



Development

Preservation of Auburn House and its stables as a single residential dwelling and conversion of stables for ancillary storage space. Demolition of the dwelling Little Auburn and associated outbuildings and stables. Construction of 98 residential units (53 houses, 37 apartments (Apartment Blocks 4 and 5) and 8 duplex units (Duplex Block 1)) with associated car parking, bicycle stores, refuse stores and plant; landscaped public and communal open spaces; boundary treatments; public lighting; an ESB unit substation; a new signalised junction entrance at the Malahide Road; and all associated site infrastructure and engineering works necessary to facilitate the development including an on-site foul sewer pumping station and foul sewer works in public roads. An EIAR and NIS were submitted with this application.

Location	Lands at Auburn House and Little Auburn, off the R107 Malahide Road, Malahide, County Dublin
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	F22A/0580
Applicant(s)	Kinwest Limited
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission with Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party vs Decision
Appellant(s)	1. Savaron Limited
Observer(s)	1. Paul G. Evans 2. Dublin Airport Authority
Date of Site Inspection	21 st February 2024
Inspector	Phillippa Joyce

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	8
4.0 Planning History.....	17
5.0 Policy Context.....	20
6.0 The Appeal	28
7.0 Planning Assessment	43
8.0 Appropriate Assessment.....	65
9.0 Environmental Impact Assessment.....	86
10.0 Recommendation	116
11.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	116
12.0 Conditions	116

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located in the townland of Auburn, c.2.2km southwest of Malahide town centre. The site has an irregular rectangular configuration, indicated as measuring c.9.03ha, which is part of a wider landholding, indicated as measuring c.13.28ha. The site also includes a c.2.3km route along parts of Malahide Road, Back Road and Kinsealy Lane.
- 1.2. The main component of the site is the protected structure, Auburn House, and the majority of its attendant grounds. These include the stable buildings, courtyard, the main avenue with front boundary wall, piers, and entrance gate along Malahide Road (the walled garden is outside of the site boundary and within the wider landholding). The site has a distinctive sylvan character due to numerous individual trees, treelines, and woodlands many contemporaneous with the house.
- 1.3. In addition to Auburn House and its stables, the site accommodates the Little Auburn residence (a modern dwelling) and an associated stables structure mid-way along the main avenue (eastern side). Save for these structures, the site is greenfield in nature, largely comprising agricultural fields, woodlands, and field boundaries with a series of drainage ditches. Access to the site is via the existing entrance from R107/ Malahide Road (southeast of the site).
- 1.4. The area surrounding the site is comprised of low density, detached residences on single sites and in residential estates. The western and northeastern boundaries are formed by properties in Abington, while the southern, southwestern and eastern boundaries include structures originally associated with the Auburn House estate under separate ownership and detached residences accessing onto Malahide Road.
- 1.5. The topography of the site is relatively flat with a small number of localised high points, such as that on which Auburn House is positioned and Little Auburn. Ground levels indicated for the site generally range from 9mOD to 11mOD with high points including up to c.11.75mOD. The site drains via a series of ditches inclusive of a local stream which merges with Hazelbrook Stream located to the southeast of the site, and in turn Baldoyle Bay.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the preservation of Auburn House and its stables as a single dwelling unit, with the conversion of the stables to ancillary storage to serve the main dwelling, and the construction of 98 residential units comprising 53 houses (detached, semi-detached, terrace, and courtyard type dwellings, predominantly 2 storeys height), 37 apartments (Apartment Blocks 4 and 5, each 4 storeys in height) and 8 duplex units (Duplex Block 1, 3 storeys in height). The proposal includes for all associated car parking, bicycle parking/ stores, refuse stores, plant, and public lighting.
- 2.2. Also included in the proposal are the demolition of the dwelling Little Auburn and associated stables/ shed structure, and the development of: landscaped public and communal open spaces, boundary treatments, a new signalised vehicular entrance at the Malahide Road junction, a pedestrian/ cyclist path north of the walled garden, shared use of the existing entrance and access road to Auburn House by pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles (vehicular use restricted to named properties within the grounds, i.e., Auburn House, Belmont, The Lodge, Bellview, and Elgin), closing of the existing vehicular entrance at the Malahide Road serving Little Auburn, and all associated site infrastructure and engineering works to facilitate the scheme, including a new on-site foul pumping station and laying foul sewer drains along Back Road and Kinsealy Lane.
- 2.3. The following table presents a summary of the principal characteristics, features, and floor areas of the proposed scheme:

Table 1: Key Statistics

Site Area	9.03ha (gross area) 2.68ha (net area)
Floor Areas (gross floor spaces)	New Residential: 10,514sqm Retained: 1,578sqm (Auburn House and stables) Demolition: 622sqm (Little Auburn and stable building)
Residential component	98 new residential units: 53 houses (c.54% of the scheme)

	37 apartments (c.38% of the scheme) 8 duplex units (c.8% of the scheme)
Net Density	c.36.5dph
Building Height	House Types A, C-F (14 designs): predominantly 2 storeys (principal heights, 7.72m (Type As) (except Type A 6 is 2.5 storeys, principal height 9.52m) to 10.02m (Type C2-C3 and E1-F) Apartment Blocks 4 and 5: 4 storeys (principal height, 14.6mm) Duplex Block 1: 3 storeys (principal height, 10.8m)
Aspect	Apartment Blocks 4-5: 29 dual aspect (78%), 8 single aspect (22%) Duplex Block 1: 8 dual aspect (100%)
Open Space	Total Public Open Space: c.1.9207ha (19,207sqm, small and pocket parks) Public: c.1.31ha (13,103sqm, excluding attenuation areas in small parks) Communal: c.0.029ha (295sqm) Private: gardens, balconies, and terraces (various sqm)
Part V provision	Total: 10 units
Car Parking	Total: 153 spaces Houses: 101 spaces (1 space per 2 bed, 2 spaces per 3-4 bed house) Apartments: 37 spaces (1 space per 1-2 bed units, 2 spaces per 3 bed units) Duplexes: 9 spaces (1 space per 1-2 bed units, 1.5 spaces per 3 bed units) Visitors: 6 spaces
Bicycle Parking	Total: 153 spaces Bicycle spaces within curtilages of houses, including anchor bolts for terrace houses. Apartment Blocks 4-5: 80 spaces in secure stores at ground floor Duplex Block 1: 14 spaces in apartment blocks Visitors: 24 spaces in external Sheffield stands within the scheme

2.4. The proposed residential mix is as follows:

Table 2: Summary of Residential Unit Mix

Houses (53 units, c.54% of the scheme)					
Unit Type	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	Total
Total	0	5	12	36	53
% of Total	-	9%	23%	68%	100%
Apartments (37 units, c.38% of the scheme)					
Unit Type	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	Total
Total	12	25	0	0	37
% of Total	32%	68%	-	-	100%
Duplex Units (8 units, c.8% of the scheme)					
Unit Type	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	Total
Total	4	2	2	0	8
% of Total	50%	25%	25%	-	100%
Combined Houses, Apartments, and Duplex Units (98 units)					
Unit Type	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	Total
Total	16	32	14	36	98
Overall %	16%	33%	14%	37%	100%

- 2.5. During the assessment of the application, the proposed development was revised through a Further Information (FI) request from the planning authority. Amendments made to the key statistics and unit mix from that outlined above include the omission of one 4 bedroom house (House No.53), and to Apartment Block 5, changing the apartment unit mix (but not the number of units) from 12 no. 1 bedroom units and of 25 no. 2 bedroom units (i.e. 4 no. 1 bedroom units and 14 no. 2 bedroom units amended to 8 no. 1 bedroom units and 10 no. 2 bedroom units). Minor amendments were also made to the car parking provision with 155 spaces provided (increased from an initial 153 spaces) with spaces being reallocated due to changes to unit mix and visitor space requirements.
- 2.6. The proposed development is one of three concurrent applications made on lands under the applicant's control at this location (blue line boundary is indicated on Dwg No. 1902PS035). The applications have each been appealed and the appeals are

being assessed concurrently (see section 4.0 Planning History below of this report). In the case documentation, the applicant has referenced the lands subject of the three applications according to character areas. The proposed development is referred to as 'Little Auburn', while the other two applications are referred to as 'Streamstown' (PA Ref. F22A/0579, ABP 316444-23, 69 residential units, southwestern area), and 'Auburn Park' (PA Ref. F22A/0581, ABP 316504-23, 92 residential units, northernmost area). For the Board's clarity, I use the same references as appropriate.

- 2.7. For clarity on the areas subject to the appeals, I refer the Board to Dwg No. 1902PS024 'Explanatory Drawing indicating redlines of contemporaneous planning applications'. Included within the development boundaries of the three appeals are the works at Auburn House and stables, the demolition of the stable block at Little Auburn, the connecting pedestrian/ cyclist path north of the walled garden, the shared use of the existing entrance and access road to Auburn House by pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles (with vehicular use restricted to named existing properties within the grounds, i.e., Auburn House, Bellmont, The Lodge, Bellview, and Elgin), and the wastewater drainage works (new on-site pumping station and foul sewer drains in public roads). Common to the development boundaries of this appeal Little Auburn (ABP 316498-23, PA Ref. F22A/0580) and that of Auburn Park (ABP 316504-23, PA Ref. F22A/0581) are areas of public open space to the east of Auburn House, closing of the existing vehicular entrance at the Malahide Road serving Little Auburn, and a new signalised vehicular entrance at the Malahide Road junction.
- 2.8. The proposed development includes a Phasing Plan (Architectural Design Report, pg. 68) for the planned implementation of the three concurrent applications. These include Phase 1: Auburn House, wastewater infrastructure and Streamstown (i.e., the proposed development), Phase 2: Auburn Park and road infrastructure, and Phase 3: Little Auburn.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Summary of Decision

3.1.1. On 29th March 2023, the planning authority issued a Notification of Decision to Grant Permission subject to 44 conditions. The majority of the conditions are standard in nature (construction, operation, procedural, and financial).

3.1.2. The conditions of note and/ or specific to the proposal include the following:

Condition 2(a) and (b): permits a total of 97 dwelling units comprising 52 houses and 45 apartments/ duplexes, and a specified design option (equally spaced gable bays on front elevations) for houses on Road 1.5.

Condition 4 (several parts): Prior to commencement phasing plan is to be agreed inclusive of:

(a) Phase 1 is to comprise the combined developments of PA Ref. F22A/0580 (i.e., the proposed development) and PA Ref. F22A/0581 inclusive of the public open space and childcare facility.

(b) No residential development to commence for Phase 2 (PA Ref. F22A/0579) until completion of the associated public open space.

(c)/ (d) Phase 1 to include implementation and completion of the Protection Plan for Auburn House and associated works (conversion of stables, new boundary treatment, repair of walled garden) prior to occupation of any dwelling unit in the scheme.

(e)/ (f) Completion and operation of the bioretention/ flood storage area and childcare facility required prior to, respectively, the occupation of any and more than 75 dwelling units.

(g) Provision of a pedestrian link in the northeastern corner of the site from Road 1.5 to the Malahide Road, with details to be agreed (note: in the interests of clarity, the reference to northeastern corner should more accurately be worded as per Condition 18(m)).

Condition 5: Compliance with Architectural Heritage Report and Maintenance Strategy for works to/ in the vicinity of Auburn House, stables, and walled garden, such works are to be supervised and certified by appropriate professional.

Condition 6: (a) Amendments to House A1: 24 (house changed from a 4 bedroom to a 3 bedroom unit with windows serving bedrooms changed from rear to front elevation), (b) dwellings on Road 1.5 to have equally spaced gable bays on front

elevations, (c) privacy screens on northern side of balconies for named apartments (5-08, 9, 13, 14, 17, and 18) in Apartment Block 5, and (d) revised fenestration in the northern elevation of Apartment Block 5 and corresponding floor plans to mitigate potential overlooking of the southern elevation of Apartment Block 4.

Condition 8: No advertising signage along the tree lined boundary of Malahide Road.

Condition 12: Cycle routes to be provided along the main access roads where appropriate in accordance with the National Cycle Manual.

Condition 16(d): ditch network on site to be subject to regular maintenance and prior to commencement agreement required for the culvert section east of the walled garden.

Condition 18 (several parts): no obstructions in visibility triangle at main entrances and junctions, final agreement on details including the signalised junction on Malahide Road, details of junction design, signalised junction and safety audit of same completed prior to occupation of dwellings, management of apartment parking spaces, EV charging points required for 10% of spaces, a construction traffic management plan, construction and maintenance requirements of roads, footpaths, verges, lighting and other infrastructure, Stage 2 and Stage 3 Road Safety Audits completed and submitted at applicable stages of design and construction, and (Condition 18(m)) provision of an additional pedestrian connection at the most northerly point of the site's eastern boundary.

Condition 19: (several parts): No development in tree protection root areas, employment of an arboricultural consultant for duration of works, annual review of Woodland Management Plan, lodgement of a €250,000 tree bond.

Condition 20 (several parts): Provision of a pedestrian link on the site's western boundary, prior to commencement agreement on play equipment and surfaces, tree root protection areas, landscape specifications and management details, and revised boundary treatments to be agreed (to prevent a gated community, and vandalism).

Condition 22 (several parts): Appointment of an Ecological Clerk of Works to monitor works and prepare an annual Ecological Survey Report, creation of 10m watercourse exclusion zone(s), vegetation removal and structural demolition overseen by same.

Conditions 23 and 31: Prior to commencement agreement on a final taking in charge drawing (showing areas of Council and private management company responsibility) and the establishment of an Owners' Management Company responsible for the development except for taken in charge areas respectively.

Condition 25: Prior to commencement agreement on the provision of a piece of public art.

Condition 26: Provision of appropriate standard of noise insulation for Noise Zone C associated with Dublin Airport.

Condition 27: Prior to commencement agreement of a CEMP incorporating all applicable mitigation measures in the EIAR and NIS.

Condition 28: Prior to commencement agreement of a Travel Plan.

Condition 33: Prior to commencement agreement on a Bat Conservation Plan for Auburn House and site (trees).

Condition 35: Requirements for archaeological monitoring and excavations as necessary.

Conditions 36 and 37: Implementation of mitigation measures in the EIAR and NIS respectively.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The key items of note from the planner's assessment of the proposed development can be summarised as follows:

Planner's Report (Initial)

- Key designations and objectives applicable from the Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023 identified as follows:
 - Subject to zoning objective RA 'Residential Area'.
 - Contains Protected Structure Ref. 448 Auburn House and a 'Protect and Preserve Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows' specific objective.
 - Located within Masterplan MP 9A and Noise Zone C associated with Dublin Airport.

- Principle of development and residential density (c.36.5 dph) are considered acceptable.
- Refers to the concurrent applications (259 dwelling units in total) and proposed phasing plan (Phase 1: Auburn House, wastewater infrastructure and Streamstown, Phase 2: Auburn Park, and Phase 3: Little Auburn (i.e., the proposed development)).
- Conversion of stables, erection of boundary fence, enclosure of private open space for Auburn House are considered acceptable as much of the historic planting is being retained.
- Notes new access arrangements (entrance and access road) involve removal of trees and highlights trees along the Malahide Road and existing access road to Auburn House require protection (recommends minimum loss of trees and condition restricting erection of any advertisements structures thereon).
- Highlights open nature of lands to the east of Auburn House being retained but two clusters of courtyard type housing proposed to the north and south of the open vista, scale of housing, landscaping and planting important to mitigate the visual impact.
- Considers the design of balconies for apartment blocks (projecting with vertical metal balustrades) to be inappropriate for the sensitive setting (recommends recessed design, consistent approach in three concurrent applications).
- Finishes for proposed houses recommended due to being within the grounds of a historic house and designed landscape (e.g. natural slate, metal, timber, brick colour, no boxed eaves).
- No construction prior to Woodland Management Plan commenced satisfactorily.
- Pump station in a sensitive location and requires additional screening proposals.
- Apartments and duplexes comply with the applicable SPPRs in the Apartment Guidelines.
- Concerns regarding residential amenity (overlooking, loss of privacy) due to substandard separation distances between Apartment Blocks 4 and 5, and certain houses in the courtyard clusters.

- No concerns raised regarding adverse impact on the residential amenity of adjacent properties.
- Considers a childcare facility is required to comply with the 2017 CDP, as the applicant's Childcare Provision Assessment report (justification for non-provision) is noted but not agreed with.
- Surface water drainage proposals considered acceptable, with the proposal according with the Flood Risk Guidelines.
- Access arrangements are acceptable in principle, including the shared-modal use of the existing access road (restricted vehicular use for five properties to be controlled by an automated bollard at the entrance), and a new entrance with a signalised junction on Malahide Road, with details on the latter required.
- Car and cycle parking are generally acceptable with amendments required for additional and reallocated provision of same relevant to the apartments and housing respectively.
- Outline of public open space provision, calculated to comply with 2017 CDP but stated that there is no over-provision that could be used for another phase of the development.
- Construction phase protection of trees to be achieved through provision of 3m setbacks between House 53 and tree protective fencing in north of site.
- Measures requires to protect trees including no development within the root protection areas and a strategy for Tree No. 712 (bat roost tree).
- Refers to a technical review of the AA screening report and NIS undertaken by environmental consultants on behalf of the planning authority, with clarity sought on data used and findings.
- Requests Further Information (FI) on 12th December 2022 seeking:
 - improved separation distances between Apartment Blocks 4 and 5, and between Houses A1/24, A5/28, A5/35 and opposing houses.
 - provision of a childcare facility.
 - Design and external finishes recommendations to address architectural conservation concerns: building height of house type A6 (reduce from 3 to 2

storeys), front elevations of Houses F/12 and F1/13, front (southern) elevations of Houses E/01-E11 onto Road 1.5, additional planting to named properties (Houses 14-18), and revised balcony design from projecting with metal balustrades to recessed/ semi-recessed with glass balustrades.

- parks related requirements seek clarity on tree protective measures (separation distance to House 53 and no development within protection areas).
- transportation related requirements seek a revised signalised junction (increased length of right turning lane from Malahide Road to Back Road, junction design model to stress test same, potential for improved pedestrian infrastructure in the junction design, provision of a footpath (c.85m length) on the eastern side of the southern arm of the R107 to the junction with Streamstown Lane, potential for a controlled pedestrian crossing along footpath route, consider implications on bus stops, for signage, and provide swept analysis, a revised car parking layout (increased rates for 3 bed units and visitors), and an additional pedestrian connection point in the north point of the eastern corner of the site.
- revised and updated AA screening report and NIS for the three concurrent applications.

Planner's Report (FI response)

- Assesses the applicant's response to the FI request, submitted on 3rd February 2023, and finds:
 - improved separation distances achieved between Apartment Blocks 4 and 5 (increased from c.14.6m to c.16.7m-c.18.7m) through amendments to the siting and design of the blocks. Revisions to the blocks are considered to be generally acceptable. Recommends further amendments be made by condition (privacy screens on balconies of 5-08, 9, 13, 14, 17, and 18) and use of clerestory windows/ obscure glazing on block's northern elevation.
 - justification for A house types accepted (separation distances, cluster arrangement, shared communal open space) though recommends

amendments by condition (A1/24 amended to a 3 bedroom unit, bedroom windows relocated to elevation addressing road).

- accepts provision of childcare facility within Apartment Block 3 (Auburn Park, PA Ref. F22A/0581, ABP 316504), enlarged to serve the proposed development.
 - revised elevation design for dwellings (options suggested), external finishes, and screening proposals submitted and acceptably addressing architectural conservation items.
 - revised balcony design (partially recessed with glass balustrades) for apartments considered acceptable.
 - accepts separation distances to (omission of House 53) and no construction within tree protection areas indicated.
 - strategy for Tree No. 712 allows its short term retention during the construction period.
 - revised parking layout has been submitted (numbers reflecting a reduction in 3 bedroom units, and an increase in visitor allocation), analysis and design amendments on junction provided (omission of right turning lane from Malahide Road to Back Road) are considered acceptable with final agreement on technical details required.
 - applicant's reason for not providing a pedestrian connection to the Malahide Road is not accepted as not sufficiently justified (due to no desire line, likely tree loss).
 - revised AA screening report and NIS have addressed previous issues and are considered to be acceptable.
- In respect of the concurrent applications, recommends these be linked as part of the phased development of the overall land holding.
 - Development within the proposed development (PA Ref.F22A/0580) and concurrent PA Ref.F22A/0581 be carried out in tandem and prior to development subject of PA Ref. F22A/0579, which shall be the final phase.

- Such an approach would ensure the restoration of the Auburn House, and the delivery of public open space, the childcare facility, and physical (foul drainage), infrastructure.
- Appropriate assessment of the proposed development concludes that subject to mitigation there is no potential for an adverse effect on European sites.
- Refers to a technical assessment of the EIAR by environmental consultants on behalf of the planning authority.
- Reasoned conclusion on EIA concludes that the proposed development is not likely to have significant effects on population and human health, biodiversity, land, soil, geology, water, air quality, noise and vibration, climate, landscape and visual impact assessment, and material assets.
- Proposed development accords with the policies and objectives of the Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023, and granting of permission is recommended.

3.2.2. Other Internal Technical Reports

Transportation: AI requested. AI report, no objection subject to condition.

Parks: AI requested. AI report, no objection subject to condition

Water Services: No objection subject to condition.

Environment: No objection subject to condition.

Heritage Officer/ Archaeology: No objection subject to conditions.

Conservation Officer: No objection subject to condition.

Arts and Culture: No objection subject to condition.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Irish Aviation Authority: No observation to make.

Dublin Airport Authority: No objection subject to condition.

Department of Housing, Development Applications Unit: No objection subject to condition.

Uisce Eireann: No objection subject to condition.

National Transport Authority: recommends additional pedestrian connectivity along northern boundary, junction design and public road works need to accord with the requirements of the National Cycle Manual.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

- 3.4.1. Submissions were received by the planning authority from third party observers at the initial assessment of the application and at the FI response stage. Issues raised in the submissions continue to form the basis of the appeal (planning application and assessment process are invalid, adverse impact on Auburn House and setting), which are outlined in detail in Section 6.0 of this report below.

4.0 **Planning History**

Appeal Site/ Lands under Applicant's Control

Residential Zoned Land Tax (RZLT)

ABP 316658-23

Confirmation on the 9th September 2023 of the determination by Fingal County Council (Reg. Ref. RZLT 136/22) to include lands (c.2.1ha) under the applicant's control on the RZLT map.

ABP 316662-23

Confirmation on the 9th September 2023 of the determination by Fingal County Council (Reg. Ref. RZLT 136/22) to include lands (c.9.6ha) under the applicant's control on the RZLT map.

ABP 316666-23

Confirmation on the 9th September 2023 of the determination by Fingal County Council (Reg. Ref. RZLT 136/22) to include lands (c.1.7ha) under the applicant's control on the RZLT map.

Concurrent Planning Appeals

PA Ref. F22A/0579, ABP 316444-23 ('Streamstown')

Permission granted to the applicant on 29th March 2023 for the preservation and protection of the existing Protected Structure of Auburn House and its stables as 1

no. residential dwelling, conversion of the existing stables of Auburn House to provide for storage space for the main Auburn House, construction of 69 no. residential units (35 no. houses and 34 no. apartments), and all associated site works.

The decision to grant permission is subject of a separate appeal, ABP 316444-23 which is being assessed concurrently.

PA Ref. F22A/0581, ABP 316504-23 ('Auburn Park')

Permission granted to the applicant on 29th March 2023 for the preservation and protection of the existing Protected Structure of Auburn House and its stables as 1 no. residential dwelling, conversion of the existing stables of Auburn House to provide for storage space for the main Auburn House, construction of 92 no. residential units (45 no. houses, 34 no. apartments and 13 no. duplex apartments), and all associated site works.

The decision to grant permission is subject of a separate appeal, ABP 316504-23 which is being assessed concurrently.

SHD Applications

ABP 313360-22

Applicant applied for permission on 19th April 2022 for the preservation of Auburn House (a Protected Structure) and stables as 1 no. residential dwelling, conversion of stables to provide storage space for Auburn House, construction of 368 no. residential units (87 no. houses, 281 no. apartments), creche and associated site works.

At the time of this assessment, a decision had not been made by An Bord Pleanála on the application.

ABP 309907-21

Permission refused to the applicant on 14th July 2021 for the demolition of 'Little Auburn' and associated outbuildings, construction of 411 no. residential units (102 no. houses including preservation of Auburn House and 309 no. apartments), childcare facilities and all other associated site works.

Permission was refused on the basis of three reasons relating to the adverse impact on the protected structure and its attendant grounds, the loss of trees, and insufficient information on daylight and sunlight.

Lands Adjacent to South

PA Ref. F18A/0445

Permission granted on 25th January 2019 for the conversion of the service entrance off main driveway to serve as new eastern entrance to dwelling house, erection of new gate posts and automated gates, entrance forecourt, new entrance canopy to east elevation, alteration to existing entrance doorway on west elevation and associated external works at "Belmont" part of courtyard housing (formerly outhouses) in the grounds of Auburn House (a protected structure), Malahide, Co Dublin.

Lands Further to the South (Streamstown Lane area)

PA Ref. F19A/0446, ABP 306844-20

Permission granted on 28th August 2020 for the upgrade of the existing road (Streamstown Lane) over c.120m (increase road width, provide 2m wide footpath, boundary wall with kerb and drainage) between the junction of Park Avenue to the west and Malahide Road to the east.

This permission was being implemented at the time of site inspection.

PA Ref. F21A/0547 (F22A/0380 amended an occupation condition)

Permission granted on 13th January 2022 for 50 residential units with access to the estate provided from Park Avenue and Streamstown Wood. The proposed development includes a raised table at the junction of Streamstown Lane and Park Avenue, and also at the junctions of Streamstown Lane and Carey's Lane, at Park Avenue and Streamstown Wood, and on the road into Streamstown Wood.

This permission was being implemented at the time of site inspection.

PA Ref. F19A/0452, ABP 307020-20

Permission refused on 16th December 2020 for the construction of 52 no. residential units of detached, semi-detached, and terraced housing.

