



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Addendum Report

ABP-320953A-24

Development	PROTECTED STRUCTURE: The construction of a mixed-use development of 93 apartments, a cafe/retail unit and all ancillary site works.
Location	Numbers 36-40 Dominick Street Upper, Dublin 7 (The Hendrons Building)
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council North
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	4790/23
Applicant(s)	Phibsborough D7 Development Ltd.
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party Third Party
Appellant(s)	Phibsborough D7 Development Ltd – (First Party) Robert Browne (Third Party) Helen Moore (Third Party)

	MPM Residents Association (Third Party)
Observer(s)	Larissa Miller & Bary Dunne Thomas Gallagher Transport Infrastructure Ireland Helen Moore James Nugent Cillian O'Neill Ann Louise Duignan
Date of Site Inspection	26 th June 2025
Inspector	Emma Nevin

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1. This is an addendum report and should be read in conjunction with the original Inspector's report prepared in respect of appeal ref. ABP-320953-24, dated 11th July 2025.
- 1.2. Coimisiún Direction CD-020398-25 dated 1st August 2024 sets out the decision of the Coimisiún to defer consideration of the case and to seek an Addendum Report as follows:

"1. The Coimisiún noted on page 76 of the EIA Screening Report submitted by the Applicant that "Within schedule at 7:00 AM, information to be provided by the developer for the purposes of screen so dash threshold development three I set out. Most development has been assessed in accordance with the information will stop the Commission what's an option with planning this already recorded this in their assessment. The Commission therefore requests that the EIA screening determination be undertaken for the proposed development.

2. The Commission requests is that the reasoning applied in support of the appropriate assessment screening be clearly recorded in accordance with the Commissions Internal Advice Note, and the conclusions of the screening exercise be clarified.

3. The Commission requests that an Addendum Inspectors Report be provided containing the aforementioned information, and any additional consequences of revisions".

2.0 Response to Direction

- 2.1. Having reviewed the Coimisiún Direction, I am satisfied that the main matters to be considered in this addendum report to the original Inspectors report for appeal ref. ABP-320953-24 dated 11th July 2025, are as follows:

- EIA Screening;
- Appropriate Assessment Screening; and
- And consequential changes

2.2. EIA Screening

- 2.2.1. In my original Inspector's report (ABP-317520-22, 21st February 2024), I noted that there was no requirement for EIA and undertook a preliminary Screening. I erred in not identifying that Schedule 7A Information had been submitted. Therefore, I have completed a revised Form 1 to reflect this (Appendix A of this Addendum Report).
- 2.2.2. The applicant has addressed the issue of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) within the submitted EIA Screening Report (Prepared by Enviroguide – Dated November 2023) and I now have regard to same. The submitted report considers that *“Based on the assessment carried out in the appropriate sections of this Screening Report, it can be concluded that the Proposed Development will not have significant effects on the environment during both the Construction and Operational Phases. Having regard to the nature and scale of the Proposed Development on an urban site served by public infrastructure, and the absence of any significant environmental sensitivities in the area, it is concluded that, by reason of the nature, scale and location of the subject site, the Proposed Development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment and a mandatory Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) is not required for the Proposed Development”*.
- 2.2.3. The applicant submitted an EIA Screening Statement with the application, and this document provides the information deemed necessary for the purposes of screening sub-threshold development for an Environmental Impact Assessment.
- 2.2.4. The various reports submitted with the application address a variety of environmental issues and assess the impact of the proposed development, in addition to cumulative impacts with regard to the existing protected structure on site, other permitted developments in proximity to the site, and demonstrate that, subject to the various standard construction practices recommended, the proposed development will not have a significant impact on the environment. I have had regard to the characteristics of the site, location of the proposed development, and types and characteristics of potential impacts. I have examined the sub criteria having regard to the Schedule 7A information and all other submissions, and I have considered all information which accompanied the application.
- 2.2.5. The EIA screening report prepared by the applicant has under the relevant themed headings considered the implications and interactions between these assessments and the proposed development, and as outlined in the report states that the

development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment. I am satisfied that all other relevant assessments have been identified for the purposes of screening out EIAR.

