



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-320119-24

Development	Demolition of buildings and construction of six-storey, 85 bedroom tourist hostel, together with all associated services and site works.
Location	49-51 Pleasants Street, Pleasants House & 5 Pleasants Lane, Dublin 8
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council South
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	3560/24
Applicant(s)	Red Rock Pleasants Street Ltd.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse.
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Red Rock Pleasants Street Ltd.
Observer(s)	Grantham Street Residents Association. West of Camden Residents Association.

Date of Site Inspection

28th May 2025.

Inspector

Terence McLellan

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site is located on the northern side of Pleasants Street, measures approximately 0.0745 ha in area, and is generally rectangular in shape, with the east and west boundaries delineated by Pleasants Lane and O'Neills Buildings respectively. The site is currently occupied by various buildings. On the main Pleasants Street frontage there is a two storey terrace of three commercial properties (Nos. 49-51) that were previously occupied by café/restaurant uses but currently appear to be vacant with the upper floors appearing to be in residential use. To the rear of these units, positioned centrally within the site, is a three storey office building/stationary store and courier business, with access onto both adjacent laneways. The rearmost building, No. 5 Pleasants Lane, is a two storey vacant building formerly in use as a dwelling. There is a small car parking area on the south-western corner of the site immediately adjacent to No. 51 Pleasants Street and a further small parking area just off Pleasants Lane to the front of the three storey office building.
- 1.2. The surrounding area is mixed use in nature and features a mix of residential, commercial, and community uses, with commercial being the predominant use to the east around Camden Street and residential being the predominant use to the west. The subject site is located at the point of transition between commercial and residential. Heights are varied between two, three and four storeys. To the north east the site abuts the Camden Hotel which is a Protected Structure, and to the north west it is bounded by a single storey shed and yard associated with Elliots Cash and Carry which has a secondary access point off O'Neills Buildings. To the east, on the opposite side of Pleasants Lane, are the Camden Hotel and a number of rear yards of buildings fronting Camden Street, Pleasants Lane, and Pleasants Street. The buildings to the east of the subject site fronting Camden Street fall within the Camden Street Conservation Area.
- 1.3. The site is bounded to the west by a small laneway known as O'Neills Buildings and the part three/part four storey Olympic House. This building appears to be in office use on its street facing frontages although there are residential units to the rearmost section on O'Neills Buildings. To the south of the subject site on the opposite side of Pleasants Street are residential uses with some commercial on the corner of pleasants

Street/Camden Street and a shared workspace facility on the corner of Pleasants Street and Pleasants Place.

- 1.4. The narrow lane of Pleasants Place is directly opposite the site. The west side of this lane is residential and whilst there appears to be some residential on the east side, the character is predominantly made up of access points to the rear yards/ground floor of the buildings on Camden Street. Further to the west of the site is a residential conservation area which generally consists of low rise (two-storey or single storey over basement) houses, many of which are Protected Structures, at Pleasant Street, Heytesbury Street and Synge Street.
- 1.5. The site is well located for public transport, being served by Dublin Bus Routes No. 9, 14, 15, 15A, 15B, 15D, 16, 65, 65B, 68, 68A, 83, 83A, 122, 140 and 142. Harcourt Luas stop on the Luas Green Line is approximately 450 metres to the south-east).

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide a six storey (over basement) tourist hostel incorporating a reception area with ancillary café/bar/restaurant/co-working use and kitchen/group dining space at ground floor level, other ancillary amenities including a cinema, guest laundry room, plant rooms, storage rooms and staff facilities at basement level, guest gym at first floor level, and the provision of 85 guest rooms across the upper five floors providing 553 bedspaces. The development would include secure cycle parking storage (20 spaces), refuse storage, switch room, ESB substation, green/blue roof/PV panels at roof level and all associated works. Access would be provided from Pleasants Street.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. Notification of the Decision to Refuse Permission was issued by Dublin City Council on 11th June 2024 for the following reason:

Having regard to the location of the site in a transitional zone between Camden Street to the east and the predominantly residential area to the west of the site, which is a residential conservation area, the Planning authority considers that the applicant has not demonstrated that the proposed development which can accommodate over 500 bedspaces, would not result in an overconcentration of tourist accommodation in the immediate area, which would result in an unacceptable intensification of activity, including night time activity, in the adjoining residential area which would be seriously injurious to the residential amenities of the area and would fail to provide an appropriate transition in use between the two areas. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the provisions of the current Dublin City Development Plan (2022-2028) including Policy CEE28 and Section 14.6.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. The Planner's Report contains the following points of note:

- The site is not situated in a key urban village.
- A tourist hostel is permitted in principle by the Z4 zoning objective.
- The site is not in a conservation area but is situated c.25m west of a red hatched conservation area along Camden Street and 45m east of an existing Z2-zoned residential conservation area which includes areas of Pleasants Street, Heytesbury Street and Synge Street, and is also adjacent to protected structures on these streets.
- Whilst having some streetscape value as remnants of the earlier urban village typology, the existing buildings are not of any particular architectural significance and the principle of demolition has been established by previous permissions granted by the Planning Authority and the Board (Ref. 3457/22, ABP-314353).
- The site is situated between Camden Street and a residential area. There are concerns that proposal would increase night-time activity including noise and disturbance in a transitional location adjoining a primarily residential area and would result in an unacceptable intensification of activity.

- Plot ratio is in excess of CDP standards and the proposed use does not represent a compelling case for the proposed plot ratio.
- The existing permission is noted. The proposal would exceed the permitted height by c.1m but the scheme is set-back behind the streetscape on Pleasants Street and would not be overly visible from the surrounding residential area. The proposal is not considered to have a significant additional visual impact when compared to the previous permission.
- The building on the western side of O'Neill's Lane includes residential uses and, in the event of permission being considered, details of measures mitigate overlooking of windows in this building would be required.
- Z4 zoning provides for mixed use including residential and a mixed-use development incorporating long term residential use would be more appropriate on this site.
- The kitchen and dining space available to guests appears substandard for a hostel development of this size. In the event of permission being considered, the kitchen/dining space would need to be increased, and the role of the proposed bar/restaurant/reception space would also need to be clarified.

3.3. Other Technical Reports

- 3.3.1. **Air Quality, Monitoring, and Noise Control unit (23.05.24):** No objection, subject to conditions.
- 3.3.2. **Archaeology (30.05.24):** Recommend conditions.
- 3.3.3. **Drainage Division (11.06.24):** Recommend conditions.
- 3.3.4. **Transportation Planning Division (29.05.24):** No objection, subject to conditions.

3.4. Prescribed Bodies

- 3.4.1. **Transport Infrastructure Ireland (09.05.24):** Recommend Section 49 Contribution condition.

3.5. Third Party Observations

3.5.1. The Planning Authority received 24 Third Party observations in response to the planning application. This includes submissions from Ivana Bacik TD and Councillor Claire Byrne. Issues raised are similar to those raised in the observations on the appeal. In summary:

- There is a high quantum of visitor accommodation in the area and the development would result in an overconcentration of tourist accommodation in a predominantly residential area adjoining architectural conservation areas.
- There are a number of alcohol related venues in the area, resulting in noise, disturbance, and anti-social behaviour.
- The development is for low-cost tourist accommodation. This would attract stag and hen parties and the development would exacerbate disturbance/nuisance and security issues.
- The area needs more housing, businesses and developments aimed at supporting a living city and community.
- The existing café serves the community and is part of the social fabric.
- The development would not contribute to a sustainable community or provide community gain.
- There would be traffic, parking, and waste management problems.
- The scale, massing and design would be out of character with the surrounding area. The proposal is higher/bigger than that previously approved.
- The scale of the proposal (553 beds) is not evident from the notices which state 85 guest rooms.
- Permission was refused for a proposed Build to rent development on the site which had 100 bedspaces and was considered to be out of character with the area.
- Proposal is premature pending a decision by An Bord Pleanála on the application for a seven-storey hotel on Camden Row.
- Pleasants Street forms a transitional area between the Z4-zoned Camden Street and the adjacent residential conservation areas which are facing an erosion of their residential amenity as a result of the changing character of Camden Street.