Further to the East/ Southeast (Back Road)

ABP 313265-22, SHD application

Permission refused on 28th March 2023 for 100 no. residential units (34 no. houses, 66 no. apartments), creche and associated site works.

ABP 313361-22, SHD application

Permission for the demolition of buildings, construction of 415 no. residential units (252 no houses, 163 no. apartments) creche and associated site works.

At the time of this assessment, a decision had not been made by An Bord Pleanála on the application.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Having regard to the nature of the proposed development, the receiving environment, the range of information on the case file, including submissions received from the third parties, prescribed bodies, and planning authority, I consider the policy and guidance relevant to the determination of the appeal to be as follows:

5.2. National Planning Context

National Planning Framework, Project Ireland 2040 (NPF)

5.2.1. A number of overarching national policy objectives (NPOs) are applicable to the proposed development from the NPF, including:

- NPO 3a: Deliver at least 40% of all new homes nationally, within the built-up footprint of existing settlements.
- NPO 4: Ensure the creation of attractive, liveable, well designed, high quality urban places that are home to diverse and integrated communities that enjoy a high quality of life and well-being.
- NPO 11: In meeting urban development requirements, there will be a presumption in favour of development that can encourage more people and

generate more jobs and activity within existing cities, towns and villages, subject to development meeting appropriate planning standards and achieving targeted growth.

- NPO 33: Prioritise the provision of new homes at locations that can support sustainable development and at an appropriate scale of provision relative to location.
- NPO 35: Increase residential density in settlements, through a range of measures including reductions in vacancy, reuse of existing buildings, infill development schemes, area or site-based regeneration and increased building heights.

Section 28 Ministerial Planning Guidelines

5.2.2. Several national planning guidelines are applicable to the proposed development (increased residential densities at certain types of locations, achievement of certain standards for residential development). The relevant guidelines include the following (my abbreviation in brackets):

- Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2024, (Sustainable Residential Development Guidelines). Applicable policy includes:
 - Section 3.3: contains Table 3.3 which requires net residential densities in the range 35-50 dph to be generally applied at suburban and edge locations of Metropolitan Towns.
 - Section 3.4: guides that while densities within the applicable range are acceptable, densities closer to the mid-range should be encouraged at intermediate locations.
 - Section 4.4: contains Policy and Objective 4.1 which requires the implementation of principles, approaches and standards in the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets, 2013, including updates (DMURS).
 - Section 5.3: includes achievement of housing standards as follows:
 - **SPPR 1 – Separation Distances** which requires a minimum of 16m between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or

side of houses, duplex units and apartment units, above ground floor level.

- **SPPR 2 – Minimum Private Open Space for Houses** which requires a minimum of between 20sqm (1 bed) to 50sqm (4+ bed) dependant on number of bedrooms in a house (private open space for duplexes and apartments as per the Apartment Guidelines).
- **Policy and Objective 5.1** which requires a public open space provision of between 10%-15% of net site area. A higher range may be applicable in sites that contain significant heritage, landscape or recreational features and sites that have specific nature conservation requirements.
- **SPPR 3 – Car Parking** which restricts the maximum rate of car parking provision for residential development in intermediate locations to 2 no. spaces per dwelling (exclusive of visitor spaces).
- **SPPR 4 – Cycle Parking and Storage** which requires a general minimum standard of 1 no. cycle storage space per bedroom (plus visitor spaces), a mix of cycle parking types, and cycle storage facilities in a dedicated facility of permanent construction (within or adjoining the residences).
- Urban Development and Building Heights, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, December 2018 (Building Height Guidelines). Applicable policy includes:
 - Section 1.9 requires building heights of at least 3 to 4 storeys, coupled with appropriate density, in locations outside city and town centre areas to be supported in principle at development management level.
 - SPPR 4 requires:

It is a specific planning policy requirement that in planning the future development of greenfield or edge of city/ town locations for housing purposes, planning authorities must secure:

 1. *the minimum densities for such locations set out in the Guidelines issued by the Minister under Section 28 of the Planning and Development*

Act 2000 (as amended), titled “Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas (2007)” or any amending or replacement Guidelines;

2. a greater mix of building heights and typologies in planning for the future development of suburban locations; and

3. avoid mono-type building typologies (e.g. two storey or own-door houses only), particularly, but not exclusively so in any one development of 100 units or more.

- Sustainable Urban Housing, Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, July 2023 (Apartment Guidelines).
Applicable policy includes:
 - Section 2.4 identifies intermediate urban locations as being suitable for medium-high density residential development of any scale that includes apartments to some extent (minimum density is indicated as 45dph).
- Architectural Heritage Protection, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2011 (Architectural Heritage Guidelines).
- Childcare Facilities, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2001 (Childcare Guidelines).
- The Planning System and Flood Risk Management, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2009 (Flood Risk Guidelines).
- Regulation of Commercial Institutional Investment in Housing, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2021, updated 2023 (Commercial Institutional Investment Guidelines).

5.3. Regional Context

Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Eastern and Midland Region 2019-2031 (RSES)

- 5.3.1. The RSES provides a development framework for the region, including a Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan (MASP) for Dublin City and suburbs, within which the appeal site is located. Accordingly, settlement strategy policy and a number of regional objectives are applicable to the proposed development, including:

- Table 4.2 Settlement Strategy defines categories of urban centres including that of ‘Self-Sustaining Town’, with which Malahide aligns.
- Table 4.3 Settlement Typologies and Policy Responses states the policy response for Self-Sustaining Towns is for consolidation coupled with targeted investment where required to improve local employment, services and sustainable transport options and to become more self-sustaining settlements.
- In respect of density, the RSES guides that higher densities should be applied to higher order settlements and that a graded reduction in residential densities should be applied for Self-Sustaining Towns that are commensurate to the existing built environment.
- RPO 5.3: Future development in the Dublin Metropolitan Area shall be planned and designed in a manner that facilitates sustainable travel patterns, increasing walking, cycling and public transport use, and creating safe environments for pedestrians and cyclists.
- RPO 5.4: Future development of strategic residential development areas within the MASP shall provide for higher densities and qualitative standards as set out in the Sustainable Residential Development Guidelines, the Apartments Guidelines, and the Building Heights Guidelines.
- RPO 5.5: Future residential development supporting the right housing and tenure mix within the MASP shall follow a clear sequential approach, with a primary focus on the consolidation of Dublin and suburbs and the development of Key Metropolitan Towns.

5.4. Local Context

Change between Fingal Development Plans

- 5.4.1. The Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023 (2017 CDP) was in effect at the time the planning application was lodged (21st October 2022) and when the planning authority made its decision to grant permission (29th March 2023). The Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 (2023 CDP) had come into effect (5th April 2023) at the time the appeals were lodged with the Board (25th April 2023).
- 5.4.2. While the application and appeal documentation understandably refer to policy and objectives in the 2017 CDP, I confirm to the Board that the 2023 CDP is now the

applicable development plan for the area and this appeal is assessed with regard to the provisions of the 2023 CDP.

Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029

5.4.3. The relevant 2023 CDP map based (Sheet 9) designations include:

- The site is located within the development boundary of Malahide (a Self-Sustaining Town, the third highest tier in the county's urban hierarchy).
- The site is zoned as 'RA' Residential Area, with the stated objective to 'Provide for new residential communities subject to the provision of the necessary social and physical infrastructure'. Permitted uses include residential, and childcare facilities.
- The site contains Auburn House, a protected structure, RPS Ref. 448 described as a 'late 18th or early 19th century house, outbuildings & walled garden'.
- The site contains three specific objectives to 'Protect and preserve trees, woodlands, and hedgerows' aligning with the woodlands adjacent to Auburn House, tree stands/ treelines along the access avenue and along the R107 roadside boundary.
- Map based Local Objective 47 applies to the southeastern boundary of the site along the Malahide Road R107 'New or widened entrances onto the Dublin Road between Streamstown Lane and the Swords Junction will be restricted, to ensure the protection of the mature tree-lined approach along the Dublin Road to Malahide'.
- The site is located within Noise Zone C associated with Dublin Airport.

5.4.4. With regard to relevant 2023 CDP policy and objectives, I direct the Board to Appendix 1 in the applicant's first party appeal response. This includes a table listing applicable policy and outlining the manner in/ extent to which the proposal complies with same. I have reviewed same and concur about the relevancy of same for the proposal.

5.4.5. Specifically, I have identified the key 2023 CDP policy, objectives, requirements, and/ or standards that are relevant to the proposal as follows:

Chapter 3: Sustainable Placemaking and Quality Homes

Policy SPQHP36 – Private and Semi-Private Open Space

Ensure that all residential development within Fingal is provided with and has access to high quality private open space and semi-private open space (relative to the composition of the residential scheme) which is of a high-quality design and finish and integrated into the design of the residential development.

Chapter 8: Dublin Airport

Objective DAO11 – Requirement for Noise Insulation

Strictly control inappropriate development and require noise insulation where appropriate in accordance with Table 8.1 ... within Noise Zone B and Noise Zone C ... as shown on the Development Plan maps...

Chapter 10: Heritage, Culture and Arts

Objective HCAO24 – Alteration and Development of Protected Structures...

Require that proposals for any development, modification, alteration, extension or energy retrofitting affecting a Protected Structure and/ or its setting ... are sensitively sited and designed, are compatible with the special character, and are appropriate in terms of the proposed scale, mass, height, density, architectural treatment, layout, materials, impact on architectural or historic features.

Objective HCAO27 – Protected Structures within Larger Developments

Where permission is being sought for a development in which works to the Protected Structure are one element of a larger proposal, the Council will seek for the repair and refurbishment of the Protected Structure to be contained and completed within the first phase.

Chapter 14: Development Management Standards

Objective DMSO27 – Minimum Private Open Space Provision

Ensure a minimum open space provision for dwelling houses (exclusive of car parking area) as follows:

... 3 bedroom houses or less to have a minimum of 60sqm ...and 4 or more bedroom houses to have a minimum of 75sqm of private open space located behind the front building line of the house.

Section 14.8.2 Separation Distances

A minimum standard of 22 metres separation between directly opposing rear first floor windows shall be observed, normally resulting in a minimum rear garden depth of 11 metres...

Objective DMSO72 – Boundary Treatment to Private Open Space

Ensure boundary treatment associated with private open spaces for all residential unit types is designed to protect residential amenity and visual amenity.

Section 14.4.1 Healthy Placemaking: Design Criteria

New residential development to incorporate high-quality sustainable and inclusive design characteristics that promote healthy placemaking and wellbeing (increase active travel and sustainable travel modes, access to community infrastructure including recreational facilities, considered, design-led public realms).

Section 14.6.5 Open Space serving Residential Development

All multi-unit residential schemes are required to indicate all private, communal, and public open space which will serve the scheme (definitions of open space types provided). Target minimum amount of 15% of new developments for public open space, with a potential range of 12% to 15% in certain circumstances.

Section 14.17.2 Bicycle Parking (Table 14.17)

Residential (Long Stay): 1 space per 1-2 bedroom units, plus 1 per bedroom, and 2 spaces per 3+ bedroom units, plus 1 per bedroom.

Residential (Short Stay/ Visitor): 0.5 space per unit (apartment blocks only).

Section 14.17.7 Car Parking (Table 14.19 Car Parking Standards for Zone 2).

Residential: 1 space per 1-2 bedroom units, and 2 spaces per 3+ bedroom units.

Residential (Visitor): 1 space per 5 units.

Objective DMSO194 – Provision of Public Art

Require new residential developments in excess of 100 units ... to provide for a piece of public art to be agreed with the Council.

5.5. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.5.1. The appeal site is not located in or immediately adjacent to a European site, a Natural Heritage Area (NHA) or a proposed NHA (pNHA).
- 5.5.2. The European site designations in proximity to the appeal site include (as measured approximately from Auburn House):
- Malahide Estuary SPA (site code 004025) and Malahide Estuary SAC (site code 000205) are c.1.2km to the north.
 - Baldoyle Bay SPA (site code 004016) and Baldoyle Bay SAC (site code 000199) are c.3.8km to the southeast.
 - North-West Irish Sea SPA (site code 004236) is c.3.9km to the east.
 - North Bull Island SPA (site code 004006) and North Dublin Bay SAC (site code 000206) are c.7.1km to the southeast.
 - South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (site code 004024) is c.9.2km to the south.
 - South Dublin Bay SAC (site code 000210) is c.11.3m to the south.
- 5.5.3. There are no NHA designations in proximity to the appeal site. The pNHA designations include:
- Feltrim Hill pNHA (site code 001208) is c.0.75km to the southwest.
 - Malahide Estuary pNHA (site code 000205) is c.1.2km to the north.
 - Sluice River Marsh pNHA (site code 001763) is c.2.7km to the southeast.
 - Baldoyle Bay pNHA (site code 000199) is c.3.8km to the southeast.
 - North Dublin Bay pNHA (site code 000206) is c.7.1km to the southeast.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. One third party appeal has been made on the proposed development on behalf of Savaron Ltd (management entity for common areas in Abington residential development). The main issues raised in the grounds of the appeal can be summarised under the following headings:

6.1.2. Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029

- Application was assessed under the previous Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023 and as the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 has since come into force the processing of the application cannot proceed any further.
- Proposed development is a material contravention of the current development plan due to over provision of car parking, under provision of cycle parking, design of open space, adverse impact on Auburn House, and being contrary to Objective HCA027.

6.1.3. Impacts on the Receiving Area

Auburn House:

- The architectural and heritage importance of Auburn House and its grounds are confirmed by several sources. The structure and its setting merit the highest degree of protection from inappropriate development which would undermine the quality of the interdependent relationship.
- The development of the lands in any intensity is wholly unsuitable to the proper protection of the Auburn House and its setting, and directly conflicts with the Architectural Heritage Guidelines (e.g., section 3.4.2 on the importance of setting).

Trees and Woodlands:

- Unclear information in the Tree Report regarding tree removal and retention under the proposed development and other applications e.g., tree removal in the vicinity of the new access road.
- No information or assessment on the impact of tree removal on the tree canopy extending across Malahide Road.

Residential Amenity:

- Public open spaces to serve residential areas are poorly provided, including the small pocket parks and walled garden area which is not readily accessible, unclear

boundary between public and private space for Auburn House, minimal passive surveillance.

6.1.4. Validity of Application Details

- Incorrect answers/ responses given in the planning authority application form on the following questions:
 - Works close to a European site, development requiring preparation of an EIAR, demolition works of a structure, and details of landowner.
- Numbers, locations, development description, and background colours of site notices as erected are respectively insufficient, unrepresentative, incorrect, and invalid.
- No detailed drawings are provided of Auburn House or a section of the wall of the walled garden proposed to be demolished.

6.1.5. Validity of Three Consecutive Applications

- Two consecutive applications were submitted with the subject application, which constitutes project splitting.
- Planning and environmental impacts of each application cannot be assessed as information provided is not based on each application being individually implemented.
- Absence of necessary information of the potential impacts across the full range of potential outcomes from making three consecutive applications (i.e. there are eight different permutations).
- Fundamental failure of this approach is evident in respect of the development of Auburn House and lands, the impact on which would be entirely different depending on which application(s) are permitted and/ or refused.
- Motivation of applicant's approach is to avoid the LRD procedure, which is mandatory for developments in excess of 100 residential units (sections 32A to 32G of the 2000 Act apply), therefore the applications are invalid, the planning authority should have refused permission and the board lacks jurisdiction to determine the appeal.

6.1.6. Validity of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report and Natura Impact Statement

- The EIAR accompanying the application has been prepared for 259 residential dwellings, which is incorrect as no such application exists.
- EIAR is based on the unreasonable assumption that each application will be granted permission and implemented, a fundamental error, which makes the EIAR null and void in any other scenario.
- Refers to examples in the EIAR that cannot be relied upon on an individual application basis, e.g., extent of human health impact, biodiversity mitigation measures, open space provision, the noise impact assessment.
- Applications include a series of duplicate reports and assessments, including the EIARs (all chapters 1-16) such that the individual topic assessments are flawed, and considerations of cumulative impacts and interactions are impossible.
- Specific reference is made to the confusion caused from the inclusion of an 'Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Assessment' as a standalone report and as a chapter in the EIAR, and which recommendations are applicable.
- EIAR is incorrectly an assessment of cumulative effects of the three applications, as opposed to being an assessment of cumulation with other existing and/ or approved projects, and fails to present and consider adequate alternatives (including a lower density development).
- It is impermissible to have an EIAR for three separate applications as section 172 of the 2000 Act contemplates a single application for development consent subject to EIA.
- EIAR fails to adequately consider impacts relating to bats (absence of scientific literature on the efficacy of the mitigation measures for bat roost destruction and disturbance) and to comply with the Water Framework Directive (identification and assessment of main impacts on nearby waterbodies).
- AA screening report and NIS have inadequately considered wintering birds (survey dates and methodology), made unsubstantiated claims in respect of habitat and treeline at the site/ receiving area, wrongly screened out ex-situ effects on

nearby SPAs, referenced out of date conservation objectives, and not considered the foul sewer construction.

6.1.7. Validity of Further Information

- Planning authority's FI request is relatively benign and superficial (save for Item 8 relating to appropriate assessment) given the complexities of the planning application as it should have included requests for:
 - Rationale for three consecutive applications.
 - Individual assessments for all potential outcomes of decisions.
- Applicant's FI response in respect of the childcare provision (a facility is to be provided within development subject of PA Ref. F22A/0581) demonstrates the unsatisfactory nature of the three application approach as what would happen to the childcare provision at the scheme if the application is refused/ not implemented.
- Applicant's FI response includes incorrect information, omissions, and/ or discrepancies:
 - Revised AA Screening Report and NIS continue to refer to PA Ref. F22A/0581 i.e. 92 dwellings (instead of different permutations and/ or cumulative examination with two other consecutive applications).
 - Revised AA Screening Report and NIS have not included the wastewater drainage works on Back Road and Kinsealy Lane crossing Hazelbrook Stream and therefore not considered or mitigated potential impacts.
 - CGIs are brochure images not verified photomontages and are flawed as they indicate the three applications as opposed to all potential outcomes.
- Notification procedure used by the planning authority of the applicant's FI response is procedurally flawed:
 - As a third party, appellant was invited to make a submission on the FI response within a four-week period.
 - Several errors referred to including timelines and dates.
 - Should have found the FI request to be significant FI (SFI) and followed the appropriate legislative procedures (readvertising, longer response period).

6.1.8. Validity of Planning Authority Decision

- Condition 4 links the implementation of the current application with the two consecutive applications (extent of open space, when childcare facility to be provided, restriction on occupation of dwelling units).
- Refers to renovation and restoration works to Auburn House which are not part of this application.
- Condition 4 is confusing, contradictory, and unenforceable.
- Evident the planning authority believes the three applications to be completely intertwined and cannot be implemented separately.
- This highlights the unacceptability of the applicant's approach to the proposal which has been endorsed by the planning authority.
- Conditions pertaining to Auburn House are inadequate (as the information provided with the application is insufficient, lacking in detailed plans and particulars, contradictory as it appears that there are no renovation and restoration works proposed) and as such with no specific condition requiring any details to be agreed with the planning authority.
- Conditions 27 and 37 are contradictory as the former requires agreement on a final CEMP, while the latter requires all mitigation measures in the EIAR and NIS to be implemented (the former includes more items/ unknown items to be included in the project which have not undergone environmental assessment).
- Enforcement issues may arise over which application is being implemented and which conditions apply (e.g., undertaking of the wastewater drainage works).
- Planning officer's recommendation to consider three applications as one/ in tandem indicates the current application is contrary to proper planning and sustainable development, and a convention of the development plan (provision of open space and childcare facility, protection of Auburn House, delivery of infrastructure).
- Approach taken by planning authority is not allowed for under section 34(4)(a) of the Planning & Development Act (provisions do not extend to permitting

development on abutting lands) and is not in accordance with the Development Management Guidelines (nature of conditions).

- Discrepancies, inadequacies, and illogical assessment of issues referred to in other planning authority internal reports (Parks, Transportation, Environmental Consultant, Conservation Officer).
- Demolitions relating to a protected structure are required to be considered under the 'exceptional' provisions of section 57 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, on which inadequate or no information has been provided.

6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1. A response to the third party grounds of appeal has been received from the applicant, and the main issues raised can be summarised as follows:

6.2.2. Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029

- Streamstown LAP and Streamstown Masterplan no longer have any legal standing (expired or superseded). The current 2023 CDP is in effect, with which the proposal complies (refers to Appendix 1). Key issue is the land use zoning remains the same as the previous 2017 CDP.
- The FI response has incorporated changes (e.g., car and cycle provision) due to the 2023 CDP coming into effect.
- Proposal complies with Objective HCA027 as Auburn House is included in the current application, in the two concurrent applications, and supported by a full Conservation Report and Protection Plan.
- Proposal complies with the 2023 CDP standards for an increased requirement of 12%-15% public open space (indeed exceeds that requirement).

6.2.3. Impacts on the Receiving Area

Auburn House:

- Heritage value and importance of Auburn House and grounds has been taken into account in the overall design of the proposal reflected by the large multi-disciplinary team (e.g., conservation architects, conservation engineers, architects, engineers, arborists, ecologists).

- Design of proposed development has been subject to pre planning consultations (planners, conservation officer) and informed by a review of the planning history (refusal reasons cited in SHD application).
- Each of the three applications includes Auburn House and its defined curtilage (woodland, entrance, avenue) to ensure their protection.
- Proposed development is consistent with the requirements of the Architectural Heritage Guidelines with character maintained, trees and woodlands retained, eastern vista protected, and landscape character fully addressed in the documentation.
- SHD application was for a materially different scheme, particularly in terms of overall layout and building heights.
- Appellant appears to be implying that no development should take place in the Auburn House grounds which is dismissed as the potential for a negative impact on the house is rejected.

Trees and Woodlands:

- Rejects the submission that there are discrepancies in the plans submitted, submits appellant has not reviewed same correctly.
- Notes that trees are being removed, this often is the case in development proposals, a balance is required to be struck between same, and highlights that new planting results in a net increase in tree numbers.

Public Open Space:

- Erroneous comments made as the total provision exceeds requirements (c.1.28ha provided, c.0.56ha required), documentation is not misleading (calculations and key are provided indicating the quantum and types of open space), or unclear (new boundary fencing proposed around Auburn House clearly defines the private open space for the house from the public open space).

6.2.4. Validity of Application Details

- Errors in the application form are de minimis in nature (given the volume of application documentation), do not mislead the public or competent authorities,

answered in respect of the subject development (e.g. the question regarding EIA requirement), are confirmed as correct (landowner details).

- Appropriate number of site notices erected at the site and public roads (including Back Road and Kinsealy Lane), public informed evidenced by submissions and appeals, planning authority deemed the notices to be correct and validated application.
- Refutes appellant's claim of ambiguity in the description of development and/ or deficiencies in drawings submitted for Auburn House and garden (full survey drawings in engineer's report, architectural drawing of wall, architectural conservation report).

6.2.5. Validity of Three Consecutive Applications

- Rejects appellant's claim that the manner of applying for permission at the site through three applications is invalid as the LRD process was not used, as there is no preclusion in the applicable LRD legislation (2021 Act) from making a number of applications (in excess of 100 dwelling units).
- States that section 32A of the 2000 Act, as inserted by section 3 of the 2021 Act, only applies if an applicant intends to apply for LRD permission on lands.
- States that section 32A does not mandate that an LRD opinion must be obtained in instances where an applicant may wish to apply for smaller schemes within a site and implement same as standalone developments.
- Refutes appellant's claim of 'project splitting' as, conversely to the manner in which the term is typically used, the applicant has not attempted to circumvent the EIA directive as an EIAR has been prepared outlining the cumulative impacts of the three applications.
- The applications can proceed independently of each other.
- The applications are themselves sub-threshold projects for EIA, with a single EIAR prepared to allow the competent authority to assess the total impacts of the three developments.

6.2.6. Validity of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report and the Natura Impact Statement

- Rejects appellant's claim that the EIAR is invalid and lacks sufficient information (cumulative impacts, alternatives considered, bats) to allow an EIA to be undertaken.
- The planning authority (as advised by environmental consultants) completed an EIA, finding the EIAR adequately describes the significant likely effects of the project on the environment.
- Having regard to section 172 of the 2000 Act, there is no jurisdictional bar preventing the Board from similarly completing an EIA, and the Board can rely on the information in Chapter 2 (alternatives considered) and Chapter 5 (biodiversity).
- Refutes the criticisms of the AA screening report and NIS including those relating to the sewer route (route is considered, surveyed, assessed with mitigation), Water Framework Directive (watercourses and water bodies (bays)) are considered, reference made to available EPA information, status of waters stable or improving and EIAR concludes the proposal has no likely significant effects on same), in-combination effects (plans and projects are considered, with potential significant effects screened in for the construction phase), survey effort (six surveys over a three year period used to build a comprehensive ecological profile of the site), wintering birds (surveys detailed, methodology reliable, scientific evidence relied upon, misunderstandings/ incorrect statements made), conservation objectives (those used are up to date, if generic objectives published then 'surrogate' objectives used) (refers to Appendix 5).
- The planning authority (as advised by environmental consultants) completed an appropriate assessment with reference to the applicant's AA screening report and NIS, agreeing with the findings and identifying no gaps of information in same.

6.2.7. Validity of Further Information

- Determining whether an FI response is significant is purely an administrative process for the planning authority.
- There is no clear statutory basis upon which a planning authority must deem a FI request to be significant.
- Of the request to provide a childcare facility, the applicant highlights that its Childcare Demand Assessment report found there was sufficient facilities.

- Notwithstanding, a childcare facility has been provided on foot of analysis undertaken as part of the FI response on the proposed development (i.e., this appeal case) and can serve the overall scheme.

