



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Direction
CD-021660-26
ACP-323444-25

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 07/01/2026.

The Commission decided to refuse permission, generally in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation, for the following reasons and considerations.

**Planning
Commissioner:**

Date: 07/01/2026

Tom Rabbette

DRAFT WORDING FOR ORDER

Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the location of a significant portion of the site in an identified Flood Zone, pending the outcome of the Camac River Flood Alleviation Scheme, the Commission is not satisfied, on the basis of the information lodged with the planning application and the appeal, that the development appropriately mitigates the risk of flooding on the site in accordance with the recommendations of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, and the provisions of the 'Planning System and Flood Risk Management - Guidelines for Planning Authorities' (2009). The proposed development if permitted would, therefore, contravene Policy SI14 and SI15 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028. The Commission are not satisfied that the development would not give

rise to a heightened risk of flooding either on the proposed development site itself, or on other lands.

2. Having regard to the height, scale and density of development, it is considered that the proposed development would constitute overdevelopment of the site, including an exceedance of the indicative density range for the site, would have an unreasonable overbearing and visually dominant effect on adjoining sites, would seriously injure the amenity of existing residents of the area by way of undue overlooking and overshadowing impacts. The development also fails to provide an adequate standard of communal and public open space for future residents. For those reasons the proposed development would contravene the development plan by failing to have regard to the performance criteria set out in table 3 of Appendix 3 as well as the Z1 zoning objective which seeks to protect, provide and improve residential amenities and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

NOTE:

The Commission also agreed with the Inspector's recommended refusal reasons numbers 3 and 4 but decided that these may be considered new issues in the context of the appeal and, given the substantive reasons for refusal as indicated above, decided not to pursue those matters any further at this juncture.

The Commission also considered that issues raised in these recommended refusal reasons introduced some degree of uncertainty with regards to the likelihood and significance of potential effects arising from the proposed development in the context of environmental impact assessment screening (notwithstanding the Inspector's recommended EIA screening conclusion). However, it was decided not to pursue these matters at this juncture given the substantive reasons for refusal.

(Direction to issue with Order.)