COMHAIRLE CHONTAE ATHA CLIATH

P. C. Reference	LOCAL GOVERNMENT (PLANNIN DEVELOPMENT) ACT 1963 & PLANNING REGISTER		REGISTER REFERENCE
1. LOCATION	Colmanstown, Co. Dublin.		S
2. PROPOSAL	replacement dwelling,		
3. TYPE & DATE OF APPLICATION	TYPE Date Received (a) Requ		ner Particulars (b) Received
	P 21st Jan., 1981 2	***********************	2
4. SUBMITTED BY	Name Kast Design, Address 8, Landscape Gardens, Churchtown, Dublin 1		
5. APPLICANT	Name M. Watt, Address 12, Northland Drive, Dublin 11.		
6. DECISION	O.C.M. No. PA/1226/81 Oate 9th June, 1981	Notified	th Jŷne, 1981 refuse permission,
7. GRANT	O.C.M. No. Date	Notified Effect	
8. APPEAL	Notified 16th July, 1981 Type 1st Party,	An	rmission refused by Bord Pleanala, th Sept., 1981
9. APPLICATION SECTION 26 (3)	Date of application	Decision Effect	
10. COMPENSATION	Ref. in Compensation Register		
11. ENFORCEMENT	Ref. in Enforcement Register		
12. PURCHASE NOTICE			
13. REVOCATION or AMENDMENT			
14. 15.			
Prepared by	Copy issued by	*************************	Regis
Checked by	1		

Fingal Agencies - Dublin 3.

AN BORD PLEANÁLA

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT) ACTS, 1963 AND 1976

County Dublin

Planning Register Reference Number: W.A. 66

APPEAL by Michael Watt of 12, Northland Drive, Glasnevin, Dublin, against the decision made on the 9th day of June, 1981, by the Council of the County of Dublin deciding to refuse a permission for the erection of a house on a site at Colmanstown, County Dublin:

<u>DECISION</u>: Pursuant to the Local Government (Planning and Development) Acts, 1963 and 1976, permission is hereby refused for the erection of the said house for the reason set out in the Schedule hereto.

SCHEDULE

The proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard because it would generate additional traffic turning movements on the adjoining heavily-trafficked national primary route.

Member of An Bord Pleanala duly authorised to authenticate the seal of the Board.

Dated this 30 th day of Seplate 1981.

DUBLIN COUNTY COUNCIL

elephone 724755 Ext. 262/264

PLANNING DEPARTMENT Block 2 Irish Life Centre Lower Abbey Street Dublin 1.

NOTIFICATION OF A DECISION TO REFUSE:

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT) ACTS, 1963 & 1976

To:	
Kast Design,	Register Reference No
8 Landscape Dardens,	Planning Control No
Churchtown,	Application Received 21/1/81
Dublin 14.	Mag. Act Per. dated. 26/5/81
APPLICANT	
<u>.</u>	ts the Dublin County Council, being the Planning Authority for the dated _9/6/81.
OCXMINICACION DE COMPANION DE C	PERMISSION XXXXXXXXX
For Proposed replacement dwelling at Col	manetown, Co. Dublin.
	mature by reason of the said existing deficiency
in the provision of public sewerage facil	ities and the period within which such deficiency
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	er public safety by reason of a traffic hazard in turning movements on the heavily trafficked Naas
 a. Confirmation of a connection to the g b. Evidence of soil suitability for a se m inspection on 16/3/81, there was nott c. Details of the design of the septic to Compliance with the I.I.R.S. recommendatingsuwas not shown. 	ank and percolation areas was not submitted. dations for septic tank drainage for single dwell-
d. Evidence offcompliance with the Count location of the septic tank was not a	y Council's distance requirements with regard to hown.
Signed on behalf of the Dublin County Council	SOLOO or PRINCIPAL OFFICER
	10th June, 1981.