- The concentration and justification report does not address the impact on adjoining residential conservation areas or the experience of local communities.
- Pleasants Street and the existing site cannot accommodate the servicing needs of the development.
- The ground floor area should not be used as a bar as it is opposite residential uses.
- Insufficient living space within the hostel and minimal non-commercial space for guests.
- Proposal will exacerbate the push towards the night time economy in the area.
- Impact of noise, dust and pollution from construction on the local environment.
- There has been no consultation with local residents or stakeholders.
- Planning conditions required to appropriately manage this type of development are largely unenforceable.
- Development plan section 15.14.1 in which refers to the presumption against an overconcentration of hotels and aparthotels.

4.0 Planning History

Subject Site

- 4.1. **ABP – 321294-24/Planning Authority Ref 4221/24** – Permission was refused by the Board in May 2025 for amendments to the permitted office scheme (P.A. Ref. No. 3457/24 / ABP-314353-24) comprising of an additional set-back storey together with all associated works. Permission was refused for the following reason:

The Board considered that the proposed revisions to the design of the permitted structure results in a design that does not transition in scale appropriately in this established area, the proposed increase in height results in a building the form of which appears oversized and monolithic at this location, the development therefore does not accord with the parameters set out in Dublin City Development Plan 2022- 2028, Appendix 3, table 3, Performance Criteria in Assessing Proposals for Enhanced Height, Density and Scale. The Board noted the permitted development on this site (Ref ABP 314353-22, PA Ref 3457/22), has a plot ratio greater than 3 (the indicative plot ratio for this area in the Development Plan is 2.5-3), the design of which was revised during the

application process setting back the upper floor resulting in a structure that complemented the setting. The proposed increase in floor area the subject of this application by an additional set back floor, further increases the plot ratio, does not result in an appropriate transition in scale and consequently does not respect and complement the wider area. The proposed revision to the permitted development would, therefore, not be in accordance with requirement of the Dublin City Development Plan, Appendix 3.

Having regard to Policy BHA9 in the Dublin City Development Plan (2022-2028) which seeks 'to protect the special interest and character of all Dublin's Conservation Areas', it is considered that the proposed additional storey to the permitted development would result in the building appearing overly dominant when viewed from the surrounding area, in particular Pleasants Street and Synge Street which are in a residential conservation area with zoning objective 2 – 'to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas'. The proposed additional floor negates the benefit of the permitted setback of the upper floor resulting in a dominant structure that does not integration into the wider setting. The proposed amendments to the permitted development would, therefore, not accord with policy BHA9, Conservation Areas, in the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028.

- 4.2. **ABP-314353-22/Planning Authority Reference 3457/22:** Permission was granted by the Board in December 2023 for the demolition of existing structures and construction of a five-storey mixed use building and all associated site works. Condition 4 of this permission required the developer to facilitate the preservation, recording and protection of archaeological materials or features that may exist within the site in the interest of conserving the archaeological heritage of the site through to securing the preservation as well as protection of any archaeological remains that may exist within the site.
- 4.3. **Planning Authority Reference 2796/21:** Permission was refused by Dublin City Council in July 2021 for the demolition of the existing structures on site and construction of a part seven / six / five / four storey over basement building with commercial/restaurant/café use, commercial storage and residents amenity facilities at ground floor level and a "Build to Rent" residential development of 45 no. residential units at 1st to 6th floor levels. Permission was refused for the following reasons:

1. Having regard to the location of the proposed development in close proximity to a number of protected structures and the Camden Street Conservation area, it is considered that a seven storey building at this location, due to its design, height, bulk, scale and mass, would visually dominate and harm the streetscape and would represent a visually discordant feature that would be detrimental to the character of this area. The proposal does not respond to its overall built environment and does not make a positive contribution to the urban neighbourhood and streetscape and would therefore be seriously injurious to the visual amenities of the area. The proposed development would, therefore, contravene materially the provisions of the Development Plan and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. Having regard to the location of the seven storey building in proximity to boundaries on both the east and west, with windows and balconies on these boundaries, it is considered that this could cause unacceptable levels of overlooking to adjoining properties and would appear overbearing when viewed from these properties, which would seriously injure their visual and residential amenities which would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
3. Policy 16.10.17 of the Dublin City Council Development Plan 2016-2022 provides that 'the planning authority will actively seek the retention and re-use of buildings/ structures of historic, architectural, cultural, artistic and/or local interest or buildings which make a positive contribution to the character and identity of streetscapes and the sustainable development of the city.' The modest but architecturally characterful buildings at No.'s 49-51 Pleasant's Street make a positive contribution to the character, appearance and quality of the local streetscape. The demolition of these locally significant historic buildings would therefore contravene Policy 11.1.1.2 and 16.10.17 of the Dublin City Council Development Plan 2016-2022 and the construction of a new 5-7 storey building in their place would seriously injure the amenities of the wider area.

Surrounding Sites

12 Camden Row, Saint Kevin's, Dublin 8

- 4.4. **ABP-318805-24 (P.A. Ref. No. 3883/23):** This site is approximately 11m to the north-west of the site but has a frontage onto Camden Row. Permission was granted by the Board in June 2025 for the demolition of the existing building and construction of a seven-storey hotel with all associated site works. This hotel would provide 163 bedrooms.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028

- 5.1.1. The site is zoned 'Z4 Key Urban Villages / Urban Villages', the stated objective of which is 'To provide for and improve mixed-services facilities'.
- 5.1.2. The site is in a transitional zone where the Z4 zoning meets Z1-Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods, and Z2 - Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas). In terms of Transitional Zone Areas, the CDP states (Section 14.6):

While zoning objectives and development management standards indicate the different uses permitted in each zone, it is important to avoid abrupt transitions in scale and land-use between zones. In dealing with development proposals in these contiguous transitional zone areas, it is necessary to avoid developments that would be detrimental to the amenities of the more environmentally sensitive zones. For instance, in zones abutting residential areas or abutting residential development within predominately mixed-use zones, particular attention must be paid to the use, scale, density and design of development proposals, and to landscaping and screening proposals, in order to protect the amenities of residential properties (see also Appendix 3: Achieving Sustainable Compact Growth Policy for Density and Building Height in the City, Chapter 4: Shape and Structure of the City, and Chapter 15: Development Standards for guiding principles regarding criteria such as height, density, urban design).

- 5.1.3. Chapter 3: Climate Action contains the Council's policies and objectives for addressing the challenges of climate change through mitigation and adaptation.
- 5.1.4. Chapter 4: Shape and Structure of the City, sets out the Council's strategy to guide the future sustainable development of the city. The objective is to ensure that growth is directed to, and prioritised in, the right locations to enable continued targeted

investment in infrastructure and services and the optimal use of public transport. Policies of relevance include:

- SC11: Compact Growth In alignment with the Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan, to promote compact growth and sustainable densities through the consolidation and intensification of infill and brownfield lands, particularly on public transport corridors, which will:
 - enhance the urban form and spatial structure of the city;
 - be appropriate to their context and respect the established character of the area;
 - include due consideration of the protection of surrounding communities and provide for enhanced amenities for existing and future residents;
 - be supported by a full range of social and community infrastructure such as schools, shops and recreational areas;
 - and have regard to the criteria set out in Chapter 15: Development Standards, including the criteria and standards for good neighbourhoods, quality urban design and excellence in architecture.
- SC14: Building Height Strategy To ensure a strategic approach to building height in the city that accords with The Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2018) and in particular, SPPR 1 to 4

5.1.5. Chapter 6: City and Enterprise is of relevance. This chapter recognises that Dublin is an international city and gateway to the European Union for many businesses. The city region contributes significantly to Ireland's economy and is a major economic driver for the country. Policies of specific relevance from this chapter are:

- CEE8: The City Centre - To support the development a vibrant mix of office, retail, tourism related and cultural activities in the city centre and to facilitate the regeneration and development of key potential growth areas such as the Diageo lands, the St. James's Healthcare Campus and Environs and the TU Dublin campus at Grangegorman.
- CEE26: Tourism in Dublin

- i. To promote and facilitate tourism as one of the key economic pillars of the city's economy and a major generator of employment and to support the appropriate, balanced provision of tourism facilities and visitor attractions.
 - ii. To promote and enhance Dublin as a world class tourist destination for leisure, culture, business, and student visitors and to promote Dublin as a setting for conventions and cultural events.
 - iii. To improve the accessibility of tourism infrastructure to recognise the access needs of all visitors to our city.
- CEE28: Visitor Accommodation - To consider applications for additional hotel, tourist hostel and aparthotel development having regard to:
 - The existing character of the area in which the development is proposed including local amenities and facilities.
 - The existing and proposed mix of uses (including existing levels of visitor accommodation i.e. existing and permitted hotel, aparthotel, Bed and Breakfast, short-term letting and student accommodation uses) in the vicinity of any proposed development.
 - The existing and proposed type of existing visitor accommodation i.e. Hotel Classification/Rating, Hostel Accommodation, Family Accommodation, Alternative Accommodation etc., in the vicinity of any proposed development.
 - The impact of additional visitor accommodation on the wider objective to provide a rich and vibrant range of uses in the city centre including residential, social, cultural and economic functions.
 - The need to prevent an unacceptable intensification of activity, particularly in predominantly residential areas.
 - The opportunity presented to provide high quality, designed for purpose spaces that can generate activity at street level and

accommodate evening and night-time activities – see also Chapter 12, Objective CUO38.

