

An Bord Pleanála



Inspector's Report

Application under section 146B of the Planning & Development Act 2000 as amended.

Proposed alterations to Connolly Satellite Centre including alteration to car parking, drainage layout and introduction of a proposed Dandelion sculpture and generator (case ref. 29S.PA0043) Connolly Hospital, Blanchardstown, Dublin 15.

Planning Authority: Fingal County Council

Requester: National Paediatric Hospital Development Board (NPHDB)

Location: Connolly Hospital, Blanchardstown, Dublin 15.

Site Visit: Monday 25th June 2018

Inspector: Tom Rabbette

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The requester was granted permission, under 29N.PA0043, for a new National Paediatric Hospital. The development as granted is located across four sites in three different planning authority administrative areas. The main hospital itself is to be located at the St. James's Hospital campus at James's Street in Dublin 8 which is in the administrative area of Dublin City Council, as is one of the other sites which accommodates a temporary construction stage compound at Davitt Road in Dublin 12. The two other sites are each to accommodate a satellite centre, one at The Adelaide & Meath Hospital (also known as Tallaght Hospital) and one at Connolly Hospital in Blanchardstown, Dublin 15. The requester is now submitting this request to An Bord Pleanála, pursuant to section 146B of the Planning & Development Act 2000 (as amended) for alterations to the terms of that permission. The alterations sought in this instance relate to the works for the satellite centre at Connolly Hospital in Blanchardstown.

There are four elements to the proposed alteration of the works at the Connolly Hospital site as per the requester's submission. They relate to: alterations to car parking; a proposed generator; alterations to the drainage layout, and a proposed sculpture.

2.0 PLANNING HISTORY

29N.PA0043: An Bord Pleanála granted permission, subject to 17 no. conditions, for the development a new National Paediatric Hospital at the St. James's Hospital campus, associated Satellite Centres at Tallaght and Connolly Hospitals and a temporary construction compound at Davitt Road, Drimnagh.

Permission was granted for a period of 10 no. years for the development of the proposed new National Paediatric Hospital, which is an integrated health infrastructure development comprising 6 no. principal elements and ancillary development as set out below:

- (i) a 473 no. bed new children's hospital (up to 118,113 sq.m. gross floor area) at the St. James's Hospital Campus, James's Street, Dublin 8 (which contains Protected Structures);
- (ii) a 53 no. bed family accommodation unit (up to 4,354 sq.m. gross floor area) at the St. James's Hospital Campus, James's Street, Dublin 8 (which contains Protected Structures);
- (iii) a children's research and innovation centre (up to 2,971 sq.m. gross floor area) at the St. James's Hospital Campus, James's Street, Dublin 8 (which contains Protected Structures);

(iv) a construction compound at the former Unilever site at Davitt Road, Drimnagh, Dublin 12;

(v) a children's hospital satellite centre at The Adelaide & Meath Hospital Dublin (Tallaght Hospital), Belgard Square North, Tallaght, Dublin 24 (up to 4,466. sq.m. gross floor area); and

(vi) a children's hospital satellite centre at Connolly Hospital Campus in Blanchardstown, Dublin 15 (up to 5,093 sq.m. gross floor area).

PM0012: An Bord Pleanála decided to alter the decision on the above application, ref. PA0043, following a request from the applicant to do so. The alteration related to works for the NPH at the St. James's Hospital campus. Specifically, it related to changes to basement levels in the main NPH building at that location.

3.0 REQUESTER'S SUBMISSION

There are four elements to the proposed alteration as per the requester's submission, they are:

Alteration to Car Parking:

- The removal of the approved crescent area of car parking to the south of the main hospital entrance and the landscaping of this area.
- The removal of the approved parallel spaces on the east-west internal service road to the west of the crescent shaped area.
- The removal of the four no. drop-off spaces on the north side of the internal east-west service road and the relocation of these spaces to the south of the ambulance zone.
- The removal and relocation of the parallel parking on the south side of the east-west internal service road.
- The reorganisation of the parking area to the east of the approved satellite centre to accommodate relocated spaces removed from the front of the satellite centre.
- The provision of a new car parking containing 39 no. spaces approximately 150 metres to the west of the approved satellite centre to replace the aforementioned spaces to be removed and relocated.
- The reorganisation of the ambulance and delivery zone area.

