

**Development**

Alterations to the previously permitted development granted under reg. ref. F15A/0609 (ABP Ref. PL06F.248052) relating to Belcamp House and Chapel including additional external and internal reconstruction, replacement, refurbishment, repair and conservation works; change of use of the basement and ground floors of Belcamp House to provide for community uses; reconfiguration of the first and second floors of Belcamp House to provide 4 apartment units and all associated works necessary to facilitate the development

**Location**

Lands at Belcamp Hall (a protected structure), Malahide Road, Belcamp, Dublin 17

**Planning Authority**

Fingal County Council

**Planning Authority Reg. Ref.**

F24A/0420E

**Applicant(s)**

Gerard Gannon Properties

**Type of Application**

Permission

**Planning Authority Decision**

Grant

**Type of Appeal**

Third Party

<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Breda Doyle
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	18 <sup>th</sup> November 2025
<b>Inspector</b>	Irené McCormack

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1.1. The appeal site is situated approximately 15km north of Dublin city centre, within the Balgriffin area of Dublin 17. Its lands are on the border between the Dublin City Authority and the Fingal County Authority, within the northern city fringe. The River Mayne demarcates the boundary between Dublin City and County Fingal in the southern part of the development.
- 1.1.2. The former Belcamp College lands consist of some 87 hectares / c.216 acres including the former college buildings and grounds primarily in Fingal but with 40 acres within the defined administrative area of Dublin City Council. The segment of the former college which is subject to this application consists of 0.33 hectares.
- 1.1.3. The site comprises the Belcamp Hall complex (a protected structure) and its immediate surrounds. The house and out-buildings have been subject to theft and vandalism in recent years, the most serious of which was a major fire in May 2020 which has almost completely destroyed the interior of the protected structure. The appeal site relates to the original house and chapel which were formerly part of the Belcamp College complex, a boarding school for boys run by the Oblate Fathers. School facilities were built onto the original c.1784 house. St Mary's Chapel was added to the complex in the early 1900s. A two storey red-brick accommodation north wing was subsequently added in the mid-20th century which has now been demolished. The chapel was adorned by 12 stained glass windows by Harry Clarke, which are currently in storage pending re-instatement.
- 1.1.4. A Recorded Monument (DU015-033) is located 150m to the east of the site, described in the Site and Monuments Record as a 'circular cropmark'. The site is located in Nosie Zone C associated with Dublin Airport.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission was sought for the following:

- alterations to the previously permitted development granted under Reg. Ref F15A/0609 (ABP Ref. PL06F.248052), F15A/0609/E1 relating to Belcamp House and Chapel including additional external and internal reconstruction, replacement, refurbishment, repair and conservation works to both buildings on foot of fire damage including upgrade works to Belcamp House's existing roof,

construction of walls and floors, and other works necessary to adapt the buildings to their new uses which includes the proposed change of use of the basement floor and ground floor of Belcamp House from the previously permitted 2 no. residential apartment units to now provide for community uses, reconfiguration of the first and second floors of Belcamp House from the previously permitted 2 no. residential apartment units (1 no. 3 bed and 1 no. 4 bed) to now provide 4 no. apartment units (2 no. 1 beds and 2 no. 2 beds) to be accessed via a new entrance door at ground floor level on the northern elevation of Belcamp House; new lift, entrance lobby and stairs to the basement of Belcamp House to connect to the ground floor of the Chapel; new lift and landing including new steps and railings at north-western side of Belcamp House; new fire exit and stairs to the east transept of the Chapel; a single storey bin and bicycle store; Sundry conservation works to include repair and reinstatement of selected joinery, plasterwork and finishes in selected rooms to appropriate conservation standard; EV charging points and bicycle parking; landscaping including boundary treatments; and all associated works necessary to facilitate the development.

