



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-302651-18

### Development

Permanent continuation of use of the existing long-term car park known as Quickpark, including construction of new entrance building with associated revised entrance layout resulting in 6,122 long-term car parking spaces, and all associated ancillary infrastructure and works.

### Location

Lands at Quickpark Car Park,  
Turnapin Great, Swords Road (Old  
Airport Road), Santry, Co. Dublin

### Planning Authority

Fingal County Council

### Applicant(s)

Gerard Gannon

### Observer(s)

Health and Safety Authority  
Transport Infrastructure Ireland  
Irish Aviation Authority  
Dublin Airport Authority  
An Taisce  
Inland Fisheries Ireland  
Irish Water  
National Transport Authority

### Date of Site Inspection

11/02/19

### Inspector

Gillian Kane

# Contents

1.0 Introduction.....	4
2.0 Site Location and Description .....	4
3.0 Proposed Development .....	4
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy Context.....	7
5.1. Environmental Impact Assessment Directive 2014/52/EU .....	7
5.3. National Planning Framework .....	7
5.4. National Aviation Policy.....	8
5.5. Regional Planning Guidelines for the Greater Dublin Area 2010-2022 .....	8
5.6. Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023.....	8
5.7. Dublin Airport Local Area Plan .....	10
5.8. Dardistown Local Area Plan.....	11
6.0 Submissions .....	11
6.1. Planning Authority Report .....	13
6.2. Applicant Response to Submissions.....	14
7.0 Assessment.....	17
7.2. Terminal 2 .....	18
7.3. New Entrance Building.....	19
7.4. Surface Water and Flooding .....	19
7.5. Financial Contribution .....	21
8.0 Environmental Impact Assessment.....	21
9.0 Appropriate Assessment.....	27
9.2. Applicant's AA Screening Report.....	27
9.3. Assessment.....	28

10.0 Recommendation ..... 31

11.0 Reasons and Considerations ..... 31

## **1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1. This report refers to the application by Mr Gerard Gannon for the permanent continuance of use of the existing space long term car park known as Quickpark that is currently used for the same purpose under temporary planning permission An Bord Pleanála ref. PL06F.PA0023. Permission is also sought for the construction of a new entrance building and revised entrance layout. The proposed development involves the reduction in car parking spaces from 6,240 no. to 6,122 no. as provided for under PL06F.220670 (F06A/1248).
- 1.2. The application is made to the Board on foot of its previous determination that the development was deemed to be strategic infrastructure, within the meaning of section 37A of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), in April 2018 (ABP-300624-18).
- 1.3. The Board decided not to hold an oral hearing having regard to the nature of the application and the planning history of both sites.

## **2.0 Site Location and Description**

- 2.1. The site has an area of approx. 17 hectares and is occupied by a surface car park. It used for long-term parking and is serviced by shuttle buses to and from the airport. Vehicular access is at the western side of the R132 Swords Road. The road frontage is comparatively narrow (55m) and is flagged by a signage to multiple barrier-controlled entry/exits points. There is a small office at the entrance.
- 2.2. The layout comprises a parking area organised in blocks with gravel surfaces served by a surfaced spine road looping around the site. A small area near the entrance is tarmac surfaced and painted. A coach parking area is also hard surfaced. The car park blocks nearer the entrance are more tightly packed than the parking layout delineated in the plans, whereas the parking is more scattered in the peripheral areas.

## **3.0 Proposed Development**

- 3.1. The proposed development is described as the permanent continuation of use of the car park currently operating under a temporary permission (PL06F.PA0023). The

development involves the removal of 118no. spaces, reducing from the permitted 6,240 no. to 6,112no, as provided for under condition no. 23 of Terminal 2.

- 3.2. The proposed development also involves the demolition of an existing single storey office and control building (470sq.m.) and to replace with a part three storey entrance building with new car park barriers, ticket machines and elevational signage. There are no changes proposed to the layout of the existing car park. Details submitted with the application state that the new entrance requirements stem from the need to provide a separate route for the airport terminal shuttle bus service.
- 3.3. The proposed three storey entrance building has an overall height of 10.3m and an overall floor area of 1,043sq.m. The ground floor of the proposed building will provide accommodation space for those using a premium parking service and those waiting for the airport shuttle bus. At first and second floor level are meeting rooms, offices and staff welfare facilities.

## 4.0 Planning History

### 4.1. Subject Site

- 4.1.1. **PL06F.PA0023** refers to grant of permission in 2011 by An Bord Pleanála for continuance of use of long term car park (phase 1 and 2) for 6,240 spaces for a period of 7 years until 4<sup>th</sup> October 2018.
- 4.1.2. **F06A/1746**: Planning permission granted for Phase 2 car park to adjoin formerly approved car park. Use to cease 2/9/2012.
- 4.1.3. **F05A/1464**: Permission granted for the continuation of 3,500 space car park as permitted under F02A/1110. Use to cease 9/4/2011.
- 4.1.4. **F03A/1224**: Permission for temporary surface car park refused.
- 4.1.5. **F02A/1110**: Permission granted for 3,500 space car park. Use to cease 31/ 12/2006
- 4.1.6. **PL06F:112955** (F99A/0376): Permission granted for 3,500 space car park. Use to cease 31/12/2004.

### 4.2. Wider area

- **ABP-301458-18**: Grant of permission for the permanent continuance of use of the 8,840 space long-term car park known as Holiday Blue on a site at

Harristown, Silloge and Ballymun Townlands, South Parallel Road, Dublin Airport, Co. Dublin, that is currently used for the same purpose under and in accordance with temporary planning permission reg. ref PL06F.PA0022, and the 2,040 space long-term car park known as Express Red Zones Y and Z (Express Red) on a site at Stockdale, Cloghran, and Toberbunny Townlands, Dublin Airport, Co. Dublin that is currently used for the same purpose under and in accordance with temporary planning permission reg. ref: PL06F.PA0030.

- **Terminal 2: Reg. PL06F.220670** – Permission granted for new airport terminal and ancillary works at Dublin Airport, subject to 43 conditions. Condition numbers 12-25 inclusive relate to traffic management. Of most relevance is the following:

23: Provision of parking to serve the development hereby permitted shall be the subject of separate planning applications, as required. Any additional parking provided shall have regard to the modal share targets established by the Mobility Management Plan and the growth of passenger numbers using the Airport. Having regard to the assumptions underpinning the Environmental Impact Statement submitted with the subject application, the submitted Mobility Management Plan and the capacity of Phase 1 of the development, the following restrictions to car parking, which are a direct result of the proposed development, shall apply:

- (a) The total number of long-term public car parking spaces serving the Airport shall not exceed 26,800.
- (b) The total number of short-term public car parking spaces shall not exceed 4,000.
- (c) There shall be no material increase in the number of employee car parking spaces at the airport.