Proposed Generator:

- A generator is to be located adjacent to the approved fuel tanks and plant on site.
- To be located to the south east of the satellite centre.

Proposed Drainage Layout:

- The relocation of the approved surface water attenuation tank from its approved location under car parking in front of the proposed satellite centre.
- The downsizing of the approved attenuation tank from 440 cu.m. to 399 cu.m.
- The construction of a separate surface water attenuation tank beneath the proposed relocated car parking of 65 cu.m.

Proposed 'Dandelion' sculpture:

- A proposed 'Dandelion' sculpture will be located at the corner of the east-west service road and entrance to the main hospital.

Some of the proposed alteration is located outside of the original red line site boundary but within the blue line landholding boundary.

In the requester's submission to the Board it is considered that the proposed alteration is not material. In holding that the proposed alteration is not material the requester cites: limited scale; location within a campus setting; accordance with the pattern of development and no/low impact on surrounding landowners. It is further held that the proposed alteration is not material when one considers that the public notices would not be different to those originally published and the Board's decision would not have been different.

However, the requester states that if the Board decides that the proposed alteration is material it then refers the Board to a report submitted that sets out the main environmental issues in relation to the alteration. The topics in the original EIS are reviewed in the context of the proposed alteration. It is held by the requester that the proposed alteration could not reasonably be expected to have any significant effects on the environment.

An AA Screening Report was also submitted with the request. It concludes that it is possible to exclude that the proposed alteration will have a significant effect on any European site.

4.0 LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

- 4.1 Section 146B of the Act provides alteration by the Board of strategic infrastructure development on request made of it.
- 4.2 Initially under the terms of section 146B(2)(a) the Board must decide as soon as possible, whether or not the making of a proposed alteration would

constitute “the making of a material alteration of the terms of the development concerned”. Section 146B(2)(b) provides that “before making a decision under this subsection, the Board may invite submissions in relation to the matter to be made to it by such person or class of person as the Board considers appropriate (which class may comprise the public if, in the particular case, the Board determines that it shall do so); the Board shall have regard to any submissions made to it on foot of that invitation”.

- 4.3 If the Board decides that the alteration proposed would not constitute a material alteration, the Board must proceed to alter the permission (Section 146B(3)(a)).
- 4.4 If, however, as provided for in section 146B(3)(b) the Board decides that the making of the alteration would constitute the making of such a material alteration, it shall then determine whether to,
- (i) make the alteration,
 - (ii) make an alteration of the terms of the development concerned, being an alteration that would be different from that to which the request relates (but which would not, in the opinion of the Board, represent, overall, a more significant change to the terms of the development than that which would be represented by the latter alteration), or
 - (iii) refuse to make the alteration.
- 4.5 Section 146B(4), however, provides that before making a determination under subsection (3)(b), the Board shall determine whether the extent and character of the alteration requested under subsection (1), and any alternative alteration under subsection (3)(b)(ii), are such that the alteration, were it to be made, would be likely to have significant effects on the environment.
- 4.6 Under section 146B(8) before the Board makes a determination under sections 146B(3)(b) or 146B(4), it is required to make, or require the requester to make, information relating to the request available for inspection to certain persons and/or the public. Submissions and observations are to be invited and the Board is required to have regard to any such submissions or observations received.
- 4.7 Section 146B(5) provides that If the Board determines that the making of either kind of alteration referred to in subsection (3)(b) is not likely to have significant effects on the environment, it shall proceed to make a determination under subsection (3)(b), or is likely to have such effects, the provisions of section 146C shall apply.
- 4.8 Section 146C relates to the preparation of environmental impact statement for purposes of section 146B and applies to a case where the determination of

the Board under section 146B(4) is that the making of either kind of alteration referred to in section 146B(3)(b) is likely to have significant effects on the environment.

5.0 ASSESSMENT

Consideration of materiality

As indicated in the preceding section, the first consideration in relation to this request to alter the terms of PA0043 is to determine if the making of the alteration would constitute the making of a material alteration of the terms of the National Children's Hospital development as granted. This will be assessed hereunder.

Alteration to Car Parking

The alteration seeks to reorganise the parking layout. Under the parent permission a total of 80 car parking spaces as well as 3 no. ambulance bays and delivery bays were granted permission. The alteration as sought will not increase or decrease the overall number of spaces but rather reorganises the parking provision.

