



**Enniskerry
Local Area Plan
2009**



Manager's Report on submissions to draft plan

February 2008

MANAGER'S REPORT

On submissions to the Draft Enniskerry Local Area Plan 2009 following the 1st public display period

Contents

- Part 1** Introduction
- Part 2** List of Persons and bodies who made submissions (including map)
- Part 3** Summary of Managers' recommended amendments
- Part 4** Considering the submissions

PART 1

1.0 Introduction

The Manager's Report is submitted under Section 20(3)(c) of the Planning & Development Act 2000; it is part of the formal statutory process of the preparation of a Local Area Plan.

This Report contains the following:

- (i) A list of the persons or bodies that made submissions,
- (ii) A summary of the issues raised by them,
- (iii) The response of the Manager to the issues raised taking into account the proper planning and sustainable development of the County and any relevant policies or objectives of the Government or Government Minister.

The Report is now formally submitted to the Council for consideration. The Report will be on the agenda of the County Council meeting on the 2nd / 9th March 2009.

1.1 Draft Consultation Process

Following the issuing of Background Issues Paper and Consultation with Stakeholders and the General Public the Draft Enniskerry Local Area Plan was placed on display during the period on Wednesday 26th November 2008 to 7th January 2009.

The aim of the consultation process was to enable the public and interested parties to give their observations on the Draft Local Area Plan.

A total of 29 written submissions were received. The written submissions are held on file and are available for Council and public inspection.

The list of persons or bodies who made submissions is contained in Part 2 of this Report.

1.2 Considering the Submissions

The written submissions have been analysed by the Forward Planning Unit of the County Council. The individual submissions are summarised and the opinion and recommendations of the County Manager, is given in Part 4 of this Report.

This Report is submitted to the Members for consideration.

1.3 Next Steps – Draft Local Area Plan Timetable

Following the distribution of this Report, the Council will consider the Report and decide whether to make the Local Area Plan with or without modifications or not make the plan.

Formally making the Local Area Plan is done by resolution of the Council.

During the entire plan-making process, the Council is restricted to considering the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. They must also take into account statutory obligations and any relevant Government policies and objectives in force.

Local Area Plan timetable

26 November 2008 – 7 th January 2009	Draft plan on public display, submissions accepted
8 th January 2009-8 th February 2009	Evaluation of submissions and preparation of Manager's Report
9 th February 2009 – 2 nd March 2009	Consideration by County Council Members of Manager's Report and Draft Plan
2 nd / 9 th March 2009	Council meeting

PART 2 Enniskerry Local Area Plan submissions

No.	Name	Agent / Representative
1	Department of Communications, Energy & Natural Resources	Frances Heaslip
2	Department of Education & Science	Shirley Kearney
3	Environmental Protection Agency	Michael Owens
4	Geological Survey of Ireland	Monica Lee/Sophie Prestelle
5	National Roads Authority	Tara Spain
6	Bluetone Ltd / Treasury Holdings	Sorcha Turnbull
7	Byrne, Frank & Corcoran, Noel	
8	Carson, James F	
9	Chandler, Reg	
10	Coleman, Eamonn	Brady Shipman Martin
11	Cookstown Road Residents Association	Maoiliosa Kelly
12	Corcoran, Noel	
13	Cowzer, Edward	
14	Craig, Mary Rose	
15	Cronin, Jackie	
16	Cronin, Lynda	
17	Dunne Kavanagh, Anne	
18	Fisher, Dermot	
19	Landsea, Gabrielle	
20	Lawlor, Colin & Valerie & Family	
21	McGlinchey, Gerry	
22	Moore, Charlie	
23	O'Hanlon, Annette	
24	O'Hara, Michael	
25	Owens, Mary & Paul	
26	Petters, Yanny	
27	Ryan, Declan	
28	Somerville, W. B.	
29	Walker, Mike	

PART 3 Summary of Manager's recommended amendments

Amendment 1 (Submission 1)

Part B: Section 10 (Heritage)

Add the following policy / objective

- *All proposals for development in the vicinity of the Glencullen / Cookstown River (a key spawning tributary of the River Dargle) shall comply with salmonid waters constraints. All proposed works shall be designed and implemented in an environmentally sound and sustainable manner and shall not impact negatively on the salmonid status of this system.*

Amendment 2 (Submission 6)

Part B: Section 4 - 'Residential development'

Amend note:

from

R1 = 20/ha max

R2 = 10/ha max

to

R1 = County Development Plan maximum densities for Enniskerry

R2 = 10/ha max

Amendment 3 (Submissions 8, 11, 24, 28)

Part B: Section 11 (Action Area Plans)

Amend Action Area 4 as follows:-

This Action Area is located south of the town centre, in the townland of Cookstown, as shown on Map 1. This action area measures c. 9.3ha. This action area shall be developed as a residential, open space, community and agricultural zone in accordance with the following criteria:-

- *A maximum of 2.15ha may be developed for housing at a maximum density of 20/ha (8/acre). A full range of unit sizes, including smaller 1 and 2-bedroomed units shall be provided and no more than 50% of the units shall exceed 3 bedrooms or 125sqm in size*
- *A minimum area of 0.4ha (1 acre) shall be provided for voluntary / sheltered housing, of a type to be agreed with the Local Authority, in addition to any Part V obligations under the Wicklow Housing Strategy. Permission will not be considered for private housing until sufficient progress has been made on this element*
- *Access to the site shall be from local road LP-1020*
- *An amenity zone shall be established along the full southern and western boundaries of the action area, which shall comprise an amenity walk area along the existing tree lined field boundaries connecting through the development to regional road R760 (Enniskerry – Kilmacanogue) and to the existing pedestrian route along the Dargle*
- *The remainder of the site not designated for a particular purpose (either housing or amenity use) shall be retained in agricultural use for possible future development purposes*
- *Any development shall be so designed to maintain maximum views of the Sugarloaf from Cookstown Road.*

Amendment 4 (Submission 27)

Part B: Section 4 (Residential)

Amend as follows (new text shown in red):-

In the RE **and R (new residential)** zones, house improvements, alterations and extensions and appropriate infill / **new** residential development in accordance with principles of good design and protection of existing residential amenity will be permitted. While new developments shall have regard to the protection of the residential and architectural amenities of houses / **buildings** in the immediate environs, alternative and contemporary designs shall be encouraged (including alternative materials, heights and building forms), to provide for visual diversity;