5.1.6. Chapter 8: Sustainable Movement and Transport, seeks to promote ease of movement within and around the city and an increased shift towards sustainable modes of travel and an increased focus on public realm and healthy placemaking, while tackling congestion and reducing transport related CO2 emissions.

5.1.7. Chapter 11: Built Heritage and Archaeology, recognises that the city's heritage contributes significantly to the collective memory of its communities and to the richness and diversity of its urban fabric. It is key to the city's character, identity and authenticity and is a vital social, cultural, and economic asset for the development of the city. The Development Plan plays a key role in valuing and safeguarding built heritage and archaeology for future generations. The plan guides decision-making through policies and objectives and the implementation of national legislation to conserve, protect and enhance our built heritage and archaeology. Relevant policies from this chapter include:

- BHA6: Buildings on Historic Maps - That there will be a presumption against the demolition or substantial loss of any building or other structure which appears on historic maps up to and including the Ordnance Survey of Dublin City, 1847. A conservation report shall be submitted with the application and there will be a presumption against the demolition or substantial loss of the building or structure, unless demonstrated in the submitted conservation report this it has little or no special interest or merit having regard to the provisions of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011).
- BHA9: Conservation Areas - To protect the special interest and character of all Dublin's Conservation Areas. Development within or affecting a Conservation Area must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting, wherever possible.
- BHA11: Rehabilitation and Reuse of Existing Older Buildings
 - a) To retain, where appropriate, and encourage the rehabilitation and suitable adaptive reuse of existing older buildings/structures/features which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of

the area and streetscape, in preference to their demolition and redevelopment.

- b) Encourage the retention and/or reinstatement of original fabric of our historic building stock such as windows, doors, roof coverings, shopfronts (including signage and associated features), pub fronts and other significant features.
- c) Ensure that appropriate materials are used to carry out any repairs to the historic fabric.

5.1.8. Chapter 15: Development Standards contains the Council's Development Management policies and criteria to be considered in the development management process so that development proposals can be assessed both in terms of how they contribute to the achievement of the core strategy and related policies and objectives. Sections of this chapter that are of specific relevance include:

- 15.5.2: Infill Development
- 15.4.4: Height
- 15.5.6: Plot Ratio and Site Coverage
- 15.7.1: Re-use of Existing Buildings
- 15.14.7.2 Restaurants/Cafes
- 15.15.1.11: Recording of Historic Buildings

5.2. Other Relevant Guidance

5.2.1. Having considered the nature of the proposal, I consider that the directly relevant section 28 Ministerial Guidelines and other national policy documents are:

- Urban Development and Building Height – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2018).

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.3.1. The nearest European sites are the South Dublin Bay SAC (000210) and the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024) both of which are approximately 3.55km to the east.

5.4. EIA Screening

- 5.4.1. The application addresses the issue of EIA within an EIA Screening Report prepared by Verde (dated April 2024), which seeks to demonstrate that there is no requirement for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Assessment Report for the proposed development. Section 4.1 of the report relates to the screening methodology and confirms that the report has had regard to the criteria set out in in Schedule 7 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 as amended (the 2001 Regs), and to the requirements under Schedule 7A of the 2001 Regs. This section also confirms that the assessment has had regard to Annex II and III of the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive.
- 5.4.2. Where an application is made for subthreshold development and Schedule 7A information is submitted, the Board must carry out a screening determination in line with the requirements of Article 109(2B)(a) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended), therefore, it cannot screen out the need for EIA at preliminary examination.

Mandatory Thresholds

- 5.4.3. The proposed development is of a class of development included in Schedule 5 to the Planning Regulations. Schedule 5 to Part 2 of the Planning Regulations provides that mandatory EIA is required for the following classes of development that are of relevance to the proposal:
- Class 10(b)(iv) - Urban development, which would involve an area greater than 2 ha in the case of a business district*, 10 ha in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 ha elsewhere. *a 'business district' means a district within a city or town in which the predominant land use is retail or commercial use.

- 5.4.4. The proposal would be significantly below the threshold and a mandatory EIA is therefore not required. Environmental Impact Assessment is required for development proposals of a class specified in Part 1 or 2 of Schedule 5 that are sub-threshold where the Board determines that the proposed development is likely to have a significant effect on the environment. For all sub-threshold developments listed in Schedule 5 Part 2, where no EIAR is submitted or EIA determination requested, a screening determination is required to be undertaken by the competent authority unless, on preliminary examination it can be concluded that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.
- 5.4.5. The Applicant's Screening Report provides the necessary information for screening this sub-threshold development for Environmental Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that the report and the other information submitted with the application includes the information specified in Schedule 7A of the Regulations, and that the information has been compiled taking into account the relevant criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations. I have completed a Screening Determination, included at Appendix 3 of this report which concludes, having regard to the following:
- (1) the criteria set out in Schedule 7 and 7A, in particular:
 - (a) the limited nature and scale of the proposed hotel development, in an established urban area served by public infrastructure;
 - (b) the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity;
 - (c) the location of the development outside of any sensitive location specified in article 109(4)(a) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended);
 - (2) the results of other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment submitted by the Applicant;
 - (3) the features and measures proposed by applicant envisaged to avoid or prevent what might otherwise have been significant effects on the environment.
- 5.4.6. It is concluded the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment, and that an environmental impact assessment report is not required (See Forms 1 & 3 Appendix 1).

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. A First Party appeal has been submitted by John Spain Associates, Planning and Development Consultants, for and on behalf of the Appellant, Red Rock Pleasants Street Ltd, against the decision of Dublin City Council to refuse planning permission for the proposed development. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

6.1.2. Overconcentration of Tourist Accommodation and Intensification of Activity

- A Tourist Accommodation Demand, Concentration and Justification Report was submitted with the application. It demonstrates a lack of publicly available Fáilte Ireland approved tourist accommodation in this area of the city.
- The report considered visitor accommodation within a 500m radius and within a 500m-1km radius of the site. The report identified only 1.6% of the total number of tourist bedrooms within a 1km radius of the site being Fáilte Ireland approved hostel bedrooms and the proposed increase of 85 hostel rooms would only be a minor increase of 1.5%.
- It is refuted that there is an overconcentration of tourist accommodation. The development would be a Fáilte Ireland approved hostel which would be more affordable and a significantly different type of tourist accommodation to traditional hotels/BnB's/aparthotels already on offer.
- Permission has been granted for a similar development on Foley Street comprising a ten storey hostel with 140 rooms. The Planning Authority accepted that there was a need for hostel accommodation in this area and that there was no overconcentration of hostel accommodation, finding an existing provision of 4% increasing to 7.4% to be acceptable. This sets a precedent that hostel accommodation levels up to 7.4% are acceptable.
- Notwithstanding that the originally submitted scheme is considered to be appropriate in respect of its location, in acknowledging the concerns of the Planning Authority and Third Parties, a revised proposal is put forward reducing the number of bedspaces from 553 to 267, equating to a 51.7% reduction in

bedspaces. The number of bedrooms and layout/massing, elevations remain the same.