**Reason:** In the interest of the free-flow of traffic and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

- **PL06F.PA0008** - Permission granted for a 4-star hotel and multi-storey car park with 2,562 spaces.

- **Metro North Rail Order:** PL06F.NA0003 – Permission granted for the Metro North railway order approving the construction, operation and maintenance of a light rail system from St. Stephen’s Green to the Estuary stop at Swords, Co. Dublin, subject to amendments.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Environmental Impact Assessment Directive 2014/52/EU

5.2. The European Commission’s EIA Directive (amending the 2011/92/EU) requires the assessment of the likely significant environmental effects of a wide range of defined public and private projects, prior to decision making. Directive 2014/52/EU came into force in May 2017, amending previous directives and requires, amongst other things, an assessment of the direct and indirect effects of qualifying development on the following factors:

- a. Population and human health,
- b. Biodiversity,
- c. Land, soil, water, air and climate,
- d. Material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape,
- e. The interaction between the above.

5.2.1. The Directive also requires the preparation of an ‘Environmental Impact Assessment Report’ and new provisions in respect of carrying out of EIA by the competent authority and its decision making, including the incorporation of reasoned conclusions on the significant environmental effects of the project, environmental conditions and monitoring.

### 5.3. National Planning Framework

5.3.1. The National Planning Framework was published in February 2018. High-quality international connectivity (National Strategic Outcome no. 4) is stated to be crucial for international competitiveness, with Airports and Ports a stated strategic investment priority. The NPF recognises that enhanced access to the airport is a key priority of the Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan. The three points of Outcome no. 4 are listed as:

- The development of additional runway and terminal facilities such as the second runway for Dublin Airport for which planning permission has been approved;
- Enhancing land-side access, particularly in public transport terms, such as through the Metro Link project in Dublin; and
- Careful land-use management of land-side areas to focus on the current and future needs of the airports.

#### 5.4. **National Aviation Policy**

- 5.4.1. Chapter 4 of the national aviation policy (2015) refers to capacity of Dublin airport, the challenges of facilitating future growth and the need to undertake capacity reviews to ensure future connectivity and delivery of growth. The policy is to develop Dublin Airport as a secondary hub airport. The policy (section 4.5) requests that strategic level capacity reviews be considered as part of SID applications.

With regard to parking, section 4. states that access to the airport is critical for arriving and departing passengers as well as for employees of the airport and businesses located there. The NAP policy position is that “Existing capacity at State Airports should be optimised in conjunction with timely planning to enable expansion of air service connections in all relevant markets delivering wider economic benefits for Ireland”. **Action 4.5.4** states “Access to the airports will be taken into account during the development of surface transport programmes, in line with the Departments Strategic Framework for Investment in Land Transport which proposed the prioritisation of improved connections to key seaports and airports”.

#### 5.5. **Regional Planning Guidelines for the Greater Dublin Area 2010-2022**

- 5.5.1. The Guidelines identify the strategic role of Dublin Airport both regionally and nationally. Its growth in the context of achieving critical mass is recognised as integral to its optimal delivery as an efficient element in the economy. The Guidelines state that both high quality public transport and high density will contribute to its viability.

#### 5.6. **Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023**

- 5.6.1. The site is zoned GE – ‘General Employment’ where it is an objective to Provide opportunities for general enterprise and employment. Whilst car parking is not a



permitted development in GE zones, the subject site has a site-specific objective for use as a car park.

5.6.2. Safeguarding the “current and future operational, safety, and technical requirements of Dublin Airport” is listed as one of the Strategic Policies of the County Development Plan.

5.6.3. Section 6.7 of the development plan refers to the **Aviation Sector**. It recognises the key role the Airport plays both nationally and at County level. Objectives and policies of relevance to the subject application are as follows:

**Objective ED30:** Engage and collaborate with key stakeholders, relevant agencies and sectoral representatives to ensure that Dublin Airport is developed and promoted as a secondary hub to capitalise on the associated wider economic benefits for Fingal and the wider region.

**Objective ED31:** Ensure that the required infrastructure and facilities are provided at Dublin Airport so that the aviation sector can develop further and operate to its maximum sustainable potential, whilst taking into account the impact on local residential areas, and any negative impact such proposed developments may have on the sustainability of similar existing developments in the surrounding area, and the impact on the environment, including the climate.

**Objective ED97:** Prepare the Dublin Airport Local Area Plan within the lifetime of the Development Plan in collaboration with key stakeholders, relevant agencies, sectoral representatives and local communities.

5.6.4. Chapter 7 of the development plan outlines the Council’s policies on movement and infrastructure. Of relevance to the subject application are:

**Objective DA01:** Facilitate the operation and future development of Dublin Airport, in line with Government policy, recognising its role in the provision of air transport, both passenger and freight

**Objective DA02:** Prepare and implement a new Local Area Plan for Dublin Airport which will accommodate the future sustainable growth and development of the airport lands while also facilitating the efficient and effective operation of Dublin Airport in accordance with the requirements of the Local Area Plan and proper planning and sustainable development.

**Objective DA03:** Safeguard the current and future operational, safety, technical and developmental requirements of Dublin Airport and provide for its ongoing development within a sustainable development framework, having regard to both the environmental impact on local communities and the economic impact on businesses within the area.

**Objective DA19:** Ensure that every development proposal in the environs of the Airport takes into account the impact on water quality, water based-habitats and flooding of local streams and rivers and to provide mitigation of any negative impacts through avoidance or design and ensure compliance with the Eastern River Basin District Management Plan.

**Objective DA22:** Control the supply of car parking at the Airport so as to maximize as far as is practical the use of public transport by workers and passengers and to secure the efficient use of land.

**Objective DA23:** Encourage and facilitate the provision of an integrated public transport network to serve Dublin Airport.

**Objective DA24:** Protect and enhance the transportation capacity required to provide for the surface access needs of the Airport.

**Objective DA25:** Maintain and protect accessibility to the Airport as a priority.

## 5.7. Dublin Airport Local Area Plan

- 5.7.1. The 2006-2015 LAP has expired and there is no new Local Area Plan to date. In the previous LAP the car parking policy stated that: 'Short-term and long-term passenger car parking facilities will be developed phased in accordance with the airport's growth and with improved public transport access. Long-term parking will be provided in a number of discrete locations on the periphery of the airport site, with good access from the external road network and frequent shuttle connections to the terminal buildings. Short-term spaces will be provided in multi-storey car park structures in proximity to the terminal buildings. The vast majority of employee parking and car hire parking will be relocated away from the central terminal area. The growth of employee parking will be strictly controlled.'
- 5.7.2. With regard to long-term car parking, section 2.4.4 of the LAP states "Currently DAA operate 14,000 long term car parking spaces at Dublin Airport with an additional

3,500 spaces privately owned by Quick-Park on the R132. These car parks are remote from the terminal building and passengers are transferred via shuttle buses to and from the terminal building. Therefore, in the current arrangement all of the long-term car parking is located away from the main terminal buildings and airport access points. The demand for long term car parking in 2005 was in the order of 20,500 spaces. The resulting shortfall of 3,000 spaces was made up by providing (a) 1,000 additional spaces in Eastlands, using "Block Parking" and (b) 2,000 additional spaces by utilising spare capacity in the short-term car park."