NOTE: An appeal against the decision may be made to An Bord Pleanala by the applicant within one month from the date of the decision of this notification or by any other person within twenty-one days of the date of the decision. The appeal all be in writing and shall state the subject matter of the appeal and grounds of the appeal and should be addressed to An Bord Pleanala, Floor 3, Blocks 6 & 7, Irish Life Centre, Lr. Abbey St., Dublin 1, and accompanied by a deposit of £10. When an appeal has been duly made and has not been withdrawn An Bord Pleanala will determine the application for permission as if it had been made to them in the first instance.

DUBLIN COUNTY COUNCIL

lephone 724755 Ext. 262/264

PLANNING DEPARTMENT Block 2 Irish Life Centre Lower Abbey Street Dublin 1.

NOTIFICATION OF A DECISION TO REFUSE:

PERMISSION: XIPEXIONEXIC

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT) ACTS, 1963 & 1976

To:		
Kast Design,		***
	Register Reference No.	WA 66
8 Landseapa Gardens, Churchtown.		
ME P. e	Planning Control No	
Churchtown,	Ammitana e e	AA la la a
Darbito 44	Application Received	21/1/81
Dublin 14.	Additional lof Reed	26/5/81
PPLICANT Watt.	To the control of the property and the same of the sam	t b e d d e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e
PPLICANT M. Watt.	***************************************	
pursuance of its functions under the above mentioned Acts to bunty Health District of Dublin, did by order P/ A/1226/8	the Dublin County Council, being	
ounty Health District of Dublin, did by order, P/A/1226/8 cide to refuse:	dated 9/6/81.	the Planning Authority for the
CXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	DEDIMONAL	
	PERMISSION	XXXXXXXX
Proposed replacement dwelling at Colma	nstown, Co. Dublin.	
		## co### = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =
the following reasons:	STATE OF STA	
The proposed development is located in a to provide for the further development of		
ral environment.	nd would militate again	presed development would est the preservation of
ral environment. There is no public sewer available to se	nd would militate again	presed development would est the preservation of
ral environment. There is no public sewer available to se The proposed development	nd would militate again	presed development would st the preservation of opment.
ral environment. There is no public sewer available to se The proposed development would be premat the provision of public several.	nd would militate again	presed development would st the preservation of opment.
There is no public sewer available to se The proposed development would be premat the provision of public sewerage faciliti reasonably be expected to be made good. The proposed development	nd would militate again erve the proposed devel ture by reason of the s es and the period with	presed development would est the preservation of opment. aid existing deficiency in which such deficienc
The proposed development to be made good. The proposed development would be premated to sever available to	nd would militate again erve the proposed devel ture by reason of the s es and the period with	presed development would st the preservation of opment. aid existing deficiency in which such deficiency
ral environment. There is no public sewer available to se The proposed development would be premat the provision of public sewerage faciliti reasonably be expected to be made good. The proposed development would endanger it it would generate additional traffic tur l Carriageway.	nd would militate againg research the proposed develours by reason of the ses and the period with public safety by reason roing movements on the	posed development would st the preservation of opment. aid existing deficiency in which such deficience of a traffic hazard is heavily trafficked Naa
There is no public sewer available to se The proposed development would be premat the provision of public sewerage faciliti reasonably be expected to be made good. The proposed development would endanger it it would generate additional traffic tur Carriageway. The proposal is upercentable to the	row the proposed develous by reason of the ses and the period with public safety by reason rning movements on the	speased development would set the preservation of opment. aid existing deficiency in which such deficience of a traffic hazard is heavily trafficked Naa
There is no public sewer available to se The proposed development would be premat the provision of public sewerage faciliti reasonably be expected to be made good. The proposed development would endanger t it would generate additional traffic tur l Carriageway. The proposal is unacceptable to the Chief Confirmation of a connection to the group Evidence of soil authorities.	row the proposed develors by reason of the ses and the period with public safety by reason rning movements on the formatter supply abbene as	presed development would set the preservation of opment. aid existing deficiency in which such deficience of a traffic hazard is heavily trafficked Naaches ont submitted
