

South Dublin County Council
County Hall Tallaght,
Dublin 24, D24 A3XC

03 December 2021

Re: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
Planning Register Reference No: SD21A/0148
Proposed refurbishment and development of Katharine Tynan House, Ballymount Road, Kingswood, Dublin 24

To whom it may concern,

On behalf of our client Hibernia REIT Holdco Two Ltd., we hereby submit Additional Information for:

“development at Ballymount Road, Kingswood, Dublin 24, to refurbish The Katharine Tynan House, or ‘Whitehall’, a protected structure (RPS ref. 197), with change of use from disused dwelling to community centre. Works will entail refurbishment of the roof and external walls, reinstatement of windows and external doors, ceilings and floors, reinstatement of a conservatory and glazed porch (10m² and 5m² respectively), new internal stairs and doors, new services and sanitary accommodation; two new single-storey open-fronted structures on part of the footprint of earlier outbuildings with an enclosed area for toilets (534m²); refurbishment of historic garden walls and gates; upgrading of the existing non-historic entrance and approach from the Ballymount Road; and provision for parking on site.”

Please find enclosed hardcopies of the following documents revised for the RFI:

1. 10 hardcopies of the following drawings and reports:

- Client Hibernia Reit:
- Hibernia Reit Response to RFI Document
- Lotts Architecture:
- 332-P01 Proposed Site Plan Rev D (1:500)
 - 332-P02 Proposed Ground Floor Plan Rev C (1:100)
 - 332-P05 Proposed Elevations Rev B (1:100)
 - 332-P06 Proposed Elevations and Sections Rev B (1:100)

Land Use Planning & Transportation

6 DEC 2021

South Dublin County Council

Directors

Desmond Byrne BArch MRIAI – Richard McLoughlin BArch MSc MRIAI
Registered in Ireland no. 408083 VAT no. 6428083T

- 332-P07 Proposed Entrance Gates Plan Rev A (1:100)
- 2021-05-25 332-19 Newlands Farm Architectural Heritage Assessment Impact Report Rev A

Murray Associates Consultant Landscape Architects:

- Landscape Masterplan: 1860_PL_P_01
- Landscape Design Details Sheet: 1860_PL_DD_01
- Tree Survey Plan: 1860_PL_TS_01
- Arboriculture Protection Plan: 1860_PL_TS_02
- 1860_Arbicultural Assessment_Planning RFI

OCSC Consultant Engineers:

- H657-OCSC-XX-XX-SK-E-001-S4-P03 Electrical Proposed Site Lighting Layout
- H657-OCSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0100-A1-C01 Site Layout-Roads and Paths
- H657-OCSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0101-A1-C01 Site Layout-Visibility Splays
- H657-OCSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0102-A1-C01 Site Layout-Autotrack Analysis
- H657-OCSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0103-A1-C01 Site Layout-Autotrack Analysis
- H657-OCSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0104-A1-C01 Site Layout-Autotrack Analysis
- H657-OCSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0500-A1-C01 Proposed Drainage Design Layout
- H657-OCSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0501-A1-C01 Surface Water Catchment
- H657-OCSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0510-A1-C01 Proposed Drainage Surface Water Longsections
- H657-OCSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0511-A1-C01 Proposed Drainage Wastewater Longsection
- H657-OCSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0700-A1-C01 Cross Sections & Build-ups
- H657-OSCC Katharine Tynan House Outdoor Lighting Report

JBA Ecology Consultants:

- DWJ-JBAI-XX-XX-RP-BD-0003-A3-C02-AA_Screening_Newlands_Farm
- DWJ-JBAI-XX-XX-RP-BD-0005-A3-C01-EcIA_Katherine_Tynan_House

Please see below items referred to in the Request for Additional Information for Katharine Tynan House, to which this application applies. Detailed below is the information requested from SDCC and our response to same, using their number/referencing system (blue).

1. Whilst the principle of a community centre is generally considered to be acceptable and weight can be given to the fact that the proposal would see the refurbishment of a protected structure, there are concerns with the lack of information submitted in relation to the proposed community centre use in the context of the site and surrounding area. Given the requirements of policy C1 Community Centres of the SDCC County Development Plan (2016-2022), the applicant is requested to submit the following information to enable the planning authority to undertake a full assessment of the proposal.

