

CUNNANE STRATTON REYNOLDS

CSR Ref: 22236/EMP/04052022

Your Reg. Ref. SD21A/0287

Senior Executive Officer
Land Use, Planning and Transportation Department
South Dublin County Council
County Hall,
Tallaght
Dublin



13th June 2022

By Post

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: Response to Request for Further Information in respect of planning application by Stanford Woods Care Centre for extension and alterations consisting of a 2 storey extension at the front main entrance of existing building (371.5sq.m ground floor addition & 367.5sq.m first floor addition); the extension will match the existing mansard roof profile; reorganisation of the first floor over an area of 272.2sq.m with the addition of 9 dormer windows; all associated services connections and ancillary site works.

Kiltipper Woods Care Centre, Kiltipper Road, Bohernabreena, Dublin 24, D24A248

We refer to the above and to the County Council's Request for Further Information dated 14th December 2021 and which required a response to the Request issued by 13th June. The period by which a response was required was subsequently extended until 22nd September by Order of the County Council dated 13th May 2022.

The County Council's request is set as follows for your ease of reference:

DUBLIN OFFICE
3 MOLESWORTH PLACE, DUBLIN 2
TEL: 01 661 0419 FAX: 01 661 0431
EMAIL: info@csrlandplan.ie

OFFICES ALSO AT:
COPLY HALL, COTTERS STREET, CORK
TEL: 021 496 9224 FAX: 021 496 9012
EMAIL: corkinfo@csrlandplan.ie

DIRECTORS
Joe Cunnane BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI MIPI: Eamonn Prenter BA (Hons) Dip TP MSc MRTPI MIPI:
Declan O'Leary BAg Sc (Land-Hort) Dip LA MILI MLI: Jim Kelly BAg Sc (Landscape-Hort) Dip LA MILI CMLI:
Keith Mitchell MA (Hons) LA Dip EIA Dip Arb MILI CMLI:

ARDA CONG, BALLYTRASNA, TUAM
CO GALWAY
TEL / FAX: 093 60854
EMAIL: galwayinfo@csrlandplan.ie
WWW.CSRLANDPLAN.IE

'1. (1) There is no report showing surface water attenuation calculations for proposed development. It is unclear what available attenuation capacity exists if any in proposed/existing surface water attenuation system. It is also unclear if proposed soakaway is new or existing. Submit a report showing surface water attenuation calculations for the entire site and proposed new extension. The report shall show the site area in hectares or m², and each surface type. Include the areas of each surface type such as buildings, roads, permeable paving, green areas in m² and their respective run off coefficients. Show what the Qbar in litres/second, SAAR (Standard Annual Average Rainfall) value is for proposed site and Met Eireann site specific rainfall data. If a soakaway is proposed to discharge water then submit a report showing percolation tests results as per BRE Digest 365 Standards. Also submit a drawing in plan and cross sectional view showing design details of proposed soakaway as per BRE Digest 365 Standards. Such a soakaway shall have an over flow connect to the public surface water sewer.

(2) The surface water drawing is incomplete. Submit a revised drawing showing the surface water layout of proposed development and include SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) as a means of attenuation. SuDS should first be used as a means of attenuating surface water and where this is not sufficient additional arched type attenuation can be used or existing surface water attenuation if there is available capacity in same. Examples of SuDS include:

- Green roof
- Blue roofs
- Permeable paving
- Grasscrete
- Filter Drains
- Channell rills
- Swales
- Tree pits
- And other such SuDS.

2. The applicant is advised that the Planning Authority considers the continued access for the residents and the public from the subject site to the Kiltipper Park as a key consideration in the justification of the increased intensity of use on the site. To ensure the future viability, the Council seeks the transfer of a small strip of land in the south west of the site at the boundary into Kiltipper Park that accommodates a section of the existing access to ensure the long term viability of the existing walking route through the site. The applicant is invited to discuss the transfer with the Planning Authority and Public Realm Sections of the Council prior to a further information response.