- 2.2. The planning application was accompanied by inter alia a Planning Statement, Design Statement, An Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment, Archaeological Assessment, Aircraft and Traffic Noise Impact Analysis Report, Flood Risk Assessment, Climate Action and Energy Statement and Appropriate Assessment Screening Report.
- 2.3. Further information was requested on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2024 in relation to the internal partitioning of and layout of apartments within Belcamp Hall, request to further explore opportunities to restore internal decorative features, additional justification for some works and detailed design drawings. A response was made on 30<sup>th</sup> August 2024.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1. Decision**

Fingal County Council issued a Notification to grant planning permission on 25<sup>th</sup> September 2025 subject to 15 no. conditions. The following conditions are of note:

Condition no. 3 stipulates -The terms and conditions of the grant of permission made by An Bord Pleanála under Ref. PL06F.248052 (Fingal Ref. F15A/0609), as amended

by reg. refs. F22A/0136, F21A/0488, F21A/0401, F19A/0221, F19A/0220, and F18A/0058, and any agreements entered into thereunder, insofar as these are applicable, shall be complied with in full in the course of the development herein permitted, save for the changes permitted under this application. REASON: In the interest of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Condition no. 4 stipulates - The restoration works herein permitted shall comprise part of Phase 1 of the development permitted under ref. PL06F.248052 (as amended by reg. refs. F22A/0136, F21A/0488, F21A/0401, F19A/0221, F19A/0220, and F18A/0058), and shall be carried out in accordance with the phasing required under that grant of permission. REASON: In the interests of clarity and to ensure the timely restoration of the Protected Structures.

### 3.1.1. Planning Reports

The Planner's Report is the basis for the Planning Authority's decision. In summary, it includes:

- The planning history, the zoning and policy objectives as set out in the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029.
- The report sets out the contents of reports including from the Conservation Officer, and the prescribed bodies.
- The principle of the development is acceptable and in line with the zoning and the existing grant of permission on the site establishes the principle of re-use of Belcamp Hall and Chapel for apartments and community use.
- The proposed apartments exceed all minimum requirements for overall floor areas as per the Apartment Guidelines 2023.
- The report notes that no private open space has been provided. Balconies are not possible due to the nature of the Protected Structures. Extant provision of communal open space is proposed to mitigate this. The existing permission ABP PL06F.248052 / F15A/0609 did not include private amenity spaces, with communal space to the rear proposed to compensate. This approach is consistent with the guidelines which allow for the relaxation of private amenity space for refurbishment schemes.
- Landscaping plan considered acceptable.
- Referencing the report from the Conservation Officer, the derelict and heavily

damages state is noted, and the sympathetic reinstatement and re-use supported.

- The report notes that issues arising from public consultation and this party properties do not directly apply to this application given the narrow focus of the application relating to Belcamp Hall and Chapel structures.
- Further information was requested in relation to the internal partitioning of and layout of apartments within Belcamp Hall, request to further explore opportunities to restore internal decorative features, additional justification for some works and detailed design drawings. Subsequent to FI response the proposed development was considered acceptable subject to conditions.
- The report notes that the Transportation Officer and Water Services Planning Section raised no concerns.
- In conclusion, the development would enable the sensitive restoration and re-use of a significant Protected Structure. It would also provide community uses to support the wider sustainable development of the Belcamp lands. Subject to conditions the development is considered to accorded with the policies and objectives of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029.

### 3.1.2. Other Technical Reports

**Conservation Officer:** Subsequent to response for further information received on 30<sup>th</sup> August 2024, the Conservation raised no objection subject to conditions.

**The Architects Department:** No response received.

**Parks Department** – No objection subject to conditions.

**Housing** – No objection subject to conditions.

**Transportation Planning Section** – No objection subject to conditions.

**Water Services** – No objection subject to conditions.

**Heritage** - No objection.

### 3.2. Prescribed Bodies

**Uisce Eireann** – No objection subject to conditions.

**DAA** -The site is located in Nosie Zone C and request a condition be attached requiring the installation of noise insulation to an appropriate standard.

**NTA** – No report received.

**Irish Airline Pilots Association** – No report received.

**Heritage Council** – No report received.

**An Taisce** – No report received.

**Irish Aviation Authority** – No report received.

### **3.3. Third Party Observations**

#### **3.3.1. Issues raised in the third-party submissions included *inter alia* the following:**

- The parent application (F15A/0609/PL06F.248052) and the impact on private property, summarised as follows:
  - The parent permission was granted on the basis that a septic tank would be decommissioned, and the property would be connected to the foul sewer network. This matter should be enforced by way of a condition on this application.
  - Failed landscaping along boundaries should be re-secured by way of condition.
- Query the status of a new right of way/entrance.
- Request to signage and lighting for the new river walk on the Mayne River.
- A phasing strategy for the restoration should be conditioned.