There are seven elements to the car parking alteration as sought. The previously approved crescent area of car parking immediately to the front of the main entrance to the existing hospital building is to be eliminated and this area is to be landscaped. This will improve the overall visual amenity of the hospital entrance. Previously approved parallel parking spaces on the east-west internal service road to the west of the crescent shaped area are to be removed. Likewise, 4 no. approved drop-off spaces on the north side of the internal east-west service road are to be removed and relocated to the south of the ambulance zone. Parallel parking spaces on the south side of the east-west service road are also to be removed and relocated. The parking area to the east of the satellite centre is to be reorganised to accommodate relocated spaces from the front of the building. A new car parking area accommodating 39 car spaces c.150 m to the west of the satellite centre will replace the above mentioned spaces to be removed and relocated. This area entails an alteration to the original site boundary, this will be addressed separately below. Finally, in terms of the car parking alteration as sought, the ambulance and delivery zone area to the east of the satellite centre is to be reorganised.

The alteration to the car parking arrangement does not result in any material change to the trip generation arising from the development, the number of spaces remains the same. The reorganised car parking is still a considerable distance from the existing residential areas located outside of the blue line boundary defining the associated landholding, the altered car parking does not result in adverse impacts on existing residential amenities in the wider

area nor does it give rise to any new impacts above those previously assessed under PA0043 on any other landowner in the area. The removal of the crescent car parking from the front of the existing hospital building entrance is a positive in terms of visual impact. The new area of car parking at the west end of the site is separated from the existing hospital building by an existing c. 3.5 m high wall. The relocated car parking will not lead to a material increase in construction stage traffic impacts either. There is no identified impact on flora or fauna outside of those identified in the original EIS, there will be some loss of a suburban type lawn area to the west but a lawn area in front of the existing hospital will now be retained, so, on balance, there is little difference in terms of impacts. I am of the opinion that the redistribution of the car parking as sought under this alteration is such that, had the car parking as now proposed been part of the original application documentation, An Bord Pleanála would have still granted permission for the development subject to the same conditions. I am of the opinion that the alteration to the car parking does not constitute the making of a material alteration to the development as granted under PA0043.

Alteration of proposed drainage layout

The alterations to the car parking as described in the previous section also requires alterations to the surface water drainage strategy as previously granted. Much of the drainage system that was previously approved under PA0043 remains unchanged except for the alterations required to facilitate the relocated car parking.

The proposed alterations include the relocation of the approved surface water attenuation tank from its approved location under the car parking to the front of the proposed satellite centre to a location immediately to the west of the satellite centre building. This tank will also be downsized from 440 cu.m. to 399 cu.m. The alteration also includes for the construction of a separate surface water attenuation tank beneath the proposed relocated car parking to the west of the site, this tank will have a capacity of 65 cu.m. This results in an increase in attenuation volume of 24 cu.m. from that scheme as previously granted.

The alteration request was accompanied by, inter alia, a report titled 'Planning Application for Relocated Car Parking at Satellite Centre, Connolly Hospital – Engineering Report' by Roughan & O'Donovan Consulting Engineers and associated drawings. That report states that all drainage will be constructed in accordance with Fingal County Council requirements. In that regard, I also note condition no. 13 of the Board's Order on PA0043 which states:

"Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the relevant planning authority for

such works and services and shall be agreed in writing with the relevant planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure a proper standard of development.”

The above condition, as with all conditions on PA0043, would be equally applicable to any alteration granted by the Board.

The alteration sought to the drainage proposals arise from the alteration sought in relation to the car parking. I do not consider that the alterations to the surface water drainage proposals are material. The increase of 24 cu.m. in surface water attenuation capacity for the site is not, in my opinion, significant. It would not have a materially different environmental impact to those originally assessed as part of the EIA process as carried out by the Board on PA0043. I am of the opinion that had the drainage proposals as now proposed been part of the original application, the Board would not have determined the application or the EIA differently. The alteration is of a technical nature, arguably, having regard to condition no. 13 of PA0043, such alterations could be accommodated by way of compliance with that condition in any event.

Proposed Generator

The alteration includes reference to a proposed generator to be located adjacent the previously approved fuel tanks and plant on site. This is to provide an emergency electricity supply in the event of disruption to the mains supply. The previously approved tanks and plant are to be located in the same location as the existing standalone plantroom on the site that serves the existing hospital.

