

**COMHAIRLE CHONTAE ÁTHA CLIATH THEAS**  
**SOUTH DUBLIN COUNTY COUNCIL**



**MEETING OF SOUTH DUBLIN COUNTY COUNCIL**

**Monday, February 12th 2007**

**HEADED ITEM No. 10**

**Report under Part 8 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001**

**PROPOSED LINK ROAD BETWEEN THE AYLMER ROAD  
AND PEAMOUNT ROAD (R120) IN THE TOWNLANDS  
OF WESTMANSTOWN AND PEAMOUNT**

The attached report was considered at the Lucan/Clondalkin Area Committee Meeting (1) on Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> January 2007.

Following consideration of the report it was recommended by the Committee that the scheme be implemented subject to the following 3 modifications as listed in the report:-

1. Access gates will be provided to severed lands
2. A noise assessment study will be carried out
3. Tree planting will be carried out in the road verge.

**COMHAIRLE CHONTAE ÁTHA CLIATH THEAS**  
**SOUTH DUBLIN COUNTY COUNCIL**



**MEETING OF LUCAN / CIONDALKIN AREA COMMITTEE (1)**

**16<sup>th</sup> January, 2007**

**HEADED ITEM No. 9**

**REPORT ON PART 8 OF THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS**  
**2001**

**PROPOSED LINK ROAD BETWEEN THE AYLMER ROAD  
AND PEAMOUNT ROAD (R120) IN THE TOWNLANDS  
OF WESTMANSTOWN AND PEAMOUNT**

**INTRODUCTION:**

Part 8 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 prescribes the requirements in respect of certain classes of Local Authority Developments. The Regulations apply to the proposed works involved in the provision of a new link road between the Aylmer Road and the Peamount Road (R120) in the townlands of Westmanstown and Peamount.

**PLANNING CONTEXT:**

The proposal is in accordance with Variation (No. 1 - Greenogue) of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2004-2010 Written Statement in respect of lands at Greenogue, Newcastle, Co. Dublin:-

*Variation (No. 1) of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2004-2010 Written Statement was made on the 9<sup>th</sup> January, 2006 as follows:*

*Deletion of existing Specific Local Objective No. 56:*

*“Prior to the commencement of development of the industrial lands at Greenogue, newly-zoned in this Development Plan, the Greenogue Road West, northwards as far as the Newcastle Road shall be completed”*

and replacing it with the new Specific Local Objective 56 as follows:

*“It is an objective of the Council to provide at the earliest possible date, a new link road between the Peamount Road and Aylmer Road to facilitate the development of zoned industrial lands and to divert through traffic away from Newcastle Village Centre”.*

### **DESCRIPTION OF THE SCHEME AS ADVERTISED:**

The proposal is to provide a link road between the Aylmer Road and Peamount Road (R120) in the Townlands of Westmanstown and Peamount as described below:

1. A link road of approximately 1.15km in length, with a cross-section of two 4.5metre wide lanes, two 1.5 metre verges and one 2.0 metre footpath;
2. A roundabout at the junction of the link road with the R120 Regional Road;
3. A roundabout at the junction of the link road with the Aylmer Road;
4. An access from the Greenogue Business Park onto the roundabout at the Aylmer Road;
5. Traffic signs, roadmarkings, public lighting, drainage and associated works; and
6. Tie-in works with the existing road network.

### **CONSULTATION PROCESS:**

The proposed development was advertised in accordance with Part 8 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, in the Irish Independent and The Echo on Thursday 13th July 2006.

The scheme went on public display on Thursday 13th July 2006 to Friday 11th August 2006 as required by the Planning and Development Regulations 2001. Details of the proposed scheme were on display at the offices of South Dublin County Council, County Hall, Tallaght; County Library, County Hall, Tallaght; and South Dublin County Council Civic Offices, Clondalkin. The closing date for submissions was Monday 28th August 2006 before 4.30pm.

### **SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED:**

Three submissions were received. A schedule of the submissions is attached to this report and a file containing the submissions is available at the meeting.