6.2.8. Validity of Planning Authority Decision

- Planning authority understood the nature of the planning applications including the extent of works to Auburn House and its stables, granting permission accordingly, attaching valid conditions that relate to phasing and the residential use of Auburn House.
- Planning authority agreed with and accepted the singular nature of the EIAR and NIS prepared for the three applications, which is evident from the FI request and acceptance of the FI response.

6.2.9. Documentation submitted with the Applicant's Response

- Appendix 1: Table of Consistency with Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029
- Appendix 2: Copy of Bat Derogation Licence
- Appendix 3: Waterman Moylan Written Response (on traffic, transportation, and wastewater drainage engineering matters)
- Appendix 4: CCK Architects Written Report (on drawings, public open space, curtilage of Auburn House, and parking standards)
- Appendix 5: Openfield Ecological Services Written Report (on the AA Screening Report and NIS)
- Appendix 6: Sheehan and Barry Conservation Architects Written Report (on Auburn House).

6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

- 6.3.1. A response has been received from the planning authority stating it is of the opinion the proposed development is acceptable, would integrate appropriately with the surrounding area without causing undue impact on same. The decision of the planning authority is requested to be upheld, as are the inclusion of certain conditions (tree bond, security bond, development contribution).

6.4. **Observations**

6.4.1. Two observations have been received on the appeal, one from a third party who made a submission on the application (an adjacent landowner, Beech Lodge), and other from prescribed body Dublin Airport Authority that made a submission on the application. The main issues raised in the observations can be summarised as follows:

6.4.2. Implications of Conditions

- Requests to be included in final agreement on the signalised junction on Malahide Road (Condition 18b).
- Requests the provision of a riparian strip on the side of the bank (under his ownership) and annual maintenance of same as part of the SuDS system (Condition 16).
- Notes proposal's access to foul sewer system (Condition 17) involves c.2km of pressured pipe to access a new Uisce Eireann facility, instead requests Uisce Eireann be mandated to provide sewerage along the Malahide Road for properties in the area to be served by.

6.4.3. Impact on Auburn House

- Main vehicular entrance on Malahide Road results in loss of trees (a previous refusal reason for ABP 309907-21).
- Concern regarding the future of Auburn House as little information is provided, leaving possibility of potential for a commercial use (with associated adverse impacts).

6.4.4. Aircraft Noise

- Dublin Airport Authority requests its initial submission be taken into consideration.
- Initial submission identifies the proposed development as being located within Noise Zone C associated with Dublin Airport.
- Objective DA07 of the 2017 CDP applies, which seeks to control new residential development and other noise sensitive uses within Zones A, B, C and where appropriate in Zone D.

- Requests a condition is attached requiring the noise sensitive uses to be provided with noise insulation to an appropriate standard to ensure appropriate internal noise levels of habitable rooms.

6.5. Further Responses

6.5.1. The applicant's response to the appeal grounds was circulated to the appellant and planning authority. Further responses (section 131 submissions) were received from the appellant and the planning authority (the latter had no further comment).

6.5.2. A number of issues raised in the further submission are reiterations of issues raised previously in the third party grounds of appeal (which I have summarised above). The main issues raised in relation to the applicant's response and additional information contained therein can be summarised as follows:

6.5.3. Impacts on the Receiving Area

Auburn House:

- States the applicant now appears to indicate that there are no works being undertaken to Auburn House and that the preservation and protection works are standard maintenance and repairs works.
- This directly contradicts the description of development and the foundation for Condition 4 is therefore flawed.

Residential Amenity:

- Maintains the proposed open space is poorly distributed through the scheme and poorly positioned next to residences, and the appellant contends open space is non-compliant with qualitative open space criteria CDP 14.4.4, 14.4.1, and 14.6.5. Further, states that the nature of the open space (private or publicly accessible) around Auburn House is unclear/ conflicted in the details.

6.5.4. Validity of Application Details

- Refutes applicant's claim that errors on the application form are de minimis, contends they are material and major errors, potentially rendering the application form of no consequence.
- Rejects applicant's claim that the site notices are sufficient, due to there being none on Kinsealy Lane and Back Road (is misleading), insufficient at main site area

(is incorrect), and some should have had yellow backgrounds (notes no response from applicant).

- Rejects applicant's position that as the planning authority validated the application and as objections were lodged, any errors (application form, site notices) are acceptable.

6.5.5. Validity of Three Consecutive Applications

- Rejects the applicant's claim that each application can be implemented independently, reiterating the position that the applications are intrinsically linked.
- Maintains submitting three consecutive applications is not valid as the range of potential outcomes have not been examined (only all granted) so it is impossible to separate out the environmental impacts for each potential outcome.
- Maintains this approach is not valid as there is no guarantee that each application will be granted permission, or that all three applications will be implemented.
- The planning authority has acted ultra vires in attaching Condition 4 which links the implementation of the other consecutive applications to the current application. It follows the decision itself is ultra vires.

6.5.6. Validity of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report and Natura Impact Statement

- Submits that the applicant appears now to acknowledge that all potential outcomes have not been examined, and that the EIAR is based on all three applications being granted and implemented.
- Maintains that the cumulative assessment does not hold true, and as all alternatives have not been examined the EIAR is null and void, and there is insufficient information to undertake the EIA.
- Refutes applicant's position that there is no requirement on a developer to identify any particular alternative as 'reasonable', as the identification of 'reasonable alternatives' are a mandatory requirement. Presentation of a lower density development should have been included as a reasonable alternative.

- Due to the redline boundaries, high degree of overlapping, the recommendations in the EIAR (and NIS, or planning conditions) cannot be enforced as there would be no certainty as to which element of which application is being implemented.
- Highlights that the Bat Derogation Licence submitted with the application was valid until 1st March 2023, as this date has passed, the terms of conditions of same cannot be adhered to.
- States an application to the NPWS for a new bat derogation licence is irrelevant, supplementary to the EIAR, and should be subject to a public participation process.
- States there remains uncertainty as to how the EIAR complies with the requirements of the WFD.
- States that the further report included in Appendix 5 of the appeal response, in respect of the NIS, fails to address concerns as the range of potential outcomes not considered, impact on Hazelbrook Stream from laying foul sewer along Back Road and Kinsealy Lane not considered, no mitigation measures are included to prevent damage to Hazelbrook Stream at this location, states the rising main will be constructed between the road-build up and the underground culvert but no evidence is provided for same, and Condition 22(b) cannot be implemented (requires a 10m exclusion zone to watercourses) at this location as would be outside the redline boundary.
- States there remains uncertainty, in terms of scientific evidence, as to the protection of European sites (use of the site by wintering birds, adequacy of surveys, methodology employed).

6.5.7. Validity of Further Information

- Rejects the applicant's argument that as the planning authority decided the FI response was not significant, that is the end of the matter.
- Contends that the information submitted by the applicant in the FI response, in particular including a revised NIS, contained significant additional data on environmental effects, should have been deemed significant FI and readvertised accordingly. It is incumbent on the Board to recognise such a fundamental error.

- The process used by planning authority (non-statutory notification procedure instead of the mandatory SFI process, and withholding advice reports prepared by environmental consultants) actively prevented the appellant, the public and indeed the applicant from making observations on the full planning file within the appropriate time period.
- States the applicant accepts the CGIs are not verified and should therefore be disregarded.

6.5.8. The planning authority's response states there is no further comment.

6.6. Public Notices

- 6.6.1. Following receipt of the section 131 submissions, in accordance with section 142(4) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended, the Board requested that public notices be published and erected informing the public that a revised NIS had been submitted as further information to the planning authority on 3rd February 2023.
- 6.6.2. The public notices were so published and erected on 4th July 2023, through which members of the public were invited to make written submissions or observations to the Board during an appropriate 5-week period. For the Board's clarity, I confirm that no submissions were received during that period.

7.0 Planning Assessment

7.1. Introduction

- 7.1.1. Having examined the appeal details and all other documentation on the case file, inspected the site, and had regard to the relevant national, regional, and local policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in the appeal to be as follows:
- Validity Issues
 - Development Plan Policy
 - Architectural Heritage
 - Residential Amenity
 - Traffic and Transportation
 - Water Services

I propose to address each item in turn below.

- 7.1.2. I have carried out an Appropriate Assessment (AA) and an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) in respect of the proposed development, which are presented in sections 8.0 and 9.0 below in this report.

7.2. **Validity Issues**

- 7.2.1. At the outset of this assessment, I consider it appropriate to address the grounds of appeal which focus on the validity of the application in the first instance. These include the manner in which the application has been made (one of three consecutive applications), the content of the application (inadequacies in the application form, site notices, plans, EIAR and NIS), and its processing by the planning authority (inadequacies in the FI request, decision, conditions attached the grant of permission). The applicant has responded to the grounds, and further submissions have been received by the appellant and planning authority (see section 6.0 above). I propose to address the substantive grounds in turn.

Validity of Three Applications

- 7.2.2. Of the grounds that the development of the site by way of three applications constitutes project splitting and is therefore invalid, I do not agree. This term is generally used to describe applying for multiple permissions for smaller schemes so as to avoid the preparation of an EIAR. Conversely, the opposite is the case in this instance as an EIAR has been prepared considering the impacts associated with this proposal in conjunction with the two concurrent appeals.
- 7.2.3. Of the grounds that the decision to lodge three applications, each under 100 dwellings units, was taken by the applicant to avoid the LRD process and is therefore invalid, I do not agree. Section 32A of the 2000 Act allows a dedicated application process (for LRD schemes in excess of 100 dwelling units) to be initiated and followed should an applicant so intend. While the LRD process allows for streamlining and efficiency, the process is not mandatory. The applicant indicates that the decision to apply for the development of the total landholding by way of three applications has been taken to allow for flexibility as it is stated that each application can be implemented independently of the others. While I consider there are limitations in the extent to which this is possible (discussed below), I am satisfied that it is not incumbent on the applicant to have applied for the development of the

landholding through a single application in the LRD process, and that the Board is not prohibited from determining the appeal(s).

7.2.4. Of the grounds that the application(s) cannot be implemented independently and is (are) therefore invalid, I agree in part with the appellant in relation to the implementation process. In my opinion, the applications are restricted in their implementation due to the inclusion of elements common to all three applications. These include the works at Auburn House and stables, the demolition of the stable block at Little Auburn, the connecting pedestrian/ cyclist path north of the walled garden, the shared use of the existing entrance and access road to Auburn House by pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles (with vehicular use restricted to named existing properties within the grounds, i.e., Auburn House, Bellmont, The Lodge, Bellview, and Elgin), and the wastewater drainage works (new on-site pumping station and foul sewer drains in public roads). These common elements are once-off development events, would only be undertaken for the application first implemented and would not be repeated for the remaining applications. The restrictions on implementation would arise as each permission is required to be implemented in accordance with the submitted plans and particulars, and clarity would be necessary as to which application was being implemented. As such, for each application to be implemented independently, as is claimed by the applicant, I consider that the common elements would need to be positively-omitted from two of the applications (i.e., removed in practice through inclusion in an earlier stage of a phasing plan). In effect, the manner in which the applicant has applied to develop the landholding (i.e., three separate applications with common elements), necessitates a decision as to which application would be implemented first. Such a decision would, in practice, constitute a phasing plan that would be required to be clear and precise. Such a phasing plan would ensure the coordinated development of the lands and the timely delivery of the elements of the application(s). In my opinion, any other approach to the development of the landholding would be piecemeal and not in the interests of proper planning and sustainable development of the area. I consider that this proposal should be implemented first followed by that of Auburn Park (ABP 316504-23, PA Ref. F22A/0581), and lastly by that of Streamstown (ABP 316444-23, PA Ref. F22A/0579). Further, there are components of the overall scheme that I consider should be commenced in the first instance, some of which maybe outside of the

applicable redline boundaries but are within the blueline boundary indicated for the overall scheme and so can be included in a phasing plan. These include the preservation/ restoration works to Auburn House, stables and walled garden (the latter is part of the Streamstown application), and all tree preservation, protection and planting measures included in the Arboricultural Report applicable to the overall landholding. In the event of a grant of permission, I recommend phasing be addressed by condition.

- 7.2.5. Of the grounds that the information submitted with the application is inadequate, fails to examine the full range of potential outcomes (i.e., eight different permutations from the three applications), prohibits a full assessment of the planning and environmental impacts of the proposed development, and is therefore invalid, I agree in part with the appellant in relation to the information provided. I acknowledge that the information provided (particularly in the EIAR and NIS due to their nature) does focus on the three applications each being permitted and implemented (i.e., the development of the total landholding), and not on the various permutations as identified by the appellant. However, I do not agree that a full assessment of the proposed development cannot be undertaken. As is outlined in this report, I consider the proposed development and the development subject of the two concurrent appeals to be acceptable and, once subject to a clear and precise phasing condition, I recommend to the Board that permission be granted for same. In this regard, I am satisfied that the information provided by the applicant is sufficient to allow a complete assessment, mindful that the appropriate and proper form of development is that of the total landholding. That being, I consider that the development of the site in the manner proposed, as part of the landholding and under the totality of the three applications, is acceptable and in the interests of proper planning and sustainable development of the area. In accepting that the development of the overall landholding is appropriate subject to phasing requirements, I consider that the preparation of a single EIAR and similarly a single NIS for the applications, which outline the environmental impacts of the three applications, is acceptable. I concur with the approach taken by the planning authority whereby the developments are assessed in combination, and the implementation of the three applications is phased and linked. In the event of a grant of permission, I recommend a similar approach be employed by the Board which ensures that the cumulative impacts of the

development are adequately described and assessed, and that the coordinated development of the lands is achieved. Finally, I am satisfied that such an approach addresses other appeal grounds relating to the omission of examination of each development scenario, the absence of a guarantee that all applications will be implemented, and the lack of clarity regarding which permission the common elements are being implemented under.

Validity of Application

- 7.2.6. Of the grounds that the application form is incorrectly completed and is therefore invalid, I acknowledge the facts as presented by the appellant and agree in part. I note that the applicant responds the instances are de minimis in effect and have not misled the public or competent authorities. Of the instances referred to by the appellant, I have reviewed the full suite of documentation in the case file. I consider that it is apparent that the proposed development involves works in proximity to a European site (referenced in several reports (planning report, AA Screening and NIS) at the initial and FI response stages), and that an EIAR has been prepared for the application(s). The case file does include details of the applicant's landholding (blue-line boundary provided) and correspondence consenting to the making of the applications(s).
- 7.2.7. Of the grounds that the public notification process (with a focus on the site notices) is insufficient, unrepresentative, incorrect, and therefore invalid, I acknowledge the facts as presented by the appellant and agree in part. The site location map submitted with application indicates locations of five site notices erected on/ at four public roads abutting the site and the wider landholding. Dissatisfaction is also raised with the public notification process at the receipt of the FI response stage (as the planning authority did not deem the FI response to be significant and therefore did not require SFI advertisements). The Board concurred with the appellant in this regard and, in accordance with section 142(4) of the 2000 Act, requested the applicant to advertise (newspaper and site notices) that a revised NIS had been submitted as FI to the planning authority on 3rd February 2023 and inviting new public participation. I have reviewed the readvertised details (newspaper notice, site notice, map indicating locations of site notices). I note that seven site notices were erected at locations on public roads including the disputed location of Back Road/ Kinsealy Lane. I consider the number and location of the sites notices to be

sufficient to readvertise the proposed development. I consider this readvertisement process to have addressed any previous shortcomings and highlight to the Board that no submissions or observations were received during that time.

- 7.2.8. Of the grounds that there are deficiencies in the development description, plans and particulars (specifically in relation to the protected structure Auburn House), in similarity with my opinion of the application form, I have reviewed the full suite of documentation and, overall, I consider these to sufficiently describe the nature and extent of the proposed development and to correlate with the plans and particulars submitted. For more detail, I direct the Board to section 7.4 below for my planning assessment of architectural heritage relevant to this appeal and to section 9.6 below for my EIA of architectural heritage as part of the overall development of the landholding. On balance, I am satisfied that the proposal's description is adequate and correlates with the details submitted, which are sufficient to allow a full assessment of the proposed development and on which the Board can rely.

Validity of EIAR and NIS

- 7.2.9. Of the grounds that the EIAR and the NIS have been prepared for the three applications (i.e. for a total of 259 dwelling units), have not examined the impacts of each individual application and/ or the range of potential outcomes, and are therefore invalid, I agree in part with the appellant in relation to the information as examined and presented. However, in similarity with my opinion that lodging three concurrent applications is valid, I consider that the development of the overall lands in this manner is appropriate and in the interests of proper planning and sustainable development of the area. I am satisfied that an EIA and AA can be undertaken by the Board based on the information prepared and presented by the applicant in the applicable environmental reports, and indeed, recommend to the Board that the developments be assessed in combination as is allowed for. Accordingly, criticisms regarding the inadequacies and duplication of information in the reports are noted but not relevant to this assessment or those of the two concurrent applications. Of section 172 of the 2000 Act ('requirement for an environmental impact statement'), I concur with the applicant that there is no legal impediment preventing the Board from undertaking its own EIA of the proposed development based on information prepared and presented in the case file (including the current scenario of the proposed development in combination with the two concurrent applications). Of the

other cited inadequacies in the EIAR, AA screening report, and NIS, these are addressed in the relevant sections of this report below.

Validity of Further Information Process

7.2.10. Of the grounds that the planning authority's FI request was inadequate, the applicant's FI response includes incorrect information, the planning authority erred in not deeming the FI response to be significant, and therefore the FI process is invalid, I agree with the applicant in part. That the FI request did not seek a rationale for lodging three consecutive applications or individual assessments of all potential outcomes, I consider it apparent that the planning authority understood and accepted the manner in which the development of the site and wider landholding was proposed, and the adequacy of the information in the EIAR (i.e., impacts associated with the development of 259 residential units within the wider landholding). As outlined above, I concur with the assessment approach taken by the planning authority and recommend a similar approach be employed by the Board to assess the proposed development(s). That the FI response includes omissions and discrepancies, I address these as applicable in the following subsections (e.g., in relation to public open space in residential amenity, to Streamstown Lane in traffic and transportation, to wastewater infrastructure in the appropriate assessment), and find that on balance the CGIs are acceptable as I consider these to serve illustrative and informative purposes. That the planning authority erred in not deeming the FI response to be significant, I acknowledge that there is no clarity on the issue in the planning authority's reports or appeal responses. Nevertheless, the matter has been considered by the Board, the appellant's position was agreed with, and the applicant was requested to advertise the submission of the FI response. In similarity with my opinion that the public notices are valid, I consider the readvertisement process to have addressed any previous shortcomings relating to the validity of the FI response process.

Validity of the Planning Authority Decision

7.2.11. Of the grounds that the planning authority's decision to grant permission for the proposed development(s) is ultra vires, Condition 4 is flawed in nature, the permission(s) is (are) unimplementable, and therefore the decision is invalid, I do not agree. As outlined above, I consider that the development of the site and wider landholding is acceptable, is in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable

development of the area preventing piecemeal development, there is no legal imperative preventing the development of the lands by way of three concurrent applications and, subject to phasing requirements, I recommend a similar approach be taken by the Board. I do not consider that by employing such an approach, the planning authority acted or indeed the Board would be acting in ultra vires. I consider Condition 4 of the planning authority's decision to be, in effect, a phasing plan for the development of the lands which are indicated as being under the applicant's control. Requiring clear and unambiguous phasing requirements by condition will ensure clarity under which permission these elements are being implemented and which can be enforceable (i.e., the common elements to the three applications will be undertaken only in the first instance). Finally, that the decision does not accord with the requirements of section 34(4)(a) of the 2000 Act, I do not agree as each consent is subject to a set of conditions applicable to each grant of permission, and the lands subject of the proposed developments (i.e., the three concurrent applications) are all on lands within the blueline boundary (i.e., indicated as being under the control of the applicant).

Conclusion

7.2.12. In conclusion, I consider that the planning application, the manner in which the development of the site and wider landholding has been applied for, and the assessment process of same are valid. Members of the public and prescribed bodies have been informed of and been able to participate in the decision-making process, most recently through the readvertisement process required by the Board. I am satisfied that the decision-making process is valid and that the Board can rely on information prepared, presented, and received during same.

7.3. Development Plan Policy

7.3.1. Between when the application was decided by the planning authority (29th March 2023) and the appeal was lodged (25th April 2023), there has been a change in county development plans. The Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023 (2017 CDP) has been superseded by the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 (CDP 2023). The 2023 CDP is the applicable development plan for the determination of the appeal. I also note that in the interim the Sustainable Residential Development Guidelines have come into effect inclusive of mandatory SPPrs 1-4 (as cited in section 5.0

Policy Context of this report above) which supercede 2023 CDP policy and/ or objectives on the same topics.

- 7.3.2. Of the grounds that the assessment of the proposed development cannot continue due to the change in development plan, I do not agree. As outlined above, the 2017 CDP is no longer in effect and has been superseded by the 2023 CDP. I have reviewed same and confirm to the Board that there are no masterplan designations and/ or references applicable to the site.
- 7.3.3. Of the grounds that the proposed development constitutes a material contravention of policies, objectives, and standards in the CDP, I do not agree. While the claims of material contraventions are discussed as relevant in subsections below, in short, I do not consider the proposed development to constitute a material contravention of the 2023 CDP. I find the proposal complies with Objective HCAO24 and Objective HCAO27 (no adverse impact on Auburn House, preservation and renovation works to structures positively noted, conservation measures to be undertaken in first phase of development), with Policy SPQHP36 and Objective DMSO72 (quantum and design of private open space serving for Auburn House, and the boundary treatment of the interface with the public open space is acceptable), and with policy in Section 14.4.1 on placemaking design criteria (access to recreational facilities in a variety of open spaces).
- 7.3.4. I note that certain 2023 CDP objectives and standards are now superseded by the applicable mandatory SPPRs in the Sustainable Residential Development Guidelines. I have reviewed the plans and particulars and confirm that the proposed dwellings are provided with a quantum of private open space which complies with SPPR 2 and of car parking spaces which complies with SPPR 3 (153 car spaces following the FI response). Regarding SPPR 4 and cycle parking provision, I recommend the attachment of a condition for updated proposals to be submitted to the planning authority for its agreement which would ensure there is sufficient quantity and acceptable design of same.

Conclusion

- 7.3.5. In conclusion, the local policy context for assessing the proposed development has changed since the planning authority's decision, and the 2023 CDP is now in effect. The main implication of the change is that the specific provisions of the Streamstown

Masterplan included in the 2017 CDP are no longer applicable. Importantly, key 2017 CDP objectives and designations are included in the 2023 CDP and continue to apply to the site and proposal. These include the 'RA – Residential Area' zoning objective for new residential communities, the protected structure status of Auburn House and its attendant grounds, and the preservation of trees, woodlands and hedgerow objectives, each of which the proposed development is consistent with/ has had regard to.

7.4. Architectural Heritage

- 7.4.1. Several issues are raised by the appellant and observer relating to the proposed development and the architectural heritage of the site. These include the inadequate application documentation, and the insensitive treatment of and adverse impact on Auburn House and its setting. I propose to address the substantive items in turn below.

Adequacy of the Application Documentation

- 7.4.2. Appeal grounds include criticisms of the case documentation relating to an incorrect description of development at Auburn House, inadequate plans and particulars of same, and insufficient information on the case file to allow an assessment of the impacts of the proposal on Auburn House and its setting.
- 7.4.3. In relation to Auburn House and its attendant grounds, I identify the proposed development as involving the preservation of the house and its stable buildings as a single residence through the conversion of the stables to storage space to serve the main dwelling and the construction of boundary treatments. That being, the proposal relates to the land use (and any potential intensification of use) of Auburn House and its stable buildings, whereby the buildings are proposed to serve as a single residential entity. The proposed development also involves the use of the existing Auburn House entrance and access road by pedestrians and cyclists associated with the proposal with use by vehicles restricted to that of existing named properties. (For the Board's clarity, the preservation, restoration, and new development works to the walled garden are included in the concurrent Streamstown appeal (ABP 316444-23, PA Ref. 22A/0579) which is within the blue line boundary of this application and thus can be included in conditions as deemed necessary).

- 7.4.4. I have reviewed the range of information on the case file (plans, particulars, reports, appeal response) and find these to align with the description of development and to adequately represent the works proposed to be undertaken. These include a full set of drawings of the house and stables (floor plans, elevations, sections), of the railings (boundary treatment plan and elevations, landscaping plans), and the existing entrance and access road (site layout plan, landscaping plans).
- 7.4.5. The drawings and plans are supplemented by several reports which provide further details on the proposed development and the nature of any works, particularly preservation works. These reports include the Architectural Heritage Report (which outlines a conservation methodology for the house and stables, and includes as appendices a Maintenance Strategy (also referred to as the Protection Plan), and a Photographic Record), the Historic Landscape Report and Landscape Design Rationale (outline the context for the proposed boundary treatment (choice and siting of railings defining the curtilage of the house), landscaping and planting (maintenance of an eastwards open vista)), the Arboricultural Report (outlines the high arboricultural value of the site, and includes as appendices a Tree and Woodland Management Plan and an Arboricultural Method Statement which includes a Tree Protection Plan), and the Planning Stage: Structural Report (outlines the methodology for construction of foundations, loadings, service movements in proximity to sensitive structures).
- 7.4.6. Overall, I do not agree with the appellant and instead find that the development description, associated drawings and plans, and range of reports provided adequately present the nature and scale of the works and provide sufficient information to allow an assessment of the impacts of the proposal on the architectural heritage of the site to be undertaken.

Treatment of and Impact on the Protected Structure and its Attendant Grounds

- 7.4.7. Appeal grounds include objections to the proposed development due to its encroachment on the house's setting, the inappropriate assimilation of the house and grounds into public open space, the absence of information on the future upkeep and maintenance of the house which may necessitate a potential and undesirable commercial use, the failure to comply with 2023 CDP Objective HCAO27 in relation

to phasing, and the loss of trees along Malahide Road to facilitate the proposed main entrance.