PART 4 Considering the submissions

Submission no. 1
Department of Communications, Energy & Natural Resources
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Feedback previously supplied on the SEA screening process still holds2. Proposed Action Areas (particularly AA3 - Crimmins Garage) are located adjacent to and encroach upon the Glencullen / Cookstown River (a key spawning tributary of the R. Dargle). The Dargle (an EU-Designated Salmonid System) and its tributaries support a nationally significant population of Sea trout in addition to a significant and biologically valuable population of Atlantic salmon (listed under Annex II and V of the EU Habitats Directive). Thus, it is vital to note that salmonid waters constraints apply to any development in this area. All proposed works must be designed and implemented in an environmentally sound and sustainable manner and should not impact negatively on the salmonid status of this system.3. Surface waters from the proposed development site potentially drain directly to the Cookstown River and proposed programme elements such as riverside walkway / boardwalk and bank works will potentially impact the river system, requiring direct consultation between the developer and the ERFB should development of these sites proceed. It should be noted that the Board advocates at least a 10m buffer zone between river channel and the line of maximum extent of development.4. It must be highlighted that it is essential that local infrastructural capacity is available to cope with increased surface and foul water generated by the proposed LAP in order to protect the ecological integrity of any receiving aquatic environment.5. It is recommended that the "Requirements for the Protection of Fisheries Habitat during Construction and Development Works at River Sites" be consulted when planning to undertake works within the LAP area (as per Draft LAP). The maintenance of habitat integrity (both in-stream and riparian) is essential in safeguarding the ecological value of this important urban natural resource. The specific details of any works directly affecting watercourses or riparian habitats in the area, river bank reinforcement / boardwalk construction must first be submitted to the Board for assessment and approval.
Manager's Response
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The feedback received on the SEA screen has already been integrated into the SEA and draft LAP2. It is noted that salmonid waters constraints will apply to any development proposed adjacent to the Glencullen / Cookstown River. It is considered that this should be reinforced by a new policy in the LAP3. The development plan does not set out specific proposals for the AA3 site (Crimmins garage site) and in particular does not require riverside walkways / boardwalk or bank works, although it is noted that these elements formed part of a previous application on this site. In the event of a future application, the draft LAP requires the developer to carry out a full ecological and hydrological assessment of the development on the river and riverbank habitats, including flood impacts. The request for a 10m buffer zone is noted; however, given the narrow width of this site, and the fact that the site already has an industrial development directly adjoining the riverbank, the implementation of such a buffer would render the site undevelopable. It is considered more reasonable to allow the developer to consult directly with the ERFB in this regard.4. Infrastructural capacity in Enniskerry is adequate to accommodate the future growth of the settlement. Further, the draft plan includes the following policies:-<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>No new development shall be permitted unless there is adequate capacity in the wastewater collection and treatment systems;</i>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure the separation of foul and surface water effluent through the provision of separate sewerage networks; • Ensure the implementation of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) <p>5. It is a proposed policy of the draft LAP that <i>All developments shall have regard to the Eastern Regional Fisheries Board "Requirements for the protection of fisheries habitat during the construction and development works at river sites", and a statement of how it is intended to comply with same shall be submitted with any applications for permission;</i></p>
<p>Managers Recommendation</p> <p>Add the following policy / objective under Part B: Section 10 (Heritage)</p> <p><i>All proposals for development in the vicinity of the Glencullen / Cookstown River (a key spawning tributary of the River Dargle) shall comply with salmonid waters constraints. All proposed works shall be designed and implemented in an environmentally sound and sustainable manner and shall not impact negatively on the salmonid status of this system.</i></p>

<p>Submission no. 2</p> <p>Department of Education & Science</p> <p>The Department of Education & Science concurs with the assessment of school needs set out in the draft plan and notes the zoning proposals</p> <p>Manager's Response</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Managers Recommendation</p> <p>No change</p>

<p>Submission no. 3</p> <p>Environmental Protection Agency</p> <p>1. The comments made at SEA screening stage still apply. In particular, the EPA recommendation for the issues that should be addressed in the plan should be reviewed</p> <p>2. Where zoning / rezoning of lands or new development is being proposed, the adequacy of the existing water supply and wastewater systems should be assessed. Zoning should be linked to the availability of water supply / wastewater treatment infrastructure and capacity. Priority should be given to the provision of adequate and appropriate infrastructure in advance of development</p> <p>Manager's Response</p> <p>1. The EPA provided a comprehensive list of issues that it recommended be addressed in the LAP. Those that were relevant to a land-use plan were incorporated into the draft.</p> <p>2. Currently Enniskerry is served by the Wastewater Treatment Plant at Cookstown on the Bray Road, which discharges treated effluent to the Cookstown River. This plant has capacity of 6,000p.e. and a current loading of 5,200p.e. This plant acts as an interim sludge hub where waste from other smaller plants is dewatered and thickened. The draft plan proposals to allow an increase in the population by 309 persons and additional community and employment facilities. Therefore the plant has sufficient capacity to accommodate the planned growth. An improved water supply scheme to Enniskerry and surrounding areas is currently being provided including a new water storage reservoir in Killegar (2,000 cu m), to be fed from the Dublin City Council Vartry water supply scheme and the existing Kilmalin water treatment plant (which extracts water from the Glencullen River) is to be substantially upgraded. Therefore there are no issues with water supply or wastewater infrastructure in Enniskerry</p> <p>Managers Recommendation</p> <p>No change</p>

Submission no. 4
Geological Survey of Ireland
The Irish Geological Heritage Programme (which is part of the GSI) is in the process of identifying and selecting important geological and geomorphological sites throughout the Country for designation as NHA's. Those sites which are not selected but are still worthy of protection should be considered for designation as County Geological Sites. Ballybrew quarry, the Enniskerry Delta and Powerscourt Waterfall are sites being considered.
Manager's Response
None of these sites are within the Local Area Plan boundary. However, the study being carried out is noted and the results of which will be considered in the review of the County Development Plan
Managers Recommendation
No change

Submission no. 5
National Roads Authority
It should be noted that the interchange improvements at Fassaroe have not been agreed with and will not be funded by the NRA
Manager's Response
The improvements of the junction at Fassaroe is not an objective of this plan and the development of Enniskerry is not contingent on these works
Managers Recommendation
No change

Submission no. 6
Bluetone Ltd / Treasury Holdings
Bluetone Ltd / Treasury Holdings is the owner of the lands proposed for AA1 designation to the west of Enniskerry town centre. The submission requests the following:- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The inclusion of a "neighbourhood centre" containing residential units, small business/ enterprise units, live-work units and retail / non-retail services. It is put forward that the proposed neighbourhood centre could act as a hub for tourism services, which are essential to developing Enniskerry's tourism potential. Furthermore the development of a retail centre at this location would ease the parking and congestion problems in the historic town centre. 2. The expansion of AA1 to include an additional parcel measuring 1.9ha immediately adjacent to Knocksink Wood for low density housing 3. The expansion of AA1 to include an additional parcel measuring 0.9ha located to the north-west of the existing AA1 boundary for primary school use. It is put forward that an excessive quantum of the 13.5ha AA1 is designated for community use (CE and AOS use totalling 3.6ha) and expansion of AA1 would go towards redressing this imbalance. 4. Allowance of increased densities in AA1- 30-35 units per hectare is suggested as an appropriate density for AA1. It is put forward that it is only reasonable to maintain the existing GAA as AOS (in the event of the relocation of the GAA) if densities are increased on the remainder of the site. 5. Amended of the population targets and the 'local need' conditions in Enniskerry 6. The LAP should designate 3 car parking nodes in the town at Bog Meadow, the proposed neighbourhood centre in AA1 and a third on the western extremity of AA1 adjacent to a future viewing platform.
Manager's Response
The current LAP designated c. 7.8ha as AA1 and allowed for its development at 20 units/ha (total 156 units). However only 5.25ha would be required to be developed prior to 2008 (105 units). The new draft plan proposes to expand AA1 to 13.5ha and to allow a total of 180 units (at 20/ha) in addition to:-

- A minimum area of 2ha shall be reserved as Active Open Space (existing GAA)
- A minimum of 1.2ha shall be provided for a primary school site
- A minimum of 0.4ha shall be provided for a community uses, including a community centre of not less than 500sqm and an equipped playground of not less than 400sqm
- A minimum of 1ha shall be provided for employment uses. Generally, this shall comprise office/studio/surgery type development of the highest architectural quality and layout. A minimum of 0.4ha of this area shall however be reserved for local service and incubator businesses.

1. Firstly, it should be pointed out that the uses other than retail / retail services proposed to be part of the suggested “neighbourhood centre” would be permissible under the draft plan objectives. Secondly, it is not considered that retail usage is appropriate at this location given the proximity to an existing neighbourhood shop and the proximity to Enniskerry town centre. Retail use at this location would undermine the viability and vitality of the town centre and furthermore would contravene the sequential development requirements of the Retail Planning Guidelines. Thirdly, it is considered that tourism services should be located in the town centre to reinforce and improve the viability of the town centre and allow visitors to utilise other town facilities such as pubs, shops and restaurants. The re-location of ‘tourism services’ to AA1 would result in visitors passing straight through the town centre and a resulting diversion of tourism visitors and income. Similarly, the relocation of retail services to this out of centre location would only serve to undermine the viability of existing businesses in the town centre and while some parking issues persist, the solution is not to relocate services, but to address the parking problem.