- In terms of an intensification of night time activity and noise/disturbance, an updated Operational Management Plan sets out appropriate mitigation. It is not considered that the development would contribute to an increase in noise and disturbance.
- A number of premises along Camden Street offer late night entertainment and hospitality (pubs/nightclubs/bars). The proposed café/bar on the ground floor would serve breakfast from 7am to 10am and public dining/beverage until 10pm. It is not intended to contribute to the existing late night entertainment venues offered on Camden Street.
- The development is located in a highly accessible location in the city centre of Dublin and is an appropriate location for an increase in the intensity of use.

6.1.3. Transitional Zone and Residential Amenity

- Section 14.6 of the CDP seeks to avoid abrupt transitions in scale and land use within transitional zones. The proposal does not contribute to an abrupt transition in land use having regard to surrounding uses in the area and the proposal's attempts to create a mixed-use development to marry its two contiguous land use zones.
- The site is zoned Z4 which transitions from the Key Urban Village of Camden Street to more residential areas to the west and south. The site is not explicitly located at the periphery of a change in land use.
- The site is zoned Z4 and therefore considered by the Planning Authority to be more suitable to be developed for uses more akin to those found on Camden Street, as per the land use zoning policy.
- Proposed uses are permitted by the zoning. The ground floor use (café/bar/restaurant) would be open to the public and would complement the residential amenity in the area and provide an appropriate transition in land use coming from Camden Street. Upper floors would be hostel use which is primarily residential in nature as they are sleeping quarters.

- The provision of a high-quality tourist hostel would contribute to a vibrant urban environment through quality architecture and employment.
- It is not considered that the development would contribute to an increased level of disturbance, noise or anti-social behaviour. Any such issues would be actively managed by the on-site team.
- The loss of the existing café is noted, the reuse of the existing buildings is not possible. The buildings are of no architectural, historic, cultural value, or social value to warrant their retention. A new café/bar/restaurant would be provided to serve as an upgraded replacement of the existing café.

6.1.4. Conservation Areas

- Concerns raised by Third Parties with regards to the adjacent conservation area seem to have been given undue weight by the Planning Authority.
- A Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment was submitted with the application which demonstrated that there would be no negative impact on the Camden Street Conservation Area or the Z2 residential conservation areas to the south and west. The overall impact on surrounding townscape was assessed as being positive (moderate/beneficial).
- The existing buildings on site do not warrant retention.
- The building is appropriate to its context having regard to siting, prevailing heights, design and character. Appropriate setbacks are provided, and modulation allows it to integrate into the established height and scale of the receiving environment.

6.1.5. Servicing and Waste Management

- Servicing and waste collection would be carried out in accordance with the Servicing, Operational, and Waste Management Plan, the measures in which would ensure no increased negative impact on traffic congestion and pedestrian safety.
- As a tourist hostel there is minimal refuse generated. Volume of waste has been generated based on predicted occupancy as well as having regard to relevant standards and recently published data. Additionally, a 51.7% reduction in bed

spaces is proposed as part of the appeal. It is submitted that there would be more than sufficient refuse storage and collection space.

- A dedicated refuse storage is provided allowing for the appropriate management, storage, and collection of waste. Bins would be transferred to the street at designated times for collection which is a long established practice at all city centre commercial developments. Bins would be removed from the street and transferred back to the refuse store immediately after collection. There would not be an exacerbation of waste storage and collection on street.
- Pleasants Lane has capacity to service the development, auto-track drawings have been provide demonstrating the ability to accommodate a refuse truck.
- The provision of zero car parking is in line with the CDP. The existing streets and loading bay are sufficient to service the development and appropriate contingency plans are set out in the Servicing, Operation, and Waste Management Plan.

6.1.6. Third Party Submissions

- Appendix 3 outlines the issues raised by Third Parties and responds to each issue individually in order to demonstrate to the Board that all concerns raised have been addressed.

6.2. **Planning Authority Response**

- 6.2.1. Request that the Board uphold the decision to refuse permission and request conditions regarding Section 48 and 49 payments if permission is granted.

6.3. **Observations**

- 6.3.1. Observations have been received from the Grantham Street Residents Association and the West of Camden Residents Association. The main points of the observations are summarised as follows:

- Commend the Council's determination that the street is transitional in nature and that residential amenity of adjoining Z2 residential areas need to be protected from infrastructure supporting the nighttime economy.

- The proposed use is not appropriate in a sensitive transitional area and would be an overdevelopment of the site. Given the number of dwellings, it is argued that the area is predominantly residential, and the development would undermine residential amenity and the public realm.
- Comparable hotel examples given are not located in sensitive locations adjoining established residential use.
- Many daytime uses have closed, and pubs have expanded. The area has become a location for public drinking and antisocial behaviour. Another tourist hostel would support problematic nighttime economy issues and would further exacerbate tensions and conflicts that are the subject of ongoing legal and licensing disputes.
- The development would undermine the possibility of residential use in the area. There is a housing crisis, and properties should be renovated for residential use. Well-designed infill housing could be achieved on the site and should be facilitated.
- The construction of a large hostel at the entrance to the street would undermine the architectural coherence of the street and amount to architectural vandalism.
- The reduction in bed spaces is noted but this amounts only to a relabelling of rooms, maintaining the overall layout. There would be nothing to prevent subsequent reconfiguration back to a higher capacity. Furthermore, the revisions do not address issues regarding overdevelopment, high plot ratio, cramped amenity facilities, and lack of larger waste management facilities.
- The changes proposed by the Appellant are significant. The opportunity to make the amendments was not taken at an earlier stage and Third parties have not been able to make comments. The amendments are disingenuous and intended to achieve permission by sleight of hand. The Board should refuse to consider the changes.
- An Operational Management Plan refers to guests in the confines of the hotel and would not account for the behaviour of guests on neighbouring streets. Operators seems to rely on reporting by residents in order to drive their management of public disorder, requiring significant input from Gardaí.

- The scheme would not contribute to a 'vibrant healthy urban environment' that enhances the quality of life of adjacent residential areas due to antisocial behaviour (street drinking, public defecation, and overt drug dealing).
- The Appellant states that the development would not attract 'hen parties' or similar and would instead facilitate tour groups and school trips. This is unlikely.
- The street is narrow and congested and servicing would be difficult. There would be a substantial increase in the number of waste bins parked on the public footpath which are left out for long periods or overnight. It is submitted that the bins attract vermin.
- The café/bar will be used as a new pub and it is implausible that the Appellant would enforce a 10pm closure.
- The height, scale and massing are excessive and would detract from the architectural quality of the area.
- The Management Plan is deficient, the operator has been changed, and the plan has been altered without commentary. There have been previous difficulties in securing commitments from UK based operators and residents must invest a considerable amount of time in engaging with management plans.
- Maintaining and actively supporting existing residential communities and Z2 areas to the west of Camden Street by refusing permission would accord with the wider objective to provide a rich and vibrant range of uses in the city centre.
- The site should be developed for residential use and there is no gain for the local community as a result of the development.

6.4. Further Responses

6.4.1. None.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. The Applicant has submitted amended plans as part of the appeal which seek to deal with concerns regarding the intensity of development (number of bedspaces) and potential overlooking concerns raised by the Planning Authority. It should be noted

that the Planning Authority did not refuse the development based on overlooking, instead stating that measures would need to be incorporated to address the concerns. As such, the Applicant has maintained the overall number of bedrooms but reduced the bedspace capacity as set out in the table below.

7.2. The changes to bedspace capacity do not require any physical alterations. Likewise, the measures to address overlooking on the northwest façade is a simple change to fenestration. As such, I am satisfied that the amendments proposed are not significant and can be considered as part of the appeal.

7.3. Therefore, having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the Local Authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Land Use
- Quantum of Development, Design, and Heritage
- Servicing and Management
- Other Matters

Land Use

7.3.1. The Planning Authority state that, having regard to the site location in a transitional area and the number of rooms being proposed, that there would be an overconcentration of tourist accommodation in the immediate area, which would result in an unacceptable intensification of activity, including night time activity, in the adjoining residential area. I will address the issues of night time activity separately.

7.3.2. The concerns of the Planning Authority are largely echoed by observers on the appeal who consider that it would be an overdevelopment of the site that would undermine residential amenity and the public realm. A preference for residential development is expressed and it is stated that the proposal would prevent residential coming forward on the site.