- 7.4.8. In considering the appropriateness of development within the house's setting, I note important historical development features highlighted in the applicant's Architectural Heritage Report, Historical Landscape Report, and Chapter 14: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage of the EIAR. These include the eastern orientation of Auburn House and open front vista (view field/ viewshed) towards Malahide Castle Demesne and its woodland setting, the treelined avenue which restricted views of the house on approach until arrival, and the contemporaneous planted woodlands to the west of the house laid out in paths as 'pleasure gardens'.
- 7.4.9. I also note the Architectural Heritage Guidelines describe the attendant grounds of a protected structure (para.13.2) as *'lands outside the curtilage of the structure but which are associated with the structure and are intrinsic to its function, setting and/or appreciation'*. Relevant to this proposal, development is proposed within the open vista to the east of the house and in proximity to the treelined avenue, thus these elements of Auburn House's attendant grounds require special consideration.
- 7.4.10. The Architectural Heritage Report outlines that the locations selected for development are those less directly visible from Auburn House, away from natural view fields, and historic landscape planting. The importance of maintaining the large open area to the east is stated as vital in retaining the sense of the house within its attendant landscape. I positively note and concur with the design approach as outlined in the report to developing this eastern area.
- 7.4.11. In the eastern/ northeastern area of the site, the proposed development accommodates the northern and southern courtyard clusters sited (i.e., at the perimeters of the eastern vista from Auburn House), and streets of houses in the northeastern perimeter (terrace rows/ pairs of semi-detached dwellings fronting Road 1 and Road 1.1). The Architectural Heritage Report submits that development within the eastern vista is low rise low density in design and scale, will be screened with new planting, and the retained angle of the view fields are similar to the existing view fields thereby maintaining the sense of landscape opening up. I have reviewed the plans and particulars and note that the northern courtyard cluster contains 10 houses of House Types A (different variations) which are of 2 storey design predominantly

c.7.72m in height. The southern courtyard cluster contains 5 houses also of House Types A. In the FI response, House No.23 was revised from a 2.5 storey to a 2 storey dwelling due to concerns raised by the Conservation Officer relating to the visual impact of same, with which I agree. Thus, the southern courtyard cluster comprises houses of 2 storey design also predominantly c.7.72m in height. The dwellings on Road 1 and Road 1.1 comprise 14 houses (as per the FI response) of House Types C, D, E, and F (different variations) which are 2 storey in design though with a higher principal height of c.10m.

7.4.12. While the proposed development within this heritage and visually sensitive area (i.e., at the peripheries of the eastern vista) will exert an impact in views to and from Auburn House and on the character of the house due to its presently undeveloped nature, I concur with the applicant and planning authority, and find that the proposed courtyard clusters and streetscapes of houses are acceptable in principle. The dwellings, in particular the courtyard clusters, are streamlined in elevational design and modest in scale and massing and will be visually assimilated due to the extent of screening proposed and appropriate choice of boundary treatment. I note that the planning authority's Conservation Officer recommends specific external finishes and materials for the courtyard clusters due to their siting/ proximity to Auburn House, which I consider reasonable having regard to Objective HCAO24. I recommend agreement on same be addressed by condition.

7.4.13. In the southern/ southeastern area of the site, the proposed development accommodates Apartment Blocks 4 and 5, Duplex Block 1 and streets of houses extending perpendicularly from the main access road (Road 1) to the eastern site boundary (groupings of terrace rows of dwellings fronting Road 1.4 and Road 1.5). In the FI response, revisions were made to the design and screening of the proposed dwellings (front elevations of House No.s 12 and 13 and screening alongside rear gardens addressing Road 1, front elevations of House No.s 1-11 onto Road 1.5), and revised balcony design of the apartment blocks (semi-recessed with glass balustrades) due to concerns raised by the Conservation Officer relating to the visual impact of same, with which I agree, including the preferred design option of equally spaced gable bays on front elevations of House No.s 1-11 (i.e., Option 1 on Dwg No.1902PLA156). In similarity with my assessment on developing the eastern/ northeastern area of the site, I find that while the proposed development within this

heritage and visually sensitive area (i.e., proximate to the treelined avenue serving and providing restricted views of Auburn House), will be visible, it does not adversely impact on the views of Auburn House nor on the original access road due to the separation distances from same (located c.10-15m to the west of proposed main access road, Road 1), the overwhelming retention of trees along its length, and the positive design and screening amendments included in the FI response for the buildings in this area.

7.4.14. Of grounds relating to the absence of information on the future upkeep and maintenance of the house which may necessitate a potential and undesirable commercial use, I do not agree. Instead, I positively note the development approach taken for the house and stables (i.e., assimilation into a single residential entity with a defined curtilage of private open space). This approach will ensure that the buildings will not be divided, sublet, or separated from each other, or that the residential use would be intensified, thereby addressing concerns relating to the future upkeep and avoidance of a potential commercial use of the house. I consider this matter can be addressed by condition.

7.4.15. Related to the maintenance of the house and attendant grounds, the appellant submits that the proposal fails to comply with 2023 CDP Objective HCAO27 in respect of phasing due to the manner in which permission has been applied for (i.e., three consecutive applications). Objective HCAO27 requires that repair and refurbishment work to a protected structure is contained and completed within the first phase of a larger development scheme. While I note the appellant's position, I do not agree as I am satisfied that the overall development of the lands can be achieved through the attachment of clear and precise conditions requiring the phased implementation of the concurrent appeals. I recommend that such a phased implementation plan include for the repair and restoration works to the house and attendant grounds in the first instance. The repair and restoration works are adequately provided for in the suite of reports accompanying the proposal including the Architectural Heritage Report (inclusive of a conservation methodology and Maintenance Strategy), the Arboricultural Report (inclusive of the Tree and Woodland Management Plan and the Arboricultural Method Statement with the Tree Protection Plan), and the Planning Stage: Structural Report (inclusive of a

construction methodology for works in proximity to sensitive structures). I consider that such an approach satisfactorily ensures compliance with Objective HCAO27.

- 7.4.16. I direct the Board to section 9.6 in the EIA of this report below in which I consider further the impact of the overall development, including that associated with the two concurrent appeals (e.g., the walled garden to the south of the house and apartments to the north) as part of my overall assessment on the architectural heritage of the site. Also, I consider the impact of the proposed access arrangements and boundary treatment along Malahide Road (use of existing entrance, closing of Little Auburn entrance, proposed development of the main new entrance and junction upgrade) as this component is common to this proposal and that of Auburn Park (ABP 316504-23, PA Ref. F22A/0581).

Conclusion

- 7.4.17. In conclusion, I am satisfied that the description of development adequately reflects the works proposed to protected structure Auburn House and its attendant grounds and aligns with the plans, particulars and reports included in the case file. I consider that the information provided, which is particular to the site's protected structure status in relation to land use and future maintenance, is sufficient to allow the Board to determine the appeal. I find that the development as proposed within the house's setting is of an appropriate design, scale and nature that can be assimilated without causing undue injury to the architecture heritage of the site. I therefore conclude that the proposal complies with applicable 2023 CDP objectives HCAO24 and HCAO27.

7.5. Residential Amenity

- 7.5.1. Issues relating to residential amenity as raised by the appellant and an observer relate to the impact of proposal on the residential amenity of Auburn House, adequacy of public open space serving the wider scheme, and specific infrastructural matters affecting an adjacent property. Further, I consider the implications for the residential amenity of future residents arising from the amendments made to the scheme by the planning authority (FI request and conditions), and the requirements arising from applicable SPPRs in the Sustainable Residential Development Guidelines which are in effect at the time of assessment. Finally, I consider the requirement of a childcare facility within the proposal.

Existing Residential Amenity

- 7.5.2. In respect of the existing residential amenity of adjacent properties, due to the separation distances between the components of the proposed development (c.19m to the closest property to the east, otherwise in excess of c.45m), the alignments and orientations of same, and the existing screening (site boundaries contain mature hedgerows and treelines) and proposed landscaping and boundary treatments (supplemented planting and/ or range of fencing and walls), I do not consider that there will be any undue impact arising from issues of overlooking, overshadowing, or overbearance. I direct the Board to sections 9.3 and 9.6 in the EIA of this report in which I consider the impact of the proposed development on the population and human health, and the material assets: transport components of the environment. In short, disturbances from construction phase impacts (increase in traffic, noise, dust), and operation phase impacts (capacity and function of local road network) are considered to be within acceptable ranges when mitigation measures are incorporated into the proposal and subject to ameliorating conditions.
- 7.5.3. Of the particular issues (i.e., the operation of the signalised junction on Malahide Road and the management and maintenance of the surface water drainage system) raised by an observer (indicated as the owner of an adjacent property to southwest/ southeast of site), I consider that matters pertaining to the provision/ design of the engineering infrastructure to support and service the proposed development should be subject to and meet the requirements of the planning authority. In the interests of the common good, I do not consider it appropriate for an individual third party to be included in such agreements. I consider both issues can be addressed by conditions (e.g., the planning authority's Condition 16(d) can come within the scope of overall agreement on surface water management). Further, I highlight that property and/ or boundary disputes are a civil matter, and any grant of permission is subject to the restrictions explicit in section 34(13) of the 2000 Act.

Future Residential Amenity

- 7.5.4. During the processing of the application, the planning authority requested that the applicant make amendments to the siting and design of Apartment Blocks 4 and 5 to improve separation distances between the buildings and reduce potential overlooking. In the FI response, revisions were made to the buildings' footprints, the elevations (fenestration arrangements, balcony locations and designs), and floor plans. Notably, the distance between the buildings (southern elevation of Block 4

and northern elevation of Block 5) increased from c.14.6m-c.18.7m to c.16.7m-c.18.7m. I consider the revisions made to the siting and design of Apartment Blocks 4 and 5 to have been warranted and acceptable.

- 7.5.5. The revisions made in the FI response result in a change of apartment unit mix (12 no. to 16 no. 1 bedroom units and of 25 no. to 21 no. 2 bedroom units), but not to the total number of apartments (37 no. apartments). I consider the change in apartment typology to be acceptable as the proportion of 1 bedroom to 2 bedroom units (see Table 2 in section 2.0 Proposed Development of this report above) increases in balance (i.e. 4 no. 1 bedroom units and 14 no. 2 bedroom units amended to 8 no. 1 bedroom units and 10 no. 2 bedroom units).
- 7.5.6. Further amendments are made to the proposed development by the planning authority. These include Condition 6(a) to House No. 24 in the southern courtyard cluster (reduction in bedroom numbers, revised floor layout with bedroom windows to the front of the dwelling), and Condition 6(c) and (d) to Apartment Block 5 (privacy screens on northern side of balconies of named apartments, and revised fenestration on northern elevation with corresponding revised floor plans). The reason for the further amendments is due to continued concerns relating to overlooking and protecting residential amenity.
- 7.5.7. While I acknowledge the concerns of the planning authority, I find these to be overly cautious. I do not consider that the design and orientation of the proposed dwelling of House No. 24 to cause an adverse impact on the residential amenity of the adjacent houses in the courtyard cluster. In respect of Apartment Block 5, I consider the revisions made in the FI response (siting of buildings, and fenestration and balcony design) to be sufficient to address the initial overlooking potential and to safeguard the future amenity of the residences.
- 7.5.8. Also, I highlight that the separation distances involved (i.e., between House No.24 and other dwellings in the courtyard, and between the southern apartments in Block 4 and northern apartments in Block 5) are in compliance with SPPR 1 (in excess of 16m separation distances between opposing windows serving habitable rooms) of the Sustainable Residential Development Guidelines (e.g., a 20m separation distance is achieved from House No.24 to the rear of opposing House No. 25, and distances of c.16.7m-c.18.7m are achieved between the units in the apartment

blocks). As such, I do not consider the amendments to be reasonable or necessary, and do not recommend to the Board the attachment of similar conditions.

- 7.5.9. With regard to private open space (quantum and rear garden depths) for the proposed dwellings, I have reviewed the applicable policy context. The related 2023 CDP standards are Objective DMSO27 and policy in section 14.8.2 (cited in section 5.0 Policy Context above). As previously referred to, the Sustainable Residential Development Guidelines are in effect at the time of assessment and in addition to SPPR 1, applicable SPPRs include SPPR 2 (minimum areas of private open space for a 2 bedroom house of 30sqm, 3 bedroom house of 40sqm, 4 bedroom house of 50sqm, with consideration allowed to be given for semi-private open space for the dwellings). I have reviewed the plans and particulars of the proposed dwellings in the streetscapes in the northeastern, and southern/ southeastern areas of the site, and confirm that the private open spaces comply with the requirements of SPPR 1 and SPPR 2 (and with the 2023 CDP standards). In respect of the northern and southern courtyard clusters, I note that there are some instances where the quantum of exclusively accessible private open space and 22m separation distances referred to in the 2023 CDP are not achieved. However, the requirements of the SPPRs are achieved and as such, I find these to be acceptable.
- 7.5.10. Of concerns raised of injury to the amenity of Auburn House, I am satisfied that future residential amenity of the property will be of a high level and quality. The proposal includes for the conversion of the house and stables as a single residential unit, which is being provided with ample private open space that will be demarcated and enclosed with the new boundary.
- 7.5.11. Of the grounds that the public open space in the proposal is of poor design, layout, and quality, I do not concur. I have reviewed the plans and particulars submitted for same which include quantitative details (compliant provision of communal and public open spaces, accords with requirements in 2023 CDP Section 14.6.5), and qualitative details on detailed design considerations (Landscape Design Rationale and accompanying landscaping plans), and planting (hard and soft as revised in the FI response details). Conversely to the appellant, I consider that the proposal provides sufficient quantum of usable, accessible, high quality and distinctive open spaces which will ensure high standards of residential amenity for future residents.

7.5.12. During the processing of this proposed development and that subject of Auburn Park (ABP 316504-23, PA Ref. F22A/0581), the planning authority sought the provision of a childcare facility. In the FI response for the Auburn Park application, the applicant provided a childcare facility in an apartment at the ground floor of Apartment Block 3 of that scheme. By way of Condition 6(a) of PA Ref. F22A/581, the planning authority omitted an adjacent apartment and increased the floor area of the childcare facility to cater for c.44 children. I concur with the planning authority's assessment that a childcare facility is necessary to serve the proposal, indeed the overall development. I likewise do not agree with the applicant's initial Childcare Provision Assessment report (justifies the non-provision of the facility). Further, I have considered the level of likely demand for such a facility arising from the overall scheme, the necessary size of such a facility (in the region of c.40 children, commensurate with the floor area of two apartments), and note that a childcare facility (measuring 196sqm, catering for 35 children) was proposed in the SHD application, ABP 313360-22 for 368 new dwelling units.

7.5.13. However, unlike the planning authority, I do not consider the location of the permitted childcare facility (i.e., the southeast corner of Apartment Block 3) to be a suitable location for the permitted childcare facility. In my opinion, this is a relatively poor location as it is not easily or readily accessible to residents in Auburn Park, nor those in the Little Auburn and Streamstown schemes, or indeed members of the wider public. In the SHD application ABP 313360-22, the childcare facility was proposed at a location similar to Apartment Block 4 of this proposed development. I have had regard to the locational advice provided in the Childcare Guidelines (preferable location close to the main entrance, sufficient space for a set down area, and a safe outdoor space), and recommend that two apartments at the ground floor level of Apartment Block 4 (Apartment No.s 4-03 and 4-04, 2 bedroom units, combined floor area of c.170sqm) be omitted and repurposed as a childcare facility with an outdoor space. I consider that the visitor car parking spaces (indicated in the vicinity of the main access road, Road 1 in the site layout plan of the FI response) to be suitable for use as part of a set down/ drop off area for the childcare facility. I recommend the requirement for a childcare facility be addressed by way of condition and require final agreement with the planning authority.

- 7.5.14. Other items of relevance for residential amenity include the requirement arising from 2023 CDP Objective DAO11 for noise insulation to be provided for the dwelling units due to the site's location within Dublin Airport's Noise Zone C, which I recommend be addressed by condition. Finally, I confirm to the Board that I have reviewed the plans and particulars (Schedule of accommodation, Housing Quality Assessment) of the proposed houses, duplexes, and apartments and confirm these satisfy the applicable quantitative and qualitative standards in the 2023 CDP and as relevant, the standards in the national planning guidelines in particular the SPPRs.
- 7.5.15. In the interests of clarity for the Board, I confirm that save for the requirement for a childcare facility, I consider the proposed development (as indicated in the FI response (site layout plan, plans and elevations, including the omission of House No. 53 due to tree protection measures)) to be acceptable in terms of residential amenity, and recommend the proposed development be implemented in accordance with same, without the inclusion of any further amending conditions.

Conclusion

- 7.5.16. In conclusion, I do not anticipate any adverse impacts on the amenity of existing residential properties, or that of future residential units and open spaces within the scheme arising from issues of overlooking, overshadowing, or overbearance. The proposal is of a design and layout that will provide acceptable standards of residential amenity for the future occupants of the scheme. The proposal includes a range of residential typologies which will meet the demographic needs of various households, further contribute to the housing offer in the vicinity of the site. The proposal meets required standards of accommodation and complies with applicable CDP and guidelines' policies, including the provision of a childcare facility.

7.6. Traffic and Transportation

- 7.6.1. The appeal site is accessed via the existing entrance and access route from Malahide Road, in the south of the site, which presently serves Auburn House and four other residences (Bellmont, The Lodge, Bellview, and Elgin). The proposed development involves the retention of the existing entrance and the repurposing of this route for shared use by pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles (with vehicular use restricted to named existing properties within the grounds). I positively note the maintenance of the existing entrance arrangement due to controlled vehicular traffic

use, an additional pedestrian/ cyclist option, and also for architectural heritage and arboricultural benefits. I consider this arrangement acceptable and note that this component is common to the three applications. The closing of the entrance serving Little Auburn and replanting of the roadside boundary are also considered acceptable.

7.6.2. The proposed main vehicular entrance, located c.20m south of the existing entrance, is planned as the fourth arm of an upgraded signalised junction (of the 'T' junction between Malahide Road and Back Road), which includes new signage and road markings. This proposed development and concurrent application Auburn Park (ABP 316504-23, PA Ref. F22A/0581, 92 residential units) are to be served by the new entrance and junction arrangement. Concurrent application Streamstown (ABP 316444-23, PA Ref. F22A/0579) is to be served by a separate vehicular entrance onto Carey's Lane. Also common to the three applications is a pedestrian/ cycle path located north of the walled garden which allows pedestrian/ cycle permeability through the overall landholding. This path is controlled by bollards thus vehicular through-traffic (save for emergency vehicles) is prevented from using the entrance at Malahide Road (and vice versa). While there are planning and traffic safety advantages for residential developments to be served by more than one vehicular entrance, as pedestrian/ cyclist and emergency vehicle permeability is incorporated into the overall road layout and design, I consider the proposed arrangement as I described above to be acceptable. I note that the planning authority does not object to the access arrangements in principle, requiring final agreement on technical details through condition.

7.6.3. I note that the layout of the proposal includes pedestrian links to adjoining lands that are in private ownership (with no consent given)/ outside of the applicant's control (e.g., links to the west of the site). For such instances, I recommend the inclusion of a condition requiring any indicated pedestrian links to be provided up to the site boundary which can facilitate future connections subject to the appropriate consents. Conditions 4(g) and 18(m) of the planning authority decision require the provision of a pedestrian link in the northernmost point of the eastern boundary on to Malahide Road. This link had been subject of a FI request and in response the applicant had outlined why it was not considered to be suitable (lack of a desire line and unknown impact on trees). Having reviewed the plans and particulars, I concur with the

applicant. I consider that pedestrian access to Malahide Road will be facilitated via the existing access road or the new access road (both likely to be safe, well trafficked, publicly lit), and there is no meaningful desire line or likely high demand for a route to this corner location. Further, a pedestrian link and construction works for same may have an undue impact on the trees/ treeline at this location. As such, I do not recommend the attachment of a condition requiring the provision of same. In the main and on balance, I consider pedestrian accessibility and safety within the proposed development to be acceptable.

7.6.4. Finally, with regard to car and cycle parking, I highlight the applicability of SPPR 3 and SPPR 4 of the Sustainable Residential Development Guidelines. As the appeal site is an intermediate location for the purposes of the guidelines, I confirm that the scheme complies with the maximum car parking standards stipulated in SPPR 3. SPPR 4 indicates requirements for cycle parking in terms of quantity (1 cycle storage space per bedroom space for residential units above ground level, plus visitor spaces) and design (dedicated facility of permanent construction). As such, proposed cycle parking should align with these mandatory requirements. I recommend the attachment of a condition for updated proposals to be submitted to the planning authority for its agreement which would ensure there is sufficient quantity and acceptable design of same.

7.6.5. For further details on traffic and transportation related issues, I direct the Board to section 9.6 in the EIA of this report in which I consider the impact of the proposed development on the material assets: transport component of the environment, and to my planning assessment of concurrent appeal of Streamstown (ABP 316444-23, PA Ref. F22A/0579) in which I consider objections raised in relation to the use of Carey's Lane and Streamstown Lane at construction and operation phases of the development.

Conclusion

7.6.6. In conclusion, I am satisfied that a development of the scale proposed at this site can be accommodated within the existing and improving road network, existing and planned public transport service and capacity, and pedestrian and cycle infrastructure. I consider the proposal would not give rise to a traffic hazard or be seriously injurious to the amenity of those in the immediate area of the site. In the

event of a grant of permission, appropriate conditions would address associated impacts.

7.7. Water Services

- 7.7.1. Of particular issues raised in respect of wastewater drainage (excessive length of foul sewer, mandate Uisce Eireann to provide foul sewer along Malahide Road) and surface water drainage (riparian strip and SuDS maintenance), I accept the applicant's justification for the wastewater proposals (necessary due to capacity issues in the immediate local network) as is attested to by Uisce Eireann. I consider that matters pertaining to the management and maintenance of the surface water drainage system be subject to and meet the requirements of the planning authority. Both matters can be appropriately addressed by condition. I direct the Board to section 9.5 in the EIA of this report in which I consider the impact of the proposed development on the water component of the environment, inclusive of water services infrastructure.

8.0 Appropriate Assessment

8.1. Overview

- 8.1.1. This section of the report considers the likely significant effects of the project on European sites by undertaking a number of distinct steps in compliance with Article 6(3) of the EU Habitats Directive and sections 177U and 177V in Part XAB of the 2000 Act. These steps include screening the need for appropriate assessment, reviewing the Screening Report for Appropriate Assessment (SRAA), the Natura Impact Statement (NIS), all associated documents, and undertaking an appropriate assessment of implications of the project on the integrity of any identified European sites.
- 8.1.2. In the interests of clarity for the Board, the 'project' subject of this appropriate assessment refers to the total development being proposed in the three concurrent applications, and the 'site' refers to the overall lands included within the three applications.
- 8.1.3. In undertaking this appropriate assessment, I have had regard to the SRAA and NIS (dated October 2022) as initially submitted with the applications, the revised SRAA

and NIS (dated January 2023) submitted in the FI responses, the associated reports reviewing the SRAA and NIS as prepared by environmental consultants on behalf of the planning authority, and to related information provided by the applicant in Appendix 5 of the first party appeal response. In the interest of clarity, where I have made references to the SRAA and/ or NIS, these are the reports dated January 2023 which were submitted to the planning authority in the FI response.

8.2. **Stage 1 – Appropriate Assessment Screening**

- 8.2.1. The project is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of a European Site and therefore it needs to be determined if the development is likely to have significant effects on a European site(s).

Test of Likely Significant Effects

- 8.2.2. The first test of Article 6(3) is to establish if the project could result in likely significant effects to a European site. This screening stage is Stage 1 of the appropriate assessment process. The project is examined in relation to any possible interaction with European sites designated as SACs and/ or SPAs to assess whether it may give rise to significant effects on any European Site.
- 8.2.3. In carrying out my assessment I have had regard to the nature of the project, characteristics of the site (i.e., the total lands within the three concurrent appeals), the distances from the site to European sites, the existence of connections, relied on applicant's SRAA, the NPWS's Conservation Objectives reports and Site Synopses, and I have had regard to the appeal grounds, observations and submissions received in relation to the potential impact on European sites.

Project Description and Site Characteristics

- 8.2.4. The application is accompanied by a SRAA, dated January 2023. In Step 2: Analysis of the Project of the SRAA, the applicant identifies components of the project which are relevant for this screening, key among which include:
- Provision of a new surface water drainage system, with attenuation storage areas and incorporating SuDS measures, discharging into on-site drainage ditches/ local stream which merge with Hazelbrook Stream which flows to Baldoyle Bay.

- New on-site wastewater pumping station with connection to the existing public wastewater system (via new foul sewers laid along Back Road and Kinsealy Lane) for treatment at Ringsend WWTP and discharge to Dublin Bay.
- Connection to the existing public water supply system via the watermains (available in the R107 and Carey's Lane) which originates in Leixlip Reservoir.

8.2.5. In Step 1: Analysis of the Natura 2000 Network of the SRAA, the applicant provides a description of the nature of the site. The key characteristics identified include:

- The habitats within the site are classified as improved agricultural grassland (GA1), broadleaved woodland (WD1), field boundaries comprising hedgerows (WL1) and treelines (WL2), drainage ditches (FW4, along two field boundaries located to the south of Auburn House and to the east of the site extending southwards along the internal access road), and buildings and artificial surfaces (BL3, for Auburn House, Little Auburn House, and Back Road and Kinsealy Lane).
- Drainage ditches are described as small watercourses, not accompanied by wetland flora, of low fisheries significance, culverted in locations on-site and under the R107, where open are observed to be slow flowing with minimal vegetation, highly modified and of low value for aquatic biodiversity.
- Drainage ditches are known to connect to the Hazelbrook Stream (reference is made to the applicant's Engineering Assessment Report) which is identified as a tributary of the Sluice River that ultimately outfalls to Baldoyle Bay.
- Route of the new foul sewer line is in the public roads, which is entirely composed of artificial surfaces, crosses the Hazelbrook Stream to the southeast of the main application site along Kinsealy Lane.
- Invasive species noted at the site include Spanish bluebells, and three-cornered garlic, with no Japanese knotweed.
- Habitats at the site are not suitable for wintering/ wetland/ migrating birds, which are qualifying interests of Natura 2000 sites.