2. The land proposed for low density housing adjacent to Knocksink Wood cannot be considered outside of the context of the carrying out of a full **Habitats Directive (Appropriate) Assessment** as Knocksink Wood is designated a cSAC. Furthermore, the population projections set out in the draft plan (which accord with the County Development Plan 2004) and the calculation of required land zoning are set out in Section Part A of the draft plan. The quantity of zoned land required takes into account the 2006 census population, permissions granted and constructed since 2006 and existing permissions, which have yet to begin construction. These sections clearly set out the process under which it was determined what land requirements were needed in order to accommodate the projected population in 2016. The calculations also provide for an “excess factor” and substantial “headroom”, given the location of the settlement of Enniskerry, its designation as a Small Growth Town I in the Regional Planning Guidelines and the demand for housing. The draft plan has proposed new residential zoning on the basis of the need identified by these calculations. No further residential zoning is required to meet the current populations targets and the excessive zoning of land (even for low density housing) may lead to population targets being exceeded, to the overall detriment of the settlement. Furthermore, Enniskerry has a surfeit of low-density housing and needs smaller, affordable units at normal densities.

3. There is no requirement to zone an additional 0.9ha of land for a primary school as the land take for a primary school can be easily accommodated in the 13.5ha of the proposed AA1

4. The draft LAP does not specify a density limit in AA1. However, under the provisions of the current County Development Plan 2004-2010, density in Enniskerry is limited to 20/ha. This may however change in the future as the County Development Plan is reviewed and amended. Therefore it is proposed that reference to a density limit of 20/ha should be omitted from the LAP.

The draft LAP does however specify that no more than 180 units may be constructed in AA1. This is necessary for the number of reasons:-

- to ensure that the population target set in the current County Development Plan is not exceeded;
- to ensure that residential growth is spread over a number of sites in the settlement, in order to ensure that a single developer cannot control the

- delivery of all new housing in the area;
- to ensure that the type of development carried out fits with the established pattern of development in Enniskerry and respects its existing character.

The Planning Authority would be open to considering higher densities at some locations on the site in the interests of urban form and good design, but this would have to be counterbalanced by lower densities elsewhere in AA1 to comply with the 180-unit restriction.

5. The population target and local need conditions applied in Enniskerry are set out in the County Development Plan. As the LAP must be consistent with the County Development Plan these cannot be altered through the LAP process.
6. There is an existing car park at Bog Meadow that is suitable for general public use and is directly adjacent to the core town services around the square. There are a number of smaller car parks around the town owned by private establishments. Furthermore, on street car parking is available. The key problem with car parking in Enniskerry is not the location or the quantity, but the unavailability of on-street spaces for short-term use (due to long stay usage) and the temporary traffic blockages caused by on-street parking on both sides of narrow streets. This can only be solved by the introduction of some sort of parking management. It is not considered appropriate to provide a new town car park in AA1, which is at too great a distance from the town centre. Such a location would not be usable by users and visitors to the town centre.

Managers Recommendation

Part B: Section 4 - 'Residential development'

Amend note:
from

R1 = 20/ha max
R2 = 10/ha max

to

R1 = County Development Plan maximum densities for Enniskerry
R2 = 10/ha max

Submission no. 7

Byrne, Frank

This submission considers that the draft LAP does not adequately protect the village character of Enniskerry and put forward that:-

1. The plan virtually guarantees the coalescence of Enniskerry and Bray through the proposals contained in the draft Bray LAP
2. The plan has failed to protect areas of outstanding natural beauty at the Bowl / Amphitheatre around Enniskerry through the proposals for a highly visible development at Fassaroe and through consideration of the Bluetone planning application
3. Enniskerry should be designated a 'heritage village' and reference to 'small town' should be deleted
4. The link road between Fassaroe and Enniskerry should be eliminated. The plan has failed to show comprehensive, realistic proposals for the routing and management of traffic at Monastery which is unfair to the residents of Ballyman Road.
5. Part B of the plan should include a policy that infill development would only be allowed where there are no topographical or other constraints which would prevent adherence of proper planning standards (reference made to ABP previously decisions)
6. The schedule of protected structure included in the draft plan is not sufficiently detailed and is inadequate and incomplete
7. Tree listed as being considered for preservation should be redesignated to

<p>'preserved'</p> <p>8. The retention of the AG zoning behind the Forge is welcomed</p>
<p>Manager's Response</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is not agreed that the Enniskerry and Bray environs LAPs 'virtually guarantee' the coalescence of these settlements. The majority of the lands at Fassaroe are already zoned in the County Development Plan for employment development and the current draft Bray environs LAP has only proposed one area of zoning extension in the south-west quadrant of Fassaroe (proposed E2 zoning around the Roadstone lands). These lands are separated from Enniskerry by topography, trees screening and a river. No additional lands have been proposed for zoning on the west side of Fassaroe. However, in order to provide adequate protection to the existing buffer zone between the settlements, it is recommended that this area be designated a 'green belt' with strict limitations of development. As this is outside the boundary of either draft LAP, it is recommended that this green belt designation occur via the Rathdown No. 2 district plan, which is currently the subject of review (current variation No. 10) 2. It is not agreed that future development at Fassaroe would undermine the natural beauty of Enniskerry given the separation between the two areas and the topography and existing screening between the two areas. The Bluetone application was considered for permission in the context of the previous zoning of this land for development. 3. The previous Board Failte administered scheme of designating settlements as 'heritage towns' is not longer in operation. It is not within the scope of the land-use plan to designate Enniskerry a 'heritage town'. Wicklow County Council has applied to Failte Ireland for Enniskerry to be included in the new Historic Towns Trails Initiative . As Enniskerry is designated a 'small growth town', not a village, in the County Development Plan, this nomenclature must be retained as the LAP must be consistent with the County Development Plan 4. The objective to provide a link between Enniskerry and the N11 at Fassaroe is a long-term objective, which was included in the previous development plan; it is considered appropriate to maintain given the current proposals to review the Bray Environs zoning which would improve the likelihood of its delivery. This possible future road would have the dual function of providing an alternative access route to Enniskerry from the N11 and allowing a link to the proposed LUAS at Fassaroe. The details of the design/route of this road and traffic management in the area will be subject to a separate process (either planning permission or Part 8), which will be open to public input. 5. Part B of the draft plan provides "<i>appropriate infill residential development in accordance with principles of good design and protection of existing residential amenity will be permitted</i>". 6. The full schedule of the RPS is set out in the County Development Plan. The list contained in the draft LAP contains all structures / buildings in the plan area that are included in the County list. This list will be reviewed as part of the County Development Plan review process 7. Tress may only be considered 'preserved' where they have legally been served a tree preservation order. The trees that are listed as those worthy to be considered have not yet been served with formal orders and therefore cannot be listed as such. A complete County survey of all TPO's and trees considered for TPOs has been carried out with a view to reviewing all, in the context of the County Development Plan review which has commenced. 8. Noted
<p>Managers Recommendation</p> <p>No change</p>