2.2.6. I concur with the Planning Authority in their Screening determination as follows;

“A screening report for EIAR has been submitted. This determines that the proposed development is sub-threshold for mandatory EIAR. The proposal is therefore assessed against the criteria set out in Schedule 7A of the Planning and Development Regulations (2001, as amended). This assessment concludes that the proposed development will not have significant impacts on the environment during either the construction or operational phases. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development on an urban site served by public infrastructure, and the absence of any significant environmental sensitivities in the area, it is concluded that the proposed development, by reason of its nature, scale and location, would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment, and that a mandatory EIAR would therefore not be required. Having reviewed the screening information, the planning authority concurs with this”.

2.2.7. I consider that the location of the proposed development and the environmental sensitivity of the geographical area would not justify a conclusion that it would be likely to have significant effects on the environment. The proposed development does not have the potential to have effects the impact of which would be rendered significant by its extent, magnitude, complexity, probability, duration, frequency or reversibility. In these circumstances, the application of the criteria in Schedule 7 to the proposed sub-threshold development demonstrates that it would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment and that an environmental impact assessment is not required before a grant of permission is considered. This conclusion is consistent with the EIA Screening Statement submitted with the application.

Conclusion:

2.2.8. A Screening Determination should be issued confirming that there is no requirement for an EIAR based on the above considerations – as noted in Appendix B of this Addendum Report (Form 3).

2.2.9. **Appropriate Assessment**

- 2.3. The original Inspector's report (ABP-320953-24 dated 11th July 2025) noted that *"The applicant submitted an Appropriate Assessment Screening Report and concluded there was no requirement for a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment. Having regard to the nature and scale of the development proposed and the distance from the nearest European site, no Appropriate Assessment issues arise, and therefore I am satisfied the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site"*.
- 2.3.1. The Planning Authority also reported that *"A screening report for appropriate assessment has been submitted. This concludes that, having regard to the nature, scale and location of the proposed works and possible impacts arising from construction works, the qualifying interests and conservation objectives of the European sites and the potential for in-combination effects arising from other plans and projects, on the basis of the best scientific knowledge available, the possibility of any significant impacts on any of the identified European sites as a result of the proposed development, either in itself or in combination with other plans or projects, can be excluded in the light of the conservation objectives of the identified sites. There is therefore no requirement for a Stage 2 appropriate assessment. From a review of the screening information submitted, the planning authority concurs with this"*.
- 2.3.2. I refer the Coimisiún to Appendix C - Appropriate Assessment Screening Determination of this Addendum Report in support of my Appropriate Assessment conclusion as elaborated upon in the following conclusion.
- Screening Determination Conclusion**
- 2.3.3. I am satisfied the potential for significant effects, as a result of the proposed development the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. It is therefore determined that Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) [under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000] is not required.
- 2.3.4. There is no terrestrial or direct hydrological or groundwater pathway between the development site and any Natura 2000 site.

- 2.3.5. I am further satisfied the potential for significant effects, as a result of surface and foul waters generated during the construction and operational stages, on the qualifying interests any Natura 2000 sites can be excluded.
- 2.3.6. No habitat fragmentation to any Natura 2000 site is predicted and there is no potential for impacts on the qualifying interests of Natura 2000 sites due to noise and other disturbance impacts during construction and operational phases.
- 2.3.7. It is evident from the information before the Coimisiún that on the basis of the nature and scale of the proposed development on serviced lands, the nature of the receiving environment which comprises a built-up urban area, the distances to the nearest European sites and the hydrological pathway considerations, submissions on file, the information submitted as part of the applicant's Appropriate Assessment Screening report that, by itself or in combination with other development, plans and projects in the vicinity, the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect on any European Site in view of the conservation objectives of such sites, and that a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment is not, therefore, required.
- 2.3.8. In reaching my screening assessment conclusion, no account was taken of measures that could in any way be considered to be mitigation measures intended to avoid or reduce potentially harmful effects of the project on any European Site. In this project, no measures have been especially designed to protect any European Site and even if they had been, which they have not, European Sites located downstream are so far removed from the subject lands and when combined with the interplay of a dilution affect such potential impacts would be insignificant. I am satisfied that no mitigation measures have been included in the development proposal specifically in relation to any potential impact to a Natura 2000 site.

