

64 Springvale, Edmondstown Road,  
Rathfarnham, Dublin 16  
13 November 2021

An Bord Pleanála,  
64 Marlborough Street,  
Dublin 1

Subject: An Bord Pleanála – Case Ref SHD3ABP-311616-21

Dear Sir/Madam,

We wish to make the following observations on the above referenced planning application:

1. The overall proposed site layout is not significantly different from application SHD3ABP-308763-20 which was refused permission. One of the reasons provided for the rejection was that “new residential development that would adjoin existing one and/or two-storey housing, shall be no more than two storeys in height, unless a separation distance of 35m or greater is achieved”

We note that on the latest site plan that the location of Block K does not appear to have changed its location, or its height, from the previous application. Rather than take on board the height and separation requirements, the applicant doesn't appear to be attempting any meaningful change, but rather the applicant justifies not making any changes. However, the basic fact is that this still appears to be in breach of the Housing (H) Policy 9 of the South Dublin County development plan 2016-2022.

2. Block K is shown as having a ffl of 96.8m at the south end of the block, and a height of 10.8m, giving an elevation of 107.6m at the southern end (not 107.15 as indicated in the document “Planning Report Statement of Consistency and Statement of Material Contravention). Our house has a ridge level of less than 7.4 metres. As there isn't a significant level difference between our land and the southern end of Block K, this development will be over 3 metres higher than our property, and so will have a significant visual impact on our property, due to its proximity.
3. In the “Daylight Analysis and Overshadowing” report, we note the following:
  - a. In Section 4, our property doesn't feature in the results in Table 12. We believe our property should have been included in these results
  - b. Again in Section 5, our property was not included in Figures 7 & 8, or the results in Table 14. Our property should have been included in this.

Our garden gets sunlight from the East, South & West. The proposed height (at nearly 11 m tall) and location of Block K (97-112) will have a significant impact to the natural light we receive, as well as impacting our privacy.

4. Proposed access from the development into the Springvale Estate

We note that the revised plan has changed from previously, and it's now proposed to only have bicycle & pedestrian access into the Springvale estate, and not vehicular traffic. However, it is noted that retractable bollards are

proposed, rather than fixed bollards, so we believe that this may allow vehicular traffic in the future between the estates.

5. Location of Public Open Spaces #1 & #4

We would have concerns that the location of Public Open Spaces #1 & #4 at the East end of the development could give rise to anti-social behaviour spilling over into the Springvale estate.

6. Concerns around Construction Waste

Our property borders the south-east corner of the proposed development. We would be concerned that this area would be used as storage for construction debris/waste, which would have a negative impact on our property due to noise, potential pollutants, noise, etc. We would like the developer to guarantee that this would not be the case.

We have lived in the Springvale estate since May 2006. While we recognise the need for additional housing in the Dublin area, the scale of this proposed development, in conjunction with all the other SHD developments in the area, will have a negative impact on our home.

Yours Sincerely,



---

Niall & Maria Brenner