3. The Planning Authority advises that the Roads Department has recommended refusal of the proposed development. The applicant is requested to provide the following:

- (a) A robust car parking justification for the subject site, including the existing, in the context of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2016-2022.
- (b) The applicant is advised that the upgrading of the existing walking route through the site to a walking and cycling route (i.e. a shared route) to facilitate use by cyclists would be a positive sustainable transport development and would reduce demand for car parking. The applicant is requested to include same.
- (c) Swept-path analysis drawings (AutoTRAK) for emergency service vehicles and refuse collection.
- (d) Staff & Resident numbers.
- (e). Revised drawings showing: - 5% mobility car parking provision -10% electric car charging point provision

4. The applicant is requested to consider a natural grass lawn in place of the artificial grass. See below justification for a natural lawn by SDCC public realm as opposed to artificial grass in the courtyard: i. A natural lawn acts as part of the natural landscape, nurturing and sustaining life, absorbing organic material, producing oxygen and helping maintain ground temperature equilibrium. ii. Lawns actually sustain living organisms which help the soil to breathe. As such they are part of the eco-system. iii. Artificial lawns are made from petroleum-based plastic which creates artificial waste in its manufacture. iv. At the end of its 20 year life, artificial lawns cannot be recycled and end up in landfill, this is not sustainable. v. In hot weather, a natural lawn has a cooling effect, the opposite of what happens with artificial grass. vi. Aesthetics is not just about how things look. It is also about how things feel, and harmonising human and natural environments. A natural lawn connects people with the natural environment – something a plastic outdoor carpet cannot do.

5. Given the proximity of the Dodder Valley, a bat survey carried out by a suitably qualified professional is required.'

Please see below our response to each of these items.

- (1) (1) There is no report showing surface water attenuation calculations for proposed development. It is unclear what available attenuation capacity exists if any in proposed/existing surface water attenuation system. It is also unclear if proposed soakaway is new or existing. Submit a report showing surface water attenuation calculations for the entire site and proposed new extension. The report shall show the site area in hectares or m², and each surface type. Include the areas of each surface type such as buildings, roads, permeable paving, green areas in m² and their respective run off coefficients. Show what the Q_{bar} in litres/second, SAAR (Standard Annual Average Rainfall) value is for proposed site and Met Eireann site specific rainfall data. If a soakaway is proposed to discharge**

water then submit a report showing percolation tests results as per BRE Digest 365 Standards. Also submit a drawing in plan and cross sectional view showing design details of proposed soakaway as per BRE Digest 365 Standards. Such a soakaway shall have an over flow connect to the public surface water sewer.

Our Response to Item 1 (1)

The necessary technical assessment and calculations are provided by Kevin McShane Ltd and are attached. That report shows surface water attenuation calculations for the proposed development. The existing available capacity in the existing surface water attenuation system is also identified in the attached work from Kevin McShane Ltd. The proposed soakaway is new. Surface water attenuation calculations for the entire site and for the proposed extension are shown in the attached. Land areas, in m² and each surface type, including buildings, is identified as requested along with the necessary calculations. The proposed soakaway is supported in the presentation of percolation test results as per BRE Digest 365 Standards. The details of the proposed soakaway are presented in plan/section format as you have requested and we confirm that the soakaway will have an over flow connection to the public surface water sewer.

We believe that all the questions posed under item 1 (1) are responded to.

(1) (2) The surface water drawing is incomplete. Submit a revised drawing showing the surface water layout of proposed development and include SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) as a means of attenuation. SuDS should first be used as a means of attenuating surface water and where this is not sufficient additional arched type attenuation can be used or existing surface water attenuation if there is available capacity in same.

Our Response to Item 1(2)

A revised surface water drawing is submitted having been undertaken by Kevin McShane Engineers. A technical surface drainage water assessment has also been undertaken.

A Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) have been used to alleviate the detrimental impacts of traditional urban storm water drainage systems. The proposed surface water for this application will include an enlargement of the existing underground StormTec attenuation tank. Surface water and foul drainage systems have been separated within the site.

Additional SUDS in the form of green roofs and porous paving or swales has been considered but given the current roof structure and relatively modest increase in hardstanding areas, of 247m², the most efficient SUDS solution is the enlargement

of the existing SUDS attenuation tank. Furthermore, this increased area is roof area, with a decrease in the existing roads area so there will be no increase in risk of pollutants entering the drainage system.