5.7.3. Long Term Parking: A dispersal policy is to be adopted, whereby car parking is provided in a number of discrete locations on the periphery of the airport site. Parking will be provided in the Designated Airport Area within the revised Public Safety Zones. Figure 5 of the plan shows the location of all parking associated with the airport.

## 5.8. Dardistown Local Area Plan

5.8.1. In 2017, the 2013 Dardistown LAP was extended to 2022.

5.8.2. Figure 3.2 of the LAP shows the subject site identified as a car park with a row of dense trees and hedging along the south-eastern boundary. The site is zoned GE as per the County Development plan map. Section 5.0 of the plan states that GE zoned lands can provide airport car parking.

## 6.0 Submissions

- **HSA:** The application which is determined to be 'parking areas, transport links' is covered by regulation 24(2)(c) of SI 209 of 2015. The development is outside the consultation zone for the fuel farm terminal CLH Aviation. The Health and Safety Authority does not advise against the granting of planning permission in the context of Major Accidents Hazard. The worst case major accident consequence to be advised of is thermal radiation, unconfined pool fire. Future development around COMAH has the potential to impact on the expansion of those establishments.
- **TII:** TII notes the traffic analysis taken in support of the subject application, as outlined in section 12 of the EIA. TII has no comment to make on the findings. The proposed development site overlies the route option of the Metrolink. The

observations of the NTA should be sought in relation to this public transport scheme.

- **Irish Aviation Authority:** In the event of planning consent being granted, the applicant should be conditioned to contact DAA / Dublin Airport to agree mitigations with regard to crane operations and notify the Authority with a minimum of 30 days prior notification of erection of cranes.
- **Dublin Airport Authority:** No comment to make.
- **An Taisce:** All development needs to address the global context of climate change. Continuing resource consumption models are questioned. The Board must complete a de novo assessment, in accordance with the EIA Directive and EU, national and local policy framework. If adverse impacts cannot be mitigated against consent cannot be allowed. The Board must assess the direct and indirect impacts of the project against national policy, traffic congestion, air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. Planning decisions have failed to mitigate continuing air pollution. The Board cannot take PL06F.226670 into consideration as it was before Smarter Travel, and this is contrary to section 34 and s143 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The EIAR fails to assess the impact of traffic generation to the site and the cumulative impact.
- **Inland Fisheries Ireland:** In the consideration of cumulative effects, the South Apron, Runway 10 and terminal buildings should have been included in the hydrology assessment. Conditions of a permission should include ground water monitoring, physiochemical monitoring in accordance with EC Environmental Objectives and mitigation measures as set out in section 5.51 and 5.52 of the EIAR.
- **Irish Water:** A site investigation must be carried out prior to any development to locate underground infrastructure. Any proposals to divert existing water services shall be submitted to IW for agreement. Temporary connection is subject to an IW agreement.
- **National Transport Authority:** The effect of the building and revised entrance layout would be to reduce the overall number of long term parking spaces from 6,240 to 6,122. Acknowledges the need to maintain the existing level of long term car parking and has no objection to the continuation of use on a permanent basis,

provided the car parking cap set under condition no. 23 of PL06F.220670 is not exceeded.

## 6.1. **Planning Authority Report**

6.1.1. The report of the Planning Authority on the proposed development states that the continued use of the car park is acceptable as the use is long-established with no adverse impacts, it complies with the development plan and would comply with the parking cap set under PL06F.220670. The report notes the following inter-departmental reports (appendix A of the report):

- The Community Archaeologist report notes that it is highly unlikely that any archaeological features have survived past construction on the site and therefore no mitigation measures are recommended.
- The Water Pollution Unit, Environmental Division recommend conditions.
- Water Services Department request further information
- Transport Section supports the application for a permanent grant of permission.
- Biodiversity Officer has no objection to the proposed development.

6.1.2. The report assesses the proposed development under the following headings:

6.1.3. **Layout & Design:** The report notes that the car park could be easily decommissioned should there be a change in circumstances.

6.1.4. **Flooding and Surface Water:** The report notes the requirement for a riparian corridor along the Mayne River under Objective WQ05 of the development plan and requests that should the Board grant permission that such a corridor be required by way of condition. The report notes that the applicants Flood Risk Assessment fails to address the potential increased flooding impacts from climate change. Clarification is required on rainfall depths and attenuation rates proposed as the report refers to 10% in some sections and 20% in others. The berm created on the perimeter of the site could increase flood risk downstream and should be removed by way of Board condition. The applicant should be requested to protect the existing outfall points to the ditch and agree same with Fingal County Council. The report notes the water sampling results presented in the EIAR that show “some anomaly results”. The Planning Authority recommend that additional monitoring or further investigation be

undertaken to determine that the source is animal faeces and not from within the car park.

- 6.1.5. **Transport:** The report acknowledges that long-term car parking is unique in three aspects: consequences of not finding parking can mean a missed flight, the traffic impacts of long term parking were taken into account when assessing development at the airport and that the car park serves passengers not airport staff.
- 6.1.6. **Traffic Management:** Fingal CC supports the general principal of long-term car parking due to the requirements of airport parking, that the car park is ancillary, that traffic impacts were taken into consideration, that the car park does not contribute to car-borne commuting and due to the fact that the Airports mobility management has achieved an excellent modal share for public transport.
- 6.1.7. The report states that the EIAR is satisfactory and that should the Board grant permission the mitigation and monitoring measures in the EIAR and the NIS should form conditions. The report concludes by stating that the Planning Authority has no objection to the grant of a permanent permission subject to 10 no. conditions.
- 6.1.8. The report includes a breakdown of the assessment of the financial contributions and bonds.
- 6.1.9. The report of the Planning Authority was presented to a Council Meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> November 2018. Two Councillors commented on the report – one to express support and one to recommend refusal on the grounds that only temporary permission should be granted as the EIA did not reflect the poor quality of the Sluice and Mayne Rivers.