## Concerns

### Expressed Submission by: (1)

1.1	Submission	Access: Our client requests a total of three access points and gates off the new road as it traverses her lands i.e. one access point to the dwelling house , one separate access point to the portion of lands on the house side and one access point to the severed lands north east of the new road. All access details to be discussed and agreed. Access points to be suitable for commercial development at all three locations.
	Response	Existing access points rendered ineffective will be replaced and an access point to any severed lands resulting from the road proposal will be provided, where such lands are rendered inaccessible from any existing access. Accesses will be constructed in accordance with current design criteria whilst having regard to current land use and zoning. Locations of these access points will be agreed at detailed design stage.
1.2	Submission	Noise Mitigation: Noise mitigation to be installed along both sides of the new road for the entire length of owner's property.
	Response	A noise assessment study will be carried out as part of the detailed design.
1.3	Submission	Landscaping: Dense landscape planting to be installed alongside both sides of the new road in the interest of visual amenity.
	Response	Tree planting will be incorporated in the verge of the proposed road.
1.4	Submission	Surplus: No lands surplus to road building requirements to be acquired in this case.
	Response	Lands deemed necessary and sufficient for the scheme will be identified at detailed design / CPO stage. No surplus lands will be acquired.
1.5	Submission	Ducts: Service ducts suitable for development to be laid under the new road. Number and size of ducts to be discussed and agreed with owner.
	Response	Service ducts and road drainage will be laid as required for the construction of the proposed road, having regard to the existing zoning of the area

**Concerns****Expressed Submission by: (1)**

1.6	Submission	Drainage: The scheme should be designed in such a manner that it facilitates the proper drainage of the retained lands with no negative drainage impacts particularly in relation to the river along the frontage of the property.
	Response	The proposed drainage system will cater for both the normal run-off from the proposed road and any resulting interference with the natural drainage system of the lands.
1.7	Submission	Structural / Condition Survey: Structural / Condition Survey to be carried out on the dwelling house prior to construction.
	Response	As Westmanstown House will be approximately 50m from the new road, a condition survey is not considered necessary. <a href="#"><u>Ground vibrations produced by road traffic are unlikely to cause structural vibration in properties located at such a distance from well-maintained and smooth road surfaces. Appropriate measures will also be undertaken at construction stage to ensure vibration will not be an issue in the vicinity of Westmanstown House.</u></a>
1.8	Submission	Lighting: Road lighting to be suitably shaded so that it causes minimal light pollution to dwelling house and property.
	Response	Any public lighting incorporated into the scheme shall be designed to current standards which incorporate minimisation of light pollution.

**Concerns****Expressed Submission by: (2)**

2.1	Submission	We believe that the proposed road will generate significant additional 'rat-run' traffic from the Naas Road to Celbridge and to Lucan. This will divert significantly increased traffic close to our house.
	Response	The purpose of the proposed road is to divert traffic primarily associated with the zoned industrial lands at Greenoge away from Newcastle Village Centre. It is not envisaged that the proposed road will be the cause of increased traffic volumes passing Reniskey House, over and above normal expected traffic growth on the Peamount Road. The proposed road will be located at a greater distance from Reniskey House than the existing R120.

**Concerns****Expressed Submission by: (2)**

<b>2.2</b>	Submission	<p>Our house is located close to the proposed roundabout on the junction of the proposed road and Peamount Road, with the proposed road running parallel to the boundary of our property. The proposed roundabout and road will generate significant additional noise and other pollution. It will also make our property significantly more visible and vulnerable from both roads. We would insist that a solid wall of a height of at least 2.5 metres be provided along the boundaries of our property to both roads and where necessary returned along our other boundaries.</p>
	Response	<p>At detail design stage full consideration will be given to the distance of Reniskey House to the proposed roundabout and any impacts of merging the proposed route with the existing R120. A noise assessment study will be carried out as part of the detailed design.</p> <p>Given the distance of the existing property from the proposed road, and the quality of existing hedging and trees surrounding Reniskey House, it is envisaged that impact will be minimal and the boundary treatments sought would be unnecessary.</p> <p>Boundary treatments will be discussed with the property owner in the context of acquisition of lands for the proposed road.</p>
<b>2.3</b>	Submission	<p>We believe the approaches to the proposed roundabout on the Peamount Road should have ramps to slow traffic approaching the roundabout as the visibility is poor due to bends in the road or alternatively that this section of road is realigned.</p>
	Response	<p>An examination of the approaches to any proposed junction is undertaken at detailed design stage and appropriate measures will be incorporated into the design.</p>
<b>2.4</b>	Submission	<p>It is not clear if you intend to acquire land from our holding for the proposed new roundabout. Can you please clarify this matter and also at which point we should make further observations.</p>

**Concerns****Expressed Submission by: (2)**

	Response	<p>The full extent of the lands required for the scheme become apparent when the detailed design is complete. Should any holding be affected, the acquisition is by way of agreement with the land owner or by way of a Compulsory Purchase Order. In the latter case the CPO is published and land owners served with the statutory notices, which will specify their statutory entitlements including the making of submissions to An Bord Pleanala.</p> <p>At any stage the land owner or interested party can seek what information they require from South Dublin County Council.</p>
--	----------	--