The wording of the documentation submitted with the alteration request suggests that this is a new element that was not subject of the original application. However, I draw the Board’s attention to drawing titled ‘Satellite Centres, Connolly Hospital Proposed Ground Floor Plan’ (drg. no. 13130.06/CH-HLM-A-DR-00-Z2-2110 by Coady Partnership Architects/HLM) on the original application ref. PA0043 which clearly indicates that a ‘generator’ was to be located to the south of a fuel tank and transformer to the east of the proposed satellite centre (copy of said drawing in attached appendix for ease of reference for the Board). Furthermore, I also draw the Board’s attention to drawing titled ‘Satellite Centres, Connolly Hospital Site Utility Services’ (drg. No. CH-EEL-E-DR-XX-002000 by Ethos Engineering) on the original application in which a fuel line is indicated connecting the fuel tank and plant area with the satellite centre in which it is labelled “Fuel line for generator” (copy of said drawing in attached appendix for ease of reference

for the Board). I am satisfied that a generator at this location was part of the original application that was subsequently granted permission by the Board.

The new location of the generator as per the alteration request is c. 10 metres to the north-east of where it was originally granted (see drawing titled 'Proposed MV Goose Protocol & Global Earthing Trench Works Infrastructure', drg. No. CH-ETH-J-DR-ZZ-Z0-SS1003 by Ethos Engineering on the current alteration request file). It is actually located further away from the proposed satellite centre and behind the plantroom thus providing further mitigation in relation to potential noise generated and also, as it is being located behind the plantroom, the new location will act as further mitigation in terms of visual impact. It should be noted that there is an existing plantroom building already sited at this location. As with the original application the new slightly altered location is a significant remove from existing residential developments outside of this large landholding and remains a significant remove from potential sensitive receptors within the holding itself. There are mature trees located to the east and north-east of the proposed generator location thus providing further visual and potential noise impact mitigations.

This new location also entails a slight alteration to the red line boundary but is well within the blue line landholding boundary. This will be addressed separately later in this report.

I am of the opinion that had the original application contained the generator as now proposed in the alteration sought, the Board would have still granted permission subject to the same conditions. Having regard to the foregoing I consider it reasonable to conclude that the generator as now proposed, with the associated alteration to the site boundary at this location, does not constitute the making of a material alteration to the development as granted under PA0043. There are no materially different environmental impacts arising from those as assessed under PA0043 in relation to this element of the alteration.

Proposed 'Dandelion' sculpture

The applicant has commissioned a sculpture that will be located at both the Connolly Hospital satellite centre and the associated Tallaght Hospital satellite centre. The Connolly 'dandelion' sculpture is to be located immediately to the south-west of the new satellite centre building in a landscaped area. The documentation on file describes the sculpture as a further part of the landscaping and beautification works, this appears to me as being a reasonable description.

I am of the opinion that this sculpture will have a positive visual impact in terms of EIA. I would consider it as part of the overall landscaping proposals

for the development. As an alteration, it is minor and of a small scale, it is not a material alteration to the development as granted.

Red line boundary

As indicated under the sections titled 'Alteration to Car Parking' and 'Propose Generator' above, both of those two elements of the alteration sought include for changes to the red line site boundary from that submitted under PA0043. The proposed car parking to the west of the site will result in the site boundary been extended to include an existing car parking area and associated access road and also proposed 39 relocated car spaces. The location of the proposed generator will include for an alteration to the red line site boundary at the eastern end of the site.

In considering this matter I draw the Board's attention to file ref. PM0010 relating to a proposed alteration to the redevelopment of the Port of Cork facilities at Ringaskiddy, Co. Cork.

Under s.37 of the 2000 Act (as amended) the Board granted approval in May of 2015 for the redevelopment of existing port facilities at Ringaskiddy, ref. PA0035. In March of 2016 the Board received a request under s.37B(1) of the 2000 Act (as amended) for pre-application consultations regarding proposed alterations to that approved scheme (it should be noted that the pre-application consultation request has a ref. no. PC0216 but is contained with file ref. PM0010 which is attached to this current file). At a meeting with representatives of An Bord Pleanála the prospective applicant requested that the pre-application procedures under s.37B be used to clarify certain legal and procedural points and that the proposed alterations then be progressed via s.146B. The reporting Inspector in a memorandum to the Board dated June 2016 recommended that the prospective applicant be advised that the proposed amendments do not fall within the scope of s.146B and that a new application be made instead under s.37B. In her report the Inspector focused on the fact that some of the proposed alterations took place outside of the red line boundary as originally submitted under PA0035. In its consideration of the matter the Board specifically did not accept the Inspector's recommendation in relation to the original red line boundary issue (Board Direction dated 24/06/16). The prospective applicant in that case subsequently proceeded to avail of the provisions of s.146B and sought to make the alteration.