Submission no. 8
Carson, James F
<p>Objects to proposed AA4 zoning for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The southern entrance to the town would be turned into just one more suburban housing complex; 2. Development on this site would undermine the view at this location of the Sugarloaf and Dargle Valley.
Manager's Response
<p>It is considered the proposed restrictions placed on the development of AA4 would address the concerns raised i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - out of an area of 9.3ha, only 2.55ha may be developed - access to the site shall be from local road LP-1020 i.e. away from the main entry into the town - an amenity zone shall be established along the full southern and western boundaries of the action area, which shall comprise an amenity walk area along the existing tree lined field boundaries connecting through the development to regional road R760 (Enniskerry – Kilmacanogue) and to the existing pedestrian route along the Dargle <p>The view referred to is the listed view from Cookstown Road to the Sugarloaf. Views (as opposed to prospects) are views of a fixed location from a fixed point. The vantage point of this listed view is the entrance to Enniskerry Demesne as this is the only location that has a clear view of the Sugarloaf. This location also co-incides with the safest location for an entrance into the AA4 lands (good road alignment, within the speed limit and limited tree removal). Given that only 2.55ha of this 9.3ha field is proposed for development, it will be possible to design and locate structures so that this view is not impeded. It is recommended that the objectives for AA4 be slightly amended to ensure maximum views of the Sugarloaf be maintained where they are available.</p> <p>The proposals to zone this land were made in light of the need for additional housing land that has been identified in Enniskerry and this land was selected due to its proximity to the town centre, available of good road access and services and its level topography.</p>
Managers Recommendation
<p>Part B: Section 11</p> <p>Amend Action Area 4 as follows:-</p> <p><i>This Action Area is located south of the town centre, in the townland of Cookstown, as shown on Map 1. This action area measures c. 9.3ha. This action area shall be developed as a residential, open space, community and agricultural zone in accordance with the following criteria:-</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A maximum of 2.15ha may be developed for housing at a maximum density of 20/ha (8/acre). A full range of unit sizes, including smaller 1 and 2-bedroomed units shall be provided and no more than 50% of the units shall exceed 3 bedrooms or 125sqm in size</i> • <i>A minimum area of 0.4ha (1 acre) shall be provided for voluntary / sheltered housing, of a type to be agreed with the Local Authority, in addition to any Part V obligations under the Wicklow Housing Strategy. Permission will not be considered for private housing until sufficient progress has been made on this element</i> • <i>Access to the site shall be from local road LP-1020</i> • <i>An amenity zone shall be established along the full southern and western boundaries of the action area, which shall comprise an amenity walk area along the existing tree lined filed boundaries connecting through the development to regional road R760 (Enniskerry – Kilmacanogue) and to the existing pedestrian route along the Dargle</i> • <i>The remainder of the site not designated for a particular purposed (either housing or amenity use) shall be retained in agricultural use for possible future development purposes</i> • <i>Any development shall be so designed to maintain maximum views of the Sugerloaf from Cookstown Road.</i>

Submission no. 9**Chandler, Reg**

This a long and very detailed submission which is difficult to succinctly summarise but the key issues arising are:-

1. The LAP is fundamentally flawed in that it is based on erroneous population assumptions and influenced unduly by the National Spatial Strategy and the Regional Planning Guidelines - the County Development Plan is similarly flawed by the same mechanisms.
2. The figures used for town population are erroneous and must refer to the DED and not the town itself
3. It is erroneous for the plan to propose population growth in Enniskerry when population has been falling. Therefore there is no logic in the zoning of additional housing land as proposed
4. The zoning of land in the town will have the negative effect of increasing land values and therefore pushing locals and first time home owners out of the market
5. The Action Area process does not benefit the local community and action areas 2, 3 and 4 should be abandoned
6. The plan should not make provision for additional retail in the town
7. There is a need for an equipped playground in the town which should be in Bog Meadow or AA3 and the LAP should include specific proposals for same
8. The LAP should include specific proposals to develop Bog Meadow
9. Road improvement proposals in the LAP should be confined to road strengthening, the installation of footpaths and provision of clear road markings. The policy of straightening road should to abandoned
10. The road link from Monastery to Fassaroe should be abandoned, in particular because it is unlikely to occur in the current economic climate. Improvements to the R117 / N11 junction are feasible obviating the need for this link road.
11. The statement that the WWTP has sufficiently capacity for the growth of the town to 2,190 is erroneous.
12. Additional tree preservation orders should be made and a view opened up between the old Texaco garage and Djouce Mountain

Manager's Response

1. The submitter has set out what he considers to be the flaws in the NSS and RPGs. It is outside the scope of this LAP to carrying out a fundamental review of the guidance documents and essentially the LAP must be consistent with the County Development Plan;
2. The population figures set out in the draft plan are confirmed as those provided by the CSO for the town of Enniskerry NOT the DED (the town population in 2006 was 1,881 and the DED was 2,696);
3. The plan must make provision for sufficient zoned land and services for the population projections set out in the County Development Plan. The targets in the County Development Plan were adopted by the elected members of Wicklow County Council in 2004. A review of the current County Development Plan is currently underway including an analysis of population trends. In the event that population targets for Enniskerry are altered, these targets will be adhered to, notwithstanding the zoning of land.
4. The surfeit of expensive, large homes in Enniskerry and the lack of affordable houses has been noted and the draft plan has proposed to address this by including the following policies:-
 - *The maximum size for any single residential estate shall be 60 units. Within each estate, a range of unit types / sizes shall be provided, within an overall unified design concept. Estates shall be differentiated from each other by the use of materially different design themes;*
 - *A full range of unit sizes, including smaller 1 and 2-bedroomed units shall be provided in all new housing areas. No more than 50% of the units in any development shall exceed 3 bedrooms or 120sqm in size;*
5. The purpose of Action Areas is to ensure the timely delivery of necessary engineering

and community infrastructure in conjunction with new housing, by phasing and time related conditions, or by requiring the housing developer to deliver the facilities. In the case of Enniskerry, the implementation of action areas 2, 3 and 4 would result in the delivery of a necessary link road between Monastery and the N11, a new community hall and voluntary / sheltered housing. These are all required in this community and may not otherwise occur.

6. The draft plan does not include any new 'retail' zoning but retail development can occur in the Town Centre zone where the demand exists – this is a matter for the market
7. The draft LAP requires the delivery of a playground in AA1. The Council will, where funding is provided, endeavour to provide playgrounds at other suitable locations.
8. A LAP is a land-use framework plan and it is outside its remit to include specific detailed proposals for Bog Meadow, which are ultimately dependent on funding becoming available.
9. The draft LAP does not include a policy for road straightening. Road safety improvements are an ongoing role of the Council and road improvements works will occur where a need is identified and funding is available
10. The objective to provide a link between Enniskerry and the N11 at Fassaroe is a long-term objective which was included in the previous development plan; it is considered appropriate to maintain given the current proposals to review the Bray Environs zoning which improve the likelihood of its delivery. This possible future road would have the dual function of providing an alternative access route to Enniskerry from the N11 and allowing a link to the proposed LUAS at Fassaroe. The option of providing a link road from the R117 / N11 junction directly to the Fassaroe Interchange has been considered and would entail significant works including a river crossing and excavation and is not considered a viable alternative.
11. The existing WWTP has a current loading of 5,200pe and a capacity of 6,000pe. This plant acts as an interim sludge hub where waste from other smaller plants is dewatered and thickened. The draft plan proposals to allow an increase in the population by 309 persons - spare capacity exists for this growth.
12. Tress may only be considered 'preserved' where they have legally been served a tree preservation order. The trees that are listed as those worthy to be considered have not yet been served with formal orders and therefore cannot be listed as such. A complete County survey of all TPO's and trees considered for TPOs has been carried out with a view to reviewing all, in the context of the County Development Plan review which has commenced. There is no listed view from the Texaco garage; however, there is a view listed for preservation between Monastery House and Djouce Mountain. It is not within the power of Wicklow County Council to enter onto private land to cut trees that may be currently blocking a view.