3.0 Consequential Revisions

- 3.1. As a result of the foregoing assessment undertaken as part of this Addendum Report, I am satisfied that there are no other consequential revisions to consider.

4.0 Conclusion

- 4.1. With reference to Coimisiún Direction CD-020398-25, the applicant's submitted EIA Screening Report, the report from the planning authority with respect to the same, Form 1 EIA – Pre-screening (Appendix A), Form 3 – EIA Screening Determination (Appendix B), the Appropriate Assessment Screening Determination (Appendix C) and the relevant provisions under the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, this addendum report as requested in Coimisiún Direction CD-020398-25 concurs with the recommendation presented in Section 10 of the original Inspector's report, i.e. to grant permission.

5.0 Recommendation

- 5.1. The recommendation remains that permission be GRANTED subject to the recommendation set out in Section 10 of the original Inspector's report and the Reasons and Considerations set out in Schedule 11.1 and Schedule 11.2 and Section 12 of the original Inspector's report.

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.

Emma Nevin
Planning Inspector

11th August 2025

Appendix A Form 1- EIA Pre-Screening

An Bord Pleanála	ABP-320953-24		
Case Reference			
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of 90 no. residential units, cultural/community use at ground floor level of the Hendrons building (Block A), multi-use café and art gallery space, also at ground floor level of Block A, and public co-working space at ground floor level of Block B and associated site works.		
Development Address	Lands at Nos. 36 – 40 Dominick Street Upper, Dublin 7		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a ‘project’ for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	X
		No	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?			
Yes	X	10(b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units.	Proceed to Q3.
No			
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes			
No	X	The proposed development does not equal or exceed the 500 unit threshold.	Proceed to Q4

4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes	X	Class 10(b)(i) construction of more than 500 dwelling units. The development is for 90 units.	Preliminary examination required (Form 2)

5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No		
Yes	X	EIAR required – Form 3

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Appendix B – Form 3 – EIA Screening Determination

A. CASE DETAILS			
An Coimisiún Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-320953-24		
Development Summary	The construction of a mixed-use development of 93 apartments, a cafe/retail unit and all ancillary site works.		
	Yes / No / N/A	Comment (if relevant)	
1. Was a Screening Determination carried out by the PA?	Yes		
2. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?	Yes	A Screening Report for EIAR has been submitted. This has also been noted in the planner's assessment.	
3. Has an AA screening report or NIS been submitted?	Yes	Stage 1 (AA) has been submitted.	
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	N/A		
B. EXAMINATION	Yes/ No/ Uncertain	Briefly describe the nature and extent and Mitigation Measures (where relevant) (having regard to the probability, magnitude (including population size affected), complexity, duration, frequency, intensity, and reversibility of impact) Mitigation measures –Where relevant specify features or measures proposed by	Is this likely to result in significant effects on the environment? Yes/ No/ Uncertain

		the applicant to avoid or prevent a significant effect.	
This screening examination should be read with, and in light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith			
1. Characteristics of proposed development (including demolition, construction, operation, or decommissioning)			
1.1 Is the project significantly different in character or scale to the existing surrounding or environment?	No	The proposal comprises a residential scheme with ground floor café/retail/community uses, which is similar to the existing uses on directly adjoining lands which are located in the city centre.	No
1.2 Will construction, operation, decommissioning or demolition works cause physical changes to the locality (topography, land use, waterbodies)?	Yes	The proposed development will result in site demolition and excavations including the refurbishment and extension to the existing Hendrons Building (RPS 8783) on site and the construction of a new development within the existing site subject for residential, retail and community use in accordance with the 'Z3' zoning objective, "to provide for and improve neighbourhood facilities", as per the Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028, that applies to these lands.	No
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?	Yes	Construction materials will be typical for the type of development proposed. The loss of natural resources as a result of the development of the site are not regarded as significant in nature.	No
1.4 Will the project involve the use, storage, transport, handling or production of substance which would be harmful to human health or the environment?	No	Some potentially contaminating construction materials. Such construction impacts would be local and temporary in nature and with the implementation of standard measures outlined in Construction Management Plan would satisfactorily mitigate the potential impacts.	No