Having regard to the precedent set by the Board as outlined in the above paragraph, and in the interests of consistency, I would advise the Board that it is already established that an alteration to a previously approved scheme that entails an alteration to the original site boundary, can be facilitated under s.146B.

As I have indicated above, I consider that the alterations to the car parking, the alterations to the drainage proposals, the relocation of the generator and the proposed art sculpture, do not constitute a material change to the scheme as approved. While the precedent mentioned above allows for an altered site boundary, the next issue to be determined is whether the changes to the site boundary itself constitute a material alteration to the scheme as approved. I reiterate here that the altered red line boundary is still within the blue line ownership boundary.

In considering this matter I refer back to PM0010. The prospective applicant in that instance proceeded to seek an alteration to PA0035 pursuant to s.146B. The reporting Inspector having considered the request, advised the Board that the proposed alteration constituted a material alteration to the terms of the permitted development (ref. Inspector's Report dated 12/08/16). The Inspector listed a number of issues as to why it was considered that the alteration would constitute a material alteration, one item listed was "The alterations...would result in works outside of the original site boundary..." Subsequently in its Direction dated 30/08/16, the Board concurred that the alteration would constitute a material alteration and listed 5 items in its reasoning for that conclusion, however, while the Inspector specifically referred to the alteration to the site boundary, the Board did not cite changes to the site boundary as a grounds of materiality in its Direction. (The alterations in that instance was subsequently the subject of public notification, were referred to a statutory body and observers on PA0035 were notified.)

The changes to the site boundary in PM0010 were of a greater scale and nature than those in this current request before the Board.

It is my interpretation of PM0010 that the Board did not consider that the changes to the site boundary in themselves in that instance constituted a material alteration. Taking that precedent, and in the interests of consistency, I would therefore advise the Board that they conclude that the change to the site boundary in this current request also does not constitute a material alteration.

Further submissions

I have considered the provisions of s.146B(2)(b) which provides for, at the Board's discretion, the inviting of submissions from persons, including the public. It is of interest to note that of the 115 observer submission received on PA0043 (excluding the submissions from the planning authorities and the prescribed bodies), none raised any specific concerns relating to the proposed satellite centre itself at Connolly Hospital. Having considered: the nature, scale and extent of the alteration; the information on file; the nature, scale and extent of the development granted under PA0043, and the

information on PA0043 including the submissions from the public and information obtained at the 10-day Oral Hearing, I am of the opinion that the inviting of submissions from the public in this instance is not necessary and is not required for the purposes of the Board determining the matter.

Appropriate Assessment

Under PA0043 the Board completed an Appropriate Assessment Screening exercise in relation to 17 Natura 2000 sites within a 15 km radius of the 4 application sites which resulted in 13 of the sites being screened out. The Board then undertook an Appropriate Assessment in relation to the effects of the development proposed under PA0043 on the 4 sites that were not screened out: the North Dublin Bay candidate Special Area of Conservation (Site Code 000206), the South Dublin Bay candidate Special Area of Conservation (Site Code 000210), the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area (Site Code 004024), and the North Bull Island Special Protection Area (Site Code 004006). The Board concluded that the proposed development, by itself, or in combination with other plans or projects, would not be likely to adversely affect the integrity of these European Sites in view of the sites' conservation objectives. A NIS was prepared and submitted as part of the application in relation to PA0043.

The requester has submitted an 'AA Screening Report' in relation to the alterations that are the subject of this s.146B request (ref. as prepared by Scott Cawley and contained at Appendix VI of GVA Report titled 'National Paediatric Hospital Connolly Satellite Centre 146B Request', dated May 2018). This AA Screening Report on file provides an analysis of all European Sites within 15km of the Connolly satellite centre site. There are 8 such sites within that 15 km radius. The report states, inter alia, that the proposed amendments are minor changes to the permitted hospital project and are all within the existing enclosing perimeter for impacts of the permitted project. Any potential pathways for impacts of the permitted hospital project have already been assessed under an Appropriate Assessment of PA0043 and the proposed amendments do not give rise to any new or different issues or impact pathways that would now need to be assessed.

