

██████████ Glebemount,
Wicklow.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

We are the owners of ██████████ Glebemount, our property immediately adjoins Fernhill House and lands, which are the subject of Proposed Material Amendment No. 26.

We note that this proposed amendment, if allowed, will change the zoning from Community/Education to permit high density housing on part of the lands and Community/Education development on Fernhill House and its immediate surroundings. It also includes a requirement for pedestrian/cycle access from the site to Friarshill. It would appear that the only way to provide same is through the private estate of Glebemount, through lands outside of the ownership & control of the Fernhill landowners.

While we are aware that submissions to the proposed material alterations must relate to the proposals contained in WCC Proposed Material Amendment No. 26, we cannot ignore the submission requesting a change in current zoning of these lands, made on behalf of the landowners, the Delahunt family (submission No. 142). As it will be too late making a submission in relation to any future planning application for the lands, once the zoning has been changed.

This submission proposes high density 3 storey, courtyard type housing on the field immediately behind our house. We have no objection in principle to housing on this land, however 3 storey houses will completely overlook the 10 bungalows in Glebemount which adjoin it, including our home. Any housing on these lands should be restricted to two stories in height and should be at least 10 metres from the rear boundary of existing houses.

The submission on behalf of the Delahunt family proposes that Fernhill House is to be brought back into use as a community/educational facility. The owners state that they have identified a potential use as a Forest School comprising after school clubs, weekend sessions, school tours & camps and daily childcare services. Before any houses are built this should be developed and operational before any houses are occupied.

Based on the above proposed change of use of Fernhill House, we are completely opposed to the proposed pedestrian access through Glebemount, which is indicated on drawings included in the landowners submission and is also stipulated as a requirement in the Councils Proposed Material Amendment No. 26. Any pedestrian access through Glebemount will require the consent of the residents and there has been no discussion or consultation with residents. The owners of these lands can not propose this when they have no legal standing.

A pedestrian access to a school would give rise to a huge increase in traffic through the cul de sacs in the vicinity of the new access, as it would definitely be used by motorists to drop/collect from the proposed school, resulting in congestion and give rise to a traffic hazard & ongoing parking issues in a residential area. The traffic and parking generated by the Fernhill development should not be allowed to spill over onto adjoining estates and the Fernhill site should be capable of accommodating all increased traffic and parking.

This is totally unacceptable to us and to our neighbours. There is very limited parking within the estate as most families have at least 2 cars and only off street parking for 1. Furthermore, many homes have

3 cars, as adult children are living at home because they cannot afford to move out. In addition, there are a lot of young children in the estate who play on the green area adjacent to the proposed pedestrian access, the additional traffic movements caused by a school in the immediate vicinity would be a danger to them.

As you may be aware there is already a preschool in the vicinity at house number [REDACTED] Glebemount, which opened in the past couple of years. This property is situated on a very busy junction and generates a lot of traffic and dangerous parking on a busy corner during drop off and collection times.

In conclusion, we are totally opposed to any development within Fernhill, which proposes a pedestrian/cycle or any access through Glebemount, as it will constitute a traffic hazard and interfere with the residential amenity of our home.

Denise & Enda Luddy

[REDACTED]
D. Luddy. 