1.5 Will the project produce solid waste, release pollutants or any hazardous / toxic / noxious substances?	Yes	Construction activities will require the use of potentially harmful materials, such as fuels and other similar substances, and will 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 and with the implementation of standard measures outlined in Construction Management Plan would satisfactorily mitigate the potential impacts. Operational waste would be managed. Other significant operational impacts are not anticipated.	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 risks are identified.	No
1.7 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	Yes	There is potential for the construction activity to give rise to noise and vibration emissions. Such emissions will be localised, short term in nature and their impacts would be suitably mitigated by the operation of standard 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?	Yes	Construction activity is likely to give rise to dust emissions. Such construction impacts would be temporary and localised in nature and the application of standard measures within a Construction Management Plan would satisfactorily address potential risks on human health.	No

1.9 Will there be any risk of major accidents that could affect human health or the environment?	No	No risk from the proposed development and the site is not located in vicinity of any major accident sites.	No
1.10 Will the project affect the social environment (population, employment)	Yes	The population in the area will increase and employment would be provided in the café/retail/community element of the proposed development. It is anticipated that the development will positively affect the social environment.	No
1.11 Is the project part of a wider large scale change that could result in cumulative effects on the environment?	No	No significant risks are identified.	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	<p>No National or European sites located on or adjacent to the site. The closest Natura 2000 site is South Dublin Bay SAC and South Dublin Bay River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area which are 4.5 km from the site.</p> <p>An Appropriate Assessment Screening (Stage 1) was provided in support of the application.</p> <p>Having regard to the nature, scale and location of the proposed works and possible impacts arising from construction works, the qualifying interests and conservation objectives of the European sites and the potential for in-combination effects, the possibility of any significant impacts on any of the identified European sites as a result of the proposed development, either in itself or in</p>	No

		combination with other plans or projects, can be excluded.	
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	No European sites located on or adjacent to the site.	No
2.3 Are there any other features of landscape, historic, archaeological, or cultural importance that could be affected?	Yes	<p>The existing Hendron's Building (Protected Structure RPS Ref. 8783) is the primary building on site. As part of the proposed works, however, this building will be renovated and extended which is welcomed and will restore the building. The proposed residential use associated with this building is welcomed and will ensure that the cultural significance of this building will be restored and maintained.</p> <p>The adjoining building No. 36 Dominick Street Upper will be demolished as part of the proposed works. No. 36 Dominick Street Upper adjoins the Hendron's Building to the southeast (side) and is located at the corner of Dominick Street Upper and Palmerston Place. It is a 3-storey, 2-bay building and is vacant and in a poor state of disrepair, with a lack of original features remaining within the building and significant works would be required for its refurbishment.</p> <p>I acknowledge the historic connection to the Hendron's building, however, No. 36 Dominick Street is not a protected structure</p>	No

		<p>and as such its demolition would not impact on the setting of the Hendrons building or the overall character of the area, and allows for the appropriate development of this zoned city centre lands and therefore does not impact on the cultural or historic importance of the lands.</p> <p>While the site is not located within an area of archaeological interest, a condition is recommended for inclusion in respect to any archaeological remains that may be located/identified during the course of the works to ensure the continued preservation of any archaeological interest on site.</p>	
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	No significant risks are identified.	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	<p>The development will implement SUDS measures to control surface water run-off. The development also proposes to incorporate a green roof provision in excess of 70%.</p> <p>The site is not at risk of flooding. Potential impacts arising from the discharge of surface waters to receiving waters are not likely or anticipated – I reference the WFD Impact Assessment Stage 1 Screening report in this regard.</p>	No
2.6 Is the location susceptible to subsidence, landslides or erosion?	No	No significant risks are identified.	No
2.7 Are there any key transport routes(eg National primary Roads) on or around the	Yes	The site is in close proximity to the LUAS and several bus stops which connect the	No