Managers Recommendation

No change

Submission no. 10

Coleman, Eamonn

This submission relates to lands located between the centre of Enniskerry and the Eagle Valley housing development to the south. The lands have road frontage onto Forge Road and onto Kilmolin Road and slope steeply upwards towards the southern site boundary. The lands were zoned 'AG' in the 2002 LAP and it is proposed to maintain this zoning in the draft LAP 2008.

It is requested that the lands be zoned R1 – new residential

This detailed submission sets out the various reasons why this zoning should be considered, the main reasons being:-

- the zoning of the lands would realise the vision for a compact town as expressed in the

<p>draft LAP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the draft LAP has zoned less appropriate lands for new residential development, in particular AA2 and AA4 - without a proactive woodland enhancement strategy, the existing trees are unlikely to survive - it is unrealistic and inappropriate to retain the agricultural objective having regard to the location of the lands in the centre of the town - insufficient regard is given the suitability of the lands for the provision of housing for the elderly, a need identified in the draft LAP
<p>Manager's Response</p> <p>It is not agreed that these lands are eminently suitable for residential development. Although it is noted that the lands are in the centre of the town and would have certain positive attributes relating to proximity to services, the provision of housing for the elderly and the provision of a new 'village green' as set out in the submission, the key determining factor in not proposing to zone the lands are the facts that (a) all of the mature trees along the Forge Road would be required to be removed to provide an entrance to the lands and (b) the lands and associated vegetation form a backdrop to the village when approached from the east and north. It is considered that the development of this area would have a significant impact on the attractiveness and rural quality of the town centre.</p> <p>When evaluating lands for possible future residential development, the planning authority considered first the lands in closest proximity to the town centre, but considered it necessary to discount lands with serious access or environmental issues. In this regard, consideration was given to the subject lands, to the lands now proposed as AA4 and lands to the north-east of the bridge (zoned AG(eco) in the previous LAP). The proposed zoning of AA4 was considered the best option given its proximity to the town centre, the flat topography of the site and the fact that an entrance could be provided on the local road obviating the need to fell any mature trees on the regional road opposite the Powerscourt entrance thereby preserving the character of this approach into the town.</p>
<p>Managers Recommendation</p> <p>No change</p>

<p>Submission no. 11</p>
<p>Cookstown Road Residents Association</p> <p>Objects to proposed zoning AA4 for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The quantity of housing proposed in AA4 is excessive given the restrictions of the Cookstown road – inadequate width, no footpaths or street lighting, no realistic speed restrictions; - There is no mains sewerage on this road; - The development of this land would impact on the listed view from Cookstown Road to the Sugarloaf
<p>Manager's Response</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Only 2.55ha of land is proposed for residential development in AA4. This would yield a maximum of 51 houses. Any development at this location would be required to show or provide adequate road infrastructure to meet the needs of residents; however, it should be noted that the speed limit restriction commences at the eastern side of proposed AA4 and there is an existing footpath along the entire length of the opposite side of Cookstown Road; 2. There is an existing rising main from Enniskerry Demesne the gravity sewer on the regional road near the Powerscourt entrance. This main is likely to have capacity to serve additional development. However, any new developments at this location would be required to show or provide adequate wastewater infrastructure to meet the needs of residents. 3. The issue of the listed view is addressed under Submission No. 8 above
<p>Managers Recommendation</p> <p>Amend AA4 (as set out in Submission 8 above)</p>

Submission no. 12
Corcoran, Noel
This submission concerns the existing mature trees along the Forge Road and the submitter's concerns regard interference / removal of these trees.
Manager's Response
Noted. The trees in question are on the GDP schedule "Trees and Groups of Trees considered for Preservation" and will be considered for TPOs in the current County Development Plan review
Managers Recommendation
No change

Submission no. 13
Cowzer, Edward
This submission concerns four residential properties that are located to the east of the proposed LAP boundary, on the regional road R117. It is requested that the LAP boundary be extended to include these properties. It is put forward that the benefit of this boundary extension would be the extension of the speed limit and piped sewerage to the properties.
Manager's Response
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The inclusion of these lands within the town boundary would not result in either a sewage connection becoming available or the speed limit being altered, as these are separate process to zoning. 2. The inclusion of these lands as RE – 'existing residential' would render open the possibility of infill development as the existing houses occupy a small portion of the lands in question. However, the likelihood of permission being obtained is extremely low due to the extremely hazardous alignment of the R117, which would render new entrances or increased turning movements impossible to consider.
Managers Recommendation
No change

Submission no. 14
Craig, Mary Rose
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Considers that Enniskerry should be designated a village with tourism identified as its key product 2. This plan does not make sufficient reference to traffic management and traffic calming 3. The maintenance of the village is poor 4. Parking is a problem in the town 5. The Summerhill Road should be designated as the preferred option from the N11 for tourists who wish to travel south 6. It is essential that no further houses are built on the remaining green spaces in the village and the AG zoning south of the village centre should be maintained.
Manager's Response
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As Enniskerry is designated a 'small growth town', not a village, in the County Development Plan, this nomenclature must be retained, as the LAP must be consistent with the County Development Plan. It is agreed that the tourism product and identity of Enniskerry is critical to its future and Wicklow County Council is supportive of suitable proposals to develop the tourism product. However, the promotion of tourism is outside the remit of a land-use plan and is managed by Failte Ireland and the County Tourism Board 2. The development plan is a framework for land-use in the town over the plan period, but is not the appropriate instrument to decide which works should be carried out, which is a matter for the budgetary process, which is decided annually. Therefore works such as road works / traffic calming would not come about through a land-use plan and therefore are not detailed / proposed in this draft plan; 3. Again, this is a land-use plan, which does not deal with detailed matters such as maintenance. This again is dealt with through the allocation of funds to the area engineer as part of the budgetary process; 4. There is an existing car park at Bog Meadow that is suitable for general public use and is

<p>directly adjacent to the core town services around the square. There are a number of smaller car parks around the town owned by private establishments. Furthermore, on street car parking is available. The key problem with car parking in Enniskerry is not the location or the quantity, but the unavailability of on-street spaces for short-term use (due to long stay usage) and temporary traffic blockages caused by on-street parking on both sides of narrow streets. Solutions can only be achieved through a parking management system, which is outside of the remit of the development plan process.</p> <p>5. The route suggested is not clear but it is assumed that the submitter is suggesting that visitors wanting to reach Powerscourt or other areas south of Enniskerry should use the Cookstown Road rather than the R117. This is a possible alternative but notwithstanding the winding nature of the R117, the Cookstown Road is a much narrower rural road with no road markings, footpaths or lighting and is not therefore considered that this route should be prioritised over the R117</p> <p>6. Noted. Residential development is not permitted on designated OS areas and the AG zoning is proposed to be maintained.</p>
<p>Managers Recommendation</p>
<p>No change</p>

<p>Submission no. 15</p>
<p>Cronin, Jackie</p>
<p>1. This submission appears to be concerned that the proposed zoning at Cookstown (AA4) is intended for a traveller halting site.</p> <p>2. The Fassaroe development would encroach on Enniskerry and this would have impacts on the village character and levels of traffic</p>
<p>Manager's Response</p>
<p>1. The draft LAP does not include proposals for a traveller halting site; however the development of AA4 is required to be accompanied by 1 acre of voluntary / sheltered housing which is intended to meet the needs of the elderly;</p> <p>2. It is not agreed that the Fassaroe proposals would unduly impact on Enniskerry or result in the coalescence of the settlement. The majority of the lands at Fassaroe are already zoned in the County Development Plan for employment development and the current draft Bray environs LAP has only proposed one area of zoning extension in the south-west quadrant of Fassaroe (proposed E2 zoning around the Roadstone lands). These lands are separated from Enniskerry by topography, trees screening and a river. No additional lands have been proposed for zoning on the west side of Fassaroe. However, in order to provide adequate protection to the existing buffer zone between the settlements, it is recommended that this area be designated a 'green belt' with strict limitation of development. As this is outside the boundary of either draft LAP, it is recommended that this green belt designation occur via the Rathdown No. 2 district plan, which is currently the subject of review (current variation No. 10). It is not clear how the development of this link road or of Fassaroe itself would increase traffic flows through Enniskerry town centre.</p>
<p>Managers Recommendation</p>
<p>No change</p>