## 6.2. **Applicant Response to Submissions**

- 6.2.1. The Applicant has responded to the 9 no. observations as follows:
- **Irish Aviation Authority:** The applicant will comply with any Board condition requiring notification of DAA 30 no. days prior to erection of a crane for the construction of the new entrance building.
  - **DAA:** The DAA do not oppose the principle of the continued use of the car park.
  - **Health and Safety Authority:** The HAS do not advise against the granting of development.

- **Transport Infrastructure Ireland:** Notes that TII do not object to the proposal.
- **National Transport Authority:** Applicant welcomes the observation of the NTA.
- **Irish Water:** Applicant will comply with the request to submit to Irish Water, any proposal to divert existing water services. Report of Consulting Engineers attached.
- **Inland Fisheries Ireland:** The subject application has introduced SuDS strategies to ensure clean surface water run-off from new and existing developments. This was agreed with Fingal County Council Drainage Division and will minimise the risk of pollutant run-off to the River Mayne. The subject car park has flow control devices at all outfalls and it is fitted with silt traps and petrol interceptors at each discharge point. The proposed SuDS measures along the proposed entrance road will facilitate the improvement of surface water runoff before draining back into the surface water network. Regular maintenance inspections will occur at six monthly intervals as per the EIAR. The applicant will comply with any monitoring programme should the board decide.
- **An Taisce:** The current application allows for a de novo assessment of the proposed development, there has been no presumption of a grant of permission. The EIAR was prepared as the subject application is a SID rather than there being any environmental concerns. The proposed development under a normal planning application would be sub-threshold. The proposed development will not have any significant negative impacts on the environment. The EIAR confirms the Airports commitment to public transport but acknowledges that long-term parking requirements will remain. Fingal County Council confirmed that the EIAR complies with the regulations and the Directive. The proposed development complies with national policy on Climate Change and Transportation. In response to the submission that Dublin Airport must support public transport, the Applicant states that certain passengers will always require parking – those coming from areas not covered by public transport and / or those traveling very early and very late. The subject car park does not generate traffic – it is ancillary to the Airport, the ongoing operation of which is a key objective of national policy. The applicant notes that neither TII or the NTA object to the proposal. Comments made by An Taisce regarding congestion on the M50 / road network do not apply

to the subject application. The continued use of the site for long-term car parking is supported by the GE zoning of the site. It is submitted that the An Taisce statement regarding Objective DA22 is incorrect as the proposed development is in line with the stated objectives of DA24 and DA25. It is submitted that car parking is the most appropriate land use for the subject site. Regarding Smarter Travel, it is stated that as more public transport options become available, more public transport choices will be made but long-term parking will always be required for those who have no public transport options.

In response to An Taisce's comments on the traffic assessment in the EIAR, the Board is directed to the Engineering report submitted with the response. The suggestion to restrict access to the car park to those outside Dublin or those with no public transport options is not accepted as it would not accommodate those taking early morning or late evening flights. The NIS submitted with the application assesses cumulative impacts and suggests mitigation measures where needed.

The proposed development does not contravene national or local policy or previous Board permissions.

- 6.2.2. **Fingal County Council:** The applicant welcomes that the Council recommend a grant of permission for the permanent use of the car park and that the Water Services Department have no objections. In response to the suggested conditions of the Water Services Department, section 4 of the submitted Engineering Report refers. The applicant has no objection to any of the suggested conditions. To correct an error made in the Flood Risk Assessment (reference to a 10% increase instead of a 20% increase) a revised Flood Risk Assessment is submitted to the Board. That the Transport Department and Biodiversity recommend that permission be granted is noted. The applicant will comply with the conditions recommended by the Bio-Diversity Officer and the Environment Department.

With regard to the request to pay a financial contribution, the Board is requested to note that financial contributions have already been paid and that should permission be granted that a revised calculation be agreed with Fingal County Council.



## 7.0 Assessment

7.1.1. I have read the planning application for the proposed development and the submissions and observations that have been made to the Board in respect of it. I have inspected the site and the surrounding area. Many of the matters raised by parties are also relevant under the environmental impact assessment, which follows in section 8.0 of this report. Having regard to this, I consider that the key issues arising in respect of the planning assessment comprise the following.

- Principle of development
- New Entrance Building
- Surface Water and Flooding
- Financial Contribution

### 7.1.2. Principle of Development

7.1.3. The principle of development on the subject site is long-established, with a series of permissions granted by both the Planning Authority and the Board. In my opinion, having regard to the planning history and to the assessment of alternatives in the EIAR which I consider reasonable and comprehensive, the option of refusing permission is therefore not reasonable nor warranted in this instance.

7.1.4. The substantive issue therefore is not whether permission should be granted or refused, but whether permission should be granted on a permanent basis or a further temporary permission.

7.1.5. The reasoning for a further temporary permission would be to facilitate assessment of the effect on long-term car parking demand within the wider context of other airport developments. As part of the ABP-300624-18 pre-application for the subject development the applicant was asked to justify the volume of car parking by reference to compliance with the cap set in the Terminal 2 permission having regard to overall car parking supply in the area serving the airport. This is addressed in greater detail below.

7.1.6. The site is located within a Public Safety Zone for the airport. Within such zones long-stay car parks are permitted. Buildings associated with PSZ are subject to population densities. The entrance building for the subject development is located in the Outer PSZ and must comply with a rate of less than or equal to 110 no. persons per half

hectare. The subject development with an expected working population of 40 no. complies with this requirement.

- 7.1.7. Within this context, I consider that the proposed development is consistent, in principle, with policies of the County Development Plan, subject to satisfactory conclusions in respect of environmental effects and the other matters raised in submissions.

## 7.2. Terminal 2

- 7.2.1. In making their case for the grant of a permanent rather than a further temporary permission, the applicant noted the significant planning history on the site and stated that the car park is in effect permanent. They noted that the three long-term car parks (subject car park, DAA operated Holiday Blue and Express Red) provide a total of 25,420 no. spaces which is below the limit applied under condition no. 23 of the Terminal 2 permission. The Applicant notes that the demand for long-term car parking has increased since the previous temporary permission was granted, with the increase in passenger numbers using the Airport in 2017. It is submitted that the grant of permission on a permanent basis would not adversely affect any move to more sustainable modes of transport. The applicant notes that 46% of passengers accessed the airport by private car as public transport is not available for early morning or late evening flights. The applicant submits that Metro North and Bus Connects will have no impact on that modal share as they will largely cater for those within the greater Dublin area.
- 7.2.2. I note the support of the Transportation department and the Planning Department of Fingal County Council for the proposed development.
- 7.2.3. It is clear from the information provided in the EIAR and the planning history on the subject carpark that passenger numbers will continue to grow and that there will continue to be certain cohort of passengers (for example those arriving between 4am-6am) for whom public transport is not a feasible option. The increase in passenger numbers since the Board assessed previous parking capacity at the airport appears to have been absorbed largely by public transport – the modal share has increased and the demand for long-term parking has remained the same. It is a safe assumption that as more public transport options become available, passengers will choose that option where feasible, but a certain cohort will continue to need

parking because of routes / times. What is unlikely is that demand for long-term car parking will fall or decrease. In that instance, I see no reason why permission should not be granted for the existing car-park on a permanent basis. It has been demonstrated that there are no adverse environmental or traffic impacts arising from the operation of the car park to date. Given that the number of parking spaces is a decrease on the existing and no change of use is proposed, no such impacts are predicted for the future.