location which are susceptible to congestion or which cause environmental problems, which could be affected by the project?		<p>site to the wider area. The site is within walking distance to the city centre. Vehicular access to the site is achievable via Dominick Street. However, no car parking is proposed as part of the development given its city centre location, which is deemed acceptable.</p> <p>No significant contribution to traffic congestion is, therefore anticipated from the subject development.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, construction traffic may impact on the area, however this will be short term and will be managed via a Construction Management Plan.</p>	
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 impact is anticipated in respect to air pollution on the nearest adjoining sensitive land uses. The site is located in the city centre.	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	No existing or permitted developments have been identified in the immediate vicinity that would give rise to significant cumulative environmental effects with the subject project. Any cumulative traffic impacts that may arise during construction would be subject to a project construction traffic management plan.	No
3.2 Transboundary Effects: Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects?	No	No transboundary considerations arise.	No
3.3 Are there any other relevant considerations?	No	No	No
C. CONCLUSION			
No real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	X	EIAR Not Required	
Real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	EIAR Required	

D. MAIN REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

EG - EIAR not Required

Having regard to: -

1. The criteria set out in Schedule 7, in particular
 - (a) the nature and scale of the proposed development, within the existing site context
 - (b) the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity, and the location of the proposed development outside of the designated archaeological protection zone
 - (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, i.e. An Appropriate Assessment Screening (Stage 1) and an Environmental Impact Statement were provided in support of the application.
3. The features and measures proposed by applicant envisaged to avoid or prevent what might otherwise have been significant effects on the environment.

The Coimisiún 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 (ADP) _____

Date _____

Appendix C – Appropriate Assessment Screening Determination

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Screening Determination

1: Description of the project

I have considered the Boherboy SHD in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

In brief the development comprises the consisting of a mixed-use development of 93 apartments, a cafe/retail unit and all ancillary site works.

There are no European sites in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development site. Table 6 of the AA screening report establishes three SACs and three SPAs were identified within a ca 12km radius of the Site.

Name	Site Code	Distance from Site
South Dublin Bay SAC	(000210)	4.5km
South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA	(004024)	4.5km
North Dublin Bay SAC	(000206)	6.5km
North Bull Island SPA	(004006)	6.5km
North-West Irish Sea cSPA	(004236)	8.2km
Rockabill to Dalkey SAC	(003000)	12km

The closest European site to the proposed development is the South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000210) and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024) both at a distance of 4.5km from the proposed site.

An Appropriate Assessment Screening report has been submitted with the application on behalf of the applicant (prepared by Enviroguide), and the objective information presented in that report informs this screening determination. The applicant's report is dated November 2023.

The subject site with a stated gross area of 3,402 sq. m., comprises an existing brownfield site, situated in the inner city centre on Dominick Street Upper and with frontage to Palmerston Place and Western Way. The site is occupied by an existing four-storey former industrial building (the

Hendrons Building - Protected Structure) fronting Dominick Street Upper. To the southeast of this building is No. 36 Dominick Street Upper, which is an existing three-storey townhouse, the site also includes two former workshop buildings, including a two-storey flat roofed structure extending behind No. 36 along the site frontage at Palmerston Place, set behind a concrete block wall, and the second workshop which extends behind the Hendrons Building.

In relation to hydrology, the site is located in the Liffey and Dublin Bay Catchment (Catchment I.D .: 09) and in the Tolka_SC_020 Sub-catchment (Sub-catchment I.D .: 09_4) (EPA, 2023). The nearest waterbody to the Site is the Liffey Estuary Upper Transitional waterbody (IE_EA_090_0400), approximately 950m south of the Site, which flows east into Dublin Bay coastal water body (IE_EA_090_0000) located 7km east of the Site, therefore hydrologically linking the proposed development to European sites therein, including; South Dublin Bay SAC, North Dublin Bay SAC, South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, and North Bull Island SPA.