<p>Submission no. 16</p>
<p>Cronin, Lynda</p>
<p>The submission relates to lands on the north side of the R117 immediately west of the Wastewater Treatment Plant (the draft LAP has proposed to zone this land RE). It is requested that the RE zone be expanded to include all the land in the Cronin family ownership. An indicative layout showing 7 houses is provided (there is currently one house on the lands). The submission is accompanied by a traffic assessment.</p>
<p>Manager's Response</p>
<p>The lands in question are zoned GB in the 2002 LAP and therefore development restrictions apply. Given the existence of a number of dwellings at this location and the 'bookend' provided by the WWTP, it is proposed in the draft plan to designate the existing properties as RE. The boundaries of the RE zone relate to the boundaries to the existing houses apparent</p>

<p>on the OS maps, which do not necessarily accord with property ownership. Given the location of these properties on the R117 which has poor alignment and sightline restrictions, the RE zoning was intended simply to recognise the existing land use and not necessarily for the purpose of allowing in-depth infill. A number of previous applications by the Cronin family at this location have been unsuccessful due to the traffic safety issues.</p> <p>It is therefore not recommend that the RE zone be expanded for the purpose of providing 6 additional units. In the event that it can be shown that one/some infill houses can be accommodated on the land currently proposed for RE zoning that meet all traffic safety criteria and other design policies of the LAP / County Development Plan, permission may be considered.</p>
<p>Managers Recommendation</p>
<p>No change</p>

<p>Submission no. 17</p>
<p>Dunne Kavanagh, Anne</p>
<p>This submissions relates to land measuring c. 1.3ha between the Cookstown Road and the R117, to the east of the Summerhill House Hotel. It is requested that these lands be zoned for low density housing</p>
<p>Manager's Response</p>
<p>The land in question measures c. 1.14ha of which 0.7ha is proposed for RE zoning in the draft LAP. The land already proposed for RE zoning is occupied by two existing houses and one additional undeveloped area measuring c. 0.3ha, which may be suitable for infill development. The additional lands requested for zoning are occupied by mature trees, which form a boundary between this part of the settlement and the lower land to the north along the R117.</p> <p>It is considered that the development of the suggested land would unduly impact on the character and natural amenity of the area through the combination of tree removal and the likely prominence of any structures at this location.</p>
<p>Managers Recommendation</p>
<p>No change</p>

<p>Submission no. 18</p>
<p>Fisher, Dermot</p>
<p>This submission relates to lands owned by the Fisher family in Monastery. It is requested that the proposed zoning of 5.7ha (AA2) be removed and an alternative area of c. 1.6ha along the Ballyman Glen zoned for housing instead.</p>
<p>Manager's Response</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. During the adoption of the previous LAP, the elected members resolved to zone 3 acres of land on the Fisher family for a maximum of 12 houses. However, the location of the land on the farm was not clearly specified and lands immediately to the south of Monastery Grove were designated. It was brought to the attention of the Planning Authority during the currency of the existing LAP that the land intended for zoning for those lands along the Ballyman Glen, just south of Ballyman Road. The rectification of this error is proposed to be made through this review process; 2. During the course of the review process, it became apparent that it would not be possible to zone the land along the Ballyman Glen in the absence of a Habitats Directive (Appropriate Assessment) as the Ballyman Glen is a cSAC. Furthermore, a submission was made by Ruth Fisher for the zoning of lands located in the area of what is proposed to be designated AA2. This suggestion was taken on board and the land was proposed for zoning. The lands originally zoned in the 2002 LAP in error were removed. <p>The lands now requested for zoning cannot be zoned due to proximity to the cSAC outside of the context of a complete Habitats Directive (Appropriate Assessment) which would need to show definitely that no impacts on the cSAC might arise from development. It is considered most likely that this site would fail such an Appropriate Assessment, given the proximity to the cSAC, the topography and drainage of the land and special characteristic of this cSAC (which is particularly susceptible to alterations in the water regime).</p>

Managers Recommendation
No change

Submission no. 19
Landsea, Gabrielle
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed increase in population of 309 persons (10%) is excessive and would put undue pressure on the village which is already suffering with traffic congestion 2. The draft plan makes no specific proposals regarding the protection of the natural environment surrounding the town 3. The development of AA4 would contradict the aim to preserve the natural environment and a park would be a more appropriate use 4. The village should be protected and preserved and not turned into a town. 5. A one-way traffic system is needed
Manager's Response
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is considered that Enniskerry has capacity to absorb additional population and the County Development Plan has in fact set the growth target. The additional growth will hopefully bring additional vitality to the town centre and will provide the impetus for new services such as an enterprise area and a new school. Any temporary traffic congestion that arises in Enniskerry is not due to high traffic flows but to unregulated on-street car parking and peak drop-off/collection times at the school 2. The draft plan includes all proposals / objectives that are within the remit of a land-use plan with regard to the protection of the natural environment. 3. The rationale for the zoning of AA4 has already been set out in this report (see Submissions 8 & 10) 4. The issue of the 'designation' of the settlement as a town in the County Development Plan has already been addresser in this report (see Submission 7) 5. The issue of traffic management has already been addressed in this report (see Submissions No.'s 6 & 14)
Managers Recommendation
No change

Submission no. 20
Lawlor, Colin & Valerie & Family
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The unique heritage of the village should be maintained and protected. The village should be designated a 'heritage village' 2. Population growth should be limited and carefully controlled 3. Children's play facilities should be provided 4. The 'amphitheatre' topography of the village should be maintained and in particular the AG zone to the south of the town centre should be maintained 5. A traffic management plan is required for the village and the issue of car parking addressed 6. Improved signage is required 7. Employment growth should be focused on tourism rather than offices – the plan to provide 1ha of office space in AA1 may not meet this goal 8. Restriction on height and design in the town centre are required 9. The re-development of Crimmins garage is supported and the move of the community hall to Bog Meadow 10. The possible future school location in AA1 is not logical given its distance from the town centre and residential areas. It is suggested that the lands zoned R2 are utilised instead for school expansion 11. A green belt around Enniskerry is required to ensure Enniskerry does not coalesce with Bray 12. All trees listed in the plan should be preserved, in particular those trees along Forge Road
Manager's Response
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The question of 'heritage village' designation has already been addressed in this report (see Submission 7)

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The draft plan does propose limited and controlled population growth 3. The draft LAP requires the delivery of a playground in AA1. The Council will, where funding is provided, endeavour to provide playgrounds at other suitable locations. 4. Noted. It is proposed to maintain the AG zoning 5. The issue of traffic management and car parking has already been addressed in detail in the report (see Submissions 6 & 14) 6. This is a land-use plan, which does not deal with detailed matters such as signage and does not effect the delivery of same. New / improved signage is a matter for the area engineer (subject to funding) and various tourism agencies 7. The importance of tourism employment is acknowledged; however, census data shows that the highest proportion (around 50%) of workers in the Enniskerry area work in office based type employment (such a clerical / officer workers, professionals and administrative workers). Therefore the draft plan has made provision of a small scale employment area in AA1 principally in an office / studio type format. 8. The draft plan includes a policy <i>"New developments (including the refurbishment of buildings) shall generally be two-storey in the town centre area and shall have regard to the protection of the residential and architectural amenities of structures in the immediate environs, but alternative and contemporary designs shall also be encouraged (including alternative materials, heights and building forms), to provide for visual diversity"</i>. 9. Noted 10. It is agreed that expansion of the existing school site would be preferable if the space issues could be resolved. However, at this time, the lands to the west of the school are zoned for residential development and have been granted planning permission for housing (currently on appeal) and are therefore not available for school expansion. Given the lack of available suitable sites in closer proximity to the town centre, the site in AA1 is considered the only viable alternative and this location has been supported by the school and the Dept of Education 11. The issues of a green belt has been addressed in Submissions 7 & 15 12. The issue of TPO's has already been addressed in this report (see Submissions 7, 9 & 12)
Managers Recommendation
No change