There is no public sewer available to se The proposed development would be premat the provision of public sewerage faciliti resonably be expected to be made good. The proposed development would endanger t it would generate additional traffic tur l Carriageway. The proposal is unacceptable to the Chief Confirmation of a connection to the group	row the proposed develors by reason of the ses and the period with public safety by reason rning movements on the formatter supply abbene as	posed development would st the preservation of opment. aid existing deficiency in which such deficience of a traffic hazard is heavily trafficked Naache following reasons:
There is no public sewer available to se The proposed development would be premat the provision of public sewerage faciliti reasonably be expected to be made good. The proposed development would endanger t it would generate additional traffic tur l Carriageway. The proposal is unacceptable to the Chief Confirmation of a connection to the group Evidence of soil suitability for a septic inspection on 16/3/81, there was nottrial Details of the design of the centility	row the proposed develous by reason of the ses and the period with public safety by reason rning movements on the fine Medical Officer for the water supply abbeness tank drainage systems habe opened for inspections.	posed development would st the preservation of opment. aid existing deficiency in which such deficiency in which such deficiency in which such deficiency in the following reasons: the following reasons: was not submitted. was not shown. On site section.
There is no public sewer available to se The proposed development would be premat the provision of public sewerage faciliti reasonably be expected to be made good. The proposed development would endanger t it would generate additional traffic tur l Carriageway. The proposal is unacceptable to the Chief Confirmation of a connection to the group Evidence of soil suitability for a septic inspection on 16/3/81, there was nottrial Details of the design of the certain	row the proposed develous by reason of the ses and the period with public safety by reason rning movements on the fine Medical Officer for the water supply abbeness tank drainage systems habe opened for inspections.	posed development would st the preservation of opment. aid existing deficiency in which such deficiency in which such deficiency in which such deficiency in the traffic hazard is heavily trafficked Nasche following reasons: the following reasons: was not submitted. was not shown. On site section.
There is no public sewer available to see The proposed development would be premated the provision of public sewerage facilities to be made good. The proposed development would endanger to the proposed development would endanger to the proposed development would endanger to the unit would generate additional traffic turns Carriageway. The proposal is unacceptable to the Chief Confirmation of a connection to the group Evidence of soil suitability for a septicional patails of the design of the septic tank Compliance with the I.I.R.S. recommendation of shown.	rve the proposed develors by reason of the ses and the period with public safety by reason for in movements on the public safety by reason for its mater supply shbeme at tank drainage system and percolation areas one for septic tank dr	posed development would st the preservation of opment. aid existing deficiency in which such deficiency in which such deficiency in which such deficiency heavily trafficked Nasche following reasons: the following reasons: was not submitted. was not shown. On site section. was not submitted. ainage for single dwelt.
There is no public sewer available to see The proposed development would be premate the provision of public sewerage facilitic reasonably be expected to be made good. The proposed development would endanger to the proposed development would endanger to the unit generate additional traffic two Carriageway. The proposal is unacceptable to the Chief Confirmation of a connection to the group Evidence of soil suitability for a septic inspection on 16/3/81, there was nottrial Datails of the design of the septic tank Compliance with the I.I.R.S. recommendati ingsuwas not shown. Evidence offcompliance with the County Septicement of the septic tank compliance offcompliance with the County Septicement of the septic tank and the septicement of the septic tank compliance offcompliance with the County Septicement of the septiceme	rve the proposed develous by reason of the ses and the period with public safety by reason rning movements on the public supply shbeme at tank drainage system the period for inspend on the period of the supply shbeme and percolation areas ons for septic tank drainage system.	posed development would st the preservation of opment. aid existing deficiency in which such deficient of a traffic hazard is heavily trafficked Nasche following reasons: the following reasons: was not submitted. was not submitted. ainage for single duel:
