceptable iew and there is no evidence that tisfectory dispose of sewage
	type of drainage for such a lar from a public health point of v the soil is suitable for the se effluent.  3. The development is a committee of the second o	ge development is unacceptable iew and there is no evidence that tisfectory dispose of sewage
	type of drainage for such a lar from a public health point of v the soil is suitable for the se effluent.  3. The development is a committee of the second o	ge development is unacceptable iew and there is no evidence that tisfectory dispose of sewage
	type of drainage for such a lar from a public health point of v the soil is suitable for the se effluent.  3. The development is a committee of the second o	ge development is unacceptable iew and there is no evidence that tisfectory dispose of sewage
	type of drainage for such a lar from a public health point of view the soil is suitable for the se effluent.  3. The development is premature area has not been determined by	ge development is unacceptable iew and there is no evidence that tisfectory disposed of sewage es the final road layout for the the Planning Authority.
ed on beha	type of drainage for such a lar from a public health point of view the soil is suitable for the se effluent.  3. The development is premature area has not been determined by	ge development is unacceptable iew and there is no evidence that tisfectory disposed of sewage es the final road layout for the the Planning Authority.
ed on beha	type of drainage for such a lar from a public health point of view the soil is suitable for the se effluent.  3. The development is premature area has not been determined by	ge development is unacceptable iew and there is no evidence that tisfactory dispose of sewage as the final road layout for the the Planning Authority.  May Alamagen
	type of drainage for such a lar from a public health point of with soil is suitable for the se effluent.  3. The development is premature area has not been determined by	ge development is unacceptable iew and there is no evidence that tisfactory dispose of sewage as the final road layout for the the Planning Authority.  May Afarington
E: An app	type of drainage for such a lar from a public health point of with soil is suitable for the se effluent.  3. The development is premature area has not been determined by the body of the Dublin County Council:	gs development is unacceptable iew and there is no evidence that tiefactory dispose of sewage as the final road layout for the the Planning Authority.  May Alamagen.  Date: 14th June 1974
E: An app	type of drainage for such a lar from a public health point of with the soil is suitable for the se effluent.  3. The development is premature area has not been determined by the development is premature area has not been determined by the development is premature area has not been determined by the development is premature area has not been determined by the development is the date of receipt by the section is the date of receipt by the section.	ge development is unacceptable iew and there is no evidence that tisfactory disposal of sewage as the final road layout for the the Planning Authority.  Date: 14th June, 1974 of the Minister by the applicant within
E: An app month from n twenty-c	type of drainage for such a lar from a public health point of v the soil is suitable for the se effluent.  3. The development is premature area has not been determined by seal against the decision may be made to the date of receipt by the applicant of one days of the date of the decision may be made to the days of the date of th	ge development is unacceptable iem and there is no evidence that tisfactory dispose of sewage as the final road layout for the the Planning Authority.  Date: 14th June 1974 of the Minister by the applicant within this notification or by any other person
E: An app month from in twenty-ce the subject	type of drainage for such a lar from a public health point of with soil is suitable for the se effluent.  3. The development is premature area has not been determined by seal against the decision may be made to the date of receipt by the applicant of one days of the date of the decision. The ct mafter of the applicant of the days of the date of the decision.	gs development is unacceptable iew and there is no evidence that tisfectory dispose of sewage as the final road layout for the the Planning Authority.  Date: 14th June 1974  o the Minister by the applicant within this notification or by any other person a appeal shall be in writing and shall
TE: An appropriate from twenty—of the subjectory.	type of drainage for such a lar from a public health point of vithe soil is suitable for the seaffluent.  3. The development is premature area has not been determined by seal against the decision may be made to the date of receipt by the applicant of the days of the date of the decision. The traiter of the appeal and grounds of the planning Appeals Seation.	ge development is unacceptable iew and there is no evidence that tiefectory disposed of sewage as the final road layout for the the Planning Authority.  Date: 14th June, 1974 of the Minister by the applicant within this notification or by any other person appeal shall be in writing and shall he appeal and should be addressed to
FE: An appropriate from twenty-ce the subjection of the subjection	type of drainage for such a lar from a public health point of vithe soil is suitable for the set offluent.  3. The development is premature area has not been determined by the applicant of the date of receipt by the applicant of the date of the decision. The traiter of the appeal and grounds of the date of the decision. Department an appeal has been duly made and the appeal has been duly made and the date of the da	ge development is unacceptable iew and there is no evidence that tisfactory dispose of sewage as the final road layout for the the Planning Authority.  Date: 14th June, 1974 of the Minister by the applicant within this notification or by any other person