

**PRE-PLAN CONSULTATION**

**PROPOSED AMENDED ADAMSTOWN  
STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT ZONE (SDZ)  
PLANNING SCHEME**

**MANAGER'S REPORT ON SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED**

**MAY 2013**



<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
<b>1.0 Introduction.....</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Purpose of the Report	
1.2 Background	
1.3 Public Consultation	
<b>2.0 Details of Consultation.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3.0 Details of Submissions .....</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1 List of Persons or Bodies	
3.2 Categorisation and Summary of Issues	
3.3 Conclusions	
<b>4.0 Consultation Workshops.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>5.0 Next Steps.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	
Appendix A: Public Consultation Information Leaflet	
Appendix B: Newspaper Notice	
Appendix C: Information Poster	

## **1.0 Introduction**

### **1.1 Purpose of the Report**

South Dublin County Council is carrying out a review of the Adamstown Strategic Development Zone (SDZ) Planning Scheme, 2003 and intends to initiate a statutory process in 2013, pursuant to Part IX of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), to amend the approved Planning Scheme. South Dublin County Council undertook non-statutory pre-plan public consultation in March/April 2013 to inform the review process. The purpose of this Manager's Report is to summarise issues raised during pre-plan consultation.

### **1.2 Background**

On June 19<sup>th</sup> 2001, the Government ordered the designation of 223.5 hectares of privately owned land at Adamstown, as a site for the establishment of a Strategic Development Zone (SDZ) for the purpose of delivering residential development and associated infrastructure and facilities (S.I. No. 272 of 2001 refers). South Dublin County Council is the specified Development Agency for the SDZ.

South Dublin County Council, as Development Agency, prepared a draft Planning Scheme for the site in 2002. The scheme was adopted by the elected members of South Dublin County Council in May 2003 and approved by An Bord Pleanála, on appeal, in September 2003. The approved Adamstown SDZ Planning Scheme sets out a detailed Masterplan for the site. The scheme specifies the type and extent of development that is permissible, together with requirements for the phased delivery of supporting infrastructure and facilities. To date, delivery of housing and infrastructure on foot of the approved scheme has focused in the north of Adamstown, in the Airlie Stud Development Area and to the south, in the Adamstown Square and Adamstown Castle Development Areas. There are 1,250 homes (SDCC House Counts) occupied and a population of 3,358 people in Adamstown (Census 2011).

Over the 10 year period since scheme approval the economic and policy context within which the scheme operates has changed. While there is no legal requirement to review a Planning Scheme, it is considered timely to review and update the approved Planning Scheme to take account of this changed context.

South Dublin County Council will initiate a statutory process, pursuant to Part IX of the Planning and Development Acts 2000-2010 in 2013, to amend the approved Planning Scheme. Material amendments will be presented in a Draft Amended Adamstown SDZ Planning Scheme. An Environmental Report (SEA) and AA Screening Report will be prepared in respect of the proposed amendments.

### **1.3 Public Consultation**

Part IX, Section 171(2) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) states that;

*“Where a planning authority proposes to amend a planning scheme under this section it shall comply with procedure laid down in section 169 and that section shall be construed accordingly.”*

While there is no requirement in section 169 to carry out of pre plan public consultation in respect of a proposed amended Planning Scheme, legislation does not preclude a planning authority from taking whatever steps it considers necessary to consult the public. It is on this basis that South Dublin County Council undertook non-statutory pre-plan consultation. The consultation took place over a four week period from Monday the 25<sup>th</sup> of March to 4pm on Monday the 22<sup>nd</sup> of April 2013. Information was disseminated to the public and submissions were invited, with 37 submissions received in total during consultation period.

## 2.0 Details of Consultation Process

The pre-plan consultation took place over a four week period from Monday 25<sup>th</sup> March 2013 to Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2013 and involved the following steps:

- Notification of pre-plan consultation was published in the *Irish Times* on Monday 25<sup>th</sup> March (see Appendix B) and issued to the Minister, the Board and the Prescribed Authorities. The submission included an invitation for written submissions/observations to 4pm on 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2013.
- Notification of intention to prepare an Environmental Report (Strategic Environmental Assessment) along with a Scoping Issues document were sent to the Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Environment, Community and Local Government, Department of Communications, Energy and Natural Resources, Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine, Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht.
- Public displays were placed on the South Dublin County Council website [www.sdcc.ie](http://www.sdcc.ie) with a link from the Adamstown website [www.adamstown.ie](http://www.adamstown.ie); at County Hall, Tallaght; Civic Offices, Clondalkin; and Lucan Library for the duration of the consultation period.
- 1,200 information leaflets were distributed to pupils of St. John the Evangelist National School, Adamstown Castle Educate Together National School and Adamstown Community College. Information posters were also provided at school entrances.
- Information posters were placed at several locations around Adamstown including Londis, several junctions within and at the entrances to the area and at Superquinn Centre, Lucan.
- Andrea Molloy, SDCC Community Worker for Adamstown circulated notification of the consultation to community contacts in the area.
- Evening community consultation workshops were held in Finnstown County House Hotel on Thursday 11<sup>th</sup> April and Monday 15<sup>th</sup> April 2013 from 7.30 – 9.30 pm.
- A series of Landowner meetings were undertaken. SDCC hosted a briefing meeting for commercial landowners on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2013. Separate meetings were held with each of the three commercial landowners on 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> April 2013.
- The Adamstown Steering Group met on 9<sup>th</sup> April 2013. The meeting included a briefing in relation to the Planning Scheme review.
- A community Stakeholder briefing meeting was held on 21<sup>st</sup> March 2013. The meeting was attended by education, community and religious stakeholders. An invitation was extended to ODMP estate management agents but there were unable to attend.

### 3.0 Details of Submissions

37 submissions were received in total. 35 submissions were received by the closing date/time and 2 submissions were received after this time. In view of the non-statutory nature of the consultation late submissions were accepted. All submissions were read, analysed, and summarised. A list of the persons and bodies that made submissions is provided under Section 3.1 and a categorisation and summary of the issues raised in submissions is provided under Section 3.2 below.

### 3.1 List of Persons and Bodies

The following table lists the persons and bodies that made written submissions. Each submission has been assigned an independent reference, which can be cross referenced against the issues set out in Section 3.2.

**Table 3.1 List of Persons/Bodies Who Made Submissions**

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Person or Body Represented</b>
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0001</a>	Marlon Claravall
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0002</a>	Adamstown Community College Parents Council
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0003</a>	Adamstown Community College Management
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0004</a>	Dept of Agriculture, Food and the Marine
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0005</a>	Himanshu Sud
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0006</a>	Stuart McKenna
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0007</a>	Michael McCabe
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0008</a>	National Transport Authority
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0009</a>	Michele UíBhuachalla
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0010</a>	Caoimhín Ua Buachalla
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0011</a>	Noel Gilligan
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0012</a>	Councillor William Lavelle
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0013</a>	Rosaleen Murphy & Una Murphy
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0014</a>	Carmel Murray
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0015</a>	Adamstown Residents Board
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0016</a>	Iarnród Éireann,
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0017</a>	Adamstown Cricket Club
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0018</a>	Frances Fitzgerald T.D Minister for Children and Youth Affairs
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0019</a>	Finnstown House Hotel Limited
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0020</a>	Adamstown Castle ETNS Management
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0021</a>	Glen Roche
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0022</a>	Tom Moriarty
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0023</a>	Robert Dowds, T.D.
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0024</a>	Finnstown Abbey/Priory-Cloisters Residents Association
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0025</a>	GVA Planning & Regeneration Ltd on Behalf of Tesco Ireland
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0026</a>	Railway Procurement Agency
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0027</a>	Fenton & Associates on behalf of Maplewood Developments (In Receivership)
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0028</a>	John Spain Associates on behalf of John A. McGreevy, Tierra Ltd
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0029</a>	Rosaleen Murphy & Una Murphy
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0030</a>	Adamstown Summer Camp (ASC)
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0031</a>	Adamstown Residents Committee
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0032</a>	Breeda De Vries
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0033</a>	The Lucan Planning Council
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0034</a>	Dr. Olga Panarina
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0035</a>	Tom Dowling

<a href="#">PDAdamRev0036</a>	Castlethorn Construction
<a href="#">PDAdamRev0037</a>	Environmental Protection Agency

### 3.2 Categorisation and Summary of Issues Raised

This section categorises and summarises the issues raised in submissions. The submission reference for each comment is included (cross reference to Table 3.1).

#### 1. General Comments in respect of the Adamstown Planning Scheme

- (i) Recommend maintenance and protection of the core planning principles which define the existing planning scheme and have characterised development to date. ([PDAdamRev0008](#))
- (ii) The plan was a fantastic plan with worldwide recognition and 10 years on it still is. ([PDAdamRev0009](#))
- (iii) Would prefer to see no further development and be surrounded by green fields than irreversible 3 bed semi detached houses or similar. ([PDAdamRev0009](#))
- (iv) Oppose any amendment to the Adamstown SDZ Planning Scheme. ([PDAdamRev0010](#))
- (v) Strongly oppose any change to the 2003 SDZ Planning Scheme. ([PDAdamRev0009](#) [PDAdamRev0011](#))
- (vi) Chose to live in Adamstown because of the excellent planning scheme and will be very disappointed and dismayed if the planning scheme is changed. ([PDAdamRev0010](#) [PDAdamRev0011](#))
- (vii) Challenge for the future of the SDZ - balance the two competing needs of kick-starting the type of development which the market wants with the imperative of protecting the 'Adamstown Concept'. ([PDAdamRev0012](#))
- (viii) Adamstown Station is a key focal point of the SDZ lands. Welcome initiatives and development which seek to; enhance the role of the station, improve access to/from the station particularly for cyclists/pedestrians and encourage modal shift from private to public transport. ([PDAdamRev0016](#))
- (ix) Original plan was good and is still good, just rolling out a little slower. The theory of the original plan does not change, development is slow everywhere and will remain slow for a few years. Sales have continued in Adamstown, and are probably ahead of most areas in Dublin. A shame to revert back to the old days of row after row of houses. Original plan should remain in place. ([PDAdamRev0021](#))
- (x) Adamstown from the train looks like a ghost town; there should be advertising to show the best that is Adamstown from the train. If commercial development at the train station was not going to develop in the next few years, the car park could be moved in front of the station. ([PDAdamRev0021](#))
- (xi) Adamstown SDZ is the first real attempt to right the wrongs inflicted on those in Lucan and Clondalkin through bad planning and corruption. What was planned was exceptional. It would be a pity to take fright given the economic circumstances and revert back to the boring, uninspiring sameness that has characterised residential development since the foundation of the state. Appreciate that plans need to be modified slightly but it is time we trusted the planners and rely on their professional vision rather than Adamstown being developer led. SDCC should put its stamp on what constitutes sustainable and appropriate development into the future and hold the line on this. ([PDAdamRev0022](#))
- (xii) Great care would need to be taken to avoid the creation of a homogenous community which would in effect turn the area in to a huge housing estate