Submissions and Observations

I refer the Coimisiún to section 7.0 of the main inspectors' report dated 11th July.

2. Potential impact mechanisms from the project

Zone of Influence

All of the European sites present in the vicinity of the proposed development are shown in Table 6 (EUROPEAN SITES CONSIDERED WITH THE SOURCE-PATHWAY-RECEPTOR (S-P-R) METHOD TO ESTABLISH NOTABLE LINKS BETWEEN THE SOURCES OF EFFECTS ARISING FROM THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT, AND ANY RELEVANT EUROPEAN SITES. THOSE SITES WITH NOTABLE S-P-R LINKS ARE HIGHLIGHTED IN GREEN (IF ANY)) and Figure 8 of the AA screening report submitted and the QIs/SCIs of the European sites in the vicinity of the proposed development are provided in Table 6 of the Screening Report.

The sites considered within the Stage 1 Screening and the distances from the development site are summarised below. Given the distance of the development from the identified sites coupled with intervening screening and topography and the lack of clear hydrological connection no direct or indirect impacts are envisaged.

Name of Site	Site Code	Qualifying Interests	Approximate Distance from Site Boundary	Potential Connection

South Dublin Bay SAC	(000210)	<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>Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]</p>	4.5km	No potential direct or indirect connection
South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA	(004024)	<p>Light-bellied Brent Goose (Branta bernicla hrota) [A046]</p> <p>Oystercatcher (Haematopus ostralegus) [A130]</p> <p>Ringed Plover (Charadrius hiaticula) [A137]</p> <p>Grey Plover (Pluvialis squatarola) [A141]</p>	4.5km	No potential direct or indirect connection

		<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>		
--	--	---	--	--

		Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]		
North Dublin Bay SAC	(000206)	<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 maritima) [1330]</p> <p>Mediterranean salt meadows (Juncetalia maritimi) [1410]</p> <p>Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]</p> <p>Shifting dunes along the shoreline with Ammophila</p>	6.5km	No potential direct or indirect connection

		<p>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>		
North Bull Island SPA	(004006)	<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>Oystercatcher (Haematopus ostralegus) [A130]</p> <p>Golden Plover (Pluvialis apricaria) [A140]</p>	6.5km	No potential direct or indirect connection

		<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>		
--	--	---	--	--

		Shoveler (Spatula clypeata) [A857] Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]		
North-West Irish Sea SPA	(004236)	Red-throated Diver (Gavia stellata) [A001] Great Northern Diver (Gavia immer) [A003] Fulmar (Fulmarus glacialis) [A009] Manx Shearwater (Puffinus puffinus) [A013] Cormorant (Phalacrocorax carbo) [A017] Shag (Phalacrocorax aristotelis) [A018] Common Scoter (Melanitta nigra) [A065] Black-headed Gull	8.2km	No potential direct or indirect connection

		<p>(Chroicocephalus ridibundus) [A179]</p> <p>Common Gull (Larus canus) [A182]</p> <p>Lesser Black- backed Gull (Larus fuscus) [A183]</p> <p>Herring Gull (Larus argentatus) [A184]</p> <p>Great Black- backed Gull (Larus marinus) [A187]</p> <p>Kittiwake (Rissa tridactyla) [A188]</p> <p>Roseate Tern (Sterna dougallii) [A192]</p> <p>Common Tern (Sterna hirundo) [A193]</p> <p>Arctic Tern (Sterna paradisaea) [A194]</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		Guillemot (<i>Uria</i> aale) [A199] Razorbill (<i>Alca</i> torda) [A200] Puffin (<i>Fratercula</i> arctica) [A204] Little Gull (<i>Hydrocoloeus</i> minutus) [A862] Little Tern (<i>Sternula</i> albifrons) [A885]		
Rockabill to Dalkey SAC	(003000)	Reefs [1170] Phocoena phocoena (Harbour Porpoise) [1351]	12km	No potential direct or indirect connection

The likely effects of the proposed development on European sites have been appraised using a source-pathway-receptor model.