There is no public sewer available to see The proposed development would be premate the provision of public sewerage facilitic reasonably be expected to be made good. The proposed development would endanger to the proposed development would endanger to the proposed development would endanger to the undereast additional traffic turns a confirmation of a connection to the group Evidence of soil suitability for a septic inspection on 16/3/81, there was nottrial Details of the design of the septic tank Compliance with the I.I.R.S. recommendation ingsuwas not shown. Evidence offcompliance with the County Countries of the septic tank was not shown.	rve the proposed develure by reason of the ses and the period with public safety by reason rning movements on the rning movements on the public safety by reason the public safety by reason rning movements on the rning movements on the public safety safe	posed development would st the preservation of opment. aid existing deficiency in which such deficiency in which such deficiency in which such deficiency in the such deficiency in the such traffic hazard is heavily trafficked Nasche following reasons: was not submitted. was not submitted. was not submitted. ainage for single dwell rements with regard to
There is no public sewer available to see The proposed development would be premate the provision of public sewerage facilitic reasonably be expected to be made good. The proposed development would endanger to the proposed development would endanger to the undergraph of the carriageway. The proposal is unacceptable to the Chief Confirmation of a connection to the group Evidence of soil suitability for a septic inspection on 16/3/81, there was nottrial Details of the design of the septic tank Compliance with the I.I.R.S. recommendatingsuwas not shown. Evidence offcompliance with the County Confirmation of the septic tank was not shown.	rve the proposed develure by reason of the ses and the period with public safety by reason rning movements on the rning movements on the public safety by reason the public safety by reason rning movements on the rning movements on the public safety safe	posed development would st the preservation of opment. aid existing deficiency in which such deficiency in which such deficiency in which such deficiency heavily trafficked Nasche following reasons: the following reasons: was not submitted. was not shown. On eiter ection. was not submitted. ainage for single dwell.
There is no public sewer available to see The proposed development would be premate the provision of public sewerage facilitic reasonably be expected to be made good. The proposed development would endanger to it would generate additional traffic two Carriageway. The proposal is unacceptable to the Chief Confirmation of a connection to the group Evidence of soil suitability for a septic inspection on 16/3/81, there was nottrial Details of the design of the septic tank Compliance with the I.I.R.S. recommendatingsuwas not shown. Evidence offcompliance with the County Coloration of the septic tank was not shown.	rve the proposed develure by reason of the ses and the period with public safety by reason rning movements on the rning movements on the public safety by reason the public safety by reason rning movements on the rning movements on the public safety safe	posed development would st the preservation of opment. aid existing deficiency in which such deficiency in which such deficiency in which such deficiency heavily trafficked Nasche following reasons: the following reasons: was not submitted. was not shown. On eiter ection. was not submitted. ainage for single dwell.
There is no public sewer available to see The proposed development would be premate the provision of public sewerage facilities reasonably be expected to be made good. The proposed development would endanger it it would generate additional traffic turn to the group of a connection to the group of the proposal is unacceptable to the Chief Confirmation of a connection to the group Evidence of soil suitability for a septic inspection on 16/3/81, there was notified Details of the design of the septic tank Compliance with the I.I.R.S. recommendation ingsumes not shown. Evidence offcompliance with the County Coloration of the septic tank was not shown. Compliance offcompliance with the County Coloration of the septic tank was not shown.	rve the proposed develous by reason of the ses and the period with public safety by reason rning movements on the mater supply shbeme at tank drainage system and percolation areas one for septic tank drainage in the luncil's distance requirements of the luncil's distance requirements of the luncil's distance requirements.	posed development would st the preservation of opment. aid existing deficiency in which such deficient in which such deficient heavily traffic hazard is heavily trafficked National Persons: the following reasons: was not submitted. was not shown. On site exition. was not submitted. ainage for single dwell rements with regard to Contd

NOTE: An appeal against the decision may be made to An Bord Pleanala by the applicant within one month from the date of ceipt by the applicant of this notification or by any other person within twenty-one days of the date of the decision. The appeal all be in writing and shall state the subject matter of the appeal and grounds of the appeal and should be addressed to An Bord Pleanala, Floor 3, Blocks 6 & 7, Irish Life Centre, Lr. Abbey St., Dublin 1, and accompanied by a deposit of £10. When an appeal made to them in the first instance.

- 6. Ribbon development on this road is particularly objectionalbe in that, this is the ma
- 7. Insufficient information has been submitted with regard to access, gradients, con-