

Planning Department  
South Dublin County Council  
County Hall  
Tallaght  
Dublin 24



17<sup>th</sup> December 2021

**RESPONSE TO CLARIFICATION OF FURTHER INFORMATION**

**REG. REF. SD21A/0051**  
**RE: PROPOSED CONTINUANCE OF USE OF 3NO. EXISTING BUILDINGS & ASSOCIATED AREAS**  
**AT: WILSONS AUCTIONS, GREEN ISLE ROAD, CORKAGH, DUBLIN 22**  
**APPLICANT: RGR HOLDINGS LIMITED**

Dear Sir/ Madam,

This Response to Clarification of Further Information Response has been prepared on behalf of RGR Holdings Limited (applicants) in relation to a planning application for continuance of use of the existing 3no. buildings and all associated external areas at Wilsons Auctions, Green Isle Road, Corkagh, Dublin 22.

South Dublin County Council issued a request for Clarification of Further Information (CFI) on 10<sup>th</sup> November 2021 containing 6no. items.

This cover letter provides the overarching response to the CFI Request directing the reader to the supporting documentation where necessary.

The enclosures include the following: -

Ronan Clarke Architects & Engineers

- Cover Letter Response relating to CFI items 1, 3, 5 and 6.
- Part Site Plan (1 of 2) Dwg. No. 4996-02-P02.
- Site Plan Signage Sheet No. 1 of 2 Dwg. No. 4996-02-P1000.
- Existing Signage Sheet 2 of 2 Dwg. No. 4996-02-P1001,
- Natural Flow Path Dwg. No. 4996-02-P30.

Kevin Fitzpatrick Landscape Architecture

- Landscape Visual Impact Assessment
- Digital Dimensions Photomontages
- Landscape Plan Dwg. No. 101
- Boundaries Plan Dwg. No. 104
- Car Parking Plan Dwg. No. 105.

DBFL Consulting Engineers

Technical Note: Clarification of Additional Information.

As requested, 6 copies of the above enclosures are submitted in complete sets.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "John Murphy". The signature is written in a cursive style with a prominent loop at the end of the name.

John Murphy  
BMA Planning

## CLARIFICATION OF FURTHER INFORMATION RESPONSE

Reg. Reg. SD21A/0051

### ITEM 1: SITE PLAN

- ‘1. Clarification of Item 1: The applicant is requested to submit P02, part site plan, identifying the external open storage areas within the site.’

### RESPONSE

Ronan Clarke & Co. have prepared the enclosed updated drawing *Part Site Plan (1 of 2) Dwg. No. 4996-02-P02*. This drawing identifies the external open storage areas within the site.

### ITEM 2: NATIONAL ROAD NETWORK

- ‘2. Clarification of Item 2: Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII) has raised objections to the proposal, stating: ‘With reference to the further information submitted in connection with the above planning application, I wish to advise that the Authority’s position remains as set out in our letter of 15-Apr-2021’. The response from TII on 15 April 2021 stated:

- (i) ‘Official policy in relation to development involving access to national roads and development along such roads is set out in the Department of Environment, Community & Local Government’s ‘Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities (January, 2012)’. Section 2.7 of the DoECLG Guidelines concerns development at National Road Interchanges or Junctions. The proposal, if approved, would create an adverse impact on the national road and associated junction and would, in the Authority’s opinion, be at variance with the foregoing national policy.’

The applicant is requested to set out how the proposed development is in accordance with the Department of Environment, Community & Local Government’s ‘Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities (January, 2012). In particular, the applicant is requested to chronically detail the past uses on the subject site with reference to the design/construction timeline of the adjacent national road interchange.’

### RESPONSE

DBFL Consulting Engineers have prepared the enclosed Technical Note confirming that the proposed development will not materially impact the operational performance of the local road network or the adjoining N7 Junction 2.

### ITEM 3: LANDSCAPING

- ‘3. Clarification of Item 3:

- (i) There are conflicts between the information on the Landscape Plan (Kevin Fitzpatrick Landscape Architects Drawing No. 101) and the drainage plan (Clarke Drawing 4966-02-P30 Natural Flow Path). The applicant is requested to provide clarification of this and provide plans for the proposals that are consistent.
- (ii) The Planning Authority has concerns over the visual impact of the proposed development. The applicant is requested to provide revised photomontages indicating further planting for view 5 (in the short term) and view 8.