**Concerns****Expressed Submission by: (3)**

3.1	Submission	<p>Access: Our clients are currently actively progressing a masterplan for future development of the Peamount lands. In this context it is submitted that the design and alignment of the proposed Link Road should consider appropriate future access arrangements to the Peamount lands. This is particularly pertinent in the context of the development plan objective which states that it is an objective of the Council to “examine the feasibility and infrastructure requirements” in relation to Peamount.</p> <p>The detail of such access should be subject to detailed agreement with Peamount Hospital and their advisors. We enclose a drawing which outlines an appropriate and potential access roundabout arrangement serving the Peamount lands from the proposed link Road.</p> <p>It is respectfully submitted that the roads and Traffic Department should not object to any future planning application in relation to the subject lands that would include a roundabout access to Peamount.</p>
	Response	<p>The current zoning in the South Dublin County Development Plan 2004 – 2010 identifies the objective to protect and improve rural amenity and provide for the development of agriculture. In the context of the current zoning the provision of other than access for agricultural use is premature.</p>
3.2	Submission	<p>Saggart – Rathcoole – Newcastle Drainage Collection Improvement Scheme: It is noted that in tandem with the current Part 8 proposal South Dublin County Council are currently progressing a major new drainage collection improvement scheme which also has a direct bearing on our client’s lands. We enclose in appendix three a drawing</p>

**Concerns****Expressed Submission by: (3)**

		<p>indicating the location of the proposed improvement scheme.</p> <p>We respectfully submit that it would be more appropriate for the Part 8 drainage to be connected to an improved drainage along the R120 than for the County Council to take a new way leave as shown on the Part 8 proposal.</p> <p>This would be a more efficient course of action from an engineering and land use perspective and ultimately would result in far less disruption to our clients lands.</p>
	Response	<p>These matters will be considered in the detailed design of the scheme.</p>
<b>3.3</b>	Submission	<p>Servicing: With regard to the provision of services, it is submitted that the development of the new Link Road should take cognisance of the development plan objective regarding the future of the Peamount Lands and that provision should be made for the routing of future services along this road. Provision should be made to accommodate all the services necessary to serve a major development on these lands such as foul sewerage, 'gas', water, broadband, ESB, telecom etc in the future.</p>
	Response	<p>Services along the proposed road will be determined at detailed design stage having regard to the zoning as shown in the current Development Plan, 2004 – 2010.</p>
<b>3.4</b>	Submission	<p>Boundary Treatment: It is submitted that the proposed Link Road should have an appropriate boundary to ensure the protection of our client's lands. Our preferred form of boundary treatment is a 1.2 stone clad base wall with metal railings extending to an overall height of 2.5 metres. We enclose in appendix four a drawing indicating the appropriate detail of our preferred boundary treatment.</p>
	Response	<p>Boundary treatment is a matter for detailed design stage having regard to the current zoning of the lands. In general in the rural environment, a timber post and rail fence is considered appropriate.</p>



**Concerns**

**Expressed Submission by: (3)**

<b>3.5</b>	Submission	Field Gates: It is noted that our client's lands currently have three farm access field gates that will be affected by the proposed development. These farm access field gates should be clearly identified on the proposed Part 8 drawings and these access gates maintained in order to ensure the necessary access to our clients lands. We enclose a drawing indicating the location of these farm access gates.
	Response	Existing access points rendered ineffective will be replaced and an access point to any severed lands resulting from the road proposal will be provided, where such lands are rendered inaccessible from any existing access. Accesses will be constructed in accordance with current design criteria whilst having regard to current land use and zoning. Locations of these access points will be agreed at detailed design stage.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

It is recommended that the scheme as advertised be implemented, subject to the following:-

1. Access gates will be provided to severed lands
2. A noise assessment study will be carried out
3. Tree planting will be carried out in the road verge.

**LIST OF SUBMISSIONS:**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Name and Address</b>	<b>Agent</b>
<b>1</b>	Kathleen Byrne, Westmanstown House, Westmanstown, Newcastle, Co. Dublin.	Mr Tom Corr, Charterer Valuation Surveyor, Gaynor Corr & Associates Ltd., 4 Abbeyleix Road, Portlaoise, Co Laois.
<b>2</b>	John and Margo Delaney, Renskey House, Peamount Road, Newcastle, Co Dublin.	
<b>3</b>	Peamount Hospital Inc	John Spain, John Spain Associates, Planning & Development Consultants, 10 Lower Mount Street, Dublin 2.