



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

**Commission Direction**  
**CD-000394**  
**PL-500550-SD-26**

---

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

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

**Planning Commissioner:**



**MaryRose McGovern**

**Date:**

**7<sup>th</sup> day of April 2026**

**DRAFT WORDING FOR ORDER**

**Reasons and Considerations**

1. Having regard to the proposed development of a single residential unit on lands which are zoned 'EE' by the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028, with the objective of providing for enterprise and employment related uses, and under which "Residential" uses are 'Not Permitted', as set out by Table

12.10 of the plan (Use Classes Related to Zoning Objective 'EE'), it is considered that the development of this greenfield site to provide a dwellinghouse and its domestic curtilage at this location, would be contrary to the zoning provisions of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area

2. Furthermore, the proposed development of an additional dwelling house at this location, at Peamount Lane which is not to Roads standard with regard to width and construction, and is not served by footpath/s or public lighting, would, by reason of increased traffic generation on a substandard road, endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard, and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

**Note:** The Commission noted the absence of details regarding the proposed proprietary wastewater treatment system, including the absence of a site characterisation assessment and details of the domestic waste water treatment system proposed for this site. Whilst ordinarily this might warrant further consideration and a request for further information, in this instance given the substantive reasons for refusal above, it was decided not to pursue these matters under the current appeal.