Submission no. 21
McGlinchey, Gerry
This submission concerns lands located on the north side of Ballyman Road, near the County boundary. The existing dwelling 'Brookville' occupies an area of 2ha of which 0.6ha is zoned RE. It is requested that the residential zoning be expanded to the north by 0.2ha.
Manager's Response
The RE zoning along Ballyman Road is for the most part confined to existing properties and some small areas of undeveloped land with road frontage between properties (which might be suitable for small infill development). No lands are as such zoned for new development along the north side of the road in an effect to prevent the spread of Enniskerry north of Ballyman Road. In this regard, the proposed zoning (which is not along the public road but to the rear of Brookville) would undermine this objective.
Managers Recommendation
No change

Submission no. 22
Moore, Charlie
This submission relates to land measuring c. 2ha at Monastery on the west side of the 'Dublin Road', between Monastery House and Ashridge Green. It is requested that these lands be zoned for low density residential
Manager's Response
The Manager is opposed to the proposal for the following reasons:-

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The land proposed for low density housing is directly adjoining Knocksink Wood (cSAC) and therefore cannot be considered for zoning / development outside of the context of the carrying out of a full Habitats Directive (Appropriate) Assessment - The population projections set out in the draft plan (which accord with the County Development Plan 2004) and the calculation of required land zoning are set out in Section Part A of the draft plan. The quantity of zoned land required takes into account the 2006 census population, permissions granted and constructed since 2006 and existing permissions, which have yet to begin construction. These sections clearly set out the process under which it was determined what land requirements were needed in order to accommodate the projected population in 2016. The calculations also provide for an “excess factor” and substantial “headroom”, given the location of the settlement of Enniskerry, its designation as a Small Growth Town I in the Regional Planning Guidelines and the demand for housing. The draft plan has proposed new residential zoning on the basis of the need identified by these calculations. No further residential zoning is required to meet the current populations targets and the excessive zoning of land (even for low density housing) may lead to population targets being exceeded, to the overall detriment of the settlement. - Enniskerry has a surfeit of low-density housing and needs smaller, affordable units at normal densities. - The land in question is located on a very poorly aligned section of the road and displays a very high bank along the roadside boundary and it is unlikely that an entrance meeting all required safety standards could be achieved
Managers Recommendation
No change

Submission no. 23
O'Hanlon, Annette
The submission refers to an area of land located on the east side of local road L-1007 between Enniskerry Bridge and Monastery, approx 75m north of the bridge. It is requested that this land be zoned 'existing residential'
Manager's Response
<p>The land in question is small triangle of land along the public road, bounded to the west by the public road, to the east of existing properties and to the south by an access lane. The site measures c. 340sqm. The site is currently a landscaped area along the public road and it appears that it has been maintained by the Enniskerry Tidy Towns as part of the 'public domain' for a number of years.</p> <p>Permission has previously been refused for a dwelling on the site, as the site was not adequate in size to meet development standards.</p> <p>The previous LAP denoted this land as being part of the public road. However in recognition of its open nature, it is proposed to redesignate it as OS (passive open space). Given that the site is not adequate in size and configuration to accommodate residential development, it is not recommended that this designation be altered</p>
Managers Recommendation
No change

Submission no. 24
O'Hara, Michael
<p>Is opposed to AA4 for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The development of this land would diminish the amenity enjoyed by residents of Enniskerry Demesne, particularly the impact on the views of the Sugarloaf 2. The building of voluntary / sheltered housing would completely change the tone of the area
Manager's Response
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This issue has already been addressed in this report in response to Submissions 8 & 11 2. It is not set out how the provision of voluntary / sheltered housing for the elderly is likely to lower the tone of the area, so it is difficult to respond to this; it is however a

needed facility in the town
Managers Recommendation
Amend AA4 as set out above

Submission no. 25
Owens, Mary & Paul
This submission addresses a number of issues but in particular:- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enniskerry should be a protected village 2. The natural bowl around the village should be protected 3. Only modest infill should be allowed 4. Sympathetic design with a heritage theme should be applied 5. The rate of development should simulate its historical development 6. Heritage, tourist and rural values should be protected 7. Traffic improvements are required
Manager's Response
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This issue has been addressed previously in this report (see Submission 7) 2. Noted 3. Only modest growth is proposed for the town 4. Noted 5. Only modest growth is proposed 6. The plan endeavours to balance the protection of heritage and qualities with the development of the town 7. The issue of traffic management has been previously addressed in this report (see Submissions 6 & 14)
Managers Recommendation
No change

Submission no. 26
Petters, Yanny
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enniskerry should continue to be called a village not a town and should be designated a 'heritage village' 2. It is important to protect Enniskerry from coalescence with Bray 3. Traffic and parking improvements are necessary 4. Infill rather than new greenfield development should be encouraged 5. The amphitheatre topography of Enniskerry should be maintained and AG land on the south side of the village maintained 6. Opposes the link road between Fassaroe and Monastery. Consider the nature of the R117 / N11 insufficient justification for the new road. The traffic management issues at Ballyman that would result from this link are not addressed. 7. AA2 zoning is excessive and is not necessary, in particular it is not necessary for the provision of access to the R1 lands adjacent which could be accessed from a new roundabout at the Monastery / Ballyman Road junction 8. AA3 lands should be developed as a terrace of houses and community hall 9. Tourism employment should be encouraged and a visitor / heritage centre should be supported (Powerscourt NS building when vacated is suggested location). Improved signage is required including new signage to local monuments 10. The design of future village infill should be strictly controlled 11. The R2 lands behind St. Mary's NS should be considered for school expansion rather than lands at Kilgarran Hill or should be considered for social & affordable housing 12. The WWTP does not appear to be operating effectively as evidenced by odours 13. The Forge should be used as a public building and not allowed to be converted to a private house 14. Items listed for preservation should be maintained 15. It is important that listed trees are preserved and a number of amendments to the list are suggested

Manager's Response
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This issue has already has already been addressed in this report (see Submission 7) 2. This issue has already has already been addressed in this report (see Submission 7) 3. This issue has already has already been addressed in this report (see Submissions 6 & 14) 4. This is noted and agreed but the plan must make provision for sufficient new zoned land to meet the population target as the quantum or likelihood of infill development is difficult to predict and impossible to guarantee that it will become available for development 5. Noted – it is proposed to maintain the AG zone 6. The necessity of this road objective has already been set out in this report (see Submission 7 & 9) 7. The proposed alternative access route to the R1 zone lands is noted but would be difficult to realise given the layout of existing roads and residential properties in the immediate area. The justification for the zoning of the AA2 lands has already been set out in this report (see Submission 18) and was not for the sole purpose of providing access to R1 8. The proposed zoning of AA3 would allow for the development suggested 9. The importance of tourism employment is acknowledged; however, it is not within the scope of land-use plan to deliver a visitor / heritage centre. The issue of signage has been previous addressed in this report (see Submission 20) 10. The plan contains policies to ensure this objective is realised 11. This issue has already been addressed in this report (see Submission 20) 12. This is not a matter for a land-use plan, but this will be referred to the Water Services Section. 13. The Forge is a structure in private ownership and therefore it is in not within the power of Wicklow County Council to require a change of use 14. Agreed 15. The issue of trees has already been addressed in this report (see Submissions 7 & 9)
Managers Recommendation
No change