- 7.2.4. I note that the Board recently granted permission for the Express Red (10,340 spaces) and Holiday Blue (8,840) on a permanent basis under ABP-301458-18. I consider it reasonable to grant permission on a permanent basis for the subject car park.

### 7.3. **New Entrance Building**

- 7.3.1. The proposed three storey entrance building with office accommodation on the upper levels and passenger facilities on the ground level is to be set back 65m from the existing entrance barrier. The existing single storey office building is to be demolished. It is considered that the proposed building will integrate into the wider industrial area without any significant negative visual impact. The set back of the building from the junction with the R132 will diminish the impact of the increased height of 10.33m. The proposed building is acceptable.

### 7.4. **Surface Water and Flooding**

- 7.4.1. An engineering report prepared for the proposed application forms appendix 7.1 of the EIAR). The report notes that the car park drainage system has the potential to contaminant ground water from pollutant run-off. There are 6 no. outfalls that discharge to the surrounding ditch network. Each outfall has a silt-trap manhole, petrol interceptor and hydrobrake manhole to reduce run-off and limit run-off rates to that of a green-field site. Test samples from 8 no. locations (five manholes within the site and three ditch locations) were taken in April 2018. The samples were tested for total coliforms, E. coli, Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD), Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD), pH, total suspended solids, conductivity, fats, oils and grease, anionic detergents and petroleum hydrocarbons.

- 7.4.2. Drawing no. P024 shows the catchment areas for each hydrobrake and outfall. Figure 1 of the Water Quality Testing report shows the location of each of the 8 no. sample sites.
- 7.4.3. Test location no. 8 exceeded the limit value for total coliforms and BOD. Test location 2 recorded an exceedance for BOD, COD and total suspended solids. The report states that no cross connections directing foul water to this surface water manhole were found and therefore the explanation for the exceedance is likely to be animal faeces or vegetation decay. Test location no. 6 recorded exceedances for total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH). The report states that test location no. 2 which is located in the ditch immediately downstream of no. 6 showed no exceedance and therefore there is no adverse effect on the surrounding waterbodies. Testing of the 6 no. petrol interceptors in September 2018 found them to be in good working order. The EIAR in assessing the results states that, contamination of the surface waters is arising from wastewater outfalls and not dangerous substances associated with the operation of the car park.
- 7.4.4. I note the report of the Water Pollution Unit of Fingal County Council that recommends that further investigation should be undertaken. I consider this approach to be reasonable. Whilst it is not considered a significant matter, it is nonetheless in the interest of all that the source of the contamination be found and mitigated against.
- 7.4.5. A Flood Risk Assessment was submitted with the application. Tidal flooding risk is deemed to be negligible. Fluvial, pluvial and groundwater flooding are all considered a low risk. I note the report of the Water Services Department that requires clarification on the attenuation rates proposed as the report refers to both a 10% and a 20% increased rainfall allowance due to climate change. The applicant stated that this was an error and that a revised FRA was submitted to the Board in January 2019
- 7.4.6. The Water Services department have also requested that the berm created on the perimeter of the site could increase flood risk downstream and should be assessed by way of a revised Flood Risk Assessment. In response, the applicant has stated that the entire car park has been deigned to retain storm water with an impermeable berm around the perimeter of the site. The berm helps restrict run-off to specific

discharge points where flow controls and petrol interceptors are used to control the flow and quality of storm water discharges. It is submitted that the surface water management system including the impermeable berm will not increase downstream flooding. I am satisfied that the subject berm is part of the surface water management of the site and to date has shown to have no adverse environmental effects.

- 7.4.7. The applicant indicates that they are willing to provide a riparian corridor as required by Objective WQ05 of the development plan.

## 7.5. Financial Contribution

- 7.5.1. The applicant has requested the Board to take into account that financial contributions have been paid in respect of previous permissions on site and that a revised calculation be agreed with Fingal County Council.
- 7.5.2. I note that under ABP-301458-18, the Board noted the policy of the Planning Authority in respect of reductions in the amounts of development contributions payable in the case of temporary permissions and therefore considered it appropriate to attach a condition requiring payment in accordance with section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. I recommend that should permission be granted for the subject development that such a condition attach to the permission.

## 8.0 Environmental Impact Assessment

- 8.1.1. The application for the proposed development was made to the Board after the 16th May 2017 and the provisions of the EIA Directive as amended by Directive 2014/52/EU apply. In accordance with the advice on administrative provisions in advance of transposition, contained in Circular letter PL 1/2017, it is proposed to apply the requirements of Directive 2014/52/EU.
- 8.1.2. The EIAR provides a non-technical summary which asks the Board to consider the following justification for granting a permanent permission:
- Quickpark provides key infrastructure for the operation of the Airport.
  - Passenger numbers continue to grow, create additional demand for long-term car parking.

- Long-term parking is used by the 1 in 3 no. passengers for whom public transport is limited or unavailable.
- Public transport is limited for those outside the GDA. This will not change with Bus connects and / or Metro North.
- Quickpark, the DAA Holiday Blue and Express Red are the only authorised long-term parking facilities and do not exceed the 26,800 no. space cap imposed by the Board under the permission for Terminal 2 (PL06F.220670).
- The Quickpark car park accords with the GE zoning objective and the Public Safety Zones for the site.
- The use of the car park for long-term parking is supported by the Development Plan and the Council have no objection to the proposal.
- The proposed development is appropriate given the established nature of the car park and its proximity to Dublin Airport.

8.1.3. The EIAR describes the proposed development and provides detail on the planning and development context. It assesses the effects of the proposal on the environment in a grouped format and under the following headings: population and human health; biodiversity, flora & fauna; land, soils & geology; water; air quality; noise & vibration; climate; landscape and visual amenity; transportation; transportation; material assets, cultural, archaeology and architectural heritage. The final chapter is an assessment of interactions. The consideration of cumulative effects with other projects is examined in Chapter 2.

8.1.4. Having regard to the above, and to my conclusions below in respect of the technical information presented, I am satisfied that the EIAR complies with article 94 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2000, as amended and the provisions of Article 5 of the EIA Directive 2014.