- Habitats at the site are not examples of those listed on Annex I of the Habitats Directive (i.e. mudflats, sandflats, amenity grasslands) (the broadleaved woodland habitat is considered to be of high local value only).

8.2.6. Taking account of the characteristics of the project in terms of its nature and location, the site characteristics, and the scale of works, I consider that relevant issues in the identification of likely significant effects on European sites include:

- Surface water pollution related to construction phase activity.

For similar reasons, I consider the following to not be relevant issues in the identification of likely significant effects on (a) European site(s):

- Loss and/ or disturbance to habitats and/ or species.
- Wastewater pollution related to construction phase activity.
- Wastewater and/ or surface water pollution related to operation phase activity.

Submissions and Observations

8.2.7. Appeal grounds/ observations have raised that the information presented in the application for screening for and/ or AA is inadequate, including information on wintering bird surveys, claims in respect of habitat and treeline at the site/ receiving area, ex-situ effects on nearby SPAs, referenced out of date conservation objectives, and not considered the foul sewer construction.

8.2.8. Submissions received from prescribed bodies include the DAU in the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage. This notes the hydrological connection between the development site and the Baldoyle Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the Baldoyle Bay Special Protection Area (SPA). The potential risk for detrimental effects on these downstream Natura 2000 sites without the implementation of suitable mitigation measures (to avoid the mobilisation of pollutants such as silt, hydrocarbons, and cementitious materials from the development into surface water runoff during its construction phase) is raised.

8.2.9. Having reviewed the range of submitted documents, while I note concerns and shortcomings raised in the appeals/ observations, I am satisfied that the full range of information provided (outlined in subsection 8.1.3 above of this report) allows for a complete examination and identification of any potential significant effects of the

development, alone, or in-combination with other plans and projects on European sites. I concur with the applicant's response and/ or planning authority's appropriate assessment whereby the foul sewer route, watercourses and water bodies, and in-combination effects have been considered, the methodology employed and scientific evidence referenced can be relied upon.

European Sites Likely to be Affected

- 8.2.10. The application site is not located in or immediately adjacent to a European site. The SRAA identifies several European sites within the precautionary 15km radius of the site, provides descriptions of the sites including the conservation objectives and qualifying interests.
- 8.2.11. The SRAA establishes the potential zone of influence of the project including therein the European sites observed as having hydrological links to the site following pathway analysis. The European sites identified include Baldoyle Bay SAC (site code: 000199) and Baldoyle Bay SPA (004016) due to the indirect hydrological link observed from the site to Baldoyle Bay (surface water drainage pathway from watercourse at the site to the Hazelbrook Stream to Baldoyle Bay estuary). Additionally, the European sites of North Dublin Bay SAC (000206), North Bull Island SPA (004006), South Dublin Bay SAC (000210), and South Dublin Bay and Tolka Estuary SPA (004024) in Dublin Bay due to the indirect hydrological link observed between the site and Dublin Bay (wastewater drainage pathway from project via foul sewers to Ringsend WWTP to Dublin Bay).
- 8.2.12. While I note the identification of several European sites within the precautionary 15km radius in the SRAA (identified on Fig. 3, pg. 8), I consider that significant impacts on these SAC and SPA sites are unlikely, and I have not considered any European sites, other than those discussed below, as being potentially within the zone of influence due to the nature and scale of the project, the distance from, and absence of a connection to the site.
- 8.2.13. I concur with the conclusions of the applicant's screening, in that the only European sites on which there is potential for likely significant effects, are the Baldoyle Bay SAC and SPA designations as a result of indirect surface water hydrological connectivity, and the Dublin Bay SPA and SAC designations in Dublin Bay due to an indirect wastewater hydrological connection.

8.2.14. Notably, I confirm to the Board that the applicant's SRAA (January 2023) and Appendix 5 of the first party appeal response (May 2023) were prepared prior to the designation of the North-West Irish Sea SPA (site code:004236) in July 2023. As such, the SRAA does not list the North-West Irish Sea SPA in the project's zone of influence. The North-West Irish Sea SPA includes Dublin Bay and adjoins several of the SPAs listed in subsection 8.2.11 above. Applying the same rationale as the applicant applies for including the Dublin Bay European sites in the project's zone of influence, I similarly include the North-West Irish Sea SPA within the zone due to an indirect surface water hydrological connection.

Identification of Likely Significant Effects

8.2.15. As outlined in subsection 8.2.6 above, likely significant effects on European sites due to loss or disturbance to habitats or species associated with the project have not been considered as the site has been demonstrated to not be suitable for regularly occurring populations of wetland or wading birds, which may be associated with the European sites identified in subsection 8.2.11 above. These birds are associated with coastal and intertidal habitats, and no amenity grassland or other such necessarily supportive habitat suitable for such species has been identified at the site.

8.2.16. Of note from Step 4: Determination of Significance of the SRAA are the findings relating to the identification of likely significant effects. The significance of effects on the European sites are determined through a consideration of the different ways in which a project can impact upon a European site if a pathway exists. Of habitat loss and habitat disturbance, of wastewater and surface water pollution at operation phase, of groundwater quality and flow, and of water abstraction, the applicant's SRAA finds that: '*No significant effects to any Natura 2000 site is likely to arise from this source*'.

8.2.17. As established in the applicant's SRAA, and supported by associated engineering and flood risk documentation, there are indirect hydrological connections between the site and six European sites in Baldoyle Bay and Dublin Bay. Of the ecological status of the bays, Baldoyle Bay is indicated as failing to meet required standards with the exact cause unknown. While for Dublin Bay, sampling of water quality indicates that the discharge from Ringsend WWTP is having an observable effect in

the 'near field' of the discharge. This includes the inner Liffey Estuary and the Tolka Estuary, but not the coastal waters of Dublin Bay.

- 8.2.18. The specific conservation objectives and qualifying interests of the potentially affected SAC sites relate to habitat area, community extent, community structure and community distribution within the qualifying interest. There are no objectives in relation to water quality. The specific conservation objectives for the bird species highlighted for the potentially affected SPA sites relate to maintaining a population trend that is stable or increasing, and maintaining the current distribution in time and space.
- 8.2.19. The hydrological connection from the site to Baldoyle Bay SAC and SPA is such that surface water from the project during construction and operation phase activity will drain to the on-site ditches then to Hazelbrook Stream and to Baldoyle Bay estuary. Of the construction phase activity, due to the extensive site clearance, demolition and construction works planned to facilitate the project and these being in close proximity to the ditches/ local stream (open watercourses) at the site, following a precautionary approach, the potential for large quantities of silt or other construction pollutants to be washed downstream means that significant effects to the Baldoyle Bay SAC and SPA cannot be ruled out. Of the operation phase activity, the surface water drainage strategy for the project involves collection, attenuation, and discharge of run-off at greenfield rates to the drainage ditches/ local stream. The proposed drainage strategy is compliant with the requirements of the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study and incorporates several SuDS measures. As a result of these measures, there will be not net change to the quantity or quality of surface water leaving the site and a risk to surface water quality during operation phase activity on the Baldoyle Bay SAC and SPA can reasonably be ruled out.
- 8.2.20. The hydrological connection from the site to the Dublin Bay SACs and SPAs is such that wastewater from the project during operation phase activity will be pumped via new foul sewers to connect to the existing public system for treatment in Ringsend WWTP and then discharge into Dublin Bay. Currently emissions from the Ringsend WWTP are not in compliance with the Urban Wastewater Treatment Directive. The Ringsend WWTP has been granted permission to upgrade Ringsend WWTP, which will improve treatment standards and increase network capacity by 50% (the current capacity is a weekly average of 1.65 million PE to 2.36 million PE). Evidence also

suggests that in the current situation, some nutrient enrichment (pollution) is benefiting wintering birds for which the SPAs have been designated in Dublin Bay. Taking into consideration the comparably small quantum of effluent discharge from the project, the distances between the site and Dublin Bay SACs and SPAs, the lack of direct hydrological connection, and the dilution effect with other effluent and surface runoff, significant effects are considered to be unlikely. Further, no negative impacts to the European sites can arise from additional loading on the Ringsend WWTP as a result of the project as there is no evidence that negative effects are occurring to SACs or SPAs from water quality.

- 8.2.21. Of note from the SRAA, in respect of the likely significant effects on the identified European sites, specifically of those in Dublin Bay, is the conclusion that: *‘No negative effects to Natura 2000 sites in Dublin Bay are likely to arise’*. However, of Baldoyle Bay SAC and SPA, the SRAA concludes that *‘significant effects cannot be ruled out’* due to the existence of surface hydrological pathways from the site to the estuary and *‘the potential for large quantities of sediment or construction pollutants to be washed into the bay due to the proximity of works to open water courses...’*.
- 8.2.22. From the foregoing, I consider that there are construction phase activities of the project that could give rise to likely significant effects, on their own or in-combination with other projects on the qualifying interests of the Baldoyle Bay SAC and SPA such that the need for Stage 2 appropriate assessment of the Baldoyle Bay SAC and SPA cannot be excluded without further analysis and assessment.
- 8.2.23. A summary of the European sites including their conservation objectives and qualifying interests, the nature of the connection (source-pathway-receptor) to the site, and the possibility of likely significant effects arising from the project are presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Screening Summary Matrix

European Site Code and Conservation Objective	Qualifying Interests or Special Conservation Interests	Distance from Site and Connection (source, pathway, receptor)	Likely Significant Effect	Screening Conclusion
---	--	---	---------------------------	----------------------

<p><u>Baldoyle Bay SAC (000199)</u></p> <p>To maintain the favourable conservation condition of the Annex I habitats for which the SAC has been designated.</p>	<p>Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140]</p> <p>Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310]</p> <p>Atlantic salt meadows (<i>Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritima</i>) [1330]</p> <p>Mediterranean salt meadows (<i>Juncetalia maritimi</i>) [1410]</p>	<p>c.3.8km</p> <p>Indirect hydrological connection between the project (source), surface water drainage via the Hazelbrook Stream (pathway) to Baldoyle Bay estuary and the European site (receptor).</p>	<p>Likely significant effects may arise on the water quality in Hazelbrook Stream from surface water pollution during the construction phase of the project affecting the protected habitats in Baldoyle Bay estuarine environment.</p> <p>No likely significant effects arising on the water quality in Hazelbrook Stream from surface water pollution during the operation phase as the project incorporates SuDS elements, attenuation of surface water, certified standard of construction and connection to water services networks, that will prevent surface water pollution.</p>	<p>Screened in for the need for AA due to potential surface water pollution during the construction phase of the project.</p>
<p><u>Baldoyle Bay SPA (004016)</u></p> <p>To maintain the favourable conservation condition of the bird species (including the</p>	<p>Light-bellied Brent Goose (<i>Branta bernicla hrota</i>) [A046]</p> <p>Shelduck (<i>Tadorna tadorna</i>) [A048]</p>	<p>c.3.8km</p> <p>Indirect hydrological connection between the project (source), surface water drainage via the Hazelbrook</p>	<p>Likely significant effects may arise on the water quality in Hazelbrook Stream from surface water pollution during the construction phase of the</p>	<p>Screened in for the need for AA due to potential surface water pollution during the construction phase of the project.</p>

<p>Annex I listed, bird species), and the wetlands habitat for which the SPA has been designated.</p>	<p>Ringed Plover (<i>Charadrius hiaticula</i>) [A137]</p> <p>Golden Plover (<i>Pluvialis apricaria</i>) [A140]</p> <p>Grey Plover (<i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>) [A141]</p> <p>Bar-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa lapponica</i>) [A157]</p> <p>Wetlands [A999]</p>	<p>Stream (pathway) to Baldoyle Bay estuary and the European site (receptor).</p>	<p>project affecting the protected habitats which the protected bird species rely upon in Baldoyle Bay estuarine environment.</p> <p>No likely significant effects arising on the water quality in Hazelbrook Stream from surface water pollution during the operation phase as the project incorporates SuDS elements, attenuation of surface water, certified standard of construction and connection to water services networks, that will prevent surface water pollution.</p>	
<p><u>North-West Irish Sea SPA (site code 004236)</u></p> <p>To maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of the bird species for which the SPA has been designated.</p>	<p>Red-throated Diver (<i>Gavia stellata</i>) [A001]</p> <p>Great Northern Diver (<i>Gavia immer</i>) [A003]</p> <p>Fulmar (<i>Fulmarus glacialis</i>) [A009]</p> <p>Manx Shearwater (<i>Puffinus puffinus</i>) [A013]</p> <p>Cormorant (<i>Phalacrocorax carbo</i>) [A017]</p>	<p>c.3.9km</p> <p>Indirect hydrological connection between the project (source), wastewater drainage to Ringsend WWTP for treatment (pathway), with discharge of treated wastewater to Dublin Bay and</p>	<p>No likely significant effects arising on the water quality of Dublin Bay from wastewater pollution during the operation phase of the project as the project incorporates a certified standard of design and construction, connection to water services networks,</p>	<p>Screened out for need for AA.</p>

	<p>Shag (Phalacrocorax aristotelis) [A018]</p> <p>Common Scoter (Melanitta nigra) [A065]</p> <p>Little Gull (Larus minutus) [A177]</p> <p>Black-headed Gull (Chroicocephalus ridibundus) [A179]</p> <p>Common Gull (Larus canus) [A182]</p> <p>Lesser Black-backed Gull (Larus fuscus) [A183]</p> <p>Herring Gull (Larus argentatus) [A184]</p> <p>Great Black-backed Gull (Larus marinus) [A187]</p> <p>Kittiwake (Rissa tridactyla) [A188]</p> <p>Roseate Tern (Sterna dougallii) [A192]</p> <p>Common Tern (Sterna hirundo) [A193]</p> <p>Arctic Tern (Sterna paradisaea) [A194]</p> <p>Little Tern (Sterna albifrons) [A195]</p> <p>Guillemot (Uria aalge) [A199]</p> <p>Razorbill (Alca torda) [A200]</p> <p>Puffin (Fratercula arctica) [A204]</p>	the European Site (receptor).	treatment of foul effluent to necessary standard that will prevent wastewater pollution.	
<u>North Bull Island SPA (side code 004006)</u>	Light-bellied Brent Goose (Branta bernicla hrota) [A046]	c.7.1km Indirect hydrological connection	No likely significant effects arising on the water quality of Dublin Bay from	Screened out for need for AA

<p>To maintain the favourable conservation condition of the bird species (including the Annex I listed, bird species), and the wetlands habitat for which the SPA has been designated.</p>	<p>Shelduck (<i>Tadorna tadorna</i>) [A048]</p> <p>Teal (<i>Anas crecca</i>) [A052]</p> <p>Pintail (<i>Anas acuta</i>) [A054]</p> <p>Shoveler (<i>Anas clypeata</i>) [A056]</p> <p>Oystercatcher (<i>Haematopus ostralegus</i>) [A130]</p> <p>Golden Plover (<i>Pluvialis apricaria</i>) [A140]</p> <p>Grey Plover (<i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>) [A141]</p> <p>Knot (<i>Calidris canutus</i>) [A143]</p> <p>Sanderling (<i>Calidris alba</i>) [A144]</p> <p>Dunlin (<i>Calidris alpina</i>) [A149]</p> <p>Black-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa limosa</i>) [A156]</p> <p>Bar-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa lapponica</i>) [A157]</p> <p>Curlew (<i>Numenius arquata</i>) [A160]</p> <p>Redshank (<i>Tringa totanus</i>) [A162]</p> <p>Turnstone (<i>Arenaria interpres</i>) [A169]</p>	<p>between the project (source), wastewater drainage to Ringsend WWTP for treatment (pathway), with discharge of treated wastewater to Dublin Bay and the European Site (receptor).</p>	<p>wastewater pollution during the operation phase of the project as the project incorporates a certified standard of design and construction, connection to water services networks, treatment of foul effluent to necessary standard that will prevent wastewater pollution.</p>	
--	---	---	--	--

	Black-headed Gull (<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>) [A179] Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]			
<u>North Dublin Bay SAC (site code 000206)</u> To maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of the Annex I/ Annex II habitats and/ or species for which the SAC has been designated.	Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140] Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210] Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310] Atlantic salt meadows (<i>Glaucopuccinellietalia maritima</i>) [1330] Mediterranean salt meadows (<i>Juncetalia maritimi</i>) [1410] Embryonic shifting dunes [2110] Shifting dunes along the shoreline with <i>Ammophila arenaria</i> (white dunes) [2120] Fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation (grey dunes) [2130] Humid dune slacks [2190] <i>Petalophyllum ralfsii</i> (Petalwort) [1395]	c.7.1km Indirect hydrological connection between the project (source), wastewater drainage to Ringsend WWTP for treatment (pathway), with discharge of treated wastewater to Dublin Bay and the European Site (receptor).	No likely significant effects arising on the water quality of Dublin Bay from wastewater pollution during the operation phase of the project as the project incorporates a certified standard of design and construction, connection to water services networks, treatment of foul effluent to necessary standard that will prevent wastewater pollution.	Screened out for need for AA.
<u>South Dublin Bay and River Tolka</u>	Light-bellied Brent Goose (<i>Branta</i>	c.9.2km	No likely significant effects	Screened out for need for AA

<p><u>Estuary SPA (site code 004024)</u></p> <p>To maintain the favourable conservation condition of the bird species (including the Annex I listed, bird species), and the wetlands habitat for which the SPA has been designated.</p>	<p>bernicla hrota) [A046]</p> <p>Oystercatcher (Haematopus ostralegus) [A130]</p> <p>Ringed Plover (Charadrius hiaticula) [A137]</p> <p>Grey Plover (Pluvialis squatarola) [A141]</p> <p>Knot (Calidris canutus) [A143]</p> <p>Sanderling (Calidris alba) [A144]</p> <p>Dunlin (Calidris alpina) [A149]</p> <p>Bar-tailed Godwit (Limosa lapponica) [A157]</p> <p>Redshank (Tringa totanus) [A162]</p> <p>Black-headed Gull (Chroicocephalus ridibundus) [A179]</p> <p>Roseate Tern (Sterna dougallii) [A192]</p> <p>Common Tern (Sterna hirundo) [A193]</p> <p>Arctic Tern (Sterna paradisaea) [A194]</p> <p>Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]</p>	<p>Indirect hydrological connection between the project (source), wastewater drainage to Ringsend WWTP for treatment (pathway), with discharge of treated wastewater to Dublin Bay and the European Site (receptor).</p>	<p>arising on the water quality of Dublin Bay from wastewater pollution during the operation phase of the project as the project incorporates a certified standard of design and construction, connection to water services networks, treatment of foul effluent to necessary standard that will prevent wastewater pollution.</p>	
<p><u>South Dublin Bay SAC (site code 000210)</u></p>	<p>Mudflats and sandflats not covered by</p>	<p>c.11.3km</p>	<p>No likely significant effects arising on the</p>	<p>Screened out for need for AA</p>

<p>To maintain the favourable conservation condition of the Annex I/ Annex II habitats and/ or species for which the SAC has been designated.</p>	<p>seawater at low tide [1140]</p> <p>Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210]</p> <p>Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310]</p> <p>Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]</p>	<p>Indirect hydrological connection between the project (source), wastewater drainage to Ringsend WWTP for treatment (pathway), with discharge of treated wastewater to Dublin Bay and the European Site (receptor).</p>	<p>water quality of Dublin Bay from wastewater pollution during the operation phase of the project as the project incorporates a certified standard of design and construction, connection to water services networks, treatment of foul effluent to necessary standard that will prevent wastewater pollution.</p>	
---	---	--	---	--

Mitigation Measures

8.2.24. No measures designed or intended to avoid or reduce any potentially harmful effects of the project on a European site have been relied upon in this screening.

8.2.25. In the interest of clarity, I confirm to the Board that of the potential surface water and wastewater pollution during operation phase activity, I have noted and had regard to measures which have been inherent in the design of the project. These include several SuDS and CDWMP best practice measures, which have not been devised to avoid or reduce any potentially harmful effects of the project on any European sites.

Screening Determination Conclusion

8.2.26. Having carried out Stage 1 screening for appropriate assessment of the proposed development, I have concluded that the project individually or in-combination with other plans or projects could have likely significant effects on Baldoyle Bay SAC (000199) and Baldoyle Bay SPA (004016) in view of the sites' conservation objectives and qualifying interests, and that a Stage 2 appropriate assessment is therefore required.

8.2.27. The possibility of likely significant effects on other European sites listed hereunder has been excluded on the basis of the nature and scale of the proposed development, separation distances, and lack of substantive connections between the project, the site and the European sites within Dublin Bay (North-West Irish Sea SPA (004236), North Bull Island SPA (004006), North Dublin Bay SAC (000206), South Dublin Bay and Tolka Estuary SPA (004024), and South Dublin Bay SAC (000210)).

8.3. State 2 – Appropriate Assessment

Natura Impact Statement

- 8.3.1. The application is accompanied by a NIS dated January 2023. In Step 2: Impact Prediction of the NIS, the elements of the project identified as having potential to cause environmental impact on the Baldoyle Bay SAC and SPA are outlined. These are largely reiterated from the determination of significance in the SRAA referenced in subsection 8.2.16 above with more detailed consideration of effects from invasive species, air quality and in-combination effects with other plans and projects, including that of the concurrent appeals and the potential effects arising from the phasing plan/ implementation of the project.
- 8.3.2. The NIS finds that if the applications within the project were to be implemented at the same time there would be the *'possibility that construction pollutants entering waterways leading to Baldoyle Bay SAC and SPA could act in combination to result in negative effects to invertebrate communities in qualifying interest habitats in the SAC and, by extension, qualifying interest bird species in the SPA'*, and that *'[o]ther than during the construction phase [of the project] there are no projects or plans which could act in combination with the current proposal to result in significant effects to Natura 2000 sites'*.
- 8.3.3. In Step 3: Conservation Objectives, analysis is provided of the impacts in the context of the conservation objectives set for the SAC and SPA. The NIS outlines the analysis of the project which resulted in detailed consideration being given to how key habitats of the SAC (mudflats, sea meadows) could be affected and the resultant impact on the key species (wintering birds) of the SPA which rely on the SAC. While Step 4: Mitigation provides details of mitigation measures proposed, how and when they will be implemented. The NIS concludes that *'...Arising from this assessment, mitigation has been proposed. With the implementation of these measures adverse*

effects to the integrity of the SAC/ SPA will not occur. This conclusion is based on best scientific knowledge’.

- 8.3.4. Having reviewed the SRAA and NIS (as revised in the FI response), the range of submitted documents (including the Engineering Assessment Report, Flood Risk Assessment (JBA), site specific Flood Risk Assessment (WM), Construction, Demolition and Waste Management Plan, Landscape Design Rationale, Invasive Species Report, and relevant chapters in the EIAR, including Chapter 5 Biodiversity and Chapter 7 Water), the environmental consultant reports prepared on behalf of the planning authority, the third party appeals and observations, and submissions from the prescribed bodies, I am satisfied that the information allows for a complete assessment of any negative effects of the development on the conservation objectives of the European sites, Baldoyle Bay SAC and SPA alone, or in combination with other plans and projects.

Assessment of the Implications of the Project

- 8.3.5. The following is a summary of the objective scientific assessment of the implications of the project on the qualifying interest features of the European sites. All aspects of the project which could result in significant effects are assessed and mitigation measures designed to avoid or reduce any negative effects are considered and assessed.
- 8.3.6. I have relied on the following guidance: Appropriate Assessment of Plans and Projects in Ireland: Guidance for Planning Authorities, DoEHLG (2010), Assessment of plans and projects significantly affecting Natura 2000 sites: methodological guidance on the provisions of Article 6(3) and 6(4) of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EC, EC (2002), and Managing Natura 2000 Sites: the provisions of Article 6 of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC, EC (2018).

The European Sites

- 8.3.7. The Baldoyle Bay SAC (000199) and Baldoyle Bay SPA (004016) are subject to this appropriate assessment. A description of the SAC and the SPA, their conservation objectives and qualifying interests, including any relevant attributes and targets for the sites are set out in Step 1: Analysis of the Natura 2000 Network of the SRAA, Step 3: Conservation Objectives of the NIS, and outlined in Table 3 of this report as part of my assessment.

8.3.8. The SAC is an estuary of the Sluice and the Mayne Rivers that is largely enclosed by a sand spit that stretches from Portmarnock to Howth. At low tide it has large areas of exposed mud and sediment that support rich invertebrate communities. The SAC is designated for its four habitats which are indicated as having intermediate status. The habitats at Baldoyle Bay are identified as being of great importance to the food chain. The SPA is composed of estuarine habitats and is designated for six bird species (wintering and breeding) ranging from highly unfavourable to favourable status.

8.3.9. The site-specific conservation objectives for the Baldoyle Bay SAC and SPA are as follows:

- Salicornia mudflats (1310): maintain habitat area and distribution including physical structure (sediment supply, creeks and pans, flooding regime). Maintain vegetation structure as measured by vegetation height, vegetation cover, typical species and sub-communities. Absences of the invasive *Spartina anglica*.
- Atlantic/ Mediterranean Salt Meadows (1330/1410): as above.
- Mudflats (1140): Permanent habitat area stable or increasing (estimated at 409 hectares), subject to natural processes.
- Birds: Long term population trend stable or increasing; there should be no significant decrease in the numbers or range of areas used by waterbird species, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.

8.3.10. The NIS considers the potential impacts of the proposed development upon the qualifying interests of the SAC and SPA areas. Effects to the habitats in the SAC may have consequential impact on the availability of food for birds using the SPA. There will be no direct habitat loss, fragmentation or direct impacts upon the qualifying interest bird species arising from the proposed development. However, as an indirect hydrological connection exists, potential for large quantities of sediment and other construction pollutants entering the Hazelbrook Stream resulting from works associated with construction of the proposed development, cannot be ruled out. This could increase deposition beyond normal levels, affecting the areas of habitat for which the SAC has been designated. The NIS also identifies that construction pollutants such as concrete or hydrocarbons could affect habitat

functioning through toxic effects to invertebrate life. Effects on the availability of food sources would reduce the range of birds using the SPA. Following the precautionary principle, it is therefore considered appropriate to use specific mitigation measures as part of the proposed development.