Having considered: the Board's determination on Appropriate Assessment on PA0043; section 3.1.26 of the Inspector's Report on PA0043; the nature, scale and extent of the alteration relative to the development subject of PA0043, and the information on file (which I consider adequate to carry out AA Screening), I consider it reasonable to conclude that the alterations proposed, individually or in combination with other plans or projects, would not be likely to have a significant effect on the European sites located within a 15 km radius in view of the sites' conservation objectives.

Conclusion

The alterations sought are of a technical nature. They are, in my opinion, of a small scale. None of the alterations sought introduce a new or additional planning consideration other than those already assessed under the parent permission PA0043. They have no impact on the residential areas which are to be removed from the site. The public notices on PA0043 would not be different had alterations as now sought been part of the original application. Having regard to the precedent set in PM0010, and in the interests of consistency, noting the limited scale and nature of the alteration to the site boundary, this may also be considered as not being material.

None of the alterations are such that, in my opinion, they would have resulted in the Board reaching any different determination or conclusion with regards to the environmental impact assessment or appropriate assessment carried out on PA0043 had the alterations formed part of that parent application.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Board decides that the making of the alteration subject of this request does not constitute the making of a material alteration of the terms of the development as granted permission under 29N.PA0043.

(Draft Order for the Board's consideration provided below.)

DRAFT ORDER

REQUEST received by An Bord Pleanála on the 25th day of May 2018 from the National Paediatric Hospital Development Board care of GVA Planning, 4th Floor, 2-4 Merrion Row, Dublin 2 under section 146B of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, to alter the terms of the National Paediatric Hospital, a strategic infrastructure development the subject of a permission under An Bord Pleanála reference number 29S.PA0043.

WHEREAS the Board made a decision to grant permission, subject to conditions, for the above-mentioned development by order dated the 26th day of April, 2016,

AND WHEREAS the Board has received a request to alter the terms of the development, the subject of the permission,

AND WHEREAS the proposed alteration is described as follows:

- Alteration to car parking as follows:
 - The removal of the approved crescent area of car parking to the south of the main hospital entrance and the landscaping of this area.

- The removal of the approved parallel spaces on the east-west internal service road to the west of the crescent shaped area.
- The removal of the four no. drop-off spaces on the north side of the internal east-west service road and the relocation of these spaces to the south of the ambulance zone.
- The removal and relocation of the parallel parking on the south side of the east-west internal service road.
- The reorganisation of the parking area to the east of the approved satellite centre to accommodate relocated spaces removed from the front of the satellite centre.
- The provision of a new car parking containing 39 no. spaces approximately 150 metres to the west of the approved satellite centre to replace the aforementioned spaces to be removed and relocated.
- The reorganisation of the ambulance and delivery zone area.
- Proposed Generator:
 - A proposed generator is to be located adjacent to the approved fuel tanks and plant on site, to the south east of the satellite centre.
- Proposed Drainage Layout:
 - The relocation of the approved surface water attenuation tank from its approved location under car parking in front of the proposed satellite centre.
 - The downsizing of the approved attenuation tank from 440 cu.m. to 399 cu.m.
 - The construction of a separate surface water attenuation tank beneath the proposed relocated car parking of 65 cu.m.
- Proposed 'Dandelion' Sculpture:
 - A proposed 'Dandelion' sculpture will sit at the corner of the east-west service road and entrance to the Main Hospital, immediately to the south-west of the Satellite Centre.

AND WHEREAS the Board decided, in accordance with section 146B(2)(b) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, not to invite submissions or observations from the public in relation to whether the proposed alteration would constitute the making of a material alteration to the terms of the development concerned,

AND WHEREAS the Board decided, in accordance with section 146B(2)(a) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that the proposed alteration would not result in a material alteration to the terms of the development, the subject of the permission,

AND WHEREAS having considered all of the documents on file and the Inspector's report, the Board considered that the making of the proposed alteration would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment or on any European Site,

NOW THEREFORE in accordance with section 146B(3)(a) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, the Board hereby alters the above-mentioned decision so that the permitted development shall be altered in accordance with the plans and particulars received by An Bord Pleanála on the 25th day of May, 2018.

Tom Rabbette
Assistant Director of Planning
6th July 2018