## 8.2. **EIAR Assessment**

8.2.1. The chapter outlining the applicant's consideration of **Alternatives Considered** examines four alternatives: do nothing, provide multi-storey car parking, provide new car parking on a greenfield site and seek a further temporary permission. In relation to the **Do Nothing scenario**, it is noted that public transport is not available to all passengers and that long-term car parking is required even with future infrastructural projects. In the absence of long-term car parking, demand would have to be met

elsewhere. The return of the site to agricultural use would be an inefficient use of zoned and serviced land. The EIAR states that the unique nature of Airports is such that long-term car parking is required. The report states that the location of the subject sites within various Airport controls is such that a large number of uses and developments are excluded. The second reasonable alternative considered in chapter 2 of the EIAR is **multi-storey provision**. This option is discounted due to the high-turnover and high costs required to make the proposal feasible. The third alternative is the creation of a **new car park on a greenfield site**. The EIAR states that the three sites identified as suitable for car parking by the Fingal County Development Plan are the two DAA sites and the subject QuickPark car park. The provision of new infrastructure and subsequent environmental impacts arising from a new greenfield development is not considered a reasonable alternative. The final alternative considered is the **grant of a further temporary permission**. The EIAR states that the subject car park has been in existence since 1999, is in close proximity to the airport and easily accessible from the M50. Section 2.9.5 of the EIAR outlines the applicants preferred option which is the granting of a permanent permission for the existing long-term car park.

I am satisfied that the all reasonable alternatives to the proposed continuance of use were assessed.

- 8.2.2. Chapter 2 examines the **cumulative effects** of the proposal against a number of permitted developments in the vicinity of the Airport. These include hotels, business park, airport developments and other. The report notes that where parking formed part of the permission, a condition was attached that restricted parking to the permitted use only.
- 8.2.3. Chapter 3 examines the **planning and development context** that supports the proposed development. It states that the proposed use is supported by national, regional and local policy as well as the planning history of the wider Airport area. It refers to condition no. 23 of the permission for Terminal 2 (PL06F.220670 refers) which considered 26,800 long-term car parking spaces to be appropriate for an airport with 32 million passengers. The report refers to MetroLink and Bus Connects and states that the demand for long-term car parking has not and will not abate, even with the provision of new public transport infrastructure given the unique characteristics of long-term car parking.

- 8.2.4. Chapter 4 of the EIAR examines the impact of the proposed development on **population and human health**. Noting that the only works proposed are to the entrance building the report states that that the continued use of the car park will not have an adverse impact on mental health or wellbeing, social, economic and environmental living conditions and will not have an impact on global health. I am satisfied that the development will have no material or significant impacts on population or human health.
- 8.2.5. **Biodiversity** is addressed in Chapter 5 of the EIAR. As the car park is existing, the habitat is buildings and artificial surfaces with some native hedgerows, a drainage ditch and some grassy verges. Irish Hare was recorded using the site. Three-cornered garlic, an alien invasive species is found at one point on the northern boundary. Section 5.63 recommends that the species be eradicated from the site using a standard herbicide during the growing period. No impacts or residual impacts will occur from the continuation of the existing development. No monitoring is required. The key environmental interactions with water and landscaping are discussed in the respective chapters. I am satisfied that the development will have no material or significant impacts on biodiversity.
- 8.2.6. Chapter 6 of the EIAR deals with **land, soils and geology**. As the car park is already constructed there is no impact on land as there will be no change to the existing land use, topography or surface cover. The construction of the entrance building is stated to have no significant adverse impacts on soils and geology of the subject site. The potential of risk to soils and bedrock from maintenance work is to be addressed through 5 no. mitigation measures (section 6.6). No residual impacts are predicted. I am satisfied that the development will have no material or significant impacts on lands, soils or geology.
- 8.2.7. **Water** is addressed in chapter 7 of the EIAR. In terms of supply and foul drainage the report states that the site has existing connections in place which are proposed to retain. These will be extended to the proposed entrance building. No impacts are predicted. For surface water, the report notes that water quality testing was undertaken in April 2018, that the car park incorporates SuDs to minimise the risk of pollutant run-off and that the permeable gravel surfacing of 300mm acts as a storage area for retained surface water and as a filter to improve the quality of water discharged. The identified risk of the rate of surface water increasing is not likely due



to proposed mitigation measures including flow control devices on all outfalls, silt traps and petrol interceptors at each discharge point and SuDS measures at the proposed entrance building. The 6-monthly routine environmental monitoring programme will continue. Residual risks are not anticipated. I am satisfied that the development will have no material or significant impacts on water.

- 8.2.8. Chapter 8 of the EIAR refers to **Air**. The report states that mean value concentrations for Sulphur Dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), Particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>), Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), Carbon Monoxide (CO) and Benzene in the Dublin conurbation from 2016 were all found to be below ambient air quality limits. By extension, the levels in the vicinity of the subject site are stated to be below the limits. The temporary slight adverse impact on the adjoining Carlton Hotel from dust during the construction phase will be mitigated against (as per section 8.7.1). In terms of traffic impact levels impacts are stated to be negligible, with no significant impact on human health. I am satisfied that the development will have no material or significant impacts on air quality and climate.
- 8.2.9. **Noise and Vibration** is assessed in chapter 9. A baseline noise survey was undertaken in March 2018, with road traffic from the R132 found to be the dominant background noise source. Short term noise impacts would be experienced at the adjoining Carlton Hotel during the construction phase. Best practice remedial measures are recommended with the result that the proposed development will not result in any increase in noise levels. I am satisfied that the development will have no material or significant impacts on air noise and vibration.
- 8.2.10. Chapter 11 of the EIAR refers to **Climate**. The report identifies the main potential risk from the proposed development as fluvial flood risk and the release of greenhouse gases from vehicular traffic. I note that no site-specific surveys were undertaken nor are details on residual impacts addressed. As the proposed development involves the continuation of an existing car park with a short-term construction at the entrance, I am satisfied that the development will have no material or significant impacts on climate.
- 8.2.11. Chapter 11 of the EIAR examines **landscape and visual impact**. The existing landscape of the subject site and the wider area is described as the industrial and agricultural. The proposed entrance building has an overall height of 10.33m in

height. The visual impact will be more pronounced during the construction phase but will have little or no impact on the landscape character. During the operational phase the impact will be imperceptible due to the proposed landscaping plan. Of the viewpoints assessed for the photomontage, all are found to have a slight, neutral cumulative and short-term impact until tree planting develops. After seven years the impact will be imperceptible. I am satisfied that the development will have no material or significant visual impacts.