- (2) *The applicant is advised that the Planning Authority considers the continued access for the residents and the public from the subject site to the Kiltipper Park as a key consideration in the justification of the increased intensity of use on the site. To ensure the future viability, the Council seeks the transfer of a small strip of land in the south west of the site at the boundary into Kiltipper Park that accommodates a section of the existing access to ensure the long term viability of the existing walking route through the site. The applicant is invited to discuss the transfer with the Planning Authority and Public Realm Sections of the Council prior to a further information response.***

Our Response to Item 2

This item covers two issues. The first and least contentious is the transfer of a small strip of land from the applicant's ownership to the Council. The applicant understands and accepts that the Council would want all of Kiltipper Park in their ownership and in a virtual meeting with the Parks Department on 12th April 2022 this was agreed as a matter of principle with the local authority.

The following are the key points with the last perhaps the most important in the context of the determination of this application.

- The south easterly element of the red line of the application site encroaches over an area of parkland and a footpath.
- For reasons of upkeep, safety and insurance that path should be in the control of the local planning authority. (It should be noted that the park is zoned open space so the development potential of this relatively small area is extremely limited). The County Council would be very uncomfortable with an area of parkland under their upkeep being owned by a third party.
- The area of encroachment is not considered significant.
- It is considered that the extension proposed is relatively significant and that it could be argued that the amount of open space available within the application site is insufficient for the scale of development existing and now additionally proposed.
- The provision of a gate would enable direct access to the park for the benefit of the homes existing and prospective residents.
- It was agreed that the transfer of lands between the applicant and the local authority would not have to be affected prior to the grant of

planning permission and that a planning condition would be sought by the applicants requesting that the transfer of lands and the provision of the gate be provided post the grant of planning permission but prior to the commencement of the permitted development.

The meeting was attended by Oisín Egan, Executive Parks Superintendent Public Realm and Lawrence Collieran Senior Executive Parks Superintendent.

Our client is willing to not only transfer the land but also provide a gate as requested in this RFI item. It has come to our attention as a result of further subsequent engagement with Oisín Egan, however, that the Parks section would prefer if such a gate is NOT provided on the basis, we understand, that the Council prefer to limit the number of entrances and exits into their parks for operational and safety reasons. There would appear to be something of a discrepancy between the position of the Parks Section and the Planning Department therefore. Our client will provide a gate if that is the Council's final position on this and revised Proposed Site Layout Plan submitted with this Further Information shows that gate. If the Council do want that gate then it can be provided by the applicant as shown and this can be a requirement of any planning permission and can be the subject of a planning condition if the County Council are so minded. Should the Council not want the gate then our client will not provide it and it can be conditioned out.

Please see attached proof of ownership by our client of the strip of land in question and also a plan of land to be transferred.

What we can say with certainty is that our client is willing to provide the gate if requested to do so. They can also assure that they will transfer the relevant strip of land. Whether the gate is provided, the facility's residents both existing and prospective can still access the park albeit over a longer distance. Whether the gate is provided there is still a significant planning gain in terms of the transfer of land within the park to the Council.

We await to hear the County Council's definitive position on the provision of the gate.

(3) The Planning Authority advises that the Roads Department has recommended refusal of the proposed development. The applicant is requested to provide the following:

(a) A robust car parking justification for the subject site, including the existing, in the context of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2016-2022.

(b) The applicant is advised that the upgrading of the existing walking route through the site to a walking and cycling route (i.e. a shared route) to facilitate use by cyclists would be a positive sustainable transport development and would reduce demand for car parking. The applicant is requested to include same.

- (c) Swept-path analysis drawings (AutoTRAK) for emergency service vehicles and refuse collection.**
- (d) Staff & Resident numbers.**
- (e). Revised drawings showing: - 5% mobility car parking provision
-10% electric car charging point provision**

Our Response to Item 3

In response to the above item Kevin McShane Ltd was commissioned to produce a car parking assessment which is attached.

In respect of part (a) above the parking assessment reached the following conclusions.

- The existing car park provision (61 spaces) at the site is currently underutilised, average car park utilisation during typical day was observed to be 47% and 50%;
- There is reserve capacity within the existing car park;
- The additional 19 residents associated with the site extension will generate additional parking demand at the site;
- The revised site layout will reduce parking supply to provide 51 spaces at the site;
- When the parking demand associated with the additional residents and the proposed car parking layout are considered, there remains sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed parking demand at the site.

We believe that the above clearly justifies the parking provision proposed and that there is no planning merit to a refusal of planning permission based in parking grounds.