8.3.11. I concur with the findings of the NIS in this regard. Due to the presence of the drainage ditches/ local stream within the site, with subsequent run-off into the Hazelbrook Stream, and the proximity to Baldoyle Bay SAC and SPA are particular characteristics that mean that likely significant effects cannot be ruled out. As such, specific mitigation measures during construction are required to protect and maintain the integrity of the habitats and species supported in Baldoyle Bay.

Aspects of the Proposed Development

8.3.12. The main aspects of the proposed development that could adversely affect the conservation objectives of the Baldoyle Bay SAC and SPA include construction phase pollution events at the site which could negatively affect water quality in the Hazelbrook Stream. These construction events include the site clearance, topsoil removal, all subsurface infrastructure including the laying of the wastewater rising main, and all above structures, roads, and areas of hardstanding.

Mitigation Measures

8.3.13. Mitigation measures are outlined in Step 4: Mitigation of the NIS, which focus on the construction phase and have been devised to address the likely significant effects specific to the project. The measures are outlined in detail under the following category headings:

- Pollution prevention during construction.
- Headwall and surface water sewer construction.
- General water protection measures.
- Run-off to ditches.
- Sediment control measures.
- Cross-connection prevention.
- Appointment of an Ecological Clerk of Works.

8.3.14. I consider that the mitigation measures are clear, straightforward and that conclusions can be reached whereby the likely significant effects of the proposed development on the qualifying interests of the Baldoyle SAC and SPA have been addressed. The measures proposed are considered to be effective, reflecting current best practice, and can be secured over the short/ medium term and the method of implementation can be secured through a detailed management plan. In the event of a grant of permission, I recommend that the implementation of these mitigation measures be subject of a condition.

In-Combination Effects

8.3.15. Within Step 2: Impact Prediction of the NIS the potential for cumulative or in-combination effects with other plans and projects on the Baldoyle Bay SAC and SPA is considered.

8.3.16. With regard to plans, the applicant's NIS refers to the broader urbanisation of Dublin City and its hinterland, which is planned for in the Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023 (which was in effect at the time the NIS was prepared (January 2023)). I confirm to the Board that the 2017 CDP has since been superseded by the 2023 CDP, and that points made by the applicant regarding the 2017 CDP continue to be applicable for the 2023 CDP. In the 2023 CDP, the site is zoned for new residential development, as are additional lands to the east and southeast of the site which are also in proximity to the length of the Hazelbrook Stream. The NIS states that a full appropriate assessment was undertaken of the 2017 CDP which found that, subject to mitigation measures, the implementation of the 2017 CDP would not have adverse impacts on European sites. I note that this is a position which is also relevant for the 2023 CDP and consider this conclusion to be reasonable.

8.3.17. In respect of projects, the applicant's NIS refers to the concurrent applications and other permissions in the vicinity of the development site, and I have also had regard to SHD applications (e.g. ABP 313265-22 and ABP 313361-22) for residential development on lands to the east and southeast that are in the Hazelbrook Stream catchment area. The NIS states that potential in-combination effects arising would be those associated with cumulative construction impacts, as I have referred to in subsection 8.3.2 above. However, it is considered that these are not likely significant effects on the SAC and SPA due to mitigation measures being included for in the

proposed development to address construction related impacts. I consider this conclusion to be reasonable.

8.3.18. In summary, the potential for in-combination effects arising from plans and projects has been referred to and considered in the applicant's NIS, and I have further considered and assessed the potential through reviewing the NIR of the 2023 CDP and the relevant planning permissions in the vicinity of the proposed development with potential to impact on the Hazelbrook Stream and thereby on the SAC and SPA. I am satisfied that there are no in-combination effects with other plans and projects that arise from implementing the proposed development.

8.4. Appropriate Assessment Conclusion

8.4.1. The project has been considered in light of the assessment requirements of sections 177U and 177V in Part XAB of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

8.4.2. Having carried out screening for appropriate assessment of the project, it was concluded that likely significant effects on the Baldoyle Bay SAC (000199) and the Baldoyle Bay SPA (004016) could not be excluded, and appropriate assessment was required of the implications of the project on the qualifying interests of the SAC and SPA in light of their conservation objectives.

8.4.3. Following an appropriate assessment, it has been ascertained that the proposed development, individually or in-combination with other plans or projects would not adversely affect the integrity of the Baldoyle Bay SAC (000199) and the Baldoyle Bay SPA (004016), or any other European site, in view of the sites' conservation objectives.

8.4.4. This conclusion is based on:

- An assessment of all aspects of the project including proposed mitigation measures in relation to the conservation objectives of the Baldoyle Bay SAC and SPA.
- An assessment of in-combination effects with other plans and projects including historical projects, current proposals, and future plans.

- No reasonable scientific doubt as to the absence of adverse effects on the integrity of the Baldoyle Bay SAC (000199) and the Baldoyle Bay SPA (004016).

9.0 Environmental Impact Assessment

9.1. Statutory Provisions

- 9.1.1. This section of the report comprises an environmental impact assessment (EIA) which considers the likely significant effects of the project on the several named factors of the environment. In the interests of clarity for the Board, the 'project' subject of this EIA refers to the total development being proposed in the three concurrent applications, and the 'site' refers to the overall lands included within the three applications. The applicant's Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) has been prepared for the project and the site as so described.
- 9.1.2. The project comprises the preservation of Auburn House and its stables as a single dwelling unit, and provides for a total of 259 residential units (113 houses, 105 apartments, and 21 duplexes). The project also includes for a total of 405 car parking spaces and 376 bicycle parking spaces, public and communal open spaces, vehicular, cyclist and pedestrian accesses, demolition of a residence, shed/ garage structures, and all other site servicing and development works including an on-site foul pumping station and laying foul sewer drains along Back Road and Kinsealy Lane. The proposal is on a site measuring 13.28 ha that is located in the townlands of Auburn and Streamstown of Malahide town.

Requirement for an Environmental Impact Assessment

- 9.1.3. Section 172(1)(a) of the 2000 Act and Item 10(b), Part 2, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (2001 Regulations) provides that an EIA is required for infrastructure projects that involve:
- i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units;
 - iv) Urban Development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere.

- 9.1.4. While the project is subthreshold in terms of number of dwelling units proposed, the total area of the site at 13.28ha (inclusive of road works and wastewater connection works) is greater than 10ha for a built-up area. I note the context for the applicant's decision to prepare an EIAR on this basis, concur that this southern area of Malahide town can be considered as a built-up area, and that accordingly an EIAR has been appropriately prepared for the proposal.
- 9.1.5. The following subsections examine the EIAR to ensure that statutory provisions in the 2000 Act (principally in Section 171A, Part X) and the 2001 Regulations (principally in Article 94, and Items 1 and 2, Schedule 6) have been complied with. These include the content of the EIAR, examination of the likely significant direct and indirect effects, identification of risk of major accidents and disasters, consideration of reasonable alternatives and undertaking of consultations.

Content of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report

- 9.1.6. The EIAR is laid out in two parts, the Main Statement with 16 chapters and the Non-Technical Summary. The latter fulfils the requirement of Article 94(c) of the 2001 Regulations.
- 9.1.7. Chapter 1 sets out the introduction and methodology including, as required by Article 94(e), a list of the competent experts involved in preparing the EIAR. Chapter 2 provides a description of the site, context, and proposed development, which accords with Item 1(a), Schedule 6, and includes an examination of reasonable alternatives, as required by Item 1(d), Schedule 6. Chapters 4 to 14 inclusive examine the likely significant effects, as required by Item 1(b), Schedule 6 of the proposed development on the environmental factors identified in Section 171A(b)(i) of the 2000 Act. Chapter 15 examines potential of interactions between the environmental factors. Chapter 16 provides a summary of mitigation measures, in accordance with Item 1(c) and Item 2(g) of Schedule 6.

Likely Significant Direct and Indirect Effects

- 9.1.8. As required by Item 1(b) and Item 2(e), Schedule 6 of the 2001 Regulations, the EIAR describes and assesses the direct and indirect significant effects of the project on the specific environmental factors identified in Section 171A(b)(i) of the 2000 Act. These are: (a) population and human health; (b) biodiversity with particular attention to the species and habitats protected under Directive 92/43/EEC and Directive

2009/147/EC; (c) land, soil, water, air and climate; (d) material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape. It also considers the interaction between the factors referred to in these points (a) to (d).

- 9.1.9. As referred to above, these environmental factors and the interaction between the factors correspond with Chapters 4 to 15 inclusive of the EIAR. The contents and layout of the chapters are relatively consistent, with a description of the receiving environment, identification of the potential impacts, outline of associated mitigation measures, and prediction and evaluation of impacts, during the construction and operation phases, with the application of same.

Risk of Major Accidents and/ or Disasters

- 9.1.10. Section 171A(b)(ii) of the 2000 Act and supplemented by Item 2(e)(i)(IV) of the 2001 Regulations, require that the expected effects derived from the vulnerability of the project to major accidents and/ or disasters that are relevant to the project concerned are considered.
- 9.1.11. The EIAR considers the risk of major accidents and/ or disasters under a specific headed item in Chapter 2. Due to the nature of the receiving area, the surrounding land uses, and the absence of any Seveso II Directive sites within 1km of the proposed project, the potential risk posed by a major accident and/ or disaster has been considered as low. Due also to the nature of the project as a residential use, the vulnerability of the scheme is considered to be low. Further I consider that due to the nature of the project, that there are no significant risks arising from the operation of the project or that the project is vulnerable to major risks. Overall, the risk of major accidents and/ or disasters is considered to be low, a position which I concur with.
- 9.1.12. I note that Chapter 7 Water of the EIAR, in respect of surface water drainage, does not identify any likely significant effect arising from flood risk (under separate cover the Flood Risk Assessment (JBA), site specific Flood Risk Assessment (WM)) for the project submit the site is located in a Flood Zone C and conclude that residual risks from all sources of flooding are extremely low/ low with the incorporation of mitigation measures). Chapter 13 Transport, in respect of construction phase impacts, identifies potential for traffic safety conflicts with mitigation measures including the preparation and agreement of a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and a Traffic

Management Plan (TMP). Traffic safety is not identified as a likely significant effect during the operational phase of the project due to the safe design and operation of the internal roads and paths, site entrances, and external junctions (the separate DMURS Statement of Design Consistency report includes a Quality Audit), the implementation of the Travel Plan, and the Development Access report (which concludes the proposed Option 1 (of four options) is the safest and most suitable).

Reasonable Alternatives

9.1.13. Item 1(d) and Item 2(b), Schedule 6 of the 2001 Regulations require that reasonable alternatives be considered. Chapter 2 of the EIAR addresses the alternatives considered. The site is zoned for Objective 'RA' Residential Area. The alternatives considered relate to variations in the design, layout, and access arrangements of the project. The applicant outlines several alternatives considered for the site, including those that were related to the previous application for which permission was refused (including on grounds of adverse impact on Auburn House and its curtilage, and the loss of trees and hedgerows), and those subject to pre-planning consultations held with the planning authority and/ or the Board. No alternatives are considered in the EIAR in respect of locations, uses or processes.

9.1.14. Having regard to the parameters of the underlying zoning, the site context (Auburn House and its historic landscape setting), and the planning history at the site, I am satisfied that alternative locations, uses and processes are not relevant to the proposal. While submitted in the appeal grounds that the alternatives are insufficient and should have included an alternative with a reduced residential density, in my opinion reasonable alternatives have been explored and the information contained in the EIAR with regard to alternatives provides a justification in environmental terms for the chosen scheme and is in accordance with the legislative requirements.

Consultations

9.1.15. The 2000 Act and the 2001 Regulations include for information being made available, consultations, and public participation in the EIA process. I am satisfied that the participation of the public has been effective, and the application documentation has been made accessible to the public by hard copy and electronic means (planning authority's planning register) with adequate opportunities and timelines afforded for the making and receipt of submissions.

Conclusion on Statutory Provisions

9.1.16. In conclusion, I am satisfied that the EIAR has been prepared by competent experts to ensure its completeness and quality, that a Non-Technical summary has been provided, in language understood, that reasonable alternatives have been considered, and consultations with the decision-making process have been facilitated. The appeal grounds include that the EIAR is invalid due to its being prepared for the project instead of for each application, however I am satisfied that the manner in which the EIAR has been prepared is valid, and that the Board can undertake an EIA of the project on the basis of the information contained therein.

9.2. Assessment of the Likely Significant Direct and Indirect Effects

9.2.1. The likely significant direct and indirect effects of the proposed development on the environment are considered under the headings below which follow the order of the factors as set out in Section 171A(b)(i) of the 2000 Act:

- (a) Population and human health
- (b) Biodiversity, with particular attention to the species and habitats protected under Directive 92/43/EEC and Directive 2009/147/EC
- (c) Land, soil, water, air, and climate
- (d) Material assets, cultural heritage, and the landscape, and
- The interaction between the factors referred to in points (a) to (d).

9.2.2. Within each of the environmental factors above, as applicable, I also examine and assess the mitigation measures identified to avoid, prevent, or reduce and if possible offset likely negative significant effects on the environment.

9.2.3. My assessment herein is based on the information provided by the applicant, including in the EIAR and the range of accompanying documentation, with regard had to the information contained in the submissions from the appellants, observers, planning authority and prescribed bodies, and on my site inspection.

9.2.4. In undertaking this EIA and determining the significance of effects on the environment, I have had regard to the requirements of the Guidelines for Planning Authorities and An Bord Pleanála on carrying out Environmental Impact Assessment, DoHPLG, 2018, and of the Guidelines on the information to be contained in

Environmental Impact Assessment Reports, EPA, 2022 (specifically to Table 3.4 Description of Effects).

9.2.5. In sections 3.0 and 6.0 of this report (and similar sections of the reports for the concurrent applications), I have presented the planning authority's decisions, outlined the submissions, appeal grounds, and responses made on the proposed development by third parties, prescribed bodies, appellants, observers, and the planning authority. I consider the main issues that are of particular relevance and applicability to this EIA to be:

- Population and Human Health
- Biodiversity
- Material Assets: Transport
- Cultural Heritage
- Landscape

9.2.6. This EIA has had regard to the planning assessment of the relevant issues set out in section 7.0 and to the appropriate assessment set out in section 8.0 of this report. This EIA section of the report should therefore be read in conjunction with those sections.

9.3. **(a) Population and Human Health**

9.3.1. Chapter 4 of the EIAR considers Population and Human Health, detailing key demographic information on the area for population, age profile, and employment activity. The project is indicated as having a potential construction period of up to 48 months with employment estimated at 150-240 persons. Once operational, the proposal will generate an increase in population and associated demands on services. I note that the CSO 2022 census information for Malahide town indicates a population of 18,608 persons. While a population increase is not indicated, using the average 2022 census household size of 2.74 persons and the area's household average size of 2.9 persons (Table 4.6 of the EIAR), I estimate a population increase in the region of c.710 and c.751 persons.

9.3.2. Section 4.8 of the EIAR describes community infrastructure and social facilities in the vicinity of the application site, which cross references to a separate submitted

Community and Social Infrastructure Audit. A range of community infrastructure, including schools, churches, library services and health services are identified within 2km of the site. Indoor recreational facilities and outdoor spaces are also highlighted within a 2km radius of the subject site.

- 9.3.3. As part of the planning assessment of the applications, I recommend the provision of a childcare facility to serve the project. While the EIAR has not included for the provision of a childcare facility in Chapter 4, I have considered and incorporated any likely associated effects in this EIA. I am satisfied that such likely impacts (primarily increased traffic generation and daytime noise) will not be significant in and of themselves, moderate in effect, and come well within the scope of the overall impacts anticipated for the project. Indeed, the provision of the facility to serve the future residents and the wider community to have a positive impact on the population.
- 9.3.4. In terms of identified impacts, after mitigation (including measures to address the negative impacts relating to traffic, noise, dust effects for residents) there are no significant impacts anticipated during the construction phase, with impacts also being temporary in nature. During operational phase, mitigation measures are not proposed as the project has been designed so as not to have any undue negative impacts on human health (including mental health or wellbeing) and the existing amenity of residential properties (no adverse overlooking, overshadowing, or overbearance). On the whole, I consider the project to result in several positive impacts including those related to increased economic activity, increased provision of housing, increased population (c.710-c.751 persons in a town of c.18,600 persons), thereby creating a new community in the town with services (recommended provision of a childcare facility) and amenities (public open spaces).
- 9.3.5. In line with the EPA Guidelines description of effects, I consider that once operational, the project will exert a moderate to significant positive effect on population and human health as the character of the environment, which is a sensitive aspect of the environment, will be altered in a manner that is consistent with existing and emerging patterns of development and the change improves the quality of the environment by improving residential amenities.

Conclusion

9.3.6. In conclusion, I am satisfied that all likely significant negative effects on population and human health would be avoided, mitigated, and managed due to measures designed into the project, from the implementation of mitigation measures, and through appropriate conditions in the event of a grant of permission. I conclude that the project would have likely moderate to significant positive effects in terms of population and human health.

9.4. **(b) Biodiversity, with particular attention to the species and habitats protected under Directive 92/43/EEC and Directive 2009/147/EC**

9.4.1. Chapter 5 contains the biodiversity context for the site and assessment of the project. I highlight there are several documents submitted with the applications overlapping with and supporting Chapter 5, including the Bat and Badger Assessment (a bat derogation licence submitted with the application, and an updated license submitted with the applicant's appeal response), SRAA, NIS, SSFRA, Landscape Design Rationale, Arboricultural Report, and Invasive Species Report.

9.4.2. The chapter identifies the protected nature conservation sites and local water courses in the vicinity of the project site, including the Malahide and Baldoyle Bay Estuaries (SAC/ SPA/ pNHA), Feltrim Hill and Sluice River Marsh (pNHA), and Gaybrook Stream, Hazelbrook Stream, and Sluice River. Within the site are several fields and a series of drainage ditches (including with a stream) that drain surface water from across the site in a southeasterly direction to Hazelbrook Stream, a tributary of the Sluice River, which in turn drains to Baldoyle Bay. As such, there is a hydrological link between the site and Baldoyle Bay. However, the lands are stated as not being located within a catchment of any significant water course as Hazelbrook Stream is not assessed under the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and Baldoyle Bay is not assigned a status under the WFD.

9.4.3. Several surveys were undertaken of the lands over four years (2019-2022), including specific surveys for badgers (most recent being October 2022), and bats (most recent being September 2022). In terms of habitats and flora, the site is described as comprising agricultural grassland and broadleaved woodland, with field boundaries of hedgerows and treelines, and drainage ditches along two such boundaries. These drainage ditches are described as very small with no wetland flora. These ditches are located centrally within the site and form an approximate 'T'

configuration to the south/ southeast of Auburn House and extending along the main access road. The northern hedgerows are assessed as being of high local value due to their age, structure, and species. The large woodland around Auburn House is noted as being of non-native species, though assessed as high local value due to its rarity. Two invasive plant species are identified (Spanish bluebell and three-cornered garlic). Buildings, hardstanding areas, and the route of the foul sewer in the public roads are categorised as artificial surfaces. No protected habitats or plant species are identified at the site.

- 9.4.4. In terms of fauna, the presence of protected species (mammal, bird, insect, aquatic) is investigated. Of note, potential badger setts are identified in woodlands near Auburn House, however, no sightings or definitive evidence of activity was recorded during the survey periods between 2019-2022. It is confirmed that badgers are not in residence at the site. Sightings of individual bats confirmed three bat species as roosting in Auburn House and/ or the stables buildings (whiskered bat, brown long-eared bat, soprano pipistrelle) and for potential for a fourth species to be (common pipistrelle). General activity was recorded in trees/ fields within the site of these four species and the Leisler's bat species (the latter in two beech trees, Tree No. 712 and 604). No wetland, wintering, or wading birds are noted, and the site's habitats is confirmed as not suitable for birds associated with the nearby European Sites (Malahide Estuary, Baldoyle Bay). The site does not drain to any river of significant fisheries value. The ditches in the site are determined to be highly modified habitats (culverted in a number of locations), and where open are slow flowing and low value for aquatic biodiversity (low fisheries significance, with minimal aquatic vegetation present).
- 9.4.5. In short, the presence of protected habitats, plant species or fauna is not recorded at the site during the surveys, save for certain bat species. Habitats at the site are concluded as having negligible to high local ecological value. The hydrological link downstream to the protected Baldoyle Bay Estuary via surface water ditches draining into Hazelbrook Stream is highlighted.
- 9.4.6. The construction phase impacts arising from the project include direct habitat loss from the removal of the grasslands, and certain hedgerows (with any ditch therein culverted), trees, and treelines, the mortality of species during land clearance (risk to birds and bats from building and tree removal), pollution of water courses from

construction activities (site ditches drain to Hazelbrook Stream and Baldoyle Bay), and damage to hedgerows and treelines to be retained (during construction and operational phases). These impacts are (predominantly) identified as negative, significant, likely, and permanent.

- 9.4.7. The operational phase impacts identified include risk of water pollution from wastewater and/ or surface water runoff, disturbance of species from increased human activity (particularly light disturbance of bat species), invasive plant species (eradication required), and impacts to protected areas (potential impact to Baldoyle Bay through the identified hydrological link, otherwise there is no impact on other nature designations). Of these impacts, the disturbance to species (including the invasive species) from human activity once operational is classified as negative, significant, likely, and permanent (long-term). The water pollution from wastewater and/ or surface water runoff is classified as imperceptible in significance.
- 9.4.8. To address the impacts which are identified as being potentially significant in effect, the chapter includes targeted mitigation measures. For the construction impacts, these focus on reducing habitat loss, through implementing tree retention and protection measures, initiating planting along perimeters to allow mammal (including badger) movement, implementing several bat protection measures (bat boxes to be erected at suitable locations within the site, checking of trees and buildings for bats prior to/ during tree felling or surgery, or modification of buildings, removal of bats under licence as necessary, and a bat specialist to oversee all works and shall ensure that bats are protected), ensuring seasonal clearance of vegetation to protect nesting birds, undertaking several measures to prevent land contamination or pollution to surface and ground water through erection of silt barriers on the ditches, proper storage and use of materials such as oils, petrol and concrete. For the operational impacts, these include tree protection measures, implementing the Woodland Management Plan and, in relation to light disturbance, are incorporated from the Bat and Badger Assessment including public lighting design, installation and standards. I consider the range of mitigation measures to be appropriate, necessary, and reasonable.
- 9.4.9. I have considered the appeal grounds and concerns raised by observers regarding, inter alia, the robustness of survey work with regard to birds, failure to adequately consider impacts relating to bats, or comply with the requirements of the Water

Framework Directive. I am satisfied that the surveys undertaken are representative of several seasons, over several years (with most recent survey work dating from September-October 2022, and the application was lodged in October 2022) and can be relied upon given the robustness of the approach taken. In respect of impacts on bats and criticisms of the applicant's derogation licence, I consider the EIAR and bat assessment have adequately identified the impacts on bats with a range of targeted protection measures (I positively note that changes made during the further information process result in the retention of Tree No. 712, a likely bat roost). I highlight to the Board that the derogation licence process is subject to the European Communities (Birds and Natural Habitats) Regulations 2011, is a separate process to the planning consent process, and a grant of permission does not obviate the need to obtain a derogation licence. In similarity with the criticism of the applicant's NIS, I consider that information has been presented about watercourses and waterbodies relative to the WFD. Overall, I concur with the conclusions described in the EIAR and consider impacts upon biodiversity to be locally significant, with suitable mitigation to reduce negative impacts.

9.4.10. In line with the EPA Guidelines description of effects, I consider that once operational, the project will exert a moderate to significant positive effect on biodiversity as the character of the environment, which is a sensitive aspect of the environment (tree and hedgerow habitat, presence of five bat species, hydrological connection to Baldoyle Bay), will be altered in a manner that is consistent with existing and emerging patterns of development and the change improves the quality of the environment (Tree Protection and Woodland Management Plans, several bat protection measures, management of surface water run-off to protect watercourses).

Conclusion

9.4.11. In conclusion, I am satisfied that all likely significant negative effects on biodiversity would be avoided, mitigated, and managed due to measures designed into the project, from the implementation of mitigation measures, and through appropriate conditions in the event of a grant of permission. I conclude that the project would have likely moderate to significant positive effects in terms of biodiversity, or on the species and habitats protected under Directive 92/43/EEC and Directive 2009/147/EC.

9.5. (c) Land, Soil, Water, Air, and Climate

9.5.1. Within the applicant's EIAR, this group of environmental categories is considered in Chapter 6 Land, Soils, and Geology, Chapter 7 Water, Chapter 8 Air Quality, Chapter 9 Noise and Vibration, and Chapter 10 Climate.

Land and Soil

- 9.5.2. Chapter 6 describes land, soil and geology and identifies the site lies over three geological formations, mainly variations of limestone and shale, and that the site is within an area of high to extreme groundwater vulnerability. During construction, works will expose subsoil to weathering and may result in the erosion of soils. Surface water runoff may also result in silt discharges to the Hazelbrook Stream and excavations will result in surplus subsoil which will be used in fill areas where applicable. Additional imported fill will also be required and must meet chemical and biological standards. Dust from the site and from soil spillages may also result in oil contamination of soils and underlying geological structures. Any hydro-geological impacts are identified as temporary and associated with the construction phase. There are no ongoing impacts on underlying soil identified as part of the operational phase.
- 9.5.3. Mitigation measures are outlined to reduce impacts and include the following: finished floor levels of buildings and roads to match existing levels, appropriate storage of topsoil to allow as much on-site reuse as possible, use of silt traps, silt fences and tailing ponds, provision of wheel wash areas, dampening down measures with water sprays during dry periods, appropriate storage and bunding measures, soil samples to investigate potential contamination, and measures to protect groundwater. Further to measures included in the preliminary Construction Demolition and Waste Management Plan (CDWMP), will be those included and implemented in the finalised Construction Management Plan, Traffic Management Plan and Waste Management Plan. During operational phase the planting programme is expected to reduce soil erosion. SuDS and filtration devices will also remove pollutants from rainwater runoff and prevent these entering the soils. The encouragement of surface water to ground water is also expected to replenish the natural groundwater table. The EIAR finds that with mitigation in place, there are no negative significant predicted impacts to land, soils and geology.