## **4.0 Planning History**

### Site

#### *Phase 1*

ABP:PL06F.248052 / F15A/0609 – Permission granted on 28/06/2017 for the construction of 263 no. residential units, shops, childcare facility and change of use of Belcamp Hall (Protected Structure, RPS no. 463) to residential use and all associated site works.

The report notes that in the '*summer of 2016, a section of the school building directly abutting Belcamp Hall was demolished, with the agreement of the planning authority, as a consequence of trespass and arson attacks on the property and in order to prevent access to the Hall and further damage. The proposed development now proposes the demolition of the remainder of the southern school buildings and their replacement with a contemporary apartment block (no. 6) on the footprint of the three*

*storey, thirteen bay wing, so that the exposed original southern elevation of Belcamp Hall is retained and repaired.'*

The Commission will note that the demolition works identified have been carried out on site.

Note: Permission extended (2022) for a period of five years, expiring 28th June 2027.

In the vicinity

F18A/0058 - Permission granted (2018) for alterations to F15A/0609 comprising replacement of 9 no. three storey bedroom houses with 8 no. two storey three-bedroom houses.

F19A/0220 - Permission granted (2018) for alterations to F15A/0609 including 6no additional units.

F19A/0221 - Permission granted (2018) for alterations to F15A/0609 comprising revisions to layout and house types of 49 no. two storey houses etc.

F20A/0379 - Permission refused (2021) for 85 dwellings etc for two reasons: (1) The design of the East-West Link Road is deficient and (2) absence of dedicated time frame for restoration of Belcamp Hall (protected structure).

ABP-312848-22 /F21/0488 - Permission granted on appeal for 77 residential units.

ABP314169-22 /F22A/0136 -Permission granted on appeal (2023) for the construction of a 4-storey mixed use building comprising 40 no. residential units and a childcare facility; a single storey cafe structure within the walled garden (protected structure) Conservation/repair works to the walls of the walled garden and an additional section of new road infrastructure pertaining to the East West Link Road.

ABP 316297-23/ F22A/0426 – Permission granted for the construction of 32 no. residential units (11 no. 1 bed units, 19 no. 2 bed units and 2 no. 2 bed live/work units) and 3 no. retail units all contained within 2 no. individual buildings and all associated works.

*Phase 1(b)*

ABP312060-21 / F21A/0401 - Permission granted on appeal for 78 residential units.

Remainder of Belcamp Lands

ABP Ref: 313494-22 SHD application seeking a 10-year permission for the construction of 2,527 no. residential units (473 no. houses, 2054 no. apartments), creche and associated site works. The application was Withdrawn.

### Section 5 Declarations

FS5/032/21 -The following works are exempted development (a) reinstatement of structural floor elements; and (b) re-instatement of structural roof elements.

FS5/032/21 - The following works are exempted development (a) recovery and analysis of building debris, (removal of building fabric remains, (c) reinstatement of Belcamp House south elevation and (d) reinstatement of chapel roof.

## **5.0 Policy Context**

### **5.1. Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029**

#### Zoning

The site is zoned 'RA' Residential Area - Provide for new residential communities subject to the provision of the necessary social and physical infrastructure.

#### Map Objective No 73 applies:

Consider a limited quantum of development on the Belcamp lands to facilitate the rehabilitation and preservation of Belcamp House. A design brief including the quantum and location of any such development, which shall not prejudice any future road requirements, shall be agreed with the Planning Authority prior to a planning application being lodged. Not more than 50% of any residential units permitted shall be sold or occupied pending the full re-instatement of Belcamp House to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority.

#### Relevant Designations:

RPS No. -0463 Belcamp Hall Belcamp College, N32 Road, Belcamp, Balgriffin, Dublin 17 - Former Belcamp College school complex (incl. 18th century original house, Washington Monument, walled garden, bridge & early 20th century chapel.