Overconcentration of Visitor Accommodation

- 7.3.3. The appeal site is Zoned Z4, and a tourist hostel is permissible use in this zone. The zoning designation does not make any reference to overconcentration of this use. CDP policy CEE28 relates to visitor accommodation and states that applications for tourist hostels will be considered having regard to a number of criteria including the character of the area and the existing/proposed mix of uses, existing and proposed types of visitor accommodation (including classification), and the impact of additional visitor accommodation on the wider objective to provide a rich and vibrant range of uses in the city centre including residential, social, cultural and economic functions and the need to prevent an unacceptable intensification of activity, particularly in predominantly residential areas.
- 7.3.4. Section 15.14.1 of the CDP states that there will be a general presumption against an overconcentration of hotels/aparthotels and where the Planning Authority deem there to be an overconcentration in an area then Applicants will be requested to submit a report indicating all existing and proposed hotel and aparthotel developments within a 1km catchment, as well as a justification that the development would not undermine the principles of achieving a balanced pattern of development in the area, in addition to demonstrating compliance with other policy requirements.
- 7.3.5. Section 15.14.1 of the CDP also states that Dublin City Council will carry out an analysis of the supply and demand for tourism related accommodation in the Dublin City area, but at the current time this does not appear to have been completed, and I have not been made aware of any updated information in this regard. Meanwhile, the Planning Authority will consider accommodation on a case by case basis, having regard to the location of the site and existing hotel provision in the area.
- 7.3.6. The Applicant submitted a *Tourist Accommodation Demand, Concentration, and Justification Report* with the planning application. The study provides information on demand as well as information on the cost differentials of hotels versus hostels and the different demographics of target groups in addition to the need for such accommodation to support the tourism industry in the city.
- 7.3.7. The report includes a survey from January 2024 of existing and permitted hotels within an initial 500m radius of the site and a further survey of facilities in a 500m-1km radius of the site. The survey identified 16 no. hotels and 2 no. hostels within a 500m radius of the subject site, with no guesthouse or aparthotels found within this area. In terms

of the wider radius of 500m-1km, the survey noted a further 32 no. hotels, 5 no. guesthouses, 5 no. aparthotels and 4 no. hostels are located within a 500m to 1km radius of the site. The report notes that much of the tourist accommodation is not Fáilte Ireland approved and/or not currently open to the public.

- 7.3.8. It should be noted that the overwhelming majority of hotels identified in the survey lie to the east of Camden Street with concentrations around Harcourt Street and to the north around Aungier Street and Great George's Street. In terms of hotels close to the subject site, there are only four hotels along this entire stretch of Camden Street equating to 382 rooms. Aparthotels are concentrated to the north of Stephen's Green. In terms of the two hostels within a 500m radius of the site, these are located to the east of Camden Street and also to the south of South Circular Road. Neither of these hostels are open to the public or Fáilte Ireland approved. The remaining four hostels are close to the edge of the 1km radius, concentrated around the Dame Street area and only two of them are open and Failte Ireland approved, providing a total of 88 bedrooms.
- 7.3.9. I note that analysis of tourism accommodation supply is yet to be prepared by the City Council (development plan Objective CEE01). Neither does the CDP provide any quantitative threshold by which the overconcentration of visitor accommodation is to be measured, nor is it indicated what parameters are being used to determine what constitutes overconcentration. The Planning Authority have clearly deemed that there could be an overconcentration of visitor accommodation in the area, but without a quantitative assessment/evidence base, it would seem that this is based purely on the sense of the character of area, which is subjective and a matter of perception.
- 7.3.10. In my view, the Planning Authority have not demonstrated that there would be an overconcentration of visitor accommodation in this location. The Applicant's study on the other hand provides evidence to the contrary, particularly with regards to hostels of which there are no publicly available Fáilte Ireland approved hostels within the 500m radius. I acknowledge that the site backs onto both the Camden Hotel and a site where a 163 bedroom hotel has recently been granted permission. On the face of it, given two large hotels on the immediate northern boundary of the appeal site, there are perhaps reasonable grounds to consider there to be an overconcentration of visitor accommodation in this area. However, the Camden Hotel has a frontage onto Camden Street and has little relationship to Pleasants Street in terms of character or amenity.

Likewise, the approved hotel on Camden Row would be very much viewed in that specific context and its operation would have limited impact on Pleasants Street and the immediate surrounding area of the subject site. As such, I am broadly satisfied that there would not be an overconcentration of visitor accommodation. I am satisfied that the principle of the provision of a tourist hostel in this area would be acceptable and that the provision of a tourist hostel in this area would not undermine the objectives of the CDP in seeking to achieve a balanced pattern of development in the area.

Intensification of Nighttime Use and Amenity

- 7.3.11. Part of the Planning Authority's objection to the development is predicated on the site being in a transitional area where it is considered that the proposal would lead to an intensification of activity, including night time activity, in the adjoining residential area, impacting on amenity and failing to provide an appropriate transition in use between the residential area and Camden Street.
- 7.3.12. This largely reflects the concerns raised in the observations where it is stated that there would be disturbance, an inappropriate transition and that the development would support problematic nighttime economy issues, further exacerbating tensions and conflicts.
- 7.3.13. The Councils reason for refusal makes specific reference to the development having over 500 bedspaces. As originally submitted, the development proposed 85 bedrooms and 553 bedspaces. I would agree that this is a significant quantum of bedspaces on the site, however, as part of the appeal the Applicant has addressed the matter of bedspaces and recategorised the 85 bedrooms which, under the amended appeal scheme, would now provide a total of 267 bedspaces, which effectively halves the capacity. On balance, I consider that the amendments suitably address the matter of the intensity of use and would result in a much more balanced offer on the site, albeit still a large hostel. I do not share the concerns of the observers that the site could be reconfigured post permission to achieve a higher capacity. The number of bedrooms and bedspaces would be secured in the permission and would therefore be enforceable. Additionally, an 'avoidance of doubt' condition could be imposed further securing the number of bedspaces, should the Board consider it necessary.
- 7.3.14. I acknowledge that the site is in a transitional area, however, in my opinion, the balance of use surrounding the site is weighted more towards commercial. Whilst I

acknowledge the presence of residential use opposite the site to the west there is a distinct separation from the predominantly residential area to the west and I find that the site has a closer contextual relationship to area to the east and Camden Street. Clearly, the vast majority of visitor attractions (museums, galleries, shops, bars, restaurants etc) are located to the east and north of the site. This certainly accounts for the fact that the main concentrations of visitor accommodation are to the east and north. In my view, visitor movements to and from the proposed hostel would overwhelmingly be to and from Camden Street and beyond, with very few movements, if at all, westwards and to the south, particularly so in the evenings. For these reasons, on balance, I do not consider that the development would lead to significant nuisance or disruption to residents in the predominantly residential areas to west.

- 7.3.15. I note the concerns raised regarding the bar/café/restaurant provided on the ground floor of the hotel. This would be a typical hotel/hostel style shared food and beverage and workspace/lounge. These offerings are typically used primarily by guests, and I do not consider that the café/bar/restaurant space is of a size or character that it would attract significant numbers of people from Camden Street. In any event, it is proposed that this café/bar/restaurant would close at 10pm, and contrary to the views of the observers, I am satisfied that this closing time could be conditioned and enforced. For these reasons I do not consider that this use would lead to an intensification of nighttime activity or result in significant disturbance or nuisance to residents. It should also be noted that the permitted office development on the site included a café/bar/restaurant space at ground floor level and as such the principle of such a use in this location has already been established.

7.4. Quantum of Development, Design, and Heritage

- 7.4.1. The Planning Authority have generally accepted the height/massing and design of the proposal but have raised concerns regarding the plot ratio. Observations on the appeal consider the building to be excessive in terms of height scale and massing and state that it would detract from the architectural quality of the area.
- 7.4.2. Policy SC16 of the CDP recognises the predominantly low rise character of Dublin in addition to the need for increased height in appropriate locations in order to facilitate compact growth. Appendix 3 of the CDP sets out Dublin's building height strategy and the criteria against which higher buildings should be assessed. In the city centre and

within the canal ring, a default height of six storeys will be promoted. As previously mentioned, there is an existing permission on this site for a five storey office development. The current hostel proposal is six storeys but only marginally taller than the permitted office scheme, as a result of the difference between commercial and hostel floor to ceiling heights.