9.5.4. In undertaking my EIA, I have had regard to the zoned and serviceable nature of the site and the low importance value of the soil/ subsoil resource. I identify additional residual impacts as those associated with construction phase land take and excavation of soil/ subsoil and, in line with the EPA Guidelines description of effects, identify these impacts as being moderate neutral in effect. That being, the character of the environment will be altered in a manner that is consistent with existing and emerging patterns of development and the alteration is within normal bounds of variation for same. Otherwise, I agree with the applicant and find the identified construction and operation phase activities to have imperceptible neutral effects whereby a change capable of measurement will be caused to the character of the environment but without significant consequences, and the change is within normal bounds of variation for same.

Conclusion

9.5.5. In conclusion, I am satisfied that all likely significant negative effects on land, soils and geology would be avoided, mitigated, and managed due to measures designed into the project, from the implementation of mitigation measures, and through appropriate conditions in the event of a grant of permission. I conclude that the project would have likely imperceptible to moderate neutral effects in terms of land and soils.

Water

9.5.6. Chapter 7 outlines the water conditions for the project with a focus on water supply, foul and surface water drainage elements. In undertaking my EIA of the water component of the environment, I have also had regard to the other relevant chapters in the EIAR (in particular Chapter 5 and Chapter 6), and other supporting documents prepared for the project including the FRA, SSFRA, Engineering Assessment Report, SRAA and NIS which elaborate more upon the water and hydrology conditions of the site and receiving area.

9.5.7. The conditions of the receiving environment are outlined, including the presence of the public water supply (available mains in Malahide Road and Carey's Lane), wastewater infrastructure (no gravity sewer available, capacity constraints in local pumping stations, two of which are in private control, capacity in the Chapel Road pumping station), and surface water drainage services (existing drain in Abington

estate on northern/ eastern boundary discharges to a culvert under the Malahide Road, site presently draining through ditches to Hazelbrook Stream).

- 9.5.8. In relation to water supply, mitigation measures include a method statement to describe correct procedures when working in the vicinity of watermains, and that watermains be cleaned and tested in accordance with Irish Water guidelines prior to connection to the public watermain, under the supervision of Irish Water or the Design Engineer. With mitigation in place, potential negative impacts will be short term only. During the operational phase, water meters will be installed to assist with the identification of potential leakages and all plumbing fixtures/ fittings will meet current best practice for water consumption minimisation. As a result of these remedial measures, the EIAR concludes that no negative significant effects are expected to arise due to the development on the water supply network. I note that Uisce Eireann has confirmed (prescribed body report, correspondence to the applicant (appendices) in the EIAR and Engineering Assessment Report) that the existing network has sufficient capacity to cater for the development in operation without the need for upgrades.
- 9.5.9. In relation to wastewater, remedial measures are identified to reduce the risk of defective or leaking foul sewers. This includes during the construction phase, testing in accordance with Irish Waters Code of Practice and Standard Details, inspection by the design Engineer in accordance with Building Regulations, surveys for physical defects, connection under supervision of Irish Water and the use of adequate protection measures during excavations in public areas in the vicinity of utilities and public services. During the operational phase, foul drains will be tested and surveyed prior to connection to public sewers. As a result of these mitigation measures, no significant long-term impacts will result from construction works. During the operational phase, the development will increase wastewater flows in the existing drainage system, and it is noted that the existing Chapel Road Pumping Station will have capacity to cater for the development flows. I note that Uisce Eireann has confirmed feasibility and design acceptance for the proposed development (prescribed body report, correspondence to the applicant (appendices) in the EIAR and Engineering Assessment Report).
- 9.5.10. In terms of surface water, during construction there is a risk of rainfall washing silts and sediments into the surface water system, to Hazelbrook Stream, a tributary of

the Sluice River, and ultimately to Baldoyle Bay. During the operational phase, runoff from roads and hardstanding areas will discharge contaminants to the surface water system. Remedial and reductive measures are outlined in the EIAR to mitigate against these potential pollutants of the water system, with implementation of measures in the preliminary CDWMP forming the core mitigation during construction. During the operational phase, surface water from the site will be attenuated and several SuDS measures included in the project will reduce and slow the rate of surface water runoff, with treatment to remove pollutants and hydrocarbons prior to discharge at greenfield rates into the Hazelbrook Stream. Maintenance measures will also be in place to ensure the longevity of this remediation. As a result, it is predicted in the EIAR that there will be some short term negative impacts during the construction phase, that with the implementation of mitigation measures will be minimised, and no significant long term impact will result. During operational phase, with the implementation of the mitigation measures described above, no negative significant impacts are envisaged.

9.5.11. For the most part, I agree with the conclusions of the applicant. I have identified further nuances in the predicted impacts particularly with regard to the interaction between surface water and groundwater aspects of the water component of the environment. In line with the EPA Guidelines description of effects, I identify the construction and operation phase activities to have predicted impacts which are moderate neutral in effect for water supply and wastewater and not significant neutral in effect for surface water and groundwater conditions. For water supply and wastewater, I consider that the character of the environment will be altered in a manner that is consistent with existing and emerging patterns of development (connection to existing services, provision of new facilitating infrastructure) and the alteration is within normal bounds of variation for same. While for surface water and groundwater, I consider that a noticeable change will be caused to the character of the environment but without significant consequences (active surface water drainage management with several SuDS features and protective measures due to discharge to and/ or modification of on-site drainage ditches, and hydrological connection to Hazelbrook Stream and Baldoyle Bay) and the alteration is within normal bounds of variation for same.

Conclusion

9.5.12. In conclusion, I am satisfied that all likely significant negative effects on water would be avoided, mitigated, and managed due to measures designed into the project, from the implementation of mitigation measures, and through appropriate conditions in the event of a grant of permission. I conclude that the project would have likely moderate neutral to not significant neutral effects in terms of water.

Air and Climate

9.5.13. Chapter 8 assesses Air Quality and outlines the legislative context and baseline air quality for the area, with an assessment of potential impacts as a result of the proposed development. Key potential construction phase impacts are identified in relation to dust and construction traffic emissions, and the potential operational phase impact is in relation to traffic emissions. Mitigation measures are described in the EIAR to mitigate dust and air quality impacts during the construction phase, comprising the implementation of standard on-site mitigation measures to control emissions. These are outlined in Appendix A: Dust Management Plan, and in addition to on-site measures the plan includes measures to minimise the impact on sensitive receptors (adjacent residences) and road users of the wider local network. With the implementation of mitigation during the construction phase, impacts are predicted to be negligible. During the operational phase, it is not expected that the scale of emissions would have a negative impact on local ambient air quality and, as a result, no specific mitigation is required. I note a Travel Plan is included with the application documentation to promote sustainable transport forms, which aims to reduce future residents' reliance on private car travel, with a focus on walking, cycling, bus and rail travel.

9.5.14. Chapter 9 describes noise and vibration, elements of the environment I identify as being within the scope of the environmental category of air. The EIAR describes the typical construction related activities that are expected to generate noise and vibration, including use of plant and machinery, both on, and travelling to, the site. Minor short term vibration impacts may occur during the construction phase as a result. During the operational phase potential noise could result from increased road traffic, alongside general maintenance activities on the site, while vibration is not expected to be a contributing factor during the operational phase. Remedial and reductive measures are described in the EIAR, with a focus on implementation on the control of construction activities to limit noise nuisance, such as erection of site

hoarding to limit noise impacts on adjacent sensitive receptors. Impact from noise during the construction phase is identified as being short term. The impact of increased traffic on noise levels is categorised as slight in the operational phase but predicted in the EIAR to decrease over the next decade as petrol and diesel cars are phased out and replaced by quieter electrical vehicles. During construction, vibration will only have minor temporary increases, while operational vibration is deemed not to have any noticeable impacts.

9.5.15. Chapter 10 considers Climate and describes the climate policy context, receiving environment and potential CO₂ emissions resulting from the project. During the construction phase, CO₂ emissions relate to material use, transport, and machinery. During the operation phase, CO₂ emissions relate to embodied CO₂, energy use, efficiency of buildings and transport. In terms of mitigation, the application of EU and Government targets for reducing CO₂, will inform reduction measures during both the construction and operation phases. During construction, mitigation includes sourcing materials locally, recycling material from excavation for reuse on site, implementation of a traffic management plan to reduce traffic emissions and maintenance of plant and equipment. During operation, mitigation includes the selection of efficient materials, measures to improve the efficiency of buildings, and low carbon and renewable energy technologies in the proposed development. Sustainable travel modes are also promoted through the design of the development. With the application of these remedial measures, CO₂ impact as a result of the proposed development is predicted as being marginal, when compared to the existing environment. Within a national context, the impact on national CO₂ emissions for the construction phase are deemed to be imperceptible and short term and for the operational phase to be imperceptible and long term. It is highlighted that any new development will increase CO₂ emissions to the national and global environment but that as reduction measures have been implemented at design stage the increase has been kept to a reasonable minimum.

9.5.16. I have considered the appeal grounds and concerns raised by observers relating to the nature and extent of construction impacts arising from noise, dust, and traffic pollution. Undoubtedly, the construction of the proposed development is likely cause disruption to adjacent residences and users of the road network and services in the receiving area, however the construction phase will be temporary, and the proposed

development incorporates mitigation to limit the extent of the disturbance. Key mitigation measures include the implementation of the CDWMP, the Dust Management Plan, and finalised Construction Management Plan and Traffic Management Plan. I consider that the construction phase impacts (including traffic related) associated with the proposed development are within reasonable limits.

- 9.5.17. In summary, the EIAR finds that, subject to mitigation, predicted construction and operation phase impacts on air, noise, and climate are predominantly negligible and not significant in effect. I concur with the conclusions of the applicant. In line with the EPA Guidelines description of effects, I identify the predicted construction and operation phase activities to have imperceptible neutral effects whereby a change capable of measurement will be caused to the character of the environment but without significant consequences (particularly the case for temporary nature of the construction phase disturbances), and the change is within normal bounds of variation for same (typical of similarly scaled residential developments once constructed and operational).

Conclusion

- 9.5.18. In conclusion, I am satisfied that all likely significant negative effects on air (including noise) and climate would be avoided, mitigated, and managed due to measures designed into the project, from the implementation of mitigation measures, and through appropriate conditions in the event of a grant of permission. I conclude that the project would have likely imperceptible neutral effects in terms of air (including noise) and climate.

9.6. (d) Material Assets, Cultural Heritage, and the Landscape

- 9.6.1. Within the applicant's EIAR, this group of environmental categories is considered in Chapter 12 Built Environment Utilities and Waste, Chapter 13 Transport, (I identify the environmental category of material assets as including utilities, waste, and transport), Chapter 14 Archaeological and Cultural Heritage, and Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.

Material Assets: Utilities and Waste

- 9.6.2. Chapter 12 considers utilities and waste impacts associated with the proposed development. There are presently electricity, gas and telecommunications utilities

available to the site. During the construction phase, potential impacts due to disruptions in supply of these utilities for users in the locality are identified, which are considered to be neutral, slight and temporary impacts. The EIAR refers to the preliminary CDWMP which describes how waste generated from the site during construction, including demolition waste arising from the structures on site. Demolition waste will be managed and disposed of appropriately, with potential effects considered to be neutral, not significant and short term. During the operational phase and as a result of increased demand on the network, impact upon electricity is predicted to be slight and long term, impact on gas is predicted to be moderate and long term, and the impact on telecommunications is predicted to be neutral, imperceptible, and long term. In terms of waste, measures to manage waste on-site are outlined, with a management company identified to have responsibility for same, and collection intended to be through an appointed waste contractor. The potential effect of operational waste from the proposed development is expected to be long term, not significant, and negative. Mitigation measures identified for utilities and waste are centred on the implementation of the CDWMP during the construction phase, and a controlled approach to waste production through the implementation of an Operational Waste Management Plan at the operational phase.

- 9.6.3. I concur with the conclusions of the applicant. In line with the EPA Guidelines description of effects, I identify the predicted construction and operation phase activities to have imperceptible neutral effects whereby a change capable of measurement will be caused to the character of the environment but without significant consequences, and the change is within normal bounds of variation for same (typical of similarly scaled residential developments once constructed and operational).

Material Assets: Transport

- 9.6.4. Chapter 13 assesses traffic and transportation impacts associated with the proposed development. I note that the appeal grounds and observations include concern for and objection to the anticipated adverse impact on the road network, the adequacy of pedestrian and cycle infrastructure, increased traffic hazards, risk to public safety, and the capacity of the existing public transport network.

- 9.6.5. The EIAR addresses these issues in tandem with the potential impacts at construction and operation phases (including cumulatively). Potential impacts on traffic during the construction phase are described as exerting a moderate effect on the surrounding environment over a short term period, estimated between 1-3 years. Mitigation measures include the preparation of a finalised Construction Management Plan (CMP) and a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) by the appointed contractor, which will outline matters such as noise, dust and dirt control measures, vehicular haulage routes and construction traffic forecasts. Through the implementation of the CMP and TMP, construction phase traffic impacts on the road network are predicted as slight short term in effect.
- 9.6.6. In determining the operation phases impacts, the EIAR presents the overall transport impacts for the proposed development i.e., the three concurrent applications. The EIAR refers to the information (data, modelling, analysis) contained in the Traffic and Transport Assessment (TTA) submitted with each of the applications. The transport impact methodology calculates trip generations for the proposed development, shares likely trip distributions to the various routes, applies to existing traffic levels in the local road network (based on a traffic count survey of four junctions (locations on Fig.13.19) undertaken on 24th September 2022), and predicts future traffic growth (base year 2022, opening year 2026, full assessment year 2041). During the operational phase, Junction 1 (R107/ Back Road (with the proposed access road as the fourth arm of the upgraded signalised junction)) is shown to operate within capacity (i.e., restrained movements) during both peak hours for the opening year and future assessment year with the proposed development in place. Junctions 2, 3 and 4 are shown to operate well within capacity during both peak hours and are expected to continue to do so for the future assessed year 2041 with the project in place.
- 9.6.7. This modelling accounts for committed and potential future developments, with development on the Broomfield Masterplan lands to the east on Back Road incorporated. Overall, the EIAR concludes that in the operational phase, junctions will operate within satisfactory capacity for the future 2041 year with both the proposal and anticipated surrounding development in place, and the impact on the local road network is slight permanent in effect. The EIAR identifies that the implementation of the Travel Plan as a mitigation measure to lessen operation phase

impacts (increased information on alternatives to private car use, car sharing), increased connectivity from the site to public transport options, and improved pedestrian and cyclist facilities (paths, storage) will result in a positive effect on sustainable transport modes.

9.6.8. As part of the planning assessment, amendments were made at the FI response and/ or are recommended by condition which the EIAR has not included for (e.g., a reduction in dwelling numbers, Malahide Road junction redesign, provision of a childcare facility). However, I have considered and incorporated any likely associated effects into this EIA and am satisfied that anticipated traffic impacts will not be significant in and of themselves, imperceptible in effect, and come well within the scope of the overall impacts anticipated for the project.

9.6.9. In line with the EPA Guidelines description of effects, I identify the predicted construction phase activities to have imperceptible neutral effects whereby a change capable of measurement will be caused to the character of the environment but without significant consequences (due to the temporary nature of the disturbances), and the change is within normal bounds of variation for same. I consider the majority of the operation phase activities (capacity and functioning of Junctions 2, 3 and 4, demands on public transport, increased pedestrian and cyclist activity) to similarly have imperceptible neutral effects. I identify the operation phase impact on Junction 1 as being moderate neutral in effect as its character will be altered in a manner that is consistent with existing and emerging patterns of development (changed design, upgraded capacity and modified functioning as a four-arm junction) and the alteration is within normal bounds of variation for same (infrastructure upgrades typically required for similarly scaled residential developments).

Conclusion

9.6.10. In conclusion, I am satisfied that all likely significant negative effects on material assets including utilities, waste, and transport would be avoided, mitigated, and managed due to measures designed into the project, from the implementation of mitigation measures, and through appropriate conditions in the event of a grant of permission. I conclude that the project would have likely imperceptible neutral effects in terms of material assets (utilities, waste, majority of transport) and

moderate neutral effects in terms of material assets (transport, with regard to the capacity and operation of Junction 1).

Cultural Heritage: Archaeological Heritage

9.6.11. Chapter 14 considers Archaeology and Cultural Heritage. The prediction of the impacts on the archaeological heritage of site is informed by a Geophysical Survey Report and Archaeology & Cultural Heritage Report, both appended to Chapter 14 of the EIAR. There are no national monuments within or in the vicinity of the appeal site. Desk-based archaeological assessment, geophysical surveys, and archaeological test excavation were undertaken and did not reveal any features, finds or deposits of archaeological interest with the subject site boundary. As a result, archaeological potential is considered to be low. Nevertheless, the EIAR recommends remedial measures for monitoring during topsoil stripping to determine whether there are any archaeological features or deposits present, recording, and excavation under licence in the event of identification of archaeological remains. The EIAR concludes that the proposed development could have a slight negative permanent impact on any archaeological features present, as a result of groundworks. No operational impacts are predicted.

9.6.12. I concur with the applicant's conclusions, and in line with the EPA Guidelines description of effects, I identify the predicted construction phase activities to have imperceptible neutral effects whereby a change capable of measurement will be caused to the character of the environment but without significant consequences (as no known recorded monuments are at the site, nor any features identified at geophysical survey and test excavation, and monitoring of sub-surface groundworks should be required by condition), and the change is within normal bounds of variation for same.

Cultural Heritage: Architectural Heritage

9.6.13. The EIAR clarifies that Chapter 14 presents information on the archaeological heritage of the site, and that submitted separately with the application are several reports which address the architectural heritage of the site and provide analysis of the proposed development. In undertaking my EIA of the architectural heritage component of the environment, I identify three key components for the site and the project. These include the impact of the proposal on Auburn House and its

outbuildings and walled garden, on the setting and woodlands, and on the existing entrance and access road.

- 9.6.14. In respect of the house, outbuildings, and walled garden, I have had regard to the Architectural Heritage Report (with the Maintenance Strategy and Photographic Survey Record as appendices), Walled Garden Report and the Planning Stage: Structural Report. For the setting and woodlands are the Historical Landscape Report, Landscape Design Rationale, Arboricultural Report (inclusive of the Tree and Woodland Management Plan and the Arboricultural Method Statement with the Tree Protection Plan as appendices), CGIs and Verified Views to be read in conjunction with Chapter 11 and Chapter 14 of the EIAR. For the entrances and boundary treatment along Malahide Road are the Arboricultural Report, Conservation Impact Assessment of the Main Entrance Strategies Report, Development Access Assessment Report, and Entrance Options Verified Views to be read in conjunction with Chapter 11 of the EIAR. I highlight to the Board that while I have grouped the applicant's reports into these categories to undertake my assessment, there is often a degree of overlap between the three components and reports. I am satisfied that these reports allow an assessment of the proposed development on Auburn House, its curtilage, and attendant grounds to be undertaken in totality.
- 9.6.15. Of the preservation of Auburn House as a single residence, I confirm that no significant works are proposed to the structure. The main intervention for the house to function as a single residence served by the outbuildings relates to the new boundary treatment to enclose the house and its curtilage and to demarcate the property's private amenity space. I do not consider any adverse impact arising on the architectural heritage of the site from the boundary treatment (railing is a suitable distance from the buildings, is open, relatively low, discreet in colour, and is consistent with and complimentary to the character of the house and historic setting). The demarcation of the residence ensures an appropriate curtilage area (ample private amenity space provided, the historical relationship between the house and outbuildings is preserved, and the functional hierarchy between the structures is maintained) and involves a programme of woodlands felling and replanting to re-establish the woodland context and pathways, interventions to the estate's setting which I consider to be significant positive in effect.

9.6.16. The works to the walled garden include the preservation and restoration of the walls and two bastion towers, development of the garden for use as public open space, and creation of a new gateway entrance in the western wall to allow for pedestrian access to the garden. Notwithstanding the demolition of original wall fabric to create the entrance, I consider this to be a minimal intervention and acceptable in terms of architectural heritage when balanced with the garden's overall restoration and reuse as the dominant conservation works will enhance the historic quality of the garden. I note that the Architectural Heritage Report finds the character of the walled garden will be modestly altered and categorises the works (conservation of walls, corner towers, rejuvenated planting, and improved access for amenity use) as a positive impact in conservation terms. I concur with the applicant's conclusion and consider the impacts arising from the proposed restoration, landscaping, and intensified open space use to be significant positive in effect.

9.6.17. The project includes for new residential development within the setting of the Auburn House estate. To be able to assess the impact of the project, I identify three components of the setting which are of most character and heritage value. These include the eastern orientation of Auburn House and open front vista (view field/viewshed) towards Malahide Castle Demesne, the treelined avenue which restricts views of the house on approach until arrival, and the contemporaneous planted woodlands to the west of the house laid out in paths as 'pleasure gardens'. Development in these three areas include the courtyard clusters and rows of dwellings to the east/northeast of Auburn House, apartment blocks (Apartment Blocks 4 and 5) and rows of dwellings to the east of the treelined avenue, and of note to the west of the house's woodlands setting are apartment blocks (Apartment Blocks 2 and 3). Due to the siting of the built forms (fitted into existing field patterns, orientated along hedge rows and tree lines, adequate separation distances from Auburn House and woodlands, outside of key views to and from Auburn House), the scale, massing and height of the proposed buildings (modest principal dimensions, acceptable range of building heights), and the appropriate design (subtle architectural features and external finishes, targeted tree planting and screening), I consider that the impact of the new buildings within the setting of Auburn House to be acceptable in terms of impact on architectural heritage, exerting a moderate neutral effect.

9.6.18. The new access arrangements from Malahide Road (R107) include the creation of new entrance and access road, and the maintenance of the existing entrance for pedestrian, cyclist and restricted vehicular use. The proposed main entrance, located c.20m south of the existing entrance, is planned as the fourth arm of an upgraded signalised junction (of the 'T' junction between Malahide Road and Back Road), which includes new signage and road markings. The access arrangement results in the removal of c.15 trees, most associated with the internal road and not at the roadside boundary. The applicant's Conservation Impact Assessment of the Main Entrances report finds the proposed arrangement to be the most appropriate due to it having a modest impact on the setting of the property and mitigating against adverse conservation impacts. The Architectural Heritage Report states the new entrance is understated, avoids any conflict with the existing entrance in terms of form, colour or materials so that the existing entrance retains visual primacy, and is likely to have the least conservation impact. I concur with the applicant's conclusion and positively note aspects of the project which have had regard to the sensitivities of the site's boundary along this section of the Malahide Road (architectural heritage, arboricultural, visual amenity sensitivity). These include the setback of proposed dwellings c.43m-57m from the roadside boundary, restrained building heights closest to the road, and preservation of the majority of treeline and tree groupings including those adjacent to the roadside boundary. I consider that impacts arising from the proposed access arrangements and boundary treatments to be significant neutral in effect.

9.6.19. As part of the planning assessment, amendments were made at the FI response and/ or are recommended by condition which the EIAR has not included for (e.g., a reduction in dwelling numbers, changes to the designs of courtyard cluster dwelling, duplex blocks and apartment blocks, R107 junction redesign, amendments to the walled garden gate). However, I have considered and incorporated any likely associated effects into this EIA and am satisfied that anticipated architectural heritage impacts will not be significant in and of themselves, imperceptible in effect, and come well within the scope of the overall impacts anticipated for the project.

9.6.20. In line with the EPA Guidelines description of effects, when assessed in totality the impact of the project on Auburn House and its attendant grounds is certainly significant in effect. However, unlike the appeal grounds and observations, I find that

the impacts as outlined above are predominantly positive in nature. Overall, I find the impacts are significant positive in effect as the architectural heritage of the site, which is a sensitive aspect of the environment will be altered, and the change improves the quality of the environment.

Conclusion

9.6.21. In conclusion, I am satisfied that all likely significant negative effects on cultural heritage including archaeological and architectural heritage would be avoided, mitigated, and managed due to measures designed into the project, from the implementation of mitigation measures, and through appropriate conditions in the event of a grant of permission. I conclude that the project would have likely imperceptible neutral effects in terms of archaeological heritage, and significant positive effects in terms of architectural heritage.

Landscape

9.6.22. Chapter 11 assesses the Landscape and Visual Impact. The EIAR outlines the landscape design rationale for the project has been based on retaining as many of the trees and as much of hedgerows within the site as possible, and maintaining the existing field patterns and field boundaries. The EIAR identifies impacts in three key components relevant to this environmental category: existing trees and hedgerows, landscape character, and views.

9.6.23. Of the existing trees and hedgerows, reference is made to the separate Arboricultural Report which includes surveys of trees and hedgerows at the site. The arboricultural value of the site is referred to in the EIAR with 1,344 individual items i.e. trees or tree groupings being identified. Contemporaneous to Auburn House include the woodland adjacent to the north, west and south of the house, and the tree belt along the front boundary with the R107. Reasons given for the removal of trees and hedgerows is due to facilitating the development, need to fill and remodel ground levels, and to the poor condition and quality of the trees. The proposal involves the removal of 310 trees (note: that figure may include a degree of double counting between the applications). The majority of the trees being removed are of category U value (165 of the 310). Of the impacts on existing trees and hedgerows, these are identified as slight/ moderate negative during the construction phase, with initial mitigation measures (establishment of trees and supplementary hedge

planting) reducing to slight negative effect, and with further mitigation (e.g. Tree and Woodland Management Plan) reducing to not significant negative during the operation phase.