(a) A full rationale for the proposed community centre use and full details of who exactly the proposal would cater for including activities proposed and levels of access for local people;

(b) Details of how the proposed community centre is anticipated to operate and be

viable in the future given the fact that there is an existing community centre located approximately 600m away from the application site; and

(c) Full details of the proposed management arrangements of the community centre.

Hibernia Reit Response:

Please refer to *Hibernia Reit Response to RFI* document for responses to items 1(a)(b)(c) above.

2. *There are contradictions in the height proposed of the palisade fence on the site boundary within two separate documents submitted with the application. In addition to this no details on elevations to show the fence or details of the materials proposed have been submitted. Given the protected nature of the site it is considered that full details of the fence are required to be submitted. Given the requirements of Policy HCL3 of the SDCC County Development Plan (2016-2022), the applicant is also requested to consider a more sympathetically designed boundary fence that would be more appropriate to the protected structure and its curtilage which is also protected.*

Lotts Response:

Please refer to Murray Associates drawing 1860_PL_DD_01 Landscape Design Details showing details of the proposed 3m high metal fence on the site boundary. We note the query to show the fence on elevation drawings. The fence is not shown in the elevations and section drawings as it is a distance away from the historic structure and to include it in these drawings would conceal important information. The chosen fence and its distance from the house shows that it will have no negative impact on the character of the historic structure and its curtilage.

3. *The Roads Department has raised a significant number of traffic and transport issues with the proposal. The applicant is requested to submit a response to the following items.*

1. *A revised layout showing vehicular/pedestrian access for the proposed development with sufficient visibility envelope in both directions and 6m width and radii to facilitate access for emergency vehicles and bin trucks.*

OCSC Response:

Please refer to OCSC drawing H657-OCSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0100 Rev C01 showing the revised road layout. This layout has been developed based on:

- A 5m wide carriageway with a 1.8m wide path
- 6m radii at entrance to facilitate ease of access.

We note that a check on visibility envelope for the proposed junction at Ballymount Road has been undertaken-please refer to drawing H657-OCSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0101 Rev C01 showing same. This confirms that the necessary sightlines are achieved at the junction, in line with the requirements of the NRA for National Roads.

We note also that swept path analysis has been undertaken for the proposed entrance road-please refer to drawing H657-OCSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0102 Rev C01. This demonstrates that access for emergency and refuse vehicles can be facilitated.

2. *A revised layout showing 5% of vehicular parking provision for mobility impaired users and 10% vehicular parking provision equipped with electrical charging points*

Lotts Response:

Please refer to Lotts Architecture drawing 332-P01 Proposed Site Plan Rev D showing the revised car parking layout. There will be provision for 12 no. car parking spaces east of the historic walled garden which include 3 no. accessible parking spaces, 2 no. electrical points and provision for spill-over car parking and bus parking in the same location. Bicycle parking accommodating 16 no. bicycles will be located adjacent to the proposed car park. The revised layout provides the adequate percentage of parking provision for mobility impaired users and electric car users.

3. *A revised layout showing the car parking, bicycle parking and pedestrian routes within the development*

a) *The minimum width of footpaths shall be 1.8m wide to aid mobility impaired users*

b) *Footpath layout shall provide adequate connectivity around the development and footpaths on the main road.*

Lotts Architecture and OCSC Response:

Please refer to Lotts Architecture drawing 332-P01 Proposed Site Plan Rev D showing the items above. We note that, bicycle parking has been relocated to the car park for ease of connectivity and as discussed in item 5 below, a 1.8m wide footpath has been provided along the access road. This footpath has adequate connectivity around the development and to footpaths on the main road.

4. *A revised layout showing swept path analysis showing emergency vehicle can access at the far edge to the development.*

OCSC Response:

We note also that swept path analysis has been undertaken for the proposed entrance road-please refer to drawing H657-OCSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0102 Rev C01. This demonstrates that access for emergency vehicles has been provided to all areas of the proposed development including the outbuildings to the western edge of the development.

5. *A revised layout showing internal road width of 6m as a shared surface or 1.8m pedestrian footpath and 4.2m road surface. Radii should be improved to provide more manoeuvrability around corners for emergency vehicles.*

OCSC Response:

Please refer to OCSC drawing H657-OCSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0100 Rev C01 showing the revised road layout. This layout has been developed based on:

- A 5m wide road surface with a 1.8m pedestrian footpath
- 6m radii at entrance to facilitate ease of access.
- We note also that swept path analysis has been undertaken for the proposed entrance road-please refer to drawing H657-OCSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0102 Rev P03.