- 8.2.12. **Transport** is assessed in chapter 12 of the EIAR. Traffic counts from February 2018 compared to March 2011 show an increase of 13% traffic using the subject car park. Traffic modelling at the junction of the car park and the R132 show that the junction will continue to operate within capacity for the next ten years. There will be no increase in traffic generated by the proposal with the exception of some construction traffic during the construction phase. The chapter notes that demand for long-term car parking has not abated and that the subject car park and the two DAA car parks all are within the cap imposed by the Board under condition no. 23 of PL06F.220670. The proposed development does not seek an increase in or an intensification of existing car parking and therefore the traffic movements will not change. I am satisfied that the development will have no material or significant impacts on traffic
- 8.2.13. The penultimate chapter of the EIAR assess the impact of the proposed development on **material assets, archaeology, cultural and architectural heritage**. There are no protected structures on either site. There are a number of archaeological sites in close proximity to the site, but no potential impacts are identified. No remedial or mitigation measures are proposed. I am satisfied that the development will have no material or significant impacts on cultural heritage in the immediate or wider area.
- 8.2.14. The final chapter of the EIAR addresses the **interactions** of the environmental impacts generated by the proposed development. Table 14.1 identifies that human beings will have interactions with land, soil & geology, air, noise, landscape and transport but that these interactions will mostly be positive. The interaction between Flora & Fauna and both soils and water will be minor. There will be a positive impact arising from the interaction between flora & fauna and visual amenity is due to the landscaping plan. No significant impacts are envisaged from land, soil & geology / water, Air/ Transport, and Air / climate. Noise will interact with human beings and

cause a short term transient impact, as will the interaction between noise and transportation. There will be no significant impact arising from the interaction between climate / flora & fauna, transport / flora & fauna and transport and climate. The conclusion of the chapter, which is considered reasonable, is that subject to the full implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, there will be no significant negative impact on the environment.

8.2.15. I am satisfied that the likely direct and indirect effects of the proposed development on the environment have been identified. I am satisfied that no likely significant adverse effects will arise. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable direct or indirect effects on the environment.

## 9.0 **Appropriate Assessment**

9.1. Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive (Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora) requires that any plan or project not directly related to the management of a European site of nature conservation interest (i.e. a Special Area of Conservation or a Special Protection Area), but likely to have significant effect on it, individually or in combination with other plans and projects, shall be subject appropriate assessment, for its implications for the site. Further, it provides that the competent authority shall agree to the plan or project only after having ascertained that it will not adversely affect the integrity of the site concerned.

### 9.2. **Applicant's Natura Impact Statement**

9.2.1. The applicant has submitted an NIS. In terms of site location and context the Cuckoo stream runs to the north of the site and the Mayne River runs to the south of the site. The Mayne River discharges to Baldoyle Bay SAC / SPA. The South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA and the Dublin Bay SAC are within the hydrological catchment of the site. The Applicants NIS states that no direct impacts will occur as the site is not located within the designated sites. The statement concludes that significant negative effects are not likely, either alone or in combination and therefore the proposed development will not affect the integrity of any Natura 2000 site.

9.2.2. Having reviewed the NIS and the supporting documentation, I am satisfied that it provides adequate information in respect of the baseline conditions, clearly identifies the potential impacts, and uses best scientific information and knowledge. Details of mitigation measures are provided and they are summarised in Section 3.0 of the NIS. I am satisfied that the information is sufficient to allow for appropriate assessment of the proposed development.

### 9.3. **Stage 1 – Screening Assessment**

9.3.1. There are 10 no. SAC's within a 15km radius of the subject car park:

- Baldoyle Bay SAC 000199
- Malahide Estuary SAC 000205
- Howth Head SAC 000202
- Irelands Eye SAC 002193
- Lambay Island SAC 000204
- Rogerstown Estuary SAC 004015
- North Dublin Bay SAC 000206
- South Dublin Bay SAC 000210
- Rye Water Valley SAC 001398
- Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC 003000

9.3.2. The proposed site is not located within or directly adjacent to any designated European site. There will be no direct loss, fragmentation or disturbance to any Annex I habitat or Annex II species (or supporting habitat) which are qualifying interests for the relevant sites.

9.3.3. Rainfall and surface water run-off from the car park drains to the storm water drainage system passing through an attenuation area and an oil-water interceptor and discharging into Mayne stream. Therefore, there is a direct hydrological link between the car park and both the Baldoyle Bay SAC / SPA. The potential impact on the Natura 2000 sites is the contamination of ground or surface water through fuel spills or leakages which would end up in one of the waterbodies discharging to the designated sites. I am, therefore satisfied that a Stage 2 AA is required for the Baldoyle Bay SAC and SPA.

#### 9.4. Stage 2 – Appropriate Assessment

9.4.1. **Baldoyle Bay SAC (000199) / SPA (004016)** is 7km from the car park. The SAC is described by the NPWS as a fine example of an estuarine system that contains four habitats listed on Annex 1 and has two legally protected plant species. The site is also important for bird species and notably internally important population of pale Bellied Brent Geese and 7 species of national importance including 2 Annex 1 Birds Directive Species. Qualifying interests for the SPA are:

- Light-bellied Brent Goose (*Branta bernicla hrota*)
- Shelduck (*Tadorna tadorna*)
- Ringed Plover (*Charadrius hiaticula*)
- Golden Plover (*Pluvialis apricaria*)
- Grey Plover (*Pluvialis squatarola*)
- Bar-tailed Godwit (*Limosa lapponica*)
- Wetlands & Waterbirds

9.4.2. Qualifying interests for the SAC are:

- Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide
- Salicornia and other annuals colonizing mud and sand
- Atlantic salt meadows (*Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritima*)
- Mediterranean salt meadows (*Juncetalia maritimi*)

9.4.3. The NPWS characterization form describes the Bay as substantially a Nature Reserve and notes that is not significantly threatened in any way. The part of the site at the Mayne River, outside of the Nature Reserve, has been proposed for development in the past however and is still considered to be under threat. The site receives pollution from a number of sources, chiefly the inflowing rivers but also an unsatisfactory sewage network. A new sewage works has been planned. Bait digging and controlled wildfowling may be problems. *Spartina* is well established in the inner estuary and may be causing unfavourable interactions with the intertidal and salt marsh habitats. *Sterna albifrons* formerly nested but regular disturbance is a problem. The NPWS identifies the main threats to the SAC site as visitor pressure, and disturbance to wildfowl and dumping. In particular, the dumping of spoil onto the

foreshore presents a threat to the value of the site. The main threat to the birds is stated to be disturbance as it is located in a densely populated area.