7.4.3. I have reviewed the Applicant's Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment in addition to the proposed photomontages and the performance criteria set out in Table 3 of Appendix 3 of the CDP. I have also had regard to the existing permission on the site. In my opinion, the proposal would be a well-designed, contemporary building that would be a suitable response to the specific site and the immediate surrounding area in terms of scale, form and architecture. It is my view that the development would fit well with the character of the area and would help to establish a sense of place, with appropriate legibility and enclosure of streets. I do not consider that the building would be highly visible, certainly not from the conservation areas to the east and west and as such I do not consider that there would be any heritage impacts.

7.4.4. In terms of plot ratio range for the 'central area' is given as 2.5-3.0. The proposed plot ratio would be 4.79. Whilst I accept that the proposal exceeds the stated development plan indicative plot ratio range, the development complies with local and national building height requirements and is well located for public transport and services. Furthermore, there is an existing permission for a large office development on this site which is largely of the same massing and the development proposal itself would facilitate the comprehensive regeneration of the site. In my opinion, there is flexibility in applying the plot ratio ranges and rigid application in all cases would impede the compact growth agenda. Having regard to the foregoing I am satisfied that the proposal is consistent with the development plan core strategy, Policies SC11 and SC16, and Appendix 3.

7.5. Management and Servicing

7.5.1. Concerns have been raised regarding how the site would be serviced as the street is narrow and congested, specifically in relation to waste collection and the fact that bins on the street would attract vermin and impede pedestrians. Further concerns are raised regarding the Management Plan submitted with the appeal where it is submitted

that the proposed operator has changed, and the plan has been amended without commentary

- 7.5.2. Operators can change for various reasons. I note that the operator has experience in managing student accommodation and I find that there would be similarities between the operations. Furthermore, the senior manager has experience on the Irish hospitality sector. In any event, the change in operator does not in my mind have any material bearing on the determination of the appeal.
- 7.5.3. The management plan confirms that the site would be staffed on a 24 hour basis. The management plan sets out measures for the prevention of anti-social behaviour and the control of noise. I am satisfied that the management plan is appropriate and fit for purpose. Regarding anti-social behaviour, on balance I am satisfied the proposal is not likely to contribute to anti-social behaviour in the area. The café/bar/restaurant would not act as a destination in its own right, with guests more likely to venture into the city centre or the Camden Street area. Whilst this may give rise to additional activity along Pleasants Street, as previously mentioned, this would be directed away from the residential areas to the west and would be largely contained to the predominantly commercial part of the street as it approaches Camden Street, this is on account of the likelihood that most guests would travel east of the hotel to Camden Street and the wider city centre.
- 7.5.4. In terms of concerns raised regarding waste collection, the strategy would require bins to be brought to Pleasants Street for collection from the waste store to the rear of the site. This is a common arrangement for commercial premises in Dublin city centre and would be case on the permitted office scheme. Pleasants Street is currently sufficient to service the existing buildings along its length, and I see no reason why it would not continue to function with the proposed development in place. Bins on the street waiting collection would be a short-term temporary issue and would be managed by on-site staff. Subject to compliance with the Operational Waste management Plan, I do not consider that this would be unacceptable.

7.6. Other Matters

- 7.6.1. Concerns have been raised by both the Planning Authority and observers that the proposal is lacking in facilities. The Planning Authority make reference to the guest kitchen and dining area. In my opinion the facilities provided for guests are sufficient

and I note that they are commensurate with, and in some case proportionally larger than other similar developments that have been approved. The development provides guest kitchen and dining area, gym, cinema (mistakenly annotated gym in the basement), laundry facilities and lounge facilities with sharing of space on the ground floor. In my opinion, this is acceptable for the proposed use and the number of bedspaces being proposed, that have been reduced as part of the appeal.

8.0 AA Screening

8.1. I have considered the proposed tourist hostel development in light of the requirements of Section 177U of the Planning & Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is not located within or adjacent any European Site designated SAC or SPA. The closest European sites are those of Dublin Bay, the closest of which are c.3.6km from the proposed development.

8.2. The subject site is located in an urban area. No significant nature conservation concerns were raised as part of the appeal. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the development I am satisfied it can be eliminated from further assessment as there is no conceivable risk to any European Site. The reason for this conclusion is:

- The nature of the site and its location in an urban area, served by mains drainage.
- The distance to the closest European sites and the urban nature of intervening habitats.
- The absence of meaningful pathways to any European site.

8.3. I consider that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually, or in-combination with other plans and projects, on a European Site and appropriate assessment is therefore not required.

9.0 Water Framework Directive

9.1. There are no water courses in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. The proposed development comprises the construction of a tourist hostel. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal. I have assessed the proposed

development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration.

9.2. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature and scale of the works;
- The location of the site in a serviced urban area and the distance from nearest Water bodies and lack of direct hydrological connections.

9.3. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

10.0 Recommendation

10.1. I recommend that the Board should grant planning permission, subject to conditions.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

11.1. Having regard to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, including the Z4 land use zoning objective for the area and to Policy CEE28 'Visitor Accommodation', and having regard to the scale, height, form, and design of the proposed hostel development, the planning history of the site, the location of the site to the pattern and nature of development in the area, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would provide for and improve mixed-services facilities, and would not seriously injure the character and amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity. The proposed development would, therefore, accord 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 and amended by the further plans and particulars received by the Board with the appeal on 8th July 2024, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions 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.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The following shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to the commencement of development:
 - a) Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed building;
 - b) Details of proposed window screening / louvres for hotel bedroom windows;
 - c) Details of hotel signage including illumination.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure an appropriate high standard of development.

3. The ground floor café/bar/restaurant shall close at 22:00 Monday to Sunday. Furthermore, no outdoor seating shall be permitted.

Reason: To protect the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.

4. For the avoidance of doubt, the hostel hereby approved shall not exceed 85 bedrooms and 267 bedspaces.

Reason: in the interests of amenity

5. A plan containing details for the management of waste (and, in particular, recyclable materials) within the development, including the provision of facilities for the storage, separation and collection of the waste and, in particular, recyclable materials shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, the agreed waste facilities shall be maintained, and waste shall be managed in accordance with the agreed plan.

Reason: To provide for the appropriate management of waste and, in particular recyclable materials, in the interest of protecting the environment and the amenities of properties in the vicinity.

6. The Developer shall facilitate the archaeological appraisal of the site and shall provide for the preservation, recording and protection of archaeological materials or features which may exist within the site, including a full photographic record of the existing buildings. In this regard, the developer shall:
 - a) notify the planning authority in writing at least four weeks prior to the commencement of any site operation relating to the proposed development, and
 - b) employ a suitably qualified archaeologist prior to the commencement of development. The archaeologist shall assess the site and monitor all site development works. The assessment shall address the following issues:
 - (i) the nature and location of archaeological material on the site, and
 - (ii) the impact of the proposed development on such archaeological material.

A report, containing the results of the assessment, shall be submitted to the planning authority and, arising from this assessment, the developer shall agree in writing with the planning authority details regarding any further archaeological requirements including, if necessary, archaeological excavation, prior to commencement of construction works. In default of agreement on any of these requirements, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála for determination.

Reason: In order to conserve the archaeological heritage of the area and to secure the preservation (in-situ or by record) and protection of any archaeological remains that may exist within the site.

7. Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. **Reason:** In the interest of public health.
8. (a) Prior to the commencement of development, a Demolition Management Plan and Demolition Waste Management Plan shall be submitted for the written

agreement of the planning authority. This plan shall be implemented in full during the course of demolition and construction of the development;

(b) Prior to commencement of works, the developer shall submit to, and agree in writing with the planning authority, a Construction Management Plan, which shall be adhered to during construction. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise and dust management measures, construction traffic, and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.

Reason: In the interest of public safety and amenity

9. 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 by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún 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.

10. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of Luas Cross City St. Stephen's Green to Broombridge Line in accordance with the terms of the Supplementary Development Contribution Scheme made by the planning authority under section 49 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement,

the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún 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 Supplementary Development Contribution Scheme made under section 49 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.