**Relevant policies and standards of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 include:**

#### **Chapter 2 - Planning For Growth Core Strategy Settlement Strategy**

Fingal settlement hierarchy defines Belcamp as located Dublin City and Suburbs Consolidation Area

**Objective CSO34 – Belcamp** - Consider a limited quantum of development on the Belcamp lands to facilitate the rehabilitation and preservation of Belcamp House. A design brief including the quantum and location of any such development, which shall not prejudice any future road requirements, shall be agreed with the Planning Authority prior to a planning application being lodged. Not more than 50% of any residential units permitted shall be sold or occupied pending the full re-instatement of Belcamp House to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority

### **Chapter 4 - Community Infrastructure and Open Space**

**Objective CIOS05** -- Residential Developments and Community Facilities - Ensure proposals for large scale residential developments include a community facility, unless it can be established that the needs of the new residents can be adequately served within existing or committed community facilities in the area.

**Objective CIOS010** - Flexibility in Design – Ensure community facilities are flexible in their design and promote optimum usage, for users of all age and abilities.

### **Chapter 5 – Climate Action**

Section 5.5.2.1 Climate Mitigation Actions for Buildings includes – *‘Another key mitigation measure in relation to the built environment is to ensure that proposals for substantial demolition and reconstruction works can be justified having regard to the ‘embodied carbon’ of existing structures as well as the additional use of resources and energy arising from new construction relative to the reuse of existing structures.’*

**Policy CAP8** – Retrofitting and Reuse of Existing Buildings- *Support the retrofitting and reuse of existing buildings rather than their demolition and reconstruction where possible.*

### **Chapter 10 – Heritage, Culture and Arts**

Section 10.5.2 Architectural Heritage sets out that there are more *‘modest or everyday structures that are part of the built heritage of the County. Through their form, scale, materials and placement they contribute positively to the urban and rural areas of Fingal, assisting in placemaking and establishing the distinctive character and architectural interest of a particular location. These structures are also of value in the*

*embodied energy they contain, their display of traditional building craftsmanship and skill in their construction, the survival within them of original or historic materials and methodologies some of which may no longer be in use.'*

This section is supported by the following policies:

**Policy HCAP8** – Protection of Architectural Heritage - *Ensure the conservation, management, protection and enhancement of the architectural heritage of Fingal through the designation of Protected Structures and Architectural Conservation Areas, the safeguarding of designed landscapes and historic gardens, and the recognition of structures and elements with no specific statutory designation that contribute positively to the vernacular, industrial, maritime or 20th century heritage of the County.*

**Policy HCAP12** – Intervention to Protected Structures - *Ensure that direct or indirect interventions to Protected Structures or adjoining development affecting them are guided by architectural conservation principles so that they are sympathetic, sensitive and appropriate to the special interest, appearance, character, and setting of the Protected Structure and are sensitively scaled and designed.*

**Policy HCAP16** – Conservation Best Practice

**Policy HCAP22** – Retention and Reuse of Existing Building Stock - *Seek the retention, appreciation and appropriate revitalisation of the historic and vernacular building stock, and 20th century built heritage of Fingal in both the urban and rural areas of the County by deterring the replacement buildings with modern structures and by protecting (through the use of Architectural Conservation Areas and the Record of Protected Structures and in the normal course of Development Management) these buildings where they contribute to the character of an area and/or where they are rare examples of a structure type, a distinctive piece of architecture or have an innate value.*

**Policy HCAP25** – Retention of Historic Fabric - *Encourage the retention of the original or historic fabric such as windows, doors, wall renders, roof coverings, shopfronts, pub fronts and other significant features of older or historic buildings, whether protected or not.*

## **Chapter 14 – Development Management Standards**

### Private Open Space

Objective DMSO24 – Apartment Development - All applications for apartment

development are required to comply with the Specific Planning Policy Requirements (SPPRs), the standards set out under Appendix 1 and general contents of the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2020 (or updated guidance as may be in place at the time of lodgement of the planning application).