In carrying out my assessment I have had regard to the nature and scale of the project, the distance from the site to Natura 2000 sites, and any potential pathways which may exist from the development site to a Natura 2000 site, aided in part by the EPA Appropriate Assessment Tool (www.epa.ie). Site synopsis and conservation objectives for each of these Natura 2000 sites are available on the NPWS website. In particular the attributes and targets of these sites are of assistance in screening for AA in respect of this project. I have also visited the site.

Habitat Impact

The site is not within or directly adjoining any Natura 2000 sites. South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000210) and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024) both at a distance

of 4.5km are the closest Natura 2000 sites to the proposed development. There is no 'direct' or 'indirect' Source-Pathway linkage between the proposed development site and the SAC. No potential impact is foreseen. Accordingly, I do not consider that there is potential for any direct impacts such as habitat loss / modification, direct emissions, or species mortality/disturbance.

There are no Annex I habitats present within the proposed development site or immediate environs. The proposed development site is a brownfield site located in the city centre. No species of conservation importance or their resting or breeding places were noted.

Flora - No protected plant species were recorded within the proposed development site.

Fauna - No SCI species were present at the time of field surveys. No protected and/or rare flora were recorded in the proposed development site. There were no signs or tracks of QI species, of any European sites present onsite.

Water Quality

The Site is located c. 1km north of River Liffey (IE_EA_090_0400), potentially flowing into North Dublin Bay SAC (000206), South Dublin Bay SAC (000210), Rockabill to Dalkey SAC (003000), North Bull Island SPA (004006), South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024) and North-West Irish Sea cSPA (004236) via the Liffey Estuary Upper to the south of the Site. However, given no waterbodies are on Site and the Site is hardstanding/concrete, the hydrological pathway to these designated sites is deemed to be negligible. SuDS measures to be used in the engineering and landscaping design. Any run-off will be via the public surface water drainage system. The surface water for the Proposed Development Site is to connect to the existing 300mm diameter storm drain located under Palmerston Place to the south of the site (Torque Consulting Engineers, 2023), entering the public surface water sewer underlying the Site. There is potential for the surface water run-off from the Site to enter this drainage network and ultimately discharge into the Liffey Estuary Upper to the south of the Site.

The foul water for the Proposed Development Site is to connect to the existing 300mm diameter storm drain located under Palmerston Place to the south of the site (Torque Consulting Engineers, 2023) connecting to the existing foul water sewer network, which will be discharged to Dublin Bay from Ringsend WwTP. I also note that the Public foul drainage system has a Green – 'Space Capacity Available' rating with a WWPT Project Planned/Underway.

As such there is a weak hydrological link between the proposed site and the nearest SPA and SAC. I also consider that the potential for foul waters to reach the nearest European Site to be negligible.

All construction associated with the development will take place within this site. Potential sources of impacts during construction and operation will be considered in the CSM and all potential sources of contamination are considered without taking account of any measures intended to avoid or reduce harmful effects of the proposed development (mitigation measures) i.e., a worst-case scenario. Surface run-off from the proposed development, during both construction and operational phases respectively, will not result in any perceptible impact on water quality in receiving waters in Dublin Bay (and thus in the European sites therein).

Conclusion on the extent of the Zone of Influence

The development is for a residential scheme and given the nature of the works within the applicants existing site and outside the Natura 2000 sites, it is not considered likely that the proposed development will interfere with any of the key relationships of any Natura 2000 site. There is no terrestrial or direct hydrological or groundwater pathway between the development site and any Natura 2000 site. It is considered that there will be no long-term residual impacts from the proposed works upon the key relationships that define any Natura 2000 sites.