- 9.4.4. The conservation objectives for both the SAC and the SPA are to maintain the favourable conservation condition of the qualifying interests based on lists of attributes and targets.
- 9.4.5. With regard to the **Baldoyle Bay SPA** I am satisfied that the distance between the subject car park and the SPA and the nature of the receiving environment is such that significant impacts can be ruled out. I am satisfied that the no likely significant impact will arise and that significant effects on the conservation objectives for the Baldoyle SPA can reasonably be ruled out. I am satisfied that the proposed development would not result in any significant “in-combination” effects with any other plans or projects.
- 9.4.6. In relation to the identified risks on **Baldoyle Bay SAC**, I note the description of the proposed development provided in the NIS and the EIAR (appendix 7.1 contains the water quality testing report). The surface of the car park is constructed of permeable gravel. This compacted stone surface allows temporary storage of oil/ fuel spillages providing additional time for microbial breakdown of hydrocarbons. Surface water run-off is filtered through an oil-water interceptor before being held in an attenuation tank. The surface of the carpark is sealed tarmac. Surface water run-off is filtered through an oil-water interceptor and an attenuation tank before discharge into the Cuckoo Stream. The low turn-over of traffic in the long-term car park, together with surface infrastructure are such that contamination reaching the watercourses can be deemed not likely and not significant.
- 9.4.7. I note the on-going biological and physiochemical monitoring of surface water carried out by the applicant. Results for 2018 are presented in the EIAR. All samples were found to be below the WHO drinking water limits with one sample slightly exceeding the 200ug limit. High levels of BOD and COD were found at two sample locations. The report states that this is from animal faeces and vegetation decay rather than the car park. I note the recommended conditions of the Planning Authority and in this instance consider them reasonable.
- 9.4.8. I am satisfied that the identified risks are not significant nor are they likely. I am satisfied that the proposed development itself would not be likely to have a

significant effect on any Natura 2000 site. Having regard to the nature and scale of the existing development, the fact that no works are proposed and the nature of the receiving environment namely a fully serviced urban site, and subject to the implementation of best practice construction methodologies and the proposed mitigation measures, I consider that it is reasonable to conclude on the basis of the information on the file, which I consider adequate in order to carry out a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment, that the proposed development, individually or in combination with other plans and projects would not adversely affect the integrity of European site Baldoyle Bay SAC (000199) and Baldoyle Bay SPA (0040160), in view of the site's Conservation Objectives.

## 10.0 Recommendation

10.1. On the basis of the above planning assessment, environmental impact assessment and appropriate assessment, I recommend that the Board grant permission under section 37G of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, for the above proposed development in accordance with the said plans and particulars based on the reasons and considerations under and subject to the conditions set out below.

## 11.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to:

- (a) the provisions of the National Planning Framework 2018 in relation to the strategic role of Dublin Airport;
- (b) the National Aviation Policy in respect of the future growth and capacity of Dublin Airport
- (c) the provisions of the Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023 and the Dardistown LAP 2022 and specifically the zoning objectives on the application site which include an objective to ensure the efficient and effective development of the airport;
- (d) the planning history of the subject sites and wider area, specifically the airport terminal granted planning permission under appeal reference number

PL06F.220670 and the requirement that the total number of long-term public car parking spaces serving the Airport shall not exceed 26,800,

- (e) the mitigation measures set out in the environmental impact statement report, and the likely consequences for the environment;
- (f) the proper planning and sustainable development of the Dublin Airport lands and the likely significant effects of the proposed development on a European site;
- (g) the submissions and observations received in relation to the proposed continuance of use and to the likely effects on the environment, and
- (h) the report of the Inspector

**Appropriate Assessment:**

The Board considered the Natura Impact Statement, and all other relevant submissions and carried out a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment in relation to the potential effects of the proposed development on designated European Sites. The Board noted that the proposed development is not directly connected with or necessary for the management of a European Site and considered the nature, scale and location of the proposed development, as well as the report of the Inspector. In completing the appropriate assessment, the Board adopted the report of the Inspector and concluded that, by itself or in-combination with other plans and projects in the vicinity, the proposed development would not adversely affect the integrity of the European site in view of the sites' conservation objectives.

**Environmental Impact Assessment:**

The Board completed an environmental impact assessment of the proposed development taking account of:

- (a) the nature, scale, location and extent of the proposed development,
- (b) the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) and associated documentation submitted in support of the planning application,
- (c) the submissions received from the local authority, prescribed bodies, and observers, and



(d) the Inspector's report.

The Board considered that the environmental impact assessment report, adequately considers alternatives to the proposed development and identifies and describes adequately the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the proposed development on the environment. The Board agreed with the examination, set out in the Inspector's report, of the information contained in the environmental impact assessment report and associated documentation submitted by the applicant and submissions made in the course of the planning application. The Board considered that the main significant direct and indirect effects of the proposed development on the environment are, and would be mitigated, as follows:

- the impact of future infrastructure projects, in particular Metro North, on the supply and demand for long-term parking at the Airport which would be avoided by compliance with the conditions of previous planning permission regarding provision of long-term car parking and the Mobility Management Update of the Airport
- the risk of hydrocarbon contamination from oil leaks / spillages which would be mitigated against by the measures set out in the EIAR which include specific provisions in relation to surface water, SuDS, drainage infrastructure and monitoring

The Board completed an environmental impact assessment in relation to the proposed development and concluded that, subject to the implementation of the mitigation measures proposed, as set out in the EIAR, and subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the effects of the proposed development on the environment, by itself and in combination with other plans and projects in the vicinity, would be acceptable. In doing so, the Board adopted the report and conclusions of the Inspector.

**Proper planning and sustainable development:**

It is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the permanent continuance of use of the car park would not undermine the delivery of public transport in the area, would not give rise to a traffic hazard, would not have an adverse impact on the environment, would not adversely impact on a designated

European site and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## CONDITIONS

1. The proposed development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require points of detail to be agreed with the planning authority, these matters shall be the subject of written agreement and shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed particulars.

**Reason:** In the interest of clarity.

2. The developer shall implement in full the mitigation measures contained in the environmental impact statement report submitted with the application

**Reason:** In the interest of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. No surface water / rainwater shall discharge into the foul sewer system and surface water discharge shall be in compliance with the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works version 6.0 FCC April 2006.

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

- 4 All surface water management measures (incorporating SuDS as appropriate) be carried out and implemented to the standards set out in the Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023 together with, over the lifetime of the proposed development, full implementation (including maintenance) of mitigation measures, the on-site pollution attenuation and drainage systems described in the SID application and regular monitoring programme of surface water discharge and groundwaters.

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

- 5 All requirements of Water Services Planning Unit of Fingal County Council be complied and where the applicant proposes to connect directly to a public water / waste water network operated by Irish Water. The applicant is required to sign any relevant connection agreement to the standards set out in the agreement.

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

- 6 The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

**Reason:** It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

---

Gillian Kane  
Senior Planning Inspector

15 February 2019