#### 14.7.1 Apartment – Unit Size and Mix

Specific Planning Policy Requirement 3 (SPPR 3) sets out the minimum floor areas for apartments

**Table 14.7: Minimum Requirements for Apartments**

Unit Type	Size (sq. m.)	Private Open Space Required (sq. m.)	Communal Open Space required (sq. m.)	Storage Space required (sq. m.)
Studio (1 person)	37	4	4	3
One Bedroom (2 person)	45	5	5	3
Two Bedroom (3 person)	63	6	6	5
Two bedroom (4 person)	73	7	7	6
Three bedroom (5 person)	90	9	9	9

#### 14.19.3 Architectural Heritage.

- Table 14.21: Directions for Proposed Development of Protected Structures
- Section 14.19.1.2 Existing Buildings/Structures states - *Where structures exist on a site their embodied carbon needs to form part of the considerations for any redevelopment to ensure the proposal adheres to sustainable development goals. Adaptive re-use and transformation of existing buildings should be the first consideration before demolition and replacement. The architectural or vernacular quality, style and materials of the buildings on the site should also form part of the evaluation as the Development Plan contains objectives to retain and re-use the historic building stock, vernacular structures and 20th century architecture of merit.*
- Objective DMSO185– Demolition or Alteration of Protected Structures -*Prevent the demolition or inappropriate alteration of Protected Structures.*
- Objective DMSO190 – Structures Contributing to Distinctive Character- *Where*

*development is proposed for a site that contains a vernacular or historic building, 20th Century building of merit and/or structures that contribute to the distinctive character of the rural or urban areas of Fingal then the scheme should have regard to the direction in Table 14.26.*

Section 14.21 relates to Climate Action

- Objective DMSO256 – Retrofitting and Re-Use of Existing Buildings - *Support the retrofitting and reuse of existing buildings rather than their demolition and reconstruction where possible.*

## **5.2. Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines**

- Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2023). (Application made prior to 9<sup>th</sup> July 2025 therefore having regard to the 'transitional arrangements' the 2025 Guidelines do not apply in this instance).
  - Par. 3.39 set out that '*Private amenity space standards for apartments are set out in Appendix 1. For building refurbishment schemes on sites of any size or urban infill schemes on sites of up to 0.25ha, private amenity space requirements may be relaxed in part or whole, on a case-by-case basis, subject to overall design quality.*'
- Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities Department of Arts, Heritage, Gaeltacht 2011.

## **5.3. Natural Heritage Designations**

The appeal site is not located within or adjacent to any European Designed sites or pNHA.

## **5.4. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening**

The proposal is for alterations to the previously permitted development granted under reg. ref. F15A/0609 (ABP Ref. PL06F.248052) relating to Belcamp House and Chapel including additional external and internal reconstruction, replacement, refurbishment, repair and conservation works; change of use of the basement and ground floors of Belcamp House to provide for community uses; reconfiguration of the first and second floors of Belcamp House to provide 4 apartment units and all associated works

necessary to facilitate the development. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment, please refer to Appendix 2: Form 1 of this report. Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

## **6.0 The Appeal**

### **6.1. Grounds of Appeal – Third Party (Brenda Doyle)**

The grounds of appeal are summarised as follows:

- The appellant does not agree with the response of FCC that her concerns are not considered to directly apply to this application, yet condition no. 3 contained in the grant of permission ‘....any agreements entered into thereunder, insofar as these are applicable, shall be complied with in full in the course of the development herein permitted, save for the changes permitted under this application’.
- The appellant’s argument is that connection to the new mains foul sewer for two properties was submitted as part of the original application and her neighbour’s connection has been completed for some time now.
- It is argued that the submission is within the scope of the application as the written agreement submitted on 23rd March 2017 by Gannon Properties agents to ABP (PL06F.2480520) to connect my septic tanks has not been completed.
- The septic tank is now defective and is having a direct negative impact on the area of the riverwalk running along the appellants boundary and is now a health risk.
- It is further noted that no major measures have been made to limit noise around the appellants boundary.
- Request condition to decommission septic tank and connection to foul sewer.

### **6.2. First Party Response to the Grounds of Appeal**

The first party response to the grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The response sets out the context of the application namely the restoration of Belcamp Hall in line with best practice in conservation.