Submission no. 27
Ryan, Declan
<p>This submission is quite detailed, particularly with regard to population calculations but the key issues are as follows:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The plan to increase the number of houses by 359 is excessive given that there were only 554 houses in the village in 2006 (increase of 65%) 2. Household size estimate used should be revised down and this will require less new land zoning 3. The proposed rezoning of lands on Cookstown Road is unsuitable given the distance to the town centre and the unsuitability of the road network in the area including poor alignment and width, the lack of speed controls on the road, the absence of pedestrian / lighting facilities 4. The zoning of agricultural lands around the periphery of the village is likely to result in unsuitable suburban type development in the settlement which would detract for the village character 5. The proposed zoning of lands will result in mature tree loss, which significantly contribute to the character of the settlement. It is requested that the trees along Cookstown Road are included in the list for preservation 6. It is put forward that the existing WWTP is not adequate to accommodate the growth in population proposed
Manager's Response
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 2006 population for the settlement of Enniskerry revealed a population of 1,881 in 554 households. It is estimated that in order to grow the population from 1,881 to 2,190 (309 persons) over an 8-year period, a total of 120 new dwellings will be required (only 20% expansion). This population target is set out in the adopted County Development Plan 2004-2010.

However, between 2006 and 2016 it is also estimated that household size will drop significantly and in Enniskerry, this may require the provision of up to 180 new dwellings. The average household size in Enniskerry is above the County average (at 3.4) and therefore may not drop to the predicted average of 2.56 by 2016. In that case, the additional 180 units will not be necessary. In order to ensure that housing growth is commensurate with population targets, the draft LAP includes a policy that *“Notwithstanding the zoning of land for residential purposes, the Development Management process shall monitor and implement the 2010 and 2016 population targets and shall phase and restrict, where necessary, the granting of residential planning permissions to ensure these targets are not exceeded”*;

2. The household size used in Enniskerry for 2016 is 2.56 which is a County-wide figure applied in all local area plans. The Local Authority will continue to monitor population trends and again, will ensure through the regulation of planning permission that population targets are not exceeded.
3. The justification for the zoning of land at Cookstown has previously been set out in this report (see Submission 8 & 10). With regard to road safety issues, development will only be considered where the road network can be shown to be suitable to accommodate the proposed increase in traffic and pedestrian movements;
4. It is considered that implementation of the policies and objectives set in this draft plan and the County Development Plan with regard to good design will result in suitably designed developments. However, it is considered that this should be re-enforced by the making of slight amendment to the draft plan (see below)
5. Those trees that are listed for preservation or to be considered for preservation will be protected. Other amenity trees will be protected where feasible, balancing the demands of the plan and the community. The trees along the roadside boundary of AA4 are not considered to be of high amenity value whereas the trees along the southern and western boundaries are and the plan therefore requires their preservation and an amenity buffer zone
6. The WWTP is of sufficient capacity for the growth of the town by 300 persons

Managers Recommendation

Amend Part B: Section 4 as follows (new text shown in red):-

In the RE and R (new residential) zones, house improvements, alterations and extensions and appropriate infill / new residential development in accordance with principles of good design and protection of existing residential amenity will be permitted. While new developments shall have regard to the protection of the residential and architectural amenities of houses / buildings in the immediate environs, alternative and contemporary designs shall be encouraged (including alternative materials, heights and building forms), to provide for visual diversity;

Submission no. 28

Somerville, W. B

1. The zoning of land at AA4 would contradict the objective to preserve the view from Cookstown Road to the Sugarloaf
2. The local road serving AA4 is inadequate to accommodate the development as is the junction of the Cookstown Road with the regional road
3. The density proposed for AA4 is excessive given the pattern of development in the area and such a quantum of development will place excessive strain on infrastructure
4. The proposed restriction on house sizes is not realistic as the demand in such an area is for 3/4/5 bedroom family homes
5. The proposals to provide sheltered housing for the elderly is welcomed and is needed in the town and therefore a greater area should be devoted to this use

Manager's Response

1. This issue has been addressed previously in this report (see Submission 8)
2. Only 2.55ha of land is proposed for residential development in AA4. This would yield a maximum of 51 houses. Any development at this location would be required to show or provide adequate road infrastructure to meet the needs of residents.

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Enniskerry has a surfeit of low-density housing (particular in this part of the settlement) and needs smaller, affordable units at normal densities. It has already been set out in this report that infrastructural serves are adequate to accommodate this growth; 4. It is apparent from a number of submissions and the public consultation carried out that there is need for smaller affordable homes in Enniskerry. House building in the last 10 years has been dominated by large dwelling in low density formats which are not affordable to first time home owners / young families / those on low incomes. 5. It is considered that the draft plan makes generous provision for voluntary / sheltered housing for the elderly
Managers Recommendation
Amend AA4 (see Submission 8)

Submission no. 29
Walker, Mike
<p>This submission raises a wide range of issues but the principal planning and land-use concerns are:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The assumptions regarding population should be reviewed in light of changing economic circumstances; 2. There should be more emphasis placed on tourism and the development of tourist activities 3. The proposed location for housing for the elderly is not optimal re distance from the town centre 4. The plan does not provide sufficient details with regard to traffic and transport proposals including pedestrian and cycling facilities. Firmer proposals are required with regard to improving public transport 5. No reference is made in the plan to energy or waste facilities 6. Plan places too much emphasis on new developments being of 'alternative and contemporary design' and 'of their own time' rather than respecting the existing character 7. The plan does not make clear how it will enhance opportunities for new enterprise 8. The plan should address the issue of disabled access to community facilities 9. Proposals to protected trees, hedgerows, watercourse and other features of natural landscape are welcomed. <p>(Note: This submission also seeks clarity of the meaning of a number of words and phrases throughout the draft plan and while these comments are noted, they are not strictly relevant to the content of the plan)</p>
Manager's Response
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manner in which population and zoning calculations have been carried out is detailed in Part A of the plan and also addressed previously in this report (see Submissions 9 & 27). Short to medium term economic conditions are not relevant to land use plans, which have a longer strategic horizon. 2. It is agreed that the tourism product and identity of Enniskerry is critical to its future and Wicklow County Council is supportive of suitable proposals to develop the tourism product. However, the promotion of tourism is outside the remit of a land-use plan and is managed by Failte Ireland and the County Tourism Board 3. The location proposed for sheltered housing is actually very close the town centre (c. 600m) and is the closest available land for housing. 4. This issue of traffic management has been addressed previously in this report (see Submission 14). Wicklow County Council plays no role in the delivery of public transport but can play a support role in providing land-use frameworks that facilitate the efficient delivery of public transport. In this regard, the plan facilitates opportunities to link Enniskerry to the future LUAS at Fassaroe by road (via new Fassaroe – Monastery link road) and by foot. 5. This is a land-use plan, which plays no role in the delivery of energy or waste infrastructure. 6. The imitation or replication of historic buildings / building styles does not necessary

enhance or improve historic areas and instead can weaken their overall value. While new buildings should respects their context, a well-designed modern building will serve to emphasis the old and add to its perceived value. This does not however prevent development of buildings in an historic idiom provided these are well designed.

7. It is identified in Part A of the draft plan and previously in this report that a high proportion of those at work residing in Enniskerry work in office based type employment. The plan has therefore made provision of employment zoned land in AA1.
8. New building are required to comply with Part M of the Building Regulations which deal with disabled access
9. Noted

Managers Recommendation

No change