- 9.6.24. The character of the site is distinctive with high arboricultural and architectural heritage value. The project alters the character of the site from recreational/ agricultural to one of more intensive residential. The EIAR identifies the impact on character as being significant negative (from within the site)/ slight negative (from outside) during the construction phase and with application of mitigation reduces to moderate negative (from within)/ slight negative (from outside) during the operation phase. I concur with the applicant's position that the project will change the landscape character of the site, though I positively note certain design elements including the maintenance of the eastern vista free of development, the visual framing and streetscape creation along the internal approach roads, the use of the courtyard cluster typology and scale of buildings' heights. I consider that the landscape character will continue to be visually interpreted as a historic setting under modern adaptation.
- 9.6.25. Views into the site from the surrounding area and public road network are described as limited due to the concealed nature of the house and its setting. The visual impact assessment in the EIAR is based on analysis of 59 viewpoints of the site from short range and long range locations. For these viewpoints, photomontages or verified views (VVs) have been generated of the existing and proposed views. The EIAR provides analysis of the views, with a description of the proposed change in the viewpoint arising from the proposal and an evaluation of the type of effect at both the construction and operation phases. There is expectedly, a broad range of effects identified in the visual analysis varying in significance and quality of effect. The evaluation incorporates the mitigation measures (includes for further maturing of existing screening, new planting, additional landscaping and boundary treatments).
- 9.6.26. I consider the visual impact assessment to be sufficiently broad and representative of the likely locations from which views would be available and encountered. I concur with the applicant's analysis of the long range views (which predominantly finds that impacts are not significant), whereby the site is well concealed and not overtly visible from publicly accessible viewpoints. Views from within the site and from adjacent properties are more vulnerable and some likely to be more

significantly affected. Mitigation measures to address predicted impacts centre on the landscape strategy to be implemented. The strategy involves the retention of trees and hedgerows, pruning and supplementary planting where possible, implementation of the measures in the Arboricultural Report (i.e., Arboricultural Method Statement with Tree Protection Plan during the construction phase, the Tree and Woodland Management Plan during the operation phase), coupled with a landscaping programme with a planting schedule for open spaces within the proposed development.

9.6.27. I have considered the project's impact on the landscape (i.e., three key components existing trees and hedgerows, landscape character, and views) through the project cycle from construction to operation phase. When assessed in totality, due to the extent of alteration, the impact of the project on the landscape of the site is certainly significant in effect for both phases. In line with the EPA Guidelines description of effects, I identify the impact arising from the project to be significant negative in effect at construction phase as a sensitive aspect of the environment will be altered, and the change reduces the quality of this aspect of the environment. I consider that the impact will improve in quality of effect to significant neutral (once construction is completed and the landscaping strategy implemented) as the alteration becomes within normal bounds of variation (appropriate design of the project, incorporates and includes for range of mitigation measures, would be typical of residential schemes in similarly sensitive landscape and historic settings). Once the project is operational, I anticipate the impact will improve to significant positive in effect as the impacts improve the quality of landscape (e.g., through tree retention, protection, and supplementation, historic structure restoration, conservation, and rejuvenation, and new buildings establishing a high quality built environment and contributing to a distinct sense of identity in the area).

9.7. Interaction between the factors referred to in points (a) to (d)

9.7.1. Chapter 15 of the EIAR considers the Interactions between the environmental categories listed above. The interactions are presented in tabular format, with identification of the interactions which are predicted as being significant in effect. The EIAR concludes that the project will have no significant negative impact when the respective range of mitigation measures are incorporated (these are listed in Chapter 16 of the EIAR).

9.7.2. I have considered the interrelationships between factors and whether these might on the whole affect the environment, even though the effects may be acceptable on an individual basis. Having considered the incorporation and/ or implementation of the range of mitigation measures, I do not identify any residual risk of significant negative interaction between the environmental categories requiring further specific mitigation measures.

9.8. **Cumulative Impacts**

9.8.1. The appeal grounds include that the cumulative impacts have not been satisfactorily identified in the EIAR to allow an adequate and accurate assessment of the project. The development of the application site is planned for as the lands zoned for new residential development, the site is included within the development boundary of Malahide, a Self-Sustaining Town, identified for continued growth within the lifetime of the 2023 CDP. The development of the site would occur in tandem with the development of other sites that are zoned in the area. Such development would be unlikely to differ from that envisaged under the 2023 CDP which has been subject to Strategic Environment Assessment. A number of developments in the surrounding area have been specifically identified as being considered in the EIAR, for example recent planning applications (Chapter 5 Biodiversity), the Clairville Lodge housing estate (Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual Impact), the Broomfield Masterplan lands (Chapter 13 Transport). In this regard, I consider that the EIAR has adequately considered cumulative impacts where relevant.

9.8.2. The intended residential use with ancillary facilities (recommended childcare facility) are permitted in principle within the applicable RA zoning objective and vision for the site. The proposed development complies within the provisions of the 2023 CDP and/ or national planning guidance. It is therefore concluded that the culmination of effects from the planned, proposed, or permitted development would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the environment other than those that have been described in the EIAR and considered in this EIA.

9.9. **Reasoned Conclusion on the Significant Effects**

9.9.1. The Board considered that the EIAR, supported by the supplementary documentation submitted with the application and appeal, provided information which is reasonable and sufficient to allow the Board to reach a reasoned conclusion

on the significant effects of the proposed development on the environment, having considered current knowledge and methods of assessment.

- 9.9.2. As such, having regard to the examination of environmental information outlined above, to the submissions received on the application from observers and prescribed bodies, the decision of the planning authority, the appeal grounds, and observations and responses on same, it is considered that the main likely significant effects of the proposed development on the environment are as follows:

Population and Human Health – moderate to significant positive effects arising from the provision of new residential units, increased population and community creation, additional local facilities and services (a childcare facility and open spaces) and increased economic activity.

Biodiversity – moderate to significant positive effects arising from the implementation of the Arboricultural Report (inclusive of a Tree Protection Plan and a Tree and Woodland Management Plan), landscaping strategy, bat protection measures, and surface water management measures to prevent pollution of local watercourses and protect nature designations.

Architectural Heritage – significant positive effects arising from implementation of the Architectural Heritage Report (inclusive of a conservation methodology and Maintenance Strategy for Auburn House and its attendant grounds), the Walled Garden Report (inclusive of methodologies for repair and construction works), the Arboricultural Report (inclusive of a Tree Protection Plan and a Tree and Woodland Management Plan), and the Planning Stage: Structural Report (inclusive of a construction methodology for works in proximity to sensitive structures).

Landscape – significant negative effects arising from construction phase activities, improving to significant neutral to positive effects arising from the implementation of the Landscape Design Rationale (inclusive of a landscaping strategy), the Arboricultural Report (inclusive of a Tree Protection Plan and a Tree and Woodland Management Plan), and from enhancements of the visual amenity of the site through appropriately sited, designed, scaled, and finished new buildings.

- 9.9.3. In conclusion, I consider that the likely significant environmental effects arising as a consequence of the project have been satisfactorily identified, described, and assessed in this EIA. I consider that the information contained in the EIAR is

sufficiently up to date, complies with the provisions of EU Directive 2014/52/EU amending Directive 2011/92/EU, and is compliant with the requirements of Article 94 of the 2001 Regulations.

10.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission be GRANTED for the following reasons and considerations, and subject to the conditions set out below.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the 'RA' Residential Area zoning of the site in the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029, the national, regional and local policy objectives which seek to increase housing supply and deliver compact urban growth at appropriate locations, the nature, scale and height of the development, and the pattern of existing and permitted development in the vicinity of the site, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would appropriately intensify the residential use at the site, constitute an acceptable quantum and density of residential development, would respect the existing character and architectural heritage of the site, would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of property in the vicinity, would not be prejudicial to public health, would not cause serious injury to biodiversity and the natural environment, would not cause serious pollution in respect of air, water, noise, vibration or disposal of waste, and would be acceptable in terms of pedestrian and traffic safety and convenience. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 Conditions

1.	The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further information plans and particulars submitted to the planning authority on the 3 rd day of February 2023, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions
----	---

	<p>require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>a) Permission is hereby granted for 95 residential units, comprising 52 houses, 35 apartments, and 8 duplexes.</p> <p>b) Permission for same shall be implemented in accordance with the site layout plan (and other plans and particulars) submitted to the planning authority as further information on the 3rd day of February 2023 (inclusive of Option 1 on Dwg No.1902PLA156 for southern elevations of House No.s 1-11 on Road 1.5).</p> <p>c) Except as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Apartment No.s 4-03 and 4-04 shall be omitted from the ground floor level of Apartment Block 4 and the released floor area repurposed for use as a childcare facility. ii. Prior to the commencement of development, plans and particulars of the childcare facility (including number of children catered for, staff numbers, set down area, car and cycle parking spaces, outdoor area, hours of operation, signage, external finishes) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority. In default of agreement the matter(s) in dispute shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination. <p>d) Auburn House, stable buildings and courtyard shall be jointly occupied as a single residential unit. The house, stable buildings and courtyard shall not be used, sold, let, or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the overall residential unit. The curtilage of the overall residential unit, including private amenity space, shall not be subdivided.</p>

	Reason: In the interests of clarity and residential amenity.
3.	<p>a) This development shall be carried out in a phased manner as part of the coordinated development of lands under the applicant's control (total lands as indicated on Dwg No. 1902PS035 (Scale 1:2500)) unless otherwise stated in Condition 3(b) below, or if agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p> <p>b) Phase 1 shall comprise the development hereby permitted under ABP 316498-23, PA. Ref F22A/0580. Measures included in/ works relating to the following shall be implemented in the first instance (as necessary applicable to lands under the applicant's control):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Architectural Heritage Report and Report on Condition, Repair and Alterations for Walled Garden and Corner Bastions. ii. Arboricultural Report. iii. Wastewater infrastructure. iv. Main entrance, access road, and road works at Malahide Road (R107) and Back Road. <p>c) Phase 2 shall comprise the development permitted under ABP 316504-23, PA. Ref F22A/0581, save for any components implemented under Condition 3(b) above.</p> <p>d) Phase 3 shall comprise the development permitted under the permission ABP 316444-23, PA Ref. F22A/0579, save for any components implemented under Condition 3(b) above.</p> <p>e) The occupation of residential units within each phase shall be restricted until the communal and public open space to serve the phase, and the childcare facility (applicable for Phase 1) have been developed, are operational and available for use, to the satisfaction of the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the protection of Auburn House and its setting, and the timely provision of amenities and infrastructure for future residents.</p>

4.	<p>Mitigation and monitoring measures outlined in the plans and particulars, including the Environmental Impact Assessment Report, as set out in Chapter 16 ‘Summary of Mitigation Measures’ and in the Natura Impact Statement, as set out in ‘Step 4: Mitigation’, submitted with this application, shall be carried out in full, except where otherwise required by conditions attached to this permission. The developer shall appoint a person with appropriate ecological and construction expertise as an environmental manager to ensure that the mitigation measures identified in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report and the Natura Impact Statement are implemented in full.</p> <p>Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit a comprehensive list of mitigation measures and a corresponding timeline/ schedule for implementation of same to the planning authority for its written agreement.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of protecting the environment, public health, and clarity.</p>
5.	<p>Mitigation and monitoring measures outlined in the plans and particulars, including the Architectural Heritage Report (inclusive of the Protection Plan/ Maintenance Strategy), the Report on Condition, Repair and Alterations for Walled Garden and Corner Bastions at Auburn House, the Planning Stage: Structural Report and the Arboricultural Report (inclusive of the Tree and Woodland Management Plan and the Arboricultural Method Statement with the Tree Protection Plan) submitted with this application shall be carried out in full, except where otherwise required by conditions attached to this permission.</p> <p>Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit a comprehensive list of mitigation measures and a corresponding timeline/ schedule for implementation of same to the planning authority for its written agreement.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the architectural and arboricultural heritage of the site.</p>

6.	<p>Proposals for a development name and numbering scheme, and associated advertisements/ marketing signage (including the location of signage along the site boundary with Malahide Road/ R107, if any), shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. The proposed name and numbering scheme shall be based on the site's historic association with Auburn House and/ or the townlands of Auburn and Streamstown, or other alternatives acceptable to the planning authority. Thereafter, all such names and numbering shall be provided in accordance with the agreed scheme.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of urban legibility and to ensure the use of locally appropriate place names for new residential areas.</p>
7.	<p>a) Details of the materials, colours, and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed buildings (subject to Condition 7(b) below), the front and rear boundary walls/ screening/ planting to residences, and to the site boundaries, shall be as submitted with the application, unless otherwise agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. In default of agreement the matter(s) in dispute shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.</p> <p>b) Details of the materials, colours, and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed dwellings within the northern and southern courtyard clusters and all boundary treatments shall be agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development. In default of agreement the matter(s) in dispute shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and safeguarding the architectural heritage of the site.</p>
8.	<p>No additional development shall take place above roof parapet level on Apartment Block 1 including lift motor enclosures, air handling equipment, storage tanks, ducts or other external plant, telecommunication aerials,</p>

	<p>antennas, or equipment, unless authorised by a further grant of planning permission.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the residential amenities of property in the vicinity and the visual amenities of the area.</p>
9.	<p>Public lighting shall be provided in accordance with a scheme, which shall include lighting along pedestrian routes through open spaces. The design of the lighting scheme shall be approved of by a suitably qualified bat specialist. The details of the lighting scheme, including written evidence indicating approval by the bat specialist, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development/ installation of lighting. The agreed lighting system shall be fully implemented and operational before the proposed development is made available for occupation.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of amenity and public safety, and wildlife protection.</p>
10.	<p>All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground. Ducting shall be provided by the developer to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.</p>
11.	<p>All links/ connections to adjoining lands (within and outside the developer's control) shall be provided up to the site boundary to facilitate future connections subject to the appropriate consents.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of permeability and safety.</p>
12.	<p>The final details (design, layout, finishes, road markings, signage) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Signalised junction on Malahide Road (R107) and Back Road b) Materials and finishes of main entrance and junctions.

	<p>c) Completion and certification of the road safety audit(s) as deemed necessary by and to the satisfaction of the planning authority</p> <p>These shall be in accordance with the detailed construction standards of the planning authority for such works, and design standards outlined in DMURS, and the National Cycle Manual issued by the National Transport Authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of amenity, traffic and pedestrian safety, and sustainable transportation.</p>
13.	<p>The internal road network serving the proposed development, including carriageway widths, corner radii, turning bays, junctions, parking areas, footpaths and kerbs, and cycle lanes shall be in accordance with the detailed construction standards of the planning authority for such works and design standards outlined in the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets and the National Cycle Manual issued by the National Transport Authority. Pedestrian crossing facilities shall be provided in suitable locations to be agreed with the planning authority. In default of agreement the matter(s) in dispute shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of sustainable transportation.</p>
14.	<p>a) Prior to the occupation of the development, a Parking Management Plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority. The plan shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. identify the total number of car parking spaces to be assigned permanently and solely for the residential units and for the childcare facility. ii. shall indicate how these and other spaces (e.g., visitor) within the development shall be assigned, segregated by user, and continually managed. <p>b) Prior to the occupation of the development, a Mobility Management Plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority. This shall provide for incentives to encourage the use of</p>

	<p>public transport, cycling, walking, and carpooling by residents/ visitors/ staff, and to reduce and regulate the extent of parking. The plan shall be prepared and implemented by the management company for all units within the development.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that adequate parking facilities are permanently available to serve the proposed residential units and childcare facility, and encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport.</p>
15.	<p>a) A minimum of 10% of all car parking spaces shall be provided with functioning electric vehicle charging stations/ points, and ducting shall be provided for all remaining car parking spaces, facilitating the installation of electric vehicle charging points/ stations at a later date. Where proposals relating to the installation of electric vehicle ducting and charging stations/ points have not been submitted with the application, in accordance with the above noted requirements, such proposals shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the occupation of the development.</p> <p>b) Electric charging facilities shall be provided for motorcycle and/ or bicycle parking, and proposals shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the occupation of the development.</p> <p>Reason: To provide for and/ or future proof the development such as would facilitate the use of electric vehicles.</p>
16.	<p>Prior to commencement of development, proposals for cycle parking and storage shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority. The proposals shall accord in quantity and design with the requirements of SPPR 4, Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2024.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that adequate bicycle parking provision is available to serve the proposed development, in the interest of sustainable transportation.</p>

17.	<p>a) The management and maintenance of the development following its completion shall be the responsibility of a legally constituted management company, or by the local authority in the event of the development being taken in charge.</p> <p>b) The communal open spaces, hard and soft landscaping, car and cycle parking areas, access ways, refuse/ bin storage, and all areas not intended to be taken in charge by the local authority, shall be maintained by a legally constituted management company.</p> <p>c) Details of the management company contract, and drawings/ particulars describing the parts of the development for which the company would have responsibility, shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority before any of the residential units are made available for occupation.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the satisfactory completion and provide for the satisfactory future maintenance of this development in the interest of residential amenity.</p>
18.	<p>a) The areas of communal and public open space in the development shall be reserved for such use, levelled, contoured, soiled, seeded, and landscaped (hard and soft) in accordance with the Landscape Design Rationale and associated landscape plans, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p> <p>b) Final design, finishes, methods of construction and/ or installation of footpaths, cycle paths, crossing points over ditches/ watercourses/ SuDS features, and equipment in play areas shall be submitted to the planning authority for its written agreement.</p> <p>c) The landscaping work shall be undertaken in accordance with the phasing requirements stipulated in Condition 3b) and shall be completed prior to any residential units being made available for occupation unless otherwise agreed with the planning authority.</p> <p>d) A schedule of landscape maintenance shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to occupation of</p>

	<p>the development. This schedule shall cover a period of at least three years and shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation.</p> <p>e) The areas of communal and public open space shall be reserved and maintained as such by the developer until taken in charge by the management company or by the local authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of nature conservation, residential amenity, and to ensure the satisfactory development of the open space areas and their continued use for this purpose.</p>
19.	<p>a) The developer shall engage the services of a qualified arborist as an arboricultural consultant for the entire period of works.</p> <p>b) The arboricultural consultant shall ensure the implementation of all recommendations in respect of tree removal, retention, protection, pruning, and other measures included in the Arboricultural Report, tree plans and particulars.</p> <p>c) Any tree felling, surgery and remedial works shall be undertaken in accordance with applicable BS standards or equivalent standards, supervised by and to the satisfaction of the arboricultural consultant.</p> <p>d) The developer shall facilitate the work of the arboricultural consultant in implementing the measures in the Arboricultural Report and bear the costs of same.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of arboricultural and environmental protection.</p>
20.	<p>a) The developer shall engage a suitably qualified archaeologist to monitor (licensed under the National Monuments Acts) all site clearance works, topsoil stripping, and groundworks associated with the development.</p> <p>b) The use of appropriate machinery to ensure the preservation and recording of any surviving archaeological remains shall be necessary. Should archaeological remains be identified during the course of archaeological monitoring, all works shall cease in the</p>

	<p>area of archaeological interest pending a decision of the planning authority, in consultation with the National Monuments Service, regarding appropriate mitigation (i.e., preservation in-situ and/ or excavation). The developer shall facilitate the archaeologist in recording any remains identified.</p> <p>c) Any further archaeological mitigation requirements specified by the planning authority, following consultation with the National Monuments Service, shall be complied with by the developer.</p> <p>d) Following the completion of all archaeological work on site and any necessary post-excavation specialist analysis, the planning authority and the National Monuments Service shall be furnished with a final archaeological report describing the results of the monitoring and any subsequent required archaeological investigative work/excavation required. All resulting and associated archaeological costs shall be borne by the developer.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the continued preservation (either in situ or by record) of places, caves, sites, features or other objects of archaeological interest.</p>
21.	<p>The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Environmental Management Plan, which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including:</p> <p>a) Location of the site and materials compound(s) including area(s) identified for the storage of construction refuse.</p> <p>b) Location of areas for construction site offices and staff facilities.</p> <p>c) Details of site security fencing and hoardings.</p> <p>d) Details of on-site car parking facilities for site workers during the course of construction.</p>

	<p>e) Details of the timing and routing of construction traffic to and from the construction site and associated directional signage, to include proposals to facilitate the delivery of abnormal loads to the site.</p> <p>f) Measures to obviate queuing of construction traffic on the adjoining road network.</p> <p>g) Measures to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble or other debris on the public road network.</p> <p>h) Alternative arrangements to be put in place for pedestrians and vehicles in the case of the closure of any public road or footpath during the course of site development works.</p> <p>i) Details of appropriate mitigation measures for noise, dust and vibration, and monitoring of such levels.</p> <p>j) Containment of all construction-related fuel and oil within specially constructed bunds to ensure that fuel spillages are fully contained. Such bunds shall be roofed to exclude rainwater.</p> <p>k) Off-site disposal of construction/ demolition waste and details of how it is proposed to manage excavated soil.</p> <p>l) Means to ensure that surface water run-off is controlled such that no silt or other pollutants enter local surface water sewers or drains.</p> <p>m) A record of daily checks that the works are being undertaken in accordance with the Construction Environmental Management Plan shall be kept for inspection by the Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of environmental protection, residential amenities, public health and safety.</p>
22.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Saturdays inclusive, and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p>

	<p>Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>
23.	<p>Prior to the commencement of development, a Resource Waste Management Plan (RWMP) as set out in the EPA's Best Practice Guidelines for the Preparation of Resource and Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects (2021) shall be prepared and submitted to the planning authority for written agreement. The RWMP shall include specific proposals as to how the RWMP will be measured and monitored for effectiveness. All records (including for waste and all resources) pursuant to the agreed RWMP shall be made available for inspection at the site office at all times.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of proper planning and sustainable development. .</p>
24.	<p>a) An Operational Waste Management Plan containing details for the management of waste within the development, including the provision of facilities for the storage, separation, and collection of the waste and for the ongoing operation of these facilities for each residential unit shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority not later than 6 months from the date of commencement of the development. Thereafter, the waste shall be managed in accordance with the agreed plan.</p> <p>b) This plan shall provide for screened communal bin stores for the apartment and duplex blocks, the locations, and designs of which shall be as indicated in the plans and particulars lodged within the application unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p> <p>c) This plan shall provide for screened bin stores, which shall accommodate not less than three standard sized wheeled bins within the curtilage of each house plot.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of residential amenity, and to ensure the provision of adequate refuse storage.</p>

25.	<p>Drainage arrangements including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and surface water management.</p>
26.	<p>a) The developer shall enter into water and/ or wastewater connection agreement(s) with Uisce Eireann, prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>b) If any proposals by the developer to build over/ near or divert existing water or wastewater services subsequently occurs, the developer shall submit details to Uisce Eireann for assessment of feasibility and have written confirmation of feasibility of diversion(s) received from Uisce Eireann prior to connection agreement.</p> <p>c) All development shall be carried out in compliance with Uisce Eireann Standards codes and practices.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health.</p>
27.	<p>All residential units to be provided with noise insulation to an appropriate standard, having regard to the location of the site within Noise Zone C for Dublin Airport.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure compliance with Objective DAO11 of Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029, and to protect residential amenity.</p>
28.	<p>Prior to commencement of development, a proposal for the provision of a piece of public art at a location within lands under the applicant's control (as indicated on Dwg No. 1902PS035 (Scale 1:2500)) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure compliance with Objective DMSO194 of Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029, and to contribute to the cultural identify and visual amenities of the area.</p>
29.	<p>Prior to commencement of development, the applicant or other person with an interest in the land to which the application relates shall enter into an agreement in writing with the planning authority in relation to the provision</p>

	<p>of housing in accordance with the requirements of section 94(4) and section 96(2) and (3) (Part V) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, unless an exemption certificate shall have been applied for and been granted under section 97 of the Act, as amended. Where such an agreement is not reached within eight weeks from the date of this order, the matter in dispute (other than a matter to which section 96(7) applies) may be referred by the planning authority or any other prospective party to the agreement to An Bord Pleanála for determination.</p> <p>Reason: To comply with the requirements of Part V of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and of the housing strategy in the development plan of the area.</p>
30.	<p>All of the permitted house or duplex units in the development, when completed, shall be first occupied as a place of residence by individual purchasers who are not a corporate entity and/ or by persons who are eligible for the occupation of social or affordable housing, including cost rental housing. Prior to commencement of development, the applicant, or any person with an interest in the land shall enter into a written agreement with the planning authority under section 47 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 as amended, to this effect. Such an agreement must specify the number and location of each house or duplex unit.</p> <p>Reason: To restrict new housing development to use by persons of a particular class or description in order to ensure an adequate choice and supply of housing, including affordable housing, in the common good.</p>
31.	<p>Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company, or such other security as may be acceptable to the planning authority to secure the tree removal, retention, protection, pruning, and other measures included in the Arboricultural Report as required by Condition 19, coupled with an agreement empowering the planning authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory implementation of said measures. This security shall remain in place until the requirements of part (a) above are completed to the satisfaction of the planning authority and for a further</p>

	<p>period of 10 years following completion of said landscaping works, or as otherwise agreed by the planning authority.</p> <p>In default of agreement on (a) and/ or (b), the matter(s) shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the satisfactory implementation of the requirements of Condition 19 in relation to tree preservation, protection, and replanting measures.</p>
32.	<p>Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company, or other security to secure the provision and satisfactory completion and maintenance until/ in the event of being taken in charge by the local authority of roads, footpaths, watermains, drains, public open space and other services required in connection with the development, coupled with an agreement empowering the local authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory completion or maintenance of any part of the development.</p> <p>The form and amount of the security shall be as agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of agreement, shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the satisfactory completion and maintenance of the development until/ in the event of being taken in charge.</p>
33.	<p>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</p>

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.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Phillippa Joyce

Senior Planning Inspector

4th March 2024