- The first party request that the appeal be consider vexatious in nature and requests ACP to dismiss the appeal in its entirety under Section 138 (a)(i) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended).
- It is set out that the appeal appears to be concerned with a prior application, lodged and granted concerning the development of the overall area within the applicant's ownership, application Reg. Ref. F15A/0609 /PL06F.248052.
- The response notes the report from FCC which includes that the concerns raised 'are not considered to directly apply to this application....'
- It is further set out that the appeal is based on a claim by the appellant that approval was granted for a previous application on site Reg. Ref. F15A/0609 /PL06F.248052, with an understanding but no explicit condition that certain works would be completed concerning her septic tank and is requesting ACP include a condition to decommission her septic tank and make a connection to a new mains foul sewer.
- It is argued that the contents of the appeal have no direct relevance to the subject application.
- It is set out that the applicant has continually made efforts to engage with the appellant over matters relating to her property in the context of the applicant's development of the adjoining Belcamp lands including decommissioning proposal of the septic tank in the form of an Uisce Eireann foul water connection application. It is stated that the appellant refused to sign the connection application thus preventing the sewer connection from proceeding.

### **6.3. Planning Authority Response**

#### **6.3.1. A response from the Planning Authority (PA) was received on 18<sup>th</sup> November 2024.**

- The planning authority's response to the appeal sets out that matters relating to phasing of the development have been addressed in condition no. 4 of the recommendation to grant planning permission.
- Other matters raised under this appeal relate to the original parent grant of permission Reg. Ref. F15A/0609 /PL06F.248052 and do not pertain to this application.

- The application relates to works necessary for the restoration of Belcamp Hall and Chapel and no other amendments to the wider scheme Ref. F15A/0609 /PL06F.248052 was proposed.
- It would not be appropriate, reasonable or justifiable to attach the condition as requested by the appellant.

#### **6.4. Observations**

None.

### **7.0 Assessment**

#### **7.1. Introduction**

7.1.1. Having inspected the site and examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submission received in relation to the appeal, and having regard to relevant local/national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal can be addressed as follows:

- The Principle of Development
- Third Party Concerns re. Connection to Main Sewer
- Other Matters

#### **7.2. The Principle of Development.**

##### *Site Context*

7.2.1. The subject application refers to the original house and chapel which were formerly part of the Belcamp College complex, a boarding school for boys run by the Oblate Fathers. School facilities were built onto the original C.1784 house. St Mary's Chapel was added to the complex in the early 1900s. A two storey red-brick accommodation north wing was subsequently added in the mid-20th century which has now been demolished. Belcamp Hall is a Protected Structure RPS No. -0463 Belcamp Hall Belcamp College - Former Belcamp College school complex (incl. 18th century original house, Washington Monument, walled garden, bridge & early 20th century chapel).

7.2.2. Planning permission is sought for development at Belcamp Hall comprising both internal and external works within the curtilage of Belcamp House and Chapel. This is a revision to the parent permission (Ref. F15A/0609, PL06F248052) approved in June

2017 and extension permission F15A/0609/E1 a period of five years, expiring 28th June 2027.

7.2.3. The proposed development to Belcamp Hall and Chapel will facilitate reuse and occupation of the vacant historic buildings and enable them to become the focal point of the new Belcamp Development as envisioned by the parent permission. The revised application includes the consolidation of surviving fabric where practicable and restoration of specific internal features lost to arson since the parent planning permission was granted. Internal and external changes will be introduced and new fabric to facilitate new uses and the requirements of Parts B and M of the Building Regulations.

7.2.4. The proposed development is summarised as follows:

(1) **The consolidation of building envelope** which survived the 2020 fire and the reconstruction/restoration of other specific inherent internal historic features lost to arson since the parent permission.

(2) **New internal fabric and internal changes** to facilitate new uses. These include community designated uses to the basement and the ground floors, 4no. residential units on the first and second floors linked via an internal staircase. The introduction of a new lift and stairs to the basement of the house to enable the viable reuse of the Chapel.

(3) **The return of historic fabric to the building**, the Harry Clarke stained glass windows, joinery and stations of the cross back into the Chapel.