Terence McLellan
Senior Planning Inspector

16th July 2025

Appendix 1: AA Screening Determination

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects				
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics				
Brief description of project	Six storey tourist hostel. First Party v. refusal.			
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	<p>A full description of the development site is set out in Section 1 of the Inspector Report. The site is brownfield and located on Pleasants Street, just off Camden Street, St Kevin's, Dublin.</p> <p>The proposed development is described in detail in the Inspector Report. In summary, the proposal is for the demolition of the existing building and redevelopment to provide a tourist hostel in a new building with six storeys over basement.</p>			
Screening report	Screening Report for Appropriate Assessment, Openfield Ecological Services, April 2024.			
Natura Impact Statement	None.			
Relevant submissions	None.			
Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model				
Five European sites were identified as detailed in Table 1 below.				
European Site (code)	Qualifying interests ¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections ²	Consider further in screening ³ Y/N
South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 0000210).	<p>Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide (1140).</p> <p>Annual vegetation of drift lines (1210).</p>	2.5km	Indirect pathway through stormwater and foul sewers connecting to Dublin Bay and the Ringsend WWTP.	Yes.

	<p>Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand (1310).</p> <p>Embryonic shifting dunes (2110).</p> <p>Link to Conservation Objectives: ConservationObjectives.rdl</p>			
North Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 0000206).	<p>Mudflats and sandflats not covered by 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>Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritimae) (1330).</p> <p>Mediterranean salt meadows (Juncetalia maritimi) (1410).</p> <p>Embryonic shifting dunes (2110).</p> <p>Shifting dunes along the shoreline with Ammophila arenaria (white dunes) (2120).</p> <p>Fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation (grey dunes) (2130).</p> <p>Humid dune slacks (2190).</p> <p>Petalophyllum ralfsii (Petalwort) (1395).</p> <p>Link to Conservation objectives:</p>	4.45km	Indirect pathway through stormwater and foul sewers connecting to Dublin Bay and the Ringsend WWTP.	Yes.

	ConservationObjectives.rdl			
South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 0004024).	<p>Light-bellied Brent Goose (<i>Branta bernicla hrota</i>) (A046).</p> <p>Oystercatcher (<i>Haematopus ostralegus</i>) (A130).</p> <p>Ringed Plover (<i>Charadrius hiaticula</i>) (A137).</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>Bar-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa lapponica</i>) (A157).</p> <p>Redshank (<i>Tringa totanus</i>) (A162).</p> <p>Black-headed Gull (<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>) (A179).</p> <p>Roseate Tern (<i>Sterna dougallii</i>) (A192).</p> <p>Common Tern (<i>Sterna hirundo</i>) (A193).</p> <p>Arctic Tern (<i>Sterna paradisaea</i>) (A194).</p> <p>Wetland and Waterbirds (A999).</p> <p>Link to Conservation Objectives:</p>	1.5km	Indirect pathway through stormwater and foul sewers connecting to Dublin Bay and the Ringsend WWTP.	Yes.

		ConservationObjectives.rdl			
North Island (Site Code 0004006).	Bull SPA	<p>Light-bellied Brent Goose (Branta bernicla hrota) (A046).</p> <p>Shelduck (Tadorna tadorna) (A048).</p> <p>Teal (Anas crecca) (A052).</p> <p>Pintail (Anas acuta) (A054).</p> <p>Shoveler (Anas clypeata) (A056).</p> <p>Oystercatcher (Haematopus ostralegus) (A130).</p> <p>Golden Plover (Pluvialis apricaria) (A140).</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>Black-tailed Godwit (Limosa limosa) (A156).</p> <p>Bar-tailed Godwit (Limosa lapponica) (A157).</p> <p>Curlew (Numenius arquata) (A160).</p> <p>Redshank (Tringa totanus) (A162).</p> <p>Turnstone (Arenaria interpres) (A169).</p> <p>Black-headed Gull (Chroicocephalus ridibundus) (A179).</p>	4.4km	Indirect pathway through stormwater and foul sewers connecting to Dublin Bay and the Ringsend WWTP.	Yes.

	<p>Wetland and Waterbirds (A999).</p> <p>Link to Conservation objectives:</p> <p>North Bull Island SPA National Parks & Wildlife Service</p>			
<p>North-West Irish Sea SPA (Site Code 004236).</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>Shag (<i>Phalacrocorax aristotelis</i>) (A018).</p> <p>Common Scoter (<i>Melanitta nigra</i>) (A065).</p> <p>Little Gull (<i>Larus minutus</i>) (A177).</p> <p>Black-headed Gull (<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>) (A179).</p> <p>Common Gull (<i>Larus canus</i>) (A182).</p> <p>Lesser Black-backed Gull (<i>Larus fuscus</i>) (A183).</p> <p>Herring Gull (<i>Larus argentatus</i>) (A184).</p> <p>Great Black-backed Gull (<i>Larus marinus</i>) (A187).</p>	6.3km	Indirect pathway through stormwater and foul sewers connecting to Dublin Bay and the Ringsend WWTP.	Yes.

	<p>Kittiwake (<i>Rissa tridactyla</i>) (A188).</p> <p>Roseate Tern (<i>Sterna dougallii</i>) (A192).</p> <p>Common Tern (<i>Sterna hirundo</i>) (A193).</p> <p>Arctic Tern (<i>Sterna paradisaea</i>) (A194).</p> <p>Little Tern (<i>Sterna albifrons</i>) (A195).</p> <p>Guillemot (<i>Uria aalge</i>) (A199).</p> <p>Razorbill (<i>Alca torda</i>) (A200).</p> <p>Puffin (<i>Fratercula arctica</i>) (A204).</p> <p>Link to Conservation objectives:</p> <p>CO004236.pdf</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

Step 3. Describe the likely effects of the project (if any, alone or in combination) on European Sites

The proposal would not result in any direct effects on any of the identified European sites however there is a connection via the surface water network and foul sewer via Ringsend WWTP. Standard construction techniques and best practice measures would be employed to prevent discharge of dust and contaminants to the surface water network. Operationally, the development Would employ standard on-site infrastructure to prevent discharge of contaminants. Foul water from the completed development would be directed to the existing sewer network and onward to Ringsend WWTP for treatment. Even in the absence of mitigation, no significant effects on European sites are anticipated.

AA Screening matrix

Site name Qualifying interests	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*	
	Impacts	Effects

Site 1: South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 0000210). QI list as above.	Water quality degradation - Potential for dust and surface water runoff during construction. Foul water during operation.	No effects anticipated. Standard construction measures would be employed. No significant additional loading to Ringsend WWTP which is being upgraded. Distance to European sites and dilution effects of Dublin Bay.
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No.	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?	
	Impacts	Effects
Site 2: North Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 0000206). QI list as above.	As for Site 1.	As for Site 1.
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No.	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?	
	Impacts	Effects
Site 3: South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 0004024). QI list as above.	As for Site 1.	As for Site 1.
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No.	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?	
	Impacts	Effects
Site 4: North Bull Island SPA (Site Code 0004006). QI list as above.	As for Site 1.	As for Site 1.

	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No.	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?	
	Impacts	Effects
Site 5: North-West Irish Sea SPA (Site Code 004236). QI list as above.	As for Site 1.	As for Site 1.
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No.	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?	
Step 4 Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site		
Having regard to the information contained within the Applicant’s Screening Assessment, my site inspection, a review of the conservation objectives and supporting documents, and adopting a precautionary principle, I consider that the proposed development would not result in any significant effects on the European sites of Dublin Bay as set out above. No mitigation measures have been relied on in coming to this conclusion.		

Screening Determination

Finding of no likely significant effects

In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the European sites of Dublin Bay in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- The nature of the site and its location in an urban area, served by mains drainage.
- The distance to any European Sites, and the urban nature of intervening habitats and absence of ecological pathways to any European Site.

I consider that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually, or in-combination with other plans and projects, on a European Site and appropriate assessment is therefore not required.