3. European Sites at risk

I am satisfied that no risks to the conservation objectives of the South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000210) and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024) or any Natura 2000 sites are considered likely due one or more of the following:

- Lack of direct connectivity between the proposed works areas and the designated areas. There will be no loss of habitat within any Natura 2000 site as a result of the proposed works. It is not anticipated that the loss of any species of conservation interest will occur as a result of the proposed works due to injury or mortality.
- Significant buffer between the proposed works area and the designated. No significant risk of disruption to any Natura 2000 sites are likely during this project.
- No habitat fragmentation to any Natura 2000 site is predicted.
- There will be no additional emissions of water from the site. Wastewater will be to existing mains.
- No emissions are predicted that will impact upon any Natura 2000 site.

Based on a consideration of the likely impacts arising from the proposed works and a review of their significance in terms of the conservation interests and objectives of the Natura 2000 Sites screened,

no significant impacts have been identified on the Natura 2000 sites as a result of the proposed development.

I refer the Coimisiún to Table 1. Summary of Analysis of Likely Significant Effects on European Sites of the AA screening report. I agree with the conclusion presented therein.

4. Where relevant, likely significant effects on the European site(s) ‘in-combination with other plans and projects’

In combination or Cumulative Effects

The applicant’s Appropriate Assessment Screening Report has considered in-combination effects.

There is potential for “in-combination” effects on water quality in Dublin Bay from any other projects carried out within the functional areas of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2016- 2022 (Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council, 2016), Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 (Dublin City Council), the Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023 (Fingal County Council, 2017), or any other land use plans which could influence conditions in Dublin Bay via rivers and other surface water features.

The AA screening report noted that Plans and developments within the other local authority areas which could influence conditions in Dublin Bay via rivers and other surface water features, also must comply with the policies and objectives relevant to the protection of European sites and water quality, including Dublin City Development Plan.

Reference is made in the AA report to the upgrade of Ringsend WWTP which will, over time, address the capacity issues at Ringsend WWTP. As noted under the surface water and foul water sections above, Dublin Bay is currently unpolluted and the proposed development will not result in any measurable effect on water quality in Dublin Bay. There are also protective policies and objectives in place at a strategic planning level to protect water quality in Dublin Bay.

Therefore, and having regard to the policies and objectives referred to under the relevant development plans, it is concluded that the possibility of any other plans or projects acting in combination with the proposed development to give rise to significant effects on any European site in, or associated with, Dublin Bay can be excluded.

It is reasonable to conclude that on the basis of the information on the file, which I considered adequate in order to issue a screening determination, that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to have a significant effect on

South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000210) and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024) or any European site, in view of the sites' conservation objectives.

Overall Conclusion- Screening Determination

I conclude that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. It is therefore determined that Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) [under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000] is not required.

There is no terrestrial or direct hydrological or groundwater pathway between the development site and any Natura 2000 site.

I am further satisfied the potential for significant effects, as a result of surface and foul waters generated during the construction and operational stages, on the qualifying interests any Natura 2000 sites can be excluded having regard to the following:

- Surface run-off from the proposed development, during both construction and operational phases respectively, will not result in any perceptible impact on water quality in receiving waters in Dublin Bay (and thus in the European sites therein). Surface water discharge points used during the construction phase shall be agreed with the Local Authority's Environment Section prior to commencing works on site.
- Should an accidental pollution event during construction has the potential to affect groundwater quality locally. Whilst this is a possibility, this would be very localised and would not result in the degradation of existing groundwater conditions. Furthermore, there are no groundwater dependent habitats or species associated with the European sites in Dublin Bay.
- Foul waters will discharge to the existing network and will travel to Ringsend Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) treatment Plant for treatment prior to discharge; the Ringsend WWTP is required to operate under EPA licence and meet environmental standards. As per Uisce Eireann website (reviewed 09/06/2025) there is spare capacity available with a WWTP Project Planned/underway, this upgrade will ensure water in the Lower Liffey Valley meets EPA standards.
- No habitat fragmentation to any Natura 2000 site is predicted and there is no potential for impacts on the qualifying interests of Natura 2000 sites due to noise and other disturbance impacts during construction and operational phases given the level of separation between the sites.

- No measures intended to avoid or reduce harmful effects on European sites were taken into account in reaching this conclusion.