#### *Zoning*

7.2.5. The site is zoned 'RA' Residential Area - Provide for new residential communities subject to the provision of the necessary social and physical infrastructure. Residential and Community Facilities are permitted in principle on lands zoned 'RA'.

In addition, Map Objective No 73 which is reflected in Objective CSO34 – Belcamp applies. This seeks to '*consider a limited quantum of development on the Belcamp lands to facilitate the rehabilitation and preservation of Belcamp House. A design brief including the quantum and location of any such development, which shall not prejudice any future road requirements, shall be agreed with the Planning Authority prior to a planning application being lodged. Not more than 50% of any residential units*

*permitted shall be sold or occupied pending the full re-instatement of Belcamp House to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority.*'. The appropriate and timely restoration and re-use of Belcamp Hall and Chapel is therefore consistent with the zoning objectives of the site. The proposed community uses are also consistent with Objective CIOS05 to ensure proposals for large scale residential developments include a community facility, unless it can be established that the needs of the new residents can be adequately served within existing or committed community facilities in the area.

- 7.2.6. The Commission will note, as set out in the planning history (section 4.0 of this report) that the existing grant of permission on this site established the principle of re-use of Belcamp Hall and Chapel for apartments and community uses. The proposed development reflects the same principal uses and seeks to address the damage caused by neglect and vandalism over the years and seeks to consolidate the structures and the reconstruct/restore other specific inherent internal historic features lost to arson since the parent permission.
- 7.2.7. The application was accompanied by An Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment. The PA in their assessment set out that the Development Plan fully supports the sensitive restoration and re-use of Protected Structures subject to compliance with conservation best practice and the preservation of the special character of the structure. In addition, the FCC Conservation Officer acknowledges the derelict and heavily damaged state of the buildings and subsequent to the further information response supported the sympathetic reinstatement and re-use. I am satisfied that the proposed development is acceptable in the context of architectural heritage and seeks to retain and restore significant features of merit and provides for an appropriate adaptative re-use of the structures to ensure their on-going protection and longevity in accordance with best conservation practice.
- 7.2.8. Subject to compliance with the attached conditions, I am satisfied that the proposed development is considered acceptable and in accordance with FCCDP objectives for the protection of built heritage including, Policy HCAP8 – Protection of Architectural Heritage, Policy HCAP12 – Intervention to Protected Structures, Policy HCAP16 – Conservation Best Practice, Policy HCAP22 – Retention and Reuse of Existing Building Stock and Policy HCAP25 – Retention of Historic Fabric.

## Conclusion

7.2.9. I am satisfied that the proposed development would be consistent with the land-use zoning objectives "RA" as set out in the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029. I am further satisfied that the proposed restoration of the Protected Structure and the introduction of residential accommodation and community uses resulting in the active use of Belcamp Hall and Chapel is acceptable and in accordance with objectives of the Development Plan as regards built heritage.

The site has remained in disrepair for years, with the degradation of the protected structure resulting in the site becoming a health and safety concern. I am satisfied that the design strategy, in particular, the restoration of the main structures on site constitutes a viable and sustainable use of the site and would be consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

### **7.3. Third Party Concerns re. Connection to Services (Compliance with Parent Permission)**

7.3.1. The appeal in this case relates to the connection of an adjacent property to the new foul sewer serving the wider Belcamp development. It is the appellants contention that connection to the new mains foul sewer for two properties was submitted as part of the original application Reg. Ref. F15A/0609 /PL06F.248052 and her neighbour's connection has been completed for some time now and her property has yet to be connected. In this context appellant does not agree with the response of FCC that her concerns are not considered to directly apply to this application referring specifically to condition no. 3 contained in the FCC recommendation to grant of permission which stipulated:

*'The terms and conditions of the grant of permission made by An Bord Pleanála under Ref. PL06F.248052 (Fingal Ref. F15A/0609), as amended by reg. refs. F22A/0136, F21A/0488, F21A/0401, F19A/0221, F19A/0220, and F18A/0058, and any agreements entered into thereunder, insofar as these are applicable, shall be complied with in full in the course of the development herein permitted, save for the changes permitted under this application. REASON: In the interest of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.'*

7.3.2. The appellant argues that her submission is within the scope of the application as the written agreement submitted on 23rd March 2017 by Gannon Properties agents to

ABP (PL06F.2480520) to connect her septic tanks has not been completed. She sets out that the septic tank is now defective and is having a direct negative impact on the area of the riverwalk running along the appellants boundary and is now a health risk and requests that the Commission include a condition to decommission septic tank and connection to foul sewer.