- (iii) *The applicant has not provided full details for the landscaping of all parking areas, nor have they demonstrated compliance with Section 11.4.4 of the County Development Plan, as was required by item (v). It is noted that the landscaping plan indicates that some, but not all parking areas would benefit from additional tree planting. The applicant is requested to address this.*
- (iv) *The applicant is requested to clarify whether type H boundary treatment has been planted. If it has not a timeframe for doing so should be provided.*
- (v) *It is noted that there are a number of fences indicated on the boundary plan that are indicated as existing. These were not indicated at the previous stage or at the compliance submission stage. The applicant is requested to clarify when these fences were installed. The planning authority has concerns regarding the visual impact of these fences.'*

## RESPONSE

Items 3 (i) to (v) are responded to as follows:-

- (i) Conflicts between drawings *Landscape Plan* (Kevin Fitzpatrick Landscape Architects Drawing No. 101) and the drainage plan (Clarke Drawing 4966-02-P30) *Natural Flow Path* have been addressed and revised versions of these drawings are enclosed.
- (ii) Revised Photomontages of Views 5 and 8 have been prepared by Digital Dimensions under the instruction of Kevin Fitzpatrick Landscape Architects and enclosed with the current response.
- (iii) The drawing entitled *Car Parking Plan* Dwg. No. 105 by Kevin Fitzpatrick Landscape Architects is enclosed and illustrates the proposed tree planting within the car parking areas in accordance with section 11.4.4 of the Development Plan.
- (iv) The enclosed *Boundaries Plan* Dwg. No. 104 confirms the location and extent of boundary type H and confirms that this boundary treatment will be planted before March 2022.
- (v) The *Boundaries Plan* Dwg. No. 104 also clarifies when existing boundaries were erected on site.

## ITEM 4: LANDSCAPING AT PROTECTED STRUCTURE

- '4. *Clarification of Item 4: Item 4(b) of the additional information request stated the applicant is requested to 'provide a landscaping scheme, which sets out how the access to the Protected Structures would be improved'. It is not apparent that the applicant has provided any additional landscaping in accordance with (b). The applicant is requested to address this matter.'*

## RESPONSE

The *Landscape Plan* dwg. no. 101 identifies the additional landscaping works proposed to enhance the access route to the Protected Structures. Additional trees are proposed along the full length of the access avenue as identified on the Landscape Plan and illustrated within View 8 of the Photomontages. This planting will screen Wilson's Auctions and enhance the avenue entrance to the Protected Structures at Kilmateed House.

## ITEM 5: SUSTAINABLE URBAN DRAINAGE SYSTEMS

- '5. Clarification of Item 5: The applicant is requested to submit further detail in relation to the sustainable drainage proposals. These should be shown on both the landscape plans and the drainage plans and they should be consistent. The swale should be vegetated. The detail of all SuDS features showing how they work and how much water they are attenuating.'

## RESPONSE

The enclosed response by Ronan Clarke & Co. provides details with regard to the proposed SuDS proposals within the site including details of the volumes of surface water to be attenuated. The proposed SuDS features are also illustrated on the submitted *Landscape Plan* Dwg. No. 101 and the *Natural Flow Path* Dwg. No. 4996-02-P30.

## ITEM 6: SIGNAGE

- '6. Clarification of Item 7:  
The applicant is requested to provide the following additional information for each sign:
- Sign No.2:  
- Further details of illumination required.  
- Photomontage required, to show signage cluster and impact on views to the Protected Structure.
- Sign No.3  
- Photomontage required, to show signage cluster and impact on views to the Protected Structure.
- Sign No.4  
• Photomontage requires indicating visual impact of sign.
- Sign No.5  
- Details of support structure required.  
- Photomontage required, to show visual impact of signage cluster
- Sign No.6  
- Details of support structure required.  
- Photomontage required, to show visual impact of signage cluster
- Sign No.7  
- Photomontage required, to show visual impact of signage cluster.  
- Concern over scale of sign  
- Concern over quality of materials – further images required.
- Sign No.8  
- Photomontage required, to show visual impact of signage cluster  
- Concern over quality of materials – further images required.
- Sign No.9  
- Photomontage required, to show visual impact of signage cluster  
- Concern over quality of materials – further images required.
- Sign No.10  
- Dimensions required.  
- Elevation of greenhouse No2 indicating sign required.  
- Concern over quality of materials – further images required.
- Sign No.11  
• Dimensions required
- Sign No.12  
- Photomontage required, to show signage cluster and impact on views to the Protected Structure.
- Sign No.13

- Width required.

Sign No.14

- *Concern over quality of materials – further images required.'*

## RESPONSE

The following signs have been removed from the site and permission is not being sought for these signs - 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13 and 14. The enclosed revised signage drawings have also been updated to remove these signs.

Regarding the remaining proposed signs 2, 3, 11 and 12 and the above clarifications: -

### Signs 2 and 3

- Sign 2 is internally illuminated as identified on the enclosed drawing. Sign 3 is not illuminated.
- Commentary on the visual impact of this signage is included within an addendum attached to the LVIA prepared by Kevin Fitzpatrick Landscape Architect.

### Sign 11

- Dimensions of Sign 11 are now included on drawing no. P1001.

### Sign 12

- Commentary on the visual impact of Sign 12 is contained within an addendum attached to the LVIA prepared by Kevin Fitzpatrick Landscape Architect.