This demonstrates that access for emergency and refuse vehicles can be facilitated.

6. *A revised layout showing that the road carriageway construction details are in accordance with Appendix 6 of the SDCC Taking in Charge standard as recommended for road construction.*

OCSC Response:

Please refer to OCSC drawing H657-OCSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0700 Rev C01 showing a cross section through the proposed road with construction details to be in accordance with Appendix 6 of the SDCC Taking in Charge standard.

7. *Information regarding the proposed bin/waste collection arrangement and collection locations, including auto track analysis showing how bin truck can access and egress the site safely*

Lotts Architecture and OCSC Response:

Please refer to Hibernia Reit Response to RFI Document for information regarding the bin/waste collection arrangement. We note also that swept path analysis has been undertaken for the proposed entrance road-please refer to drawing H657-OCSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0102 Rev C01. This demonstrates that access has been provided for refuse vehicles to the proposed bin-store located in the north-western corner of the development.

4. *The Water Services Department has raised concerns regarding surface water. The applicant is requested to provide the following information to address these concerns.*

- a) *A report to show percolation test results for location of proposed soakaway as per BRE Digest 365 Standards.*

OCSC Response:

We note the drainage design submitted as part of the original planning application had relied upon soakaways to accommodate the storm drainage run-off. Following percolation tests undertaken at the proposed locations in accordance with BRE Digest 364 Standards, it was determined that soakaways were not an appropriate solution for the site location. Thus, a revised drainage layout has been prepared as detailed on drawing H657-OCSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0500 Rev C01. This shows the run-off being attenuated on site before discharging to adjacent stream in the applicants ownership at 2l/s. This proposed layout was discussed between OCSC Engineers and SDCC Water Services and considered appropriate for the application.

- b) *A report to clarify the area of hard standing buildings, permeable paving if any, grasslands and other surface types with their respective runoff coefficients.*

OCSC Response:

Please refer to drawing H657-OCSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0501 Rev C01 showing the Surface Water Catchment area. This indicates the variety of hard standing, permeable paving and grasslands on the site.

- c) *Details of water butts as part of SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System)*

OCSC Response

We note that the proposed developments consists predominantly of a refurbishment and conservation work to a protected structure. Given the nature of the project, the use of water butts was not considered appropriate with other SuDS measures referred to above provided in lieu.

5. *Given the historical nature of the building, the fact that it is derelict and the site context, as well as the requirements of policy HCL15 of the SDCC County Development Plan (2016-2022), the applicant is requested to submit a full ecological survey that should include but not be limited to a bat survey. The ecological survey should include biodiversity management proposals and mitigation measures.*

Lotts Architecture and OCSC Response:

A full ecological impact assessment has been prepared for the application site by JBA Consulting, see document:

DWJ-JBAI-XX-XX-RP-BD-0005-S3-P01-EcIA_Katharine_Tynan_House. The EcIA includes a number of biodiversity management proposals and mitigation measures. Included within the EcIA is a full bat survey, and an accompanying bat roost potential survey.

A number of recommendations have been made in this report with regards to lighting design, in particular with in relation to:

- **Hours of Illumination**

It is recommended that site lighting should be switched off or at a lower output during inactive site hours and that lighting should be controlled by occupancy/motion sensors so that it will remain off/low if there is no pedestrian traffic nearby.

The lighting column proposed is a motion sensor type and thus will only be activated once pedestrian or vehicular traffic requires same.

- **Light Levels and type**

It is recommended that:

- Lighting levels meet lowest light levels under health and safety;
- LED luminaires should be used where possible
- A warm white spectrum (2700k-3000k should be used;
- The LED luminaires could also feature peak wavelengths higher than 550nm to avoid component of light most disturbing to the bats

The lighting column proposed achieves all of the recommendations above and these will be implemented in the detailed design of the project.

- **Column heights of lamp posts**

It is recommended that light columns are kept to a height of 6m or less.

Please refer to OCSC drawing H657-OCSC-XX-XX-SK-E-0001 for the proposed site lighting layout with lighting columns to be a maximum of 6m high.

We trust the contents of this Request for Additional Information package are in order, however, should you require any additional information please do not hesitate to contact us. We look forward to receipt of acknowledgement of this submission.

With best regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Desmond Byrne". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a period at the end.

Desmond Byrne BArch MRIA
RIAI Conservation Architect Grade III
Director
Lotts Architecture and Urbanism Ltd