7.3.3. In the first instance the Commission will note that the site boundaries the subject of this application and as outlined in red on the accompanying documentation are limited to Belcamp House and Chapel and the immediate surrounds only, with a stated site area of 0.330ha. While the proposed development is for an alteration to the previously permitted development granted under reg. ref. F15A/0609 (ABP Ref. PL06F.248052) the 'alterations' the works the subject of this application are limited to Belcamp House and Chapel as specifically referred to in the development description. In this context, while the current application is intrinsically linked to the wider development of the Belcamp lands under the parent permission by virtue of access and sequential development and works not identified with the site boundary as outlined in red relates to the parent planning permission and any subsequent amendment thereto (as applicable). Therefore, I agree with the PA and the applicant that the matter relating to the connection of the appellants property to the foul sewer relates to the original parent grant of permission Reg. Ref. F15A/0609 /PL06F.248052 and does not pertain to this application as defined by the site boundaries identified in red the subject of this application.

7.3.4. Matters of enforcements of conditions (including compliance with any drawings and documentation submitted as part of this permission) pertaining to Reg. Ref. F15A/0609 /PL06F.248052 and any amendments thereto are matters for Fingal County Council and not within the remit of the Commission to address (including reference made in the appellants appeal to noise mitigation around her property). It is not within the scope of the Commission to condition works outside of the identified site boundaries that are not relevant to the permission being sought in this instance.

7.3.5. In any case with respect to the imposition by the Commission of a specific condition requiring the decommissioning of the septic tank and connection to the foul sewer no details, specification or drawings relating to such works accompany the application and therefore cannot be considered.

- 7.3.6. Regarding the appellants statement that her septic tank is defective and is having a direct negative impact on the area of the riverwalk running along the appellants boundary and is now a health risk. The management and maintenance (including prevention of pollution) of the septic tank within the appellants property is a matter for the appellant to address and not the applicant.
- 7.3.7. Regarding the first party request that the appeal be consider vexatious in nature and that ACP dismiss the appeal in its entirety under Section 138 (a)(i) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended). In this context, I note the applicant has stated that they have continuingly made efforts to engage with the appellant over matters relating to decommissioning proposal of the septic tank in the form of an Uisce Eireann foul water connection application and that the appellant refused to sign the connection application thereby preventing the sewer connection from proceeding. While this may be the case no evidence in this regard has been submitted. On the basis of the evidence presented there is no evidence to suggest that the appeal is not vexatious.
- 7.3.8. Similarly, the connection of another third-party property to the foul sewer is independent of this application and not the subject of this application.

#### Conclusion

- 7.3.9. The application relates to works necessary for the restoration of Belcamp Hall and Chapel and no other amendments to the wider scheme Ref. F15A/0609 /PL06F.248052 are proposed. In this context, I agree with the PA that it would not be appropriate, reasonable or justifiable to attach the condition as requested by the appellant to decommission her septic tank and require connection to foul sewer.

#### **7.4. Other Matters**

##### *Private Open Space*

- 7.4.1. The PA in their assessment note that the scheme does not provide any private open space for the proposed apartments. It is acknowledged that balconies are not possible due to the nature of the Protected Structures. Extant provision of communal open space is proposed to mitigate this. It is further noted that the existing permission ABP PL06F.248052 / F15A/0609 did not include private amenity spaces, with communal space to the rear proposed to compensate.

7.4.2. In this regard, I refer the Commission to Table 14.7: *Minimum Requirements for Apartments* of the CDP establishes 5sqm of private open space for one-bedroom apartments and 6/7sqm of private open space for a two-bedroom apartment. While the absence of private open space is contrary to these requirements and I draw the Commissions attention to Objective DMSO24 – Apartment Development of the FCDP which sets out at ‘all applications for apartment development are required to comply with the Specific Planning Policy Requirements (SPPRs), the