In respect of Part (b) of Item 3 upgrades of the existing walking routes are shown in Drawing 21-182-SK006 which is attached.

In respect of Part (c) Drawing 21-182-SK003 shows the requested swept path analysis.

In respect of Part (d) The resident numbers are set out in 21-182 Car Parking Technical Note Rev A. The number of staff varies depending with the level of care to be provided to residents. Therefore, the number of staff is not fixed. The attached car parking technical note fully justifies the parking provision proposed based on acknowledged parameters and current standards.

In respect of Part (e) the Car Parking Technical Note advises that one EV charging point is required. We attach therefore a revised site plan showing the mobility parking and EV charging point. It is considered that the requirements stipulated are unduly onerous and what is proposed is fully justified.

- (3) The applicant is requested to consider a natural grass lawn in place of the artificial grass. See below justification for a natural**

lawn by SDCC public realm as opposed to artificial grass in the courtyard: i. A natural lawn acts as part of the natural landscape, nurturing and sustaining life, absorbing organic material, producing oxygen and helping maintain ground temperature equilibrium. ii. Lawns actually sustain living organisms which help the soil to breathe. As such they are part of the eco-system. iii. Artificial lawns are made from petroleum-based plastic which creates artificial waste in its manufacture. iv. At the end of its 20 year life, artificial lawns cannot be recycled and end up in landfill, this is not sustainable. v. In hot weather, a natural lawn has a cooling effect, the opposite of what happens with artificial grass. vi. Aesthetics is not just about how things look. It is also about how things feel, and harmonising human and natural environments. A natural lawn connects people with the natural environment – something a plastic outdoor carpet cannot do.

Our Response to Item 3

Our client is agreeable to providing natural grass as requested in the RFI. This is shown in revised site layout Plan PL02A.

(5) *Given the proximity of the Dodder Valley, a bat survey carried out by a suitably qualified professional is required.*

Our Response to Item 5

In response to this item a bat survey was undertaken by Allen and Mellon Environmental of a section of a building situated at Kiltipper Road, Tallaght, County Dublin.

The building is a modern structure purpose-built as a care home in 2004. The proposed extension will affect only a small part of the building and a significant section of the area affected is a flat-roofed area which houses the current reception area.

The survey to assess the use of the building by bats was undertaken under NPWS licence in February 2022. No evidence of bat occupation such as live bats, droppings or food remains was found in either the interior or exterior of the building. There were no notable gaps between the roof slates and ridge tiles while the PVC fascia boards and soffits were generally in excellent repair and fit tightly to the walls and roof. The PVC window frames were also in good repair with no cracks or cavities between frame and walls.

There were no obvious access points to the building's roof voids which were extremely well-insulated and maintained. The roof-void ceilings were lined with

plywood-faced boarding and insulation panels preventing access by bats into the roof space area. Many sections were partially floored and were used as storage space.

Several gaps were recorded in the exterior roof structure. However, on the basis of the evidence obtained, the building was classified as low suitability for roosting bats. However, the presence of individual or small numbers of bats using the building in spring or summer could not be excluded.

In line with the Bat Mitigation Guidelines, a single dusk emergence survey is recommended by Allen and Mellon be undertaken in advance of construction work in order to confirm whether bats are present. That survey would be carried out between May and August should planning permission be granted. If no emerging bats are recorded then the applicant's ecologist's advice that no further work is recommended for this proposal. If the presence of roosting bats is confirmed further survey work may be required and a Mitigation Plan will be required before development work can commence. Our client will accept a planning condition to this effect.

As the existing Bat report had stated

'No bats or evidence of roosting bats was found during the survey. However, several potential bat roost features were identified, and the building was assessed as being of low bat roost suitability.'

and the recommendation was:

'In light of this assessment it is recommended that before construction work begins, a single dusk emergence survey should be undertaken at an appropriate time of year (May to August) to confirm the presence or absence of roosting bats at the potential roost features identified.'

We believe that a planning condition as indicated above can be imposed in this instance.

In conclusion, we believe that all concerns raised in each of the RFI are now addressed.

We look forward to a determination of this application by the County Council.

Yours sincerely,



Eamonn Prenter MIPI MRTPI
Director
CUNNANE STRATTON REYNOLDS
LAND PLANNING & DESIGN

www.csrlandplan.ie