Appendix 2

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP-320119-24
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of buildings and construction of six-storey, 85 bedroom tourist hostel, together with all associated services and site works.
Development Address	49-51 Pleasants Street, Pleasants House & 5 Pleasants Lane, Dublin 8
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2,	

<p>Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	<p>Class 10 (iv) - Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district.</p>

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No <input type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 3 - Form 3 - EIA Screening Determination Sample Form

A. CASE DETAILS		
An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-320119-24	
Development Summary	Demolition of existing buildings and structures and redevelopment to provide a six storey tourist hostel.	
	Yes / No / N/A	Comment (if relevant)
1. Was a Screening Determination carried out by the PA?	Yes	Determination - EIAR not required.
2. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?	Yes	EIA Screening Report, Verde (April 2024).
3. Has an AA screening report or NIS been submitted?	Yes	AA Screening Report, Openfield (April 2024).
4. Is a IED/ IPC or Waste Licence (or review of licence) required from the EPA? If YES has the EPA commented on the need for an EIAR?	No.	
5. Have any other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment which have a significant bearing on the project been carried out pursuant to other relevant Directives – for example SEA	No.	SEA has been undertaken for the Dublin City Development Plan.

B. EXAMINATION	Yes/ No/ Uncertain	<p>Briefly describe the nature and extent and Mitigation Measures (where relevant)</p> <p>(having regard to the probability, magnitude (including population size affected), complexity, duration, frequency, intensity, and reversibility of impact)</p> <p>Mitigation measures –Where relevant specify features or measures proposed by the applicant to avoid or prevent a significant effect.</p>	<p>Is this likely to result in significant effects on the environment?</p> <p>Yes/ No/ Uncertain</p>
<p>This screening examination should be read with, and in light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith</p>			
<p>1. Characteristics of proposed development (including demolition, construction, operation, or decommissioning)</p>			
<p>1.1 Is the project significantly different in character or scale to the existing surrounding or environment?</p>	<p>No.</p>	<p>The proposal is for a six storey building, this is generally consistent with heights to the north and also consistent with previous approvals on the site. Whilst taller than buildings to the south and west, the building would not be significantly taller in the context of the surrounding environment.</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>1.2 Will construction, operation, decommissioning or demolition works cause physical changes to the locality (topography, land use, waterbodies)?</p>	<p>No.</p>	<p>Site is an urban brownfield site. Existing buildings would be replaced by a hotel. comprises an existing commercial building which will be replaced by a hotel.</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>1.3 Will construction or operation of the project use natural resources such as land, soil, water, materials/minerals or energy, especially resources which are non-renewable or in short supply?</p>	<p>No.</p>	<p>Some excavation would be required. Construction materials will be typical for an urban development of this nature and scale. The loss of natural resources or local biodiversity as a result of the development of the site whilst of some local significance, are not regarded as significant in nature in terms of the wider environment.</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>1.4 Will the project involve the use, storage, transport, handling or production of substance</p>	<p>No.</p>	<p>Construction activities will require the use of potentially harmful materials, such as fuels and other such substances which are typical for</p>	<p>No.</p>

which would be harmful to human health or the environment?		construction sites. Any impacts would be local and temporary in nature and the implementation of the construction practice measures outlined in the Construction Management Plan and Operational Waste Management Plan would satisfactorily mitigate potential impacts. No significant operational impacts in this regard are anticipated.	
1.5 Will the project produce solid waste, release pollutants or any hazardous / toxic / noxious substances?	No.	Construction activities will require the use of potentially harmful materials, such as fuels and other similar substances and give rise to waste for disposal. The use of these materials would be typical for construction sites. Noise and dust emissions during construction are likely. Such construction impacts would be local and temporary in nature. Measures outlined in the Construction Management Plan and Operational Waste Management Plan would satisfactorily mitigate the potential impacts.	No.
1.6 Will the project lead to risks of contamination of land or water from releases of pollutants onto the ground or into surface waters, groundwater, coastal waters or the sea?	No.	No significant risk identified. Operation of the measures listed in the Construction Management Plan would satisfactorily mitigate emissions from spillages during construction and operation. Separate on-site infrastructure would be used for foul and storm water. The operational development will connect to mains services.	No.
1.7 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	No.	There is potential for construction activity to give rise to noise and vibration emissions. Such emissions will be localised and short term in nature, and their impacts would be suitably mitigated by the operation of measures listed in a Construction Management Plan.	No.

1.8 Will there be any risks to human health, for example due to water contamination or air pollution?	No.	Construction activity is likely to give rise to dust emissions. Such construction impacts would be temporary and localised in nature and the application of measures within the Construction Management Plan would satisfactorily address potential risks on human health, including dust, monitoring, suppression, and abatement. No significant operational impacts are anticipated for the piped water supplies in the area.	No.
1.9 Will there be any risk of major accidents that could affect human health or the environment?	No.	The nature and scale of the hotel incorporates no components or substances which would present any risk of major accidents.	No.
1.10 Will the project affect the social environment (population, employment)	No.	The project comprises a hostel in a mixed use area. Population increase would be transient and minor in the context of the overall area and the character/use of surrounding streets.	No.
1.11 Is the project part of a wider large scale change that could result in cumulative effects on the environment?	No.	Cumulative impacts have been considered, including permitted schemes in the area. No significant cumulative impacts are anticipated.	No.
2. Location of proposed development			
2.1 Is the proposed development located on, in, adjoining or have the potential to impact on any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - European site (SAC/ SPA/ pSAC/ pSPA) - NHA/ pNHA - Designated Nature Reserve - Designated refuge for flora or fauna - Place, site or feature of ecological interest, the preservation/conservation/ protection of which is an objective of a development plan/ LAP/ draft plan or variation of a plan 	No.	No site specific natural or environmental policy designation relates to the site. The closest European Sites are South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA and South Dublin Bay SAC are c.3.6km east	No.

2.2 Could any protected, important or sensitive species of flora or fauna which use areas on or around the site, for example: for breeding, nesting, foraging, resting, over-wintering, or migration, be affected by the project?	No.	The proposed development would not result in significant impacts to protected, important or sensitive species. The site comprises a commercial premises in a settled urban area. No such species were identified in the documentation on file.	No.
2.3 Are there any other features of landscape, historic, archaeological, or cultural importance that could be affected?	No.	The site is in an urban area. Nearby protected structures and conservation areas, or their character and setting, are not likely to be affected. The site is within the notification zones for 2 no. recorded monuments. Archaeological conditions are recommended which would provide suitable mitigation.	No.
2.4 Are there any areas on/around the location which contain important, high quality or scarce resources which could be affected by the project, for example: forestry, agriculture, water/coastal, fisheries, minerals?	No.	The site is entirely brownfield urban in nature.	No.
2.5 Are there any water resources including surface waters, for example: rivers, lakes/ponds, coastal or groundwaters which could be affected by the project, particularly in terms of their volume and flood risk?	No.	The site is entirely brownfield in nature. There are no waterbodies on or in close proximity to the site.	No.
2.6 Is the location susceptible to subsidence, landslides or erosion?	No.	No information on file indicates that the location is susceptible to subsidence.	No.
2.7 Are there any key transport routes(eg National primary Roads) on or around the location which are susceptible to congestion or which cause environmental problems, which could be affected by the project?	No.	There are no key transport routes on or around the site.	No.
2.8 Are there existing sensitive land uses or community facilities (such as hospitals, schools etc) which could be affected by the project?	No.	No such uses are identified in the area. No significant impacts from the project in this regard are considered likely due to its nature and scale.	No.

3. Any other factors that should be considered which could lead to environmental impacts

3.1 Cumulative Effects: Could this project together with existing and/or approved development result in cumulative effects during the construction/ operation phase?

No.

Cumulative effects have been considered (section 4.3.2). No effects are anticipated.

No.

3.2 Transboundary Effects: Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects?

No.

The scale, nature and location of the site within Dublin City make transboundary effects unlikely.

No.

3.3 Are there any other relevant considerations?

No.

No matters identified.

No.

C. CONCLUSION

No real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.

Agreed

EIAR Not Required

Real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.

EIAR Required

D. MAIN REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

Having regard to: -

- the criteria set out in Schedules 7 and 7A, in particular
 - the limited nature and scale of the proposed hotel development, in an established urban area served by public infrastructure
 - the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity,
 - the location of the development outside of any sensitive location specified in article 109(4)(a) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)
- the results of other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment submitted by the applicant
- the features and measures proposed by applicant envisaged to avoid or prevent what might otherwise have been significant effects on the environment.

The Board concluded that the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment, and that an environmental impact assessment report is not required.

Inspector _____

Date _____

Approved (DP/ADP) _____

Date _____