- and re-create the social problems that were seen in other area of south-west Dublin in the Late 70's and 80's. ([PDAdamRev0024](#))
- (xiii) Hope that the development of Adamstown will continue as originally envisaged, with strong focus on sustainable transport modes as this will contribute to a more sustainable transport environment in Dublin. ([PDAdamRev0026](#))
  - (xiv) Maplewood receiver is continuing to complete and sell houses in Adamstown. It is the intention of the Receiver and Bank to continue to complete, construct and sell units in Adamstown. Bank and Receiver note their commitment to the long term success of the Adamstown development and SDZ. ([PDAdamRev0027](#))
  - (xv) Requested that revised planning scheme caters for flexibility and that specific matters (such as material finishes; car parking; requirements for increased quality or standards etc) are not mandatory but are catered for at pre planning stage. ([PDAdamRev0027](#))
  - (xvi) The shape of development areas could be refined, where necessary to match ownerships. ([PDAdamRev0027](#))
  - (xvii) Relationship with additional adjoining undeveloped lands that could be incorporated into the SDZ in the future needs to be considered. ([PDAdamRev0027](#))
  - (xviii) Hope further construction is given a lot more thought and that the original Adamstown vision is not forgotten. ([PDAdamRev0031](#))
  - (xix) Concern that review of the Scheme may result in a reduction or complete loss of the level or quality of public benefits delivered by the scheme, such as the front-loading of infrastructure, provision of amenities and strict adherence to the planning scheme. ([PDAdamRev0033](#))
  - (xx) Concerns re legal status of any changes that may be proposed to the SDZ scheme and possibility that the scheme may fall. Trust that the Council will, as will we, take legal advice on the implications of any proposed changes. ([PDAdamRev0033](#))
  - (xxi) The amended and award winning scheme presented the best way forward for future planning moving away from the 3 bed semi-detached urban sprawl. The blue print for Adamstown is still a good one. The economic downturn is the reason for the stall, the area is well served with infrastructure for this stage of completions and the design and layout of units is to a high standard. ([PDAdamRev0035](#))
  - (xxii) There is a huge contrast between the aesthetically pleasing feel of Castlethorn's Castlegate Area and Maplewood's The Paddocks which has been left in a very unsatisfactory state. ([PDAdamRev0035](#))
  - (xxiii) Residential density, commercial development and social and physical infrastructure requirements of the scheme must be significantly moderated to ensure the Planning Scheme is viable and capable of being implemented over a reasonable timeframe. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))

## **2. Design Statement**

- (i) The architectural and urban design objectives of the planning scheme need to be reviewed in terms of whether the qualitative expectation is reasonable and deliverable. Expectations of urban grain, form, animation and finish of commercial development and landscaping within public realm should be moderated. Welcome publication of DMURS for facilitation of a more intimate pedestrian orientated urban character of the development. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))

### 3. Development Density

- (i) Recognise/support need to revisit the Adamstown SDZ. In terms of the nature and scale of development, would seek to retain the residential mix of uses and density supported in the current SDZ. ([PDAdamRev0008](#))
- (ii) Strongly oppose and reduction in density. ([PDAdamRev0009](#))
- (iii) Oppose amendment that will reduce the population densities. Reduction in population densities will have the following effect; fewer facilities and services because of smaller population; reduced public transport services; increase in private car traffic; decreased passive surveillance security and fewer local businesses and employment opportunities. ([PDAdamRev0010](#)  
[PDAdamRev0011](#))
- (iv) Existing Adamstown residents expressed their strong desire to protect the 'Adamstown Concept' from any drift to low density developer led building. ([PDAdamRev0012](#))
- (v) Believe it is possible to balance the two competing needs of kick-starting the type of development which the market wants with the imperative of protecting the 'Adamstown Concept' by modifying residential mix and maintaining sustainable medium densities and the Adamstown character. Strongly support the revision of the residential mix, while maintaining medium level densities to allow for the development of more town-houses and less apartment and duplexes. Support appropriately designed perimeter blocks involving terraces of houses with duplex/apartments on the corners allowing for up to 80% housing. ([PDAdamRev0012](#))
- (vi) Note that 40% of the permitted housing is currently built/occupied; welcome initiatives that encourage the completion of the lands to agreed SDZ targets given the clustering of developments around the rail station. ([PDAdamRev0016](#))
- (vii) The provision of family housing, in the form of terraced town-housing, can be achieved with a framework of sustainable medium density plan-led development. ([PDAdamRev0018](#))
- (viii) Have concerns that proposed change to the development would introduce a lower density housing model. Any proposed changes in the density of future development would effectively allow the developers to avoid having to provide the essential facilities and services that made the region such an attractive place to live. ([PDAdamRev0024](#))
- (ix) Recommend not to allow any changes in housing density/facilities ratio that would allow the developer to renege on his original contractual obligations. ([PDAdamRev0024](#))
- (x) If existing densities are revised a more viable and sustainable housing product can be catered for. ([PDAdamRev0027](#))
- (xi) Current scheme expresses densities in terms of plot ratio and residential yield as units per hectare. Changes have occurred in the 10 years since adoption in terms of Building Regulations, guidelines on dwelling sizes and in the housing market, impacting on the net density that can be delivered on the ground. Adamstown is an outer suburban location and should be developed in that context providing for a wide mix of dwelling types that can cater for *inter alia* family type dwellings. Cognisance should be given to the type of dwellings that are sustainable in the long term.
  - Request that current density targets be reduced such that housing can be delivered to meet need and demand.
  - The Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas Guidelines 2009 state that Outer Suburban/Greenfield sites should have densities

in the range of 35-50 units per hectare (net). The SDZ scheme set out the following net density targets; Airlie Stud (40-48 units/ha) Somerton (35-42 units/ha) Tobermaclugg Village (45-54 units/ha) Tandy's Lane Village (50-60 units/ha) and St. Helen's (65-78 units/ha).

- Larger unit types can cater for a larger population but if there is an emphasis on units per hectare then there may be no change to the population figure such units cater for. This will impact on the diversity of the community and character of the area. Revisions should include a bed-space per hectare ratio. This provides for a more realistic and market flexible development and flexibility to provide housing that will satisfy market demand. Note: table submitted detailing relationship between unit types and density in terms of units per hectare and bed spaces per hectare.
  - Overall density targets should be reduced. Density targets for Tobermaclugg Village, Tandy's Lane Village and St. Helens areas should be reduced and bed-space per hectare ration introduced, as opposed to units per hectare only.
  - Welcome access to empirical evidence Development Agency has; and the identification of any specific schemes in Dublin and what density they delivered.
  - If the Planning Scheme used a density based on bed-spaces rather than density per hectare it would allow for greater flexibility for developers in terms of types of units they could provide. ([PDAdamRev0028](#))
  - Permissions granted to February 2011 to build a similar density scheme at Clonburris. What has changed planners thinking since 2011 putting lower Density back on the table? Economy will return over next few years. At the moment the problem is with access to mortgages so why change now? ([PDAdamRev0035](#))
- (xii) Strongly object to continued development of 3 bed houses currently under construction: do not fit the design or over all look of Adamstown; and are a poor comparison to existing buildings. If such middle/low density type construction were to continue we will end up having an urban sprawl lacking amenities and facilities. This is not what residents bought into. ([PDAdamRev0031](#))
- (xiii) Public transport frequency has not increased; higher density should bring more services. Would like to see all commitments around density linking to more frequent public transport service at Adamstown honoured. ([PDAdamRev0035](#))
- (xiv) Expected population growth in the GDA means we cannot return to sprawl of past 20 years. Lowering the density of Adamstown will make the town centre unviable. The key to Adamstown is to create employment close to residents. ([PDAdamRev0035](#))
- (xv) Density ranges are very high, particularly closest to the Rail Station. Range from 43-50 dwellings per hectare up to 75 dwellings plus for Adamstown Square, Boulevard and Station. Development at 75 dwellings per hectare necessitates heavy predominance of apartments and duplexes and incorporation of basement car parking.
- Review provides the opportunity to kick start development through a recalibration of density requirements as a whole for Adamstown and the promotion of innovative housing design and layout, providing for delivery of much greater proportion of own-door housing.

- The key challenge going forward will be to facilitate an appropriate density of development that responds to built context, proximity to rail station and has regard to high densities and housing types that have been delivered to date. An appropriate relaxation of residential density would facilitate development which is in demand and improve diversity in terms of the resident and community profile while meeting the lifecycle requirements of existing community.
- Higher densities will not be deliverable in an outer suburban location such as Adamstown. Capital costs of delivering dense typologies will not be supported by the achievable sales price in the short to medium term.
- Landowners have experience in providing efficient schemes of predominantly own-door housing. Residential schemes comprising entirely own-door housing can be comfortably achieved at densities of 35 dwellings per hectare - pushed as high as 40 dwellings per hectare in more urban configuration. Pelletstown development at 48 dwellings per hectare comprising 146 houses and 62 apartments/duplexes. Medium density scheme of entirely own door housing in Stepside comprising 126 houses on net site of 3.5 hectares. A density of 40 dwellings per hectare represents the 'tipping point' beyond which capital intensive apartments and duplexes must be incorporated to reach higher densities.
- Densities beyond 40 dwellings per hectare necessitate the incorporation of some apartments and/or duplexes. 45 dwellings / hectare necessitates c. 15% apartments/duplexes. 50 dwellings / hectare necessitates 30% provision of apartments/duplexes. In the virtually complete Adamstown Castle development at 53 dwellings to the hectare on net site area of 12.15 hectares only 192 houses at most will be delivered, representing 30% of the total number of units being developed. Square III permission at Adamstown for 177 dwellings represents highly efficient and innovative medium density scheme of 150 houses and 27 apartments on site of 4 hectares; requires 15% of dwellings to be provided in apartments to achieve net residential density of 44 dwellings per hectare.
- Fundamental review of residential density requirements must start with National Planning Policy Documents which set out densities within and beyond 1km of light rail stop / rail station. In Adamstown 5 development areas are within 1km of the Rail Station and 6 are located outside 1km. A table provided sets out the minimum densities required to comply with national policy, giving an average of 42 dwellings / ha and 6,525 units.
- Sustainable minimum overall density target of 43 dwellings per hectare would result in modest overall reduction of just over 20% from the minimum allowable under the current scheme. There is opportunity for local variation in scale, built form and dwelling types within each development tile. The application of two broad bands of density could lead to a less diverse environment.
- A second table is submitted setting out suggested proposal for more viable yet sustainable densities that could be delivered in the short to medium term achieving an average density range of 42-50 dwellings / ha and 6,575-7,675 dwellings overall (Summary: Castle 42-50 dwelling/ha; Somerton, Airlie Stud, Tobermaclugg Village and Tubber Lane 35-42 dwellings/ha; Tandy's Lane Village, St. Helen's, Aderrig 42-50 dwellings/ha, Square and Boulevard 50-60 dwellings/ha and Station 60-90 dwellings /ha). We do not purport to speak for other developers in setting out the suggested densities. Proposal seeks to address the unfeasible densities currently prescribed for the development tiles closest to Adamstown Rail Station.

- Southern tiles are most sustainable in terms of proximity to rail station and existing community facilities. Development around the station will help build critical mass necessary to secure major convenience retail anchor and facilitate incremental delivery of the District Centre.
- Believe there may be potential for further reductions in density below 35 dwellings per hectare along the periphery of the SDZ. Densities at 35-42 could be developed entirely as own door housing; densities at 42-50 would require at least 10% apartments and duplexes; 50-60 dwellings will necessitate minimum of 30% apartments and duplexes and 60-90 dwellings per hectare would be predominantly apartments and duplexes. Design criteria provided for each scenario.
- The Clongriffin/Baldoyle (North Fringe) LAP 2012, DCC, allows for consideration of a number of bed-spaces per hectare as an alternative, complimentary means of measuring residential density to that of number of dwellings per hectare. Typical dwelling is assumed to represent 5 bed spaces; that is a 3 bed apartment, duplex or house comprising two doubles and a single bedroom. A density of 50 dwellings per hectare would equate to 250 bed-spaces per hectare; 35dph equates to 175 bed spaces per hectare. Table provided of consideration of actual bed-spaces provided in Square III - equivalent density in terms of bed-spaces per hectare based on assumed average of 5 bed-spaces per dwellings be applied to each density band under a revised planning scheme to encourage modest shift towards own door housing and improve the feasibility and likelihood of development recommencing at Adamstown.
- Fortunestown LAP 2001 adopted net residential densities of 35-50 dwellings per hectare to facilitate the provision of own door housing with higher end of range to be provided within 5 minute walk of Luas stops. 5 minute walk (500 metres). 1km is normal catchment as advocated for higher density development with respect to rail based transport. Planning authority must be consistent with issue of residential density, to do otherwise would be inequitable and would give competitive advantage to one strategic land bank in the County over another. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))

#### **4. Building Type and Height**

- (i) Consider lowering required building heights, esp. for perimeter buildings. Requirements for 4/5 storey perimeter buildings (esp. residential) should be significantly reduced. Good design with the use of good material can deliver high quality, modern housing; the necessity to have high buildings does not necessarily lead to good design. High buildings will not cater for large family type units; there are associated management costs, likely underground car parking and no demand for same. ([PDAdamRev0027](#))

#### **5. Landmark Buildings**

- (i) Significantly reduce or omit required heights for landmark buildings. No of landmark buildings on Maplewood Lands (c. 15) is excessive and landmark building requirements need to be re-examined in terms of height, floorspace, indicative number and location. Landmarks through design/art features could be introduced as opposed to landmark buildings. ([PDAdamRev0027](#))

## 6. Building Language and Finishes

- (i) Maintenance fees are far too high; maintenance costs should be considered when planning/building apartments e.g. low maintenance materials, common areas lights with sensors, less wood panelling. ([PDAdamRev0021](#))
- (ii) Would not like to see a diminution in the quality or range of materials used. Any redesign of units should incorporate current regulations of thermal and sound insulation. Statutory minimum required levels should be exceeded in all cases. ([PDAdamRev0033](#))

## 7. Dwelling Size

- (i) Size of units should be increased to provide greater levels of floorspace to residents. Recommend DCC floor space levels should be adopted. ([PDAdamRev0033](#))

## 8. Dwelling Type

- (i) Stop Building Houses. ([PDAdamRev0001](#))
- (ii) Welcome more diverse unit types; granting large number of 2 bed apartments was poor planning. Focus should shift to large more family friendly units and houses. ([PDAdamRev0015](#))
- (iii) Review Adamstown SDZ to provide more family-friendly terraced town-housing while protecting the character of Adamstown. ([PDAdamRev0018](#))
- (iv) Irish people are hesitant about buying apartments for the following reasons; insufficient storage space compared to apartments on the Continent; there are no bicycle storage areas. If proper storage areas were provided it would be easier to sell apartments especially to families. ([PDAdamRev0021](#))
- (v) It appears that houses are currently being built instead of high density units and they already look out of place. ([PDAdamRev0021](#))
- (vi) As a result of the changes to the housing market (inc. credit restrictions/ price reductions) there is little or no demand for apartments/duplex units. Vast majority of potential purchasers are demanding 3/4 bedroom houses. Consideration must be given to delivering 3/4 bed family units in the lower density areas of Adamstown. Housing can be delivered in detached, semi-detached and terraced forms. ([PDAdamRev0027](#))
- (vii) Would support change to 2/3 bed dwellings by amalgamating the footprint of two or more single bed units. This should provide a more suitable (and saleable) dwelling with no loss of public space and only a slight overall rise in the population density. ([PDAdamRev0033](#))
- (viii) New residential schemes are competing with existing housing stock across the city and beyond. New housing carries a range of real costs older housing do not; space and energy standards, Social and Affordable housing contributions and VAT. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))

## 9. Boundary Treatment

- (i) New developments adjoining built or soon-to-be-built residential areas should include a condition requiring attractive boundary treatment to any 'active' building site i.e. hoarding set back behind planted mound of earth ,further protected by green Harris fencing. ([PDAdamRev0012](#))

## 10. Road Network

- (i) Traffic flow, particularly around schools, increased significantly - must consider traffic flow management including one way systems in school zones ([PDAdamRev0003](#))
- (ii) Link road connecting Castlegate and Tandys Lane with The Paddocks needs to be completed. ([PDAdamRev0005](#))
- (iii) It is critically important that the opening of the north south link road to link the Paddock and Castlegate/Adamstown Square area is prioritised. ([PDAdamRev0012](#))
- (iv) There is a need to introduce a one-way system for traffic flow in the vicinity of schools ([PDAdamRev0012](#))
- (v) Residents require access to and from The Paddocks and Castlegate from surrounding residential areas. Residents currently relying on a 'gap in the hedge' at the corner of The Paddocks and Meadowview Grove/Hillcrest Walk. Request that this gap is upgraded; provides vital link into the site as well as to access to bus stops on the N4. ([PDAdamRev0013](#))
- (vi) Request that North/South Road be completed to provide a proper link road from The Paddocks to Station Road. This would offer an alternative to the car for Paddocks residents. ([PDAdamRev0013](#))
- (vii) Speed limits need to be enforced with speed ramps. ([PDAdamRev0013](#))
- (viii) Suggest a one way system for station road to combat dangerous parking and drop off at schools. ([PDAdamRev0013](#))
- (ix) Link road should be completed as a matter of priority to connect the Paddock and Castlegate. ([PDAdamRev0014](#))
- (x) Link road is not in use, this is a wasted piece of infrastructure; SDCC could use the road as a focal point for initial new phases and when the road opens it should be done so in tandem with the introduction of traffic calming measures. ([PDAdamRev0015](#))
- (xi) Many families are travelling to primary schools from the Paddocks to Adamstown Castle. Request that the road linking these two areas of Adamstown be opened. ([PDAdamRev0020](#))
- (xii) Road between Adamstown and The Paddocks could be opened earlier; completing the area, providing better access between estates and open up access to train station/shops/schools and to Dodosboro. ([PDAdamRev0021](#))
- (xiii) Suggest cycle lane put in along the Newcastle Road going from Superquinn to Adamstown continuing further to Lucan Sarsfield or to the new Canal Walk. ([PDAdamRev0021](#))
- (xiv) The access road from The Paddocks to the rest of Adamstown should be completed and opened as soon as possible. ([PDAdamRev0023](#))
- (xv) Proper link road for all of Adamstown (partially built but not in use). ([PDAdamRev0024](#))
- (xvi) Access required to and from The Paddocks and Castlegate. Request that the north/south road be finished to link The Paddocks to Station Road. This could be used by children travelling to school on foot. ([PDAdamRev0029](#))
- (xvii) Speed limits need to be properly enforced inc. speed ramps. ([PDAdamRev0029](#))
- (xviii) Suggest a one way system be introduced for Station Road to combat dangerous parking when children are being dropped off. ([PDAdamRev0029](#))
- (xix) Propose expeditious completion of the link road between Castlegate and The Paddocks to improve connectivity facilitating access to infrastructure and allowing children in The Paddocks to cycle safely to school and reduce isolation for The Paddocks residents. ([PDAdamRev0030](#))
- (xx) Area of most concern; access to Adamstown south specifically the train station. ([PDAdamRev0032](#))

- (xxi) Not joining up Castlegate and the Paddocks has left all infrastructure in the Castlegate Area. ([PDAdamRev0035](#))
- (xxii) Landowner is conscious of strong resident desire, particularly within The Paddocks to see completion of Loop Road No 1. The haul road along this route was funded by Chartridge Developments Ltd and Landowners will liaise with development partner, funders and the Planning Authority with a view to facilitating completion of this road at as early a stage as possible, probably through Chartridge. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))

## 11. Streets / Car Parking / Public Areas

- (i) Parking in bus lane on Adamstown Avenue and kerb parking happening every day and night and is dangerous. Double yellow lines are needed on every kerb. ([PDAdamRev0001](#))
- (ii) Car parking spaces should be allocated for each residence. ([PDAdamRev0003](#) [PDAdamRev0005](#))
- (iii) Provide wide roads which facilitate on street parking. ([PDAdamRev0015](#))
- (iv) Footpath at Lucan Sarsfields needs to be improved providing better access to facilities. ([PDAdamRev0021](#))
- (v) In the Paddocks roads are too narrow with not enough parking spaces. ([PDAdamRev0032](#))
- (vi) Huge problem with parking. The numbers of spaces is extremely low. There are less spaces on the Dodsboro side of The Paddocks and the roads are narrower. ([PDAdamRev0034](#))
- (vii) Request a revision of parking ratios for future developments to reflect the realities of private car demand and of public transport capacity and effectiveness. An assessment (at night-time and early mornings) of existing parking levels in both parts of Adamstown requested with report back to Elected Members. Suggest the need to provide new overflow parking areas close to existing residential areas. ([PDAdamRev0012](#))
- (viii) Ratio of parking spaces to units needs to be radically increased. ([PDAdamRev0015](#))
- (ix) Revised scheme should cater for both on street/communal parking and on curtilage parking across the SDZ. On each plot of land, good design will prevail. How each scheme deals with associated parking should be a design solution rather than a prerequisite. ([PDAdamRev0027](#))
- (x) Parking in Adamstown (esp. in The Paddocks) is grossly inadequate. Communal parking creates strained relations amongst residents. Residents have abandoned allocated underground parking. ([PDAdamRev0030](#))
- (xi) In the Paddocks the roads are simply too narrow with not enough parking spaces. ([PDAdamRev0032](#))
- (xii) Recommend that if apartment units were amalgamated, that the number of parking places in the scheme be reduced and the space released for soft landscaping. ([PDAdamRev0033](#))
- (xiii) If units cannot be completed adjacent to The Paddocks Crescent, environment should be made to look nice and useful by converting to green space and parking space. There is a huge problem with parking; the numbers of spaces is extremely low. ([PDAdamRev0034](#))
- (xiv) Change of design in parking spaces along with increasing road widths and providing 'tilted parking' could increase parking spaces. Parallel parking is a waste of space. ([PDAdamRev0034](#))
- (xv) Car parking to be accommodated at grade. Cost associated with providing parking underground cannot be sustained. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))

- (xvi) Residents have serious concerns at the delays in completing boundaries, public lighting, road services and the taking in charge of some areas of Adamstown, including The Paddocks and areas adjacent to schools. ([PDAdamRev0012](#))

## 12. Parks and Public Open Spaces

- (i) Construction compound adjacent to Castlegate Close could be replaced with play area - streets have become play area. Safety issue for children playing between parked cars. ([PDAdamRev0001](#) [PDAdamRev0006](#))
- (ii) Play area needed for children and park for all kids. Children are playing on main streets. ([PDAdamRev0005](#))
- (iii) Tandys Lane Park should be incrementally developed on a phased basis, starting immediately. Provide a facility for Adamstown Cricket Club as well as more pocket parks at an early stage in residential areas. ([PDAdamRev0012](#))
- (iv) Green spaces play areas and separate areas for ball playing are badly needed. The Paddocks does not have as many trees and small green areas as Castlegate. ([PDAdamRev0013](#))
- (v) Playgrounds, tennis courts, handball alleys, basketball courts and open green areas are required. Children are using streets as playgrounds; this is dangerous with fast traffic. ([PDAdamRev0014](#))
- (vi) The community has difficulty accessing the existing playing pitches as operation outsourced. Would like the introduction of playing pitches that puts the communities' needs first - controlled by 3rd part e.g. SDCC. ([PDAdamRev0015](#))
- (vii) Public parks an undelivered promise. Fundamentally important that public parks are given adequate priority in the early phases of any new plans. ([PDAdamRev0015](#))
- (viii) Need more playing fields in Adamstown with at least two allocated cricket grounds with security boundary and permanents changing and tea making facility. Require the provision to lay cricket nets training facility to required size and specifications. Cricket is the majority sport in Adamstown; it is regrettable that there is no cricket ground allotted to the club within Adamstown. Children playing cricket on the paths and roads of Adamstown is not safe. ([PDAdamRev0017](#))
- (ix) Adamstown is a very young town and as children grow it is vital that more sports playing fields are made available – no sports playing fields available to the young people outside of school hours. ([PDAdamRev0017](#))
- (x) Request that planned parkland contiguous to the link road be developed. ([PDAdamRev0020](#))
- (xi) Could garden plots be fit into the development? ([PDAdamRev0021](#))
- (xii) People in Adamstown are not aware of the football fields - signage should be provided. ([PDAdamRev0021](#))
- (xiii) A dedicated cricket pitch would be beneficial. Cricket and hurling are played in Adamstown Park where small children are playing. This is potentially dangerous. ([PDAdamRev0021](#))
- (xiv) Open areas that were intended as building sites should be grassed and made available as play / recreation space in the interim (those that are large enough), given that in some cases it may be years before building is commenced. ([PDAdamRev0023](#))
- (xv) Open Green Space (completely absent). ([PDAdamRev0024](#))
- (xvi) Green spaces and play areas are badly needed. The Paddocks does not have as many trees and green spaces as Castlegate. Specific play areas for

- younger children and separate areas for ball playing are required. ([PDAdamRev0029](#))
- (xvii) Adamstown needs well designed landscaped areas and playgrounds for children. ([PDAdamRev0030](#))
  - (xviii) A playground and green area for children is really badly needed. ([PDAdamRev0032](#))
  - (xix) The amount of public space in the scheme is already too low and any changes to the scheme must result in a significant increase in the amount of public space. ([PDAdamRev0033](#))
  - (xx) All open space and public areas should be public open space and not private open space. ([PDAdamRev0033](#))
  - (xxi) There is a huge demand for open green space for kids to place and families to socialise-as friendly community is one of the key points of Adamstown. ([PDAdamRev0034](#))
  - (xxii) If units cannot be completed adjacent to The Paddocks Crescent then the environment should be made to look nice and useful by converting this deserted land to green space and parking space. ([PDAdamRev0034](#))
  - (xxiii) Design and specification of Tandys Lane Park; if it proves feasible to deliver would need to be fundamentally reconsidered in terms of design and specification. Residential development in Tandys Lane Village and St. Helens important to address and passively supervise the park. Landowner willing to explore the potential to bring forward a more rational and conventional design for Tandy's Lane Park at an earlier phase of development than suggested in the planning scheme with at least one playing field and children's playground. This is outside of Castlethorn ownership and will be dependent on the active involvement of development partners. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))

### 13. Community Facilities

- (i) School is lacking an indoor sports facility. ([PDAdamRev0002](#))
- (ii) Adamstown Community College has no indoor sports facility and extremely limited outdoor space available. This may have an impact on ability to deliver mandatory physical activity from 2014 and college is at a disadvantage compared to others schools in Lucan. Developers have a responsibility to provide sports hall. ([PDAdamRev0003](#))
- (iii) SDCC have a responsibility to provide community facilities for the residents of Lucan/Adamstown. ([PDAdamRev0003](#))
- (iv) Provision of the Community Centre is vital to facilitating the consolidation of a vibrant community life in Adamstown and to maintaining confidence in the SDZ delivery model. ([PDAdamRev0012](#))
- (v) Community Centre is badly needed for all residents' esp. young people - currently hanging around in underground car parks. ([PDAdamRev0013](#))
- (vi) Adamstown Community College has over 750 pupils with no access to a sport hall; sports hall would benefit the students as well as the entire community and should be made a priority in the future of the SDZ. ([PDAdamRev0015](#))
- (vii) New Community Centre should be required before construction begins on any future development. Work should commence on a community centre in tandem with any new construction in the SDZ. ([PDAdamRev0015](#))
- (viii) Community centres with indoor cricket training facilities are required; standard size community hall would be sufficient with volunteers available to manage and maintain such a training facility. ([PDAdamRev0017](#))
- (ix) Adamstown is a great model town and the cricket club has attracted people to move to Adamstown. Further development is needed to continue Adamstown's progress with the right facilities at the right time handed over to

- the right organisations for correct management and maintenance. ([PDAdamRev0017](#))
- (x) Strongly support the delivery of the promised community/sports hall next to Adamstown Community College. ([PDAdamRev0018](#))
  - (xi) The original plan for Adamstown included a sports centre and all weather pitch which were to be available to the schools during term time. The school buildings are to a high specification but are built on very confined sites. The primary schools currently have two basketball courts and a small playground for approximately 450 pupils. When at full capacity the three schools in Adamstown will be catering for over two thousand pupils with no sports facilities. ([PDAdamRev0020](#))
  - (xii) A community centre, recommended in the plan for every 1,000 dwelling units has not yet been delivered. Since 2007 the Primary Schools have acted as the de-facto community centre for the numerous groups which are now active in the Adamstown Area. Shortly the primary schools will not be in a position to offer rooms to these groups soon as they will be at capacity. ([PDAdamRev0020](#))
  - (xiii) Community Centre, Sports Hall, Public Swimming Pool are completely absent. ([PDAdamRev0024](#))
  - (xiv) Existing requirement for Community Centre in Tubber Lane. More appropriate to provide larger community buildings in central locations, such as district or local centres. Suggest a reduced number of facilities with no requirement for a community building in Area 5. ([PDAdamRev0028](#))
  - (xv) Community Centre is badly needed for all residents' especially young people - teenagers are gathering at underground car parks in The Paddocks. ([PDAdamRev0029](#))
  - (xvi) Absence of a community centre in Adamstown is a major constraint to the realising of full potential of Adamstown Summer Camp - currently using primary schools to meet and host camps. ([PDAdamRev0030](#))
  - (xvii) Adamstown Community in dire need of community sports hall. Adamstown Community College students have to practise sports in the open area adjoining the college. ([PDAdamRev0030](#))
  - (xviii) Lack of community facilities, the marketing suite would make an ideal community meeting room. ([PDAdamRev0032](#))
  - (xix) Advertising the opening of a sports complex and swimming pool for 2009 was reckless; residents are more upset by false advertising. ([PDAdamRev0035](#))
  - (xx) Adamstown Community College still without a sports hall. ([PDAdamRev0035](#))
  - (xxi) No public pool exists in Lucan; the only major urban area in South Dublin not to have one. This is one of the first amenities the developer will ask to be removed under this review because of costs. Chartridge Developments opposed and succeeded in preventing a planning application for the development of a 20 metre pool at Finnstown House Hotel on the grounds that one would be developed in Adamstown. ([PDAdamRev0035](#))
  - (xxii) No stated basis for community centre provision in the scheme; believe requirement is overstated and unnecessary. Landowner has delivered community rooms of such scale in other residential communities. We propose that facilities are likely to become a charge or burden on the local residents in terms of utilities, maintenance and insurance costs. Suggest Planning Authority should reconsider the appropriateness of requiring so many community facilities, their size and means of funding and ongoing management and maintenance. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))
  - (xxiii) Landowner intends to honour commitment to provide sports hall for Adamstown Community College which would act as a community facility and resource for wider community. However it is not reasonable or appropriate to expect private development to carry the full capital burden of delivering a

series of speculative and somewhat questionable community facilities. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))

- (xxiv) Landowner is compliant with respect to phasing requirements of Planning Scheme based on quantum of residential development- suggest that the role of the school halls, both existing and proposed be acknowledged and specifically taken into account with respect to analysis of the need for future built community facilities in Adamstown. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))
- (xxv) Suggest Tandys Lane Park could be substituted with the planned leisure centre, incorporating swimming pool and all weather pitches in terms of timing under the phasing sequence. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))
- (xxvi) Delivery of the leisure centre is market dependent; pushing this facility back a phase would allow flexibility in terms of allowing potential to build further critical mass to attract commercial operator to fund and develop a centre. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))

#### **14. Education/Schools**

- (i) Permission for new schools/extensions should be based on need in the local catchment. There is a concern that current decisions are impacting on integration and inclusion in Adamstown Schools. ([PDAdamRev0003](#))
- (ii) Note with concern that 3 permanent schools and one temporary school in the area have foreign national students making up in excess of 90% of the school going population. ([PDAdamRev0024](#))
- (iii) Request relocation of future school in Tandy's Lane Village to north-eastward to front onto Adamstown Drive - more prominent position; more expedient delivery based on existing roads network and would lead to a better layout for future housing. Location should be discussed with DoES. ([PDAdamRev0027](#))

#### **15. Childcare Facilities**

- (i) Current standards very high. Ratio of childcare places to residential development should be reduced to one childcare facility for every 225 dwellings. ([PDAdamRev0028](#))
- (ii) Planning authority should forecast resident population for Adamstown based on adjusted density targets and liaise with existing childcare providers in Adamstown and South Dublin Childcare Committee with the aim of identifying the overall realistic future childcare needs of Adamstown. Changing economic circumstances since the adoption of planning guidelines and up to date reports support assertion – see The National Children's Nurseries Association - *Irish Childcare In Recession; and An Analysis of the 2009 NCNA Member's Survey* refers. Landowners developed existing Giraffe operated Crèche in Adamstown and this crèche is serving the needs of Adamstown Castle, Square and The Paddocks and the wider Lucan Area and still has significant spare capacity. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))

#### **16. Shopping and Retail Services**

- (I) Substantial Commercial Centre; absent/provided at a very poor level. ([PDAdamRev0024](#))
- (II) Need commercially focussed amendments to allow the plan to be realised in full.

- The District Centre needs to be attractive to end users, avoid conflicting uses adjacent to each other, ensure appropriate floor plates, and facilitate all modes of transport including the private car.
  - Key stakeholders, particularly investors and retail operators need to be engaged to ensure that retail designations are appropriate.
  - Where a viable framework is not provided to secure the construction and occupation of key anchors such as a convenience food store, the overall District Centre is unlikely to be successful.
  - Development management policies should move towards a more evidence based system that balances development management and community planning with market demand and investor returns. It is a concern that the planning policies and development control standards contained within the SDZ to date may have curtailed the realisation of the District Centre.
  - The operational characteristics of anchor retail units should be assessed by the Planning Authority from the outset. These requirements include car accessibility, car-parking layout, delivery access and screening from adjoining land uses e.g. it may not be appropriate to locate a major anchor store adjacent to residential units, due to the issues including noise generated during servicing.
  - Acknowledge Planning Scheme is intended to deliver construction over a protracted period. No retail operators will enter the market unless it is viable and feasible to trade. Therefore, it is equally important that investors, landowners and retail operators are assured that the Scheme, when adopted, has been formulated following a review of all available market data and that sufficient policies are included to ensure that the Scheme adapt in line with the retail market.
  - Amended scheme should allow for a more comprehensive layout, which would take account of access, servicing car parking etc. with a clear justification for the location of retail. This may not necessarily require any changes to the overall quantum of retail development permissible in the Adamstown SDZ. The original scheme made provision for a minimum of 19,950 sq. m. of retail floorspace within the SDZ lands. Despite this allocation and planning permission being secured, only a single convenience store (a local Londis) has been occupied.
  - Parking standards should take account of the detailed requirements of customers, which are now reflected within planning policy; Retail Planning Guidelines, 2012 & The National Transport Authority's (NTA) Greater Dublin Area Draft Transport Strategy, 2011- 2030 (Section 8.5, 'Parking Supply'). The existing scheme does not recognise the different parking requirements generated by different forms of retail. ([PDAdamRev0025](#))
- (III) Upper ranges of non-residential floor space extremely ambitious even in 2003. There is great flexibility in the current scheme although it is pitched way too high in terms of its min and max floorspace requirements and with regard to medium term forecasts. The floorspace requirements for Adamstown Station (District Centre) are unusually specific and inflexibly narrow. Suggest the range needs to be substantially reduced to 10,000sq.m - 18,750sq.m. Min retail floor space requirements for Tobermaclugg Village and Tandy's Lane Village should be reduced to suggested min 1,500msq and max of 5,000sq.m each. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))
- (IV) Appropriateness/likelihood of any retail development of significance, other than a corner shop or two, outside village centres and the District Centre is questionable. Landowner will continue to work towards securing a major

convenience retail anchor for the District Centre. It will take significant time to achieve critical mass and realisation of mixed use urban centre; needs to be realised in phasing programme. It will not be feasible to roll out a speculative new town centre or any part thereof in a single phase of development. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))

- (V) Strongly submit that a detailed, objective and up to date retail assessment be carried out during the review and prior to the preparation of the Draft Amended Planning Scheme. Landowner intends to undertake such analysis through independent retail specialist. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))

## **17. Adamstown Castle**

- (i) Construction compound in front of Castlegate Close for 5.5 years. Construction has been complete for over 4 years; wish to have it moved. ([PDAdamRev0006](#))
- (ii) Castlegate Way and Adamstown Avenue act as a gateway into a great area; looking and feeling different and European Like. ([PDAdamRev0009](#))
- (iii) Residents have serious concerns at the delays in completing boundaries, public lighting, road services and the taking in charge of some areas of Adamstown, including The Paddocks and areas adjacent to schools. ([PDAdamRev0012](#))
- (iv) Litter is an issue in Adamstown. Bins provided at the current shop are inadequate. ([PDAdamRev0021](#))
- (v) There is a huge contrast between the aesthetically pleasing feel of Castlethorn's Castlegate Area and Maplewood's The Paddocks which has been left in a very unsatisfactory state. ([PDAdamRev0035](#))
- (vi) Unfinished sentinel building has encouraged anti-social behaviour. ([PDAdamRev0035](#))

## **18. Somerton**

- (i) Request that Traveller Accommodation requirement for Somerton be re-examined in terms of location or that requirements be spread out to other locations. Consideration current requirements for Traveller Accommodation in the County and a revised or smaller location of Traveller Accommodation rather than a large concentration within Somerton. ([PDAdamRev0027](#))
- (ii) Request investigation as to whether Fire Station in Somerton remains a current or future requirement and examine flexibility on location in conjunction with landowner. ([PDAdamRev0027](#))
- (iii) Undeveloped lands at Finnstown adjoining Somerton may be developed in the future or incorporated into the SDZ. Somerton could cater for connectivity into this area in line with sustainable development and permeability/connectivity. ([PDAdamRev0027](#))

## **19. Airlie Stud**

- (i) Complete all roads in the Paddocks. ([PDAdamRev0005](#))
- (ii) Plot of land to rear of property at Hillcrest Heights being used for anti-social behaviour by local youths - fly tipping occurring. Access to lands at rear of Hillcrest Heights gained through fence. Information is required on; who owns/is responsible for lands and fences dividing the lands (map provided) and what security measures are in place for lands between rear of property at Hillcrest and Superquinn Centre? ([PDAdamRev0007](#))

- (iii) Residents support early opening of a vehicular link to Dodosborough Road/Tandys Lane as well as formalisation through paving and construction of steps/ramp of the existing gap from the Paddocks to Hillcrest. ([PDAdamRev0012](#))
- (iv) Vehicular and pedestrian entrances into the estate are unfinished and need to be reviewed. ([PDAdamRev0014](#))
- (v) Footpaths and green areas are poorly planned and finished and give a poor impression of the estate. ([PDAdamRev0014](#))
- (vi) Amenities in the estate are non-existent. ([PDAdamRev0014](#))
- (vii) For sale signage should be removed as this contributes to the unfinished feeling in the estate. ([PDAdamRev0014](#))
- (viii) Really want the estate to be finished out in terms of what has been built or started and a quality place to live be delivered. Amenity areas help to build a community please can this be made a priority for the Paddocks. ([PDAdamRev0014](#))
- (ix) Residents have concerns about the provision of play areas at The Paddocks. ([PDAdamRev0018](#))
- (x) South eastern corner of Airlie Stud projects to the east. Could be better included in the Somerton development area, Block B/The Paddocks Grove is located in the south eastern corner of the Paddocks. Airlie Stud Development Area Boundary could be modified to terminate adjacent to these buildings while lands to the immediate east could be incorporated in the Somerton Development Area. ([PDAdamRev0027](#))
- (xi) 'Gap in the hedge' at the corner of The Paddocks and Meadowview Grove/Hillcrest Walk needs to be upgraded to increase permeability of the area. ([PDAdamRev0029](#))
- (xii) The Paddocks Drive needs to be completed however if 5 more houses are built the area for turning cars will be too narrow. A maximum of 4 more houses should be built. ([PDAdamRev0032](#))
- (xiii) Residents of The Paddocks Rise are living on an unfinished street which is adjacent to the building site at the Dodsboro Road-there are rubbish problems associated with the site affecting the residents. ([PDAdamRev0034](#))

## 20. Tubber Lane

- (i) Current scheme seeks to provide 700-850 dwellings and up to 4,250sqm of non residential development at density rate of 40-48 units per hectare. Requirement to have perimeter buildings at a height of 3/4 storeys is no longer feasible on lands at Tubber Lane. ([PDAdamRev0028](#))
- (ii) Development of lands at Tubber lane is not viable in the short to medium term with the current scheme requirements. ([PDAdamRev0028](#))
- (iii) Requested that a reduced height of 2-3 storeys be permitted in the Tubber lane lands; allowing for development of primarily family housing with 3 storeys addressing the linear park and main access roads to be delivered in the short to medium term. ([PDAdamRev0028](#))
- (iv) Request that the density range of the Tubber Lane lands be reduced to an average density of 35 units per hectare. This is considered reasonable for the area given the distance of the lands to Adamstown Train Station and would be consistent with the Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas 2009. ([PDAdamRev0028](#))
- (v) Masterplan currently being prepared for the Tubber Lane Lands illustrating how reduced densities and heights could be achieved whilst still achieving Urban Design Characteristics for Area 5. Indicative sketch of how roads,

- parking, access could be achieved with reduced heights and densities in accordance with DMURS included. ([PDAdamRev0028](#))
- (vi) Family housing development at Tubber Lane could kick start development in Adamstown. ([PDAdamRev0028](#))
  - (vii) Preliminary assessments confirm that 35 units per hectare can be achieved with almost 100% 2 and 3 storey family houses, with occasional duplex buildings on corner sites. ([PDAdamRev0028](#))
  - (viii) Tubber Lane is a low development density character area. 3 storey terraced buildings fronting the linear park and main access roads would provide a long terrace of development to linear park to encourage sense of surveillance and safety. ([PDAdamRev0028](#))
  - (ix) Developers have experienced significant difficulty in trying to sell and insure duplex apartments in the surrounding area - potential purchasers are highly mobile and demand is primarily for family housing and is price rather than location driven. ([PDAdamRev0028](#))
  - (x) Reducing densities at Tubber Lane and developing at higher density locations in proximity to the train station when demand returns would be consistent with NTA Draft Planning and Development of Large Scale Residential Development Areas in Dublin, 2012 which recommends a kick-start Incremental Development Approach for strategic residential development areas. ([PDAdamRev0028](#))
  - (xi) Key concern for development at Tubber Lane is additional costs. Planning Scheme includes ambitious proposals for parks within the SDZ area, all funded by the landowner and in turn the house purchasers; reducing affordability of units. ([PDAdamRev0028](#))

## **21. Adamstown Square**

- (i) Unfinished development in Stratton Walk; want developments complete before new housing is commenced. ([PDAdamRev0001](#))
- (ii) Landowners intend to turn attention to Square III; have a viable and implementable permission for medium density own door family orientated housing of high quality. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))

## **22. Finnstown House Hotel**

- (i) Existing SDZ Planning Scheme has indicated two 'Principal Access Roads' to the Finnstown lands while a pedestrian access is currently being maintained via the location of the leftmost access. The Scheme indicates portion of 'Existing Open Space' which appears to relate to the lands within the former grounds of Finnstown House Hotel which included a par 3 golf course. Finnstown Hotel lands appear to form a part of the overall Masterplan for the lands, without ever being included in the scheme. ([PDAdamRev0019](#))
- (ii) It is requested that all plans and images associated with the current SDZ are updated to reflect the current landholding under the ownership of Finnstown House Hotel Ltd and the fact that the remaining attendant grounds are no longer used as a golf course. ([PDAdamRev0019](#))
- (iii) Review should recognise beneficial synergy which has developed between Finnstown House Hotel and Adamstown, to the point that, notwithstanding its location outside the scheme area, it has become an integral part of the new town and will continue to be a key element of Adamstown's social infrastructure, particularly in the absence of a slower than envisioned realisation to date of the SDZ. This relationship should be strengthened. ([PDAdamRev0019](#))

- (iv) Finnstown House Hotel has temporarily permitted the local Adamstown primary schools to use the grounds for activities while Adamstown Cricket Club have requested the use of the grounds as a training area on a complimentary basis for recreation purposes. ([PDAdamRev0019](#))
- (v) It is requested that the future development potential of Finnstown House Hotel is recognised in the reviewed the SDZ as an ancillary and synergistic facility that offers accommodation, function and leisure facilities to the residents of Adamstown as well as to the wider area. ([PDAdamRev0019](#))
- (vi) Request inclusion of following objective; 'South Dublin County Council recognises that Finnstown House Hotel is a key element of the social infrastructure provision for Adamstown and complements existing and proposed facilities to be developed within the SDZ lands. The Council supports the continued enhancement of existing facilities at Finnstown House Hotel and the development of new/complementary facilities that support its continued viability'. ([PDAdamRev0019](#))

### 23. Phasing and Implementation

- (i) Need to agree on amenities before building houses. ([PDAdamRev0002](#); [PDAdamRev0005](#); [PDAdamRev0006](#))
- (ii) Confirm the role of Management Company when SDCC take over. ([PDAdamRev0005](#))
- (iii) Strongly oppose any reduction in infrastructure and facilities that would occur as a result of lower densities. ([PDAdamRev0009](#))
- (iv) Believe it is possible to balance the two competing needs through appropriate and reasonable revisions to the phasing and sequencing of infrastructure. ([PDAdamRev0012](#))
- (v) Recommend revision of phasing of residential development so as to consolidate and complete the existing built areas and to ensure that the next areas to be built will be those along the corridor of the north-south link road linking the Paddock and Castlegate/Adamstown Square areas. ([PDAdamRev0012](#))
- (vi) Seek the early delivery of three key elements of infrastructure; the promised community/sports hall, the first major park at Tandy's Lane, the proposed north-south link road. ([PDAdamRev0012](#))
- (vii) Immediate next phases of residential development should be prioritised along the north south road corridor. ([PDAdamRev0012](#))
- (viii) Failure to contain contingency in phasing requirement for a downturn in the economy; phases are set with unrealistic goals. ([PDAdamRev0015](#))
- (ix) Phases should contain sub-phases i.e. 1a,1b occurring at much lower construction thresholds e.g. every 250 units. Maximum time limit to deliver services attributed to each phases should be applied e.g. X no of units or within max of 1 year. ([PDAdamRev0015](#))
- (x) Houses should be put in place in tandem with adequate transport and road infrastructure. ([PDAdamRev0015](#))
- (xi) New schools should be factored in at early stages of construction. ([PDAdamRev0015](#))
- (xii) Residents have serious concerns at the delays in completing public lighting and road surfaces. ([PDAdamRev0018](#))
- (xiii) Support the timely completion of taking in charge of all residential areas in the SDZ. ([PDAdamRev0018](#))
- (xiv) While it is understood that the economic crises has impacted on the progress of the development, it is felt that a change in the emphasis should still have

- the provision of facilities and services for the population of Adamstown at its core. ([PDAdamRev0020](#))
- (xv) The only change that should be made to the SDZ is the phasing. ([PDAdamRev0021](#))
  - (xvi) Consider Adamstown at its present developmental stage to be greatly lacking in the public services that would allow the area thrive as a standalone entity. Recommend that scheme insists on the provision of the majority of these facilities before further residential development proceeds. Recommend to retain the contractual obligation of the developers to complete provision of the facilities that were originally agreed. ([PDAdamRev0024](#))
  - (xvii) In light of the infrastructure provided to date; much of which is ahead of phasing schedule, request that future development be allowed to proceed without further delivery of such infrastructure until such time it becomes economically and financially viable to do so. Non critical pieces of infrastructure could occur at later phases e.g. delivery of Tandys Lane Park in Phase 4 which is required to cater for a population of 2,600 persons. The delivery of such non critical items should occur when the units are occupied as opposed to granted planning permission. Regard must be paid to the need for necessary and pragmatic physical works such as roads and drainage etc and optional works such as parks, community centres etc prior to housing being delivered. There is a need for development to commence/proceed in Adamstown which will fund further development and allow for a larger residential base that will sustain the viability for other elements within the SDZ such as commercial/retail, parks and community centres etc. ([PDAdamRev0027](#))
  - (xviii) Request more flexible approach to phasing, one which allows lower density areas to process in the short term provided the necessary road infrastructure is in place. Tubber Lane lands should be allowed to proceed initially provided the east-west link from The Paddocks is in place. Planning scheme should allow for smaller phases of development to proceed on an incremental basis. ([PDAdamRev0028](#))
  - (xix) Request reduction in number of remaining units required to complete phase two to facilitate a speedy delivery of facilities and infrastructure. Threshold for the delivery of facilities in each phase should be time related; recommend significantly reducing number of dwelling units in each phase. ([PDAdamRev0030](#))
  - (xx) Would like to see the completion of any structures or buildings that have commenced. ([PDAdamRev0033](#))
  - (xxi) Any revival must not be at the expense of infrastructural commitments made under the original plan. Any changes to the plan will allow the developers to renege/remove firm commitments made to deliver future infrastructure as set out and achieved in the plan by local groups appealing the decision to An Bord Pleanala. ([PDAdamRev0035](#))
  - (xxii) Believe that changes to the plan are veiled attempt by developers>Nama to remove key and expensive infrastructural amenities. ([PDAdamRev0035](#))
  - (xxiii) Landowner has constructed almost 1,000 dwellings at Adamstown and delivered associated communal and public open space including c.1 acre neighbourhood park and playground within Adamstown castle and neighbourhood centre facilities including crèche as well as key physical and social infrastructure as delivered by Chartridge Developments of Adamstown Rail Station, Link Road, two primary schools, a secondary school and substantial roll out of water supply and drainage infrastructure and public utilities across a wide area and significant delivery of internal distributor roads. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))

- (xxiv) Landowner currently on site developing unfinished infill areas within Adamstown Square and Castle with a view to consolidating and completing development as far as possible and exploring means of delivering on commitments to provide sports hall for Adamstown Community College. Development of lands in St. Helens and west from developed Paddocks area into Tobermaclugg would appear to be the logical next sequential phases of development. This is dependent on ability to realise a sustainable mix of dwelling types that responds to market demands and ability to develop in an incremental manner. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))
- (xxv) Delivery of the leisure centre is market dependent; pushing this facility back a phase would allow flexibility in terms of allowing potential to build further critical mass to attract commercial operator to fund and develop a centre. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))
- (xxvi) Items of infrastructure associated with future phases that have also been completed to date ahead of schedule at Adamstown listed, noting the considerable private sector investment (c€75million) from Adamstown Developers to deliver the range of infrastructure in addition to S.48 contributions (c€20 million). Such heavy front loaded delivery of infrastructure cannot be sustained going forward. Strongly submit that any review of the phasing requirements should give the developers full credit for all that has been delivered and pragmatically re-evaluate the need, specification and timing of future infrastructural delivery to lighten the load to that which is strictly necessary over the next couple of phases. Suggest that the Planning Authority should consider alternative and innovative means to either divert some S.48 funding to Adamstown to re-classify some social infrastructure projects of priority to Adamstown with a view to funding some through offsets against S.48 contributions. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))
- (xxvii) The number of proposed community centres and crèches needs to be reviewed and considerably reduced across the phasing programme. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))
- (xxviii) The first phase of Adamstown District Centre should be pushed back a phase. ([PDAdamRev0036](#) - Landowner)
- (xxix) Suggest the phasing programme should be less specific with respect to internal estate roads and physical services as these will be delivered as a matter of course. ([PDAdamRev0036](#))

## 24. Environmental Appraisal

- (i) SDCC to identify elements/sections/issues that have relevance to the Department of Agriculture, Food and The Marine. ([PDAdamRev0004](#) – Department of Agriculture, Food and The Marine)
- (ii) Drainage and attenuation issue of concern and the provisions for same should not be reduced. ([PDAdamRev0033](#))
- (iii) EPA Submission relating to the integration of the environmental considerations and recommendations that have been set out in the Environmental Report, as well as the additional information highlighted by the EPA, within the Plan. Suggestions are put forward for consideration with a view to addressing the integration of a number of key environmental considerations within the Plan. In addition to the generic guidance below, specific environmental information relating to Adamstown is provided. Both the generic and specific information should be taken into account in the preparation of the Plan and SEA in the context of integrating the protection of environmental vulnerabilities / sensitivities into the Plan, where relevant and as appropriate. ([PDAdamRev0037](#))

## 25. Transportation

- (i) Capacity on Dublin Bus services to Adamstown inadequate. Sub contracted services put in place by Dublin Bus to meet after school needs - capacity on services needs to be increased. ([PDAdamRev0003](#))
- (ii) Adamstown due to its location contiguous to existing built up area of Dublin, on commuter rail and on a high frequency radial bus service to the city centre is regarded as a high priority development area by the NTA. Draft Transport Strategy for Greater Dublin Area states; Local Area plans – including SDZ Planning Schemes should ensure, inter alia, that: there is a sequential approach to development whereby lands which are most accessible by public transport are prioritised for growth and densities will be increased in order to support public transport, walking and cycling with rail stations in district Centres as the focus of higher densities. Policy shift could have knock on effects in terms of viability and level of service of public transport to Adamstown, associated higher levels of car use and subsequent congestion. In the short to medium term the NTA intends to enhance accessibility from Adamstown to the city centre by rail. Long term objective remains to build DART Underground and electrify the Kildare Commuter line as far as Hazelhatch. Bus services will be maintained and enhanced as demand determines. Cycle provision in the Adamstown/South Lucan area will also be improved over the coming years. ([PDAdamRev0008](#))
- (iii) The 25B is not a "one fits all" solution to transport needs in Adamstown. Route takes 20 minutes to get to N4 and does not suit all commuters. The 25X service needs to be replaced. Commuters need access to the 'City Speed/Xpresso' buses which stop on the N4. ([PDAdamRev0013](#))
- (iv) Dublin bus could be convinced to improve the bus route by extending the 25 bus, currently stopping in Dodsboro. It could start/stop in Adamstown (castle), The Paddocks, Dodsboro and proceed as normal to the city. ([PDAdamRev0021](#))
- (v) The train is excellent but only brings you to Heuston, which works out more expensive. ([PDAdamRev0021](#))
- (vi) Train Service (very poor). ([PDAdamRev0024](#))
- (vii) Bus Service (very poor). ([PDAdamRev0024](#))
- (viii) Proposed Luas Lucan Line and possible future extension has been deferred. ([PDAdamRev0026](#))
- (ix) 25B is not a "one fits all" solution to transport needs in Adamstown. Dublin Bus insisted, in face of opposition, in withdrawing the 25X which served commuters in the morning and evening and left Griffeen Road and travelled by the Newcastle road onto the N4. This bus need to be replaced. Access to the "City speed"/Xpresso buses which stop on the N4 near Tesco or Vesey Park is required in order to get into town quickly. ([PDAdamRev0029](#))
- (x) Public transport frequency has not increased; higher density should bring more services. ([PDAdamRev0035](#))

## 26. Social Housing

- (i) Current housing contravenes SDCC social housing policy; need to address disparity between SDCC planning guidelines and those used for residents in social housing. ([PDAdamRev0015](#))
- (ii) Scheme required 15% social and affordable housing. The Government are currently reviewing Part V and may make amendments. Request that a statement requiring S&A housing to be consistent with Government Policy /SDCC policy. ([PDAdamRev0028](#))

- (iii) Need to ensure social housing is distributed evenly through Adamstown and no located in confined areas. ([PDAdamRev0035](#))

## **27. Estate Management and Taking in Charge**

- (i) Recommend enhanced and expedited arrangements for ensuring completion and taking-in-charge of future development be examined and agreed with developers. ([PDAdamRev0012](#))
- (ii) Specific building design requirements in particular locations can lead to a fragmented pattern of development leading to difficulties with management, maintenance and completion of phases resulting in an unfinished look to a particular development. Each development area should be capable of being marketed as an entity without recourse to future intervention to complete a phase. ([PDAdamRev0027](#))
- (iii) Management fees are a huge issue in developments with shared services. Homeowners are getting a poor service for their fees. ([PDAdamRev0035](#))

## **28. Community Participation**

- (i) Recommend permanent arrangement to ensure resident representation on the SDZ steering group or other bodies. ([PDAdamRev0012](#))
- (ii) Residents should be kept up to date on any developments, could Facebook be used for communication. ([PDAdamRev0014](#))
- (iii) Advertising of consultation/review very poor. Hope greater effort will be made at draft stage to ensure every resident of Adamstown is given the opportunity to participate -surely a plan can be delivered to every household at very little expense. ([PDAdamRev0032](#))

## **29. Proposals for Services**

- (i) A fast electric charging point could be fitted at the train station car park or Londis. ([PDAdamRev0021](#))

## **4.0 Community Consultation Workshops**

### **4.1 Workshop Format**

A team of six planners, with two colleagues from the Council's Community Department worked with experienced facilitators Dr Liz Hayes and Margaret Barry of Corporate Community to design, organise and facilitate two community consultation workshops.

The events were aimed at local residents, interest groups and stakeholders and were designed to maximise participation and create opportunity for dialogue. On arrival, people were invited to complete a short warm-up exercise by locating where they live on a map and offering a positive comment about their neighbourhood. A series of "round table conversations" were then undertaken. The format sought to promote open and honest dialogue in relation to key "next steps" for Adamstown and the "medium to long term future" of Adamstown. The format also sought to build a comprehensive picture of the experience of living in Adamstown to date.

121 people took part in the discussions and a broad age-range, cultural mix and representation from Adamstown and the surrounding neighbourhoods were clearly evident. A summary of the key outputs is set out below.

### **4.2 Main Findings**

The facilitators undertook a review of each meeting on the following day based on their recollection from discussions and notes taken on each night. A summary of the main findings are outlined below:

- (i) The prevailing attitude to Adamstown is very positive - people like living in Adamstown and want to stay in Adamstown.
- (ii) People feel that the original plan and vision is good and should be maintained. There are concerns in relation to the changed economic context and the impact of this on future roll-out.
- (iii) In general people considered the overall environment to be safe and of a high standard, with design and quality of material finishes mentioned by many. There were concerns in relation to incomplete areas, particularly in The Paddocks.
- (iv) The sense of a multi-cultural community is seen as a benefit that should be encouraged and celebrated.
- (v) The consensus among most residents is that Adamstown is different to surrounding areas – contributors described it as modern, urban, continental and European. Residents reinforced that this is what they signed up to and that this is what they expect. Concerns were expressed in relation to any deviation from the original vision and how this would impact on the sense of place and the level of infrastructure and facilitates achievable. While many acknowledged that, based on changed market conditions, some downward adjustment may be needed to position Adamstown for the future and prevent stagnation, there is strong opposition to changes that move too far from the current format towards a suburban or "average semi-detached" model. It was suggested that changes to density/development type need to be based on independent market advice and not developer led.
- (vi) People generally felt that Adamstown was very safe from a personal point of view although there was a feeling from a few people that property (such as cars) could be targeted.

- (vii) The progressive nature of the development and the provision of infrastructure in tandem with residential development is welcomed. There are concerns in relation to actual delivery. It was indicated that people have 'bought into the concept' that higher density would result in higher level of facilities and services and that this now needs to be delivered. "Adamstown is different to Lucan where the houses are bigger and the gardens are bigger and therefore amenities are key to the success of Adamstown".
- (viii) In relation to key next steps, the consensus is that a north/south link, a community centre and a public park are required at the earliest possible stage. A retail centre or focal point for community life is also seen as important. Residents have a sense that they have been let down as facilities which they thought would be delivered by now have are not. Residents from the wider Lucan area are also disappointed that facilities such as a leisure centre/swimming pool have not yet been delivered as they too could use these amenities and provide the numbers to support such services. The need to make provisions for children, emerging clubs, teenagers and older people was particularly apparent.
- (ix) It is accepted that there is a link between profitable housing output and roll out of infrastructure and facilities, but residents suggest that changes to phasing and implementation need to be based on independent market research and that the delivery model needs to be looked at. This cannot be led by commercial interests.
- (x) Parking and parking management is a big issue for many. The consensus is that more car parking is needed closer to people's homes. Public transport good but people still have cars – even those using bus/train.
- (xi) Estate management is an issue for residents. People feel like they have no control over estate management or its cost and that too large an area is covered by same company.

#### **4.3 Review Process**

- (i) The review should position Adamstown in the longer term and knee-jerk reactions to the economic downturn should be avoided. The principles of the original concept include important assumptions that are still sound and should be sustained. The progressive nature of the development and the provision of infrastructure in tandem with residential development is good.
- (ii) Overall people felt that a slight lowering of the density and a change of house type would be reasonable. However, there were also reservations about any changes that might reduce the quality of housing or impinge on the character of Adamstown.
- (iii) The high standard of design and material finishes e.g. 'The European feel' should continue through a balanced mix of housing types.
- (iv) In reducing housing densities, seek an appropriate balance between compact development and low density development. Provide housing units that are flexible to changing household needs and provide for family needs.
- (v) The provision of local services including a community centre, a public park and play areas and retail facilities – were seen as a priority. Some people even suggested that evidence of infrastructural progress should be seen before further housing development was allowed.
- (vi) Roll-out of community facilities needs to be reconsidered – can't be dependent on developers solely. Models for the provision of community facilities should be looked at.
- (vii) Access and use of safe open space in an area of high population density is regarded as a necessity. Parks, playing pitches, walks, cycle routes and roads were all seen as necessary when living in a modern-day urban

environment. Some of these comments were linked to a desire to see Adamstown as a sustainable, low carbon emitting community.

- (viii) Create a mechanism whereby the district centre and key facilities such as Tandy's Lane park could be brought forward. This would make Adamstown more attractive to potential buyers.
- (ix) Consider increasing and shortening the number of phases.
- (x) The North/South link was seen as pivotal in enabling access to services within Adamstown but also as a means of sustaining connections between Adamstown and the wider Lucan area. The initial plan for Adamstown was for it to be a stand-alone neighbourhood. But now the inter-connections between Lucan and Adamstown should be addressed. For example, the provision of facilities could be seen as serving these inter-connected communities and this might empower SDCC to provide facilities through property tax and reduce the reliance on developers.

## **5.0 Conclusions and Next Steps**

### **5.1 Conclusions**

The issues raised in the submissions and at the consultation workshops reflect the range of views held by residents of Adamstown, residents of the surrounding area, landowners, public representatives, school communities, local businesses, local interest groups and government bodies all of which must be considered when drafting amendments to the Adamstown SDZ Planning Scheme, 2003.

A broad range of topics were covered in submissions and at the consultation workshops with issues in respect of Development Density, Phasing and Implementation, Roads and Transportation and Community Facilities occurring most frequently. Issues in relation to Scheme Philosophy, Car Parking, Estate Management, Individual Development Areas and Shopping and Retail Services were also raised by a number of interests.

The majority of submissions highlight a desire to protect the original vision for Adamstown. Submissions from residents and local interest groups generally sought to maintain and protect the core principles of the existing scheme, noting that any reduction of residential densities would have knock on effects for the character of the area and for the provision of key infrastructure and facilities. Landowner submissions draw attention to the changed economic context and the need to position Adamstown to respond to these changes. Development Density, Design Specifications, Phasing and Implementation and Retail, Commercial and Community Development were among the key concerns raised by Landowners. Government bodies, in their submissions, reinforced the strategic nature of the Adamstown lands in terms of location along a rail corridor and refer to relevant guidelines to which the Local Authority must have regard to. This range of interests must be considered and balanced in any amendments to the Planning Scheme.

This report will play a significant role in guiding the preparation of the Draft Amended SDZ Planning Scheme.

### **5.2 Next Steps**

The next steps in the process of making the Draft Amended Planning scheme are as follows:

1. Manager's Report on submissions received during pre-plan consultation stage to be presented to Area Committee for noting.
2. Review of Adamstown SDZ Planning Scheme and draft proposed Material Amendments, Environmental Report (SEA) and AA Screening Report.
3. Statutory public consultation on proposed material amendments.
4. Council to consider managers report on consultation and proposed material amendments to Adamstown SDZ Planning Scheme.

# Appendix A: Pre-Plan Consultation Leaflet



**ADAMSTOWN STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT ZONE (SDZ) PLANNING SCHEME**

**SOUTH DUBLIN COUNTY COUNCIL HAS COMMENCED A REVIEW OF THE ADAMSTOWN SDZ PLANNING SCHEME, 2003.**

**TO FIND OUT MORE AND HAVE YOUR SAY**

**Information**

An information leaflet and posters can be viewed on the Council's website at [www.sdcc.ie](http://www.sdcc.ie). Information can be viewed at Lucan Library, Superquinn Centre, Lucan, the Civic Offices Clondalkin and County Hall Tallaght, during normal opening hours (excluding public holidays).

**Public Consultation Workshops**

Members of the public, local groups and stakeholders are invited to participate in community consultation workshops at Finnstown Country House Hotel, Lucan on

**Thursday 11th April 2013, 7.30pm to 9.30pm**  
**and**  
**Monday 15th April 2013 7.30pm to 9.30pm.**  
 Registration from 7.15pm.

Advanced notice of attendance would be appreciated, where possible, for event planning purposes. (Phone 01 4149000 ext. no. 2313/2386 or email [adamstownreview@sdublincoco.ie](mailto:adamstownreview@sdublincoco.ie))

**PRE PLAN CONSULTATION 25th MARCH - 22nd APRIL**



**HAVE YOUR SAY**

Submissions and observations can be made in writing to the addresses below from Monday 25th March 2013 to 4.00pm on Monday 22nd April 2013 inclusive. Submissions and observations should state the name, address, and where relevant, the body represented.

By Email: [adamstownreview@sdublincoco.ie](mailto:adamstownreview@sdublincoco.ie)  
 By Post: Administrative Officer, Projects and Forward Planning, Development Economic & Transport Planning Department, South Dublin County Council, County Hall, Tallaght, Dublin 24.

Contact Details:  
 For further information please contact a Member of the Adamstown Review Team on 01 4149000 ext. no. 2313/2386.



**ADAMSTOWN STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT ZONE (SDZ) PLANNING SCHEME PRE DRAFT CONSULTATION**

**CONTEXT**

- In 2001, the Government designated Adamstown as a Strategic Development Zone, for the purpose of delivering residential development and associated infrastructure and facilities.
- To date, the delivery of housing and facilities has focused in the north of Adamstown, at The Paddocks and to the south, at Adamstown Square and Adamstown Castle, with 1,249 new homes now occupied.
- Over €100 million has been spent on infrastructure and facilities that directly support Adamstown. Including a new railway station, 2 primary schools, a post-primary school, a crèche, a neighbourhood park, local retail facilities, a new sewerage pumping station, water supply and surface water drainage infrastructure, an electrical transformer station, an internal road network and upgrades to adjoining road network. Much of this investment has come from the Adamstown Developers.
- The Adamstown SDZ Planning Scheme, 2003, sets out a detailed Masterplan for the site. The scheme specifies the type and extent of development that is permissible, together with requirements for the phased delivery of supporting infrastructure and facilities.
- Over the 10 year period since scheme approval the economic and policy context with in which the Planning Scheme operates has changed. It is now time to review and update the approved Planning Scheme to take account of this changed context, whilst maintaining its core principles.
- During the review process South Dublin County Council intends to re-examine the types and extent of development that are permissible within the site and phasing and implementation requirements. Given the strategic nature of the site, significant public and private investment to date and the long term nature of the vision for the area, it is envisaged that the overall plan structure will remain largely unchanged.

**SDZ PLANNING SCHEME**

The Adamstown SDZ Planning Scheme, 2003, consists of a written statement and a plan. The scheme sets out the types and extent of development that is permissible within Adamstown and requirements for the overall design of the area. The approved scheme facilitates up to 10,150 new homes and 125,000 sq. metres of non-residential development, including community, shopping, leisure and employment uses together with a new transport interchange, a minimum of five schools and four major parks, all on a phased basis. The applicable residential density range in Adamstown is between 35 and 90 dwellings per hectare with the highest densities located around the rail station in the south of the area.





## Appendix B: Newspaper Notice



**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT  
ACTS 2000 – 2010 (PART IX)  
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT  
(STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL  
ASSESSMENT) REGULATIONS 2004  
NOTICE OF PRE-PLAN CONSULTATION  
FOR PROPOSED AMENDED  
ADAMSTOWN STRATEGIC  
DEVELOPMENT ZONE (SDZ)  
PLANNING SCHEME**

Notice is hereby given that South Dublin County Council intends to carry out a review of the Adamstown SDZ Planning Scheme, 2003 and to prepare a proposed amended Planning Scheme.

An Environmental Report will be prepared as part of a Strategic Environmental Assessment of the proposed amended Planning Scheme. The amended Planning Scheme will also be subject to Appropriate Assessment Screening under the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC).

**Pre-plan public consultation will take place from Monday 25th March until 4.00pm on Monday 22nd April 2013 inclusive.**

An information leaflet and posters can be viewed on the Council's website [www.sdcc.ie](http://www.sdcc.ie). Information can also be viewed at Lucan Library, Superquinn Centre, Lucan, the Civic Offices Clonsilla and County Hall Tallaght, during normal opening hours (excluding public holidays).

Members of the public, local groups and stakeholders are invited to participate in community consultation workshops at Finstown Country House Hotel, Lucan on Thursday 11th April, 7.30pm to 9.30pm and Monday 15th April, 7.30pm to 9.30pm. Registration from 7.15pm.

**Submissions and observations in relation to the proposed review can be made in writing to the addresses below from Monday 25th March 2013 to 4.00pm on Monday 22nd April 2013 inclusive.** Late submissions or submissions made in any other format or to any other e-mail or postal addresses will not be considered. Submissions and observations should state the name, address, and where relevant, the body represented.

**By e-mail:** [adamstownreview@sdblincoco.ie](mailto:adamstownreview@sdblincoco.ie) or

**By Post:** Administrative Officer,  
Projects & Forward Planning,  
Development, Economic & Transport  
Planning Department,  
South Dublin County Council,  
County Hall, Tallaght, Dublin 24

For further information please call 01 4149000 ext. no. 2313/2386.

**Frank Nevin  
Director  
Development, Economic &  
Transport Planning Department**

**Web:** [www.sdcc.ie](http://www.sdcc.ie)

## Appendix C: Information Poster



### ADAMSTOWN STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT ZONE (SDZ) PLANNING SCHEME

**SOUTH DUBLIN COUNTY COUNCIL HAS COMMENCED A  
REVIEW OF THE ADAMSTOWN SDZ PLANNING SCHEME, 2003.**

**PRE PLAN CONSULTATION 25th MARCH - 22nd APRIL**



#### HAVE YOUR SAY

Submissions and observations can be made in writing to the addresses below from **Monday 25th March 2013 to 4.00pm on Monday 22nd April 2013 inclusive**. Submissions and observations should state the name, address, and where relevant, the body represented.

By e-mail: [adamstownreview@sdublincoco.ie](mailto:adamstownreview@sdublincoco.ie) or

By Post: Administrative Officer, Projects and Forward Planning,  
Development Economic & Transport Planning Department,  
South Dublin County Council, County Hall, Tallaght, Dublin 24.

#### Contact Details:

For further information please contact a Member of the Adamstown Review Team on 01 4149000 ext. no. 2313/2386.



#### INFORMATION

An information leaflet and posters can be viewed on the Council's website at [www.sdcc.ie](http://www.sdcc.ie). Information can be viewed at Lucan Library, Superquinn Centre, Lucan, the Civic Offices Clondalkin and County Hall Tallaght, during normal opening hours (excluding public holidays).



#### PUBLIC CONSULTATION WORKSHOPS

Public consultation workshops will be held at Finnstown Country House Hotel, Lucan on **Thursday 11th April 2013, 7.30pm to 9.30pm** and

**Monday 15th April 2013, 7.30pm to 9.30pm.**  
Tea/coffee and Registration from 7.15pm.

Members of the public, local groups and stake holders are invited to attend. Advanced notice of attendance would be appreciated, where possible, for event planning purposes.

(Phone 01 4149000 ext. no. 2313/2386 or email [adamstownreview@sdublincoco.ie](mailto:adamstownreview@sdublincoco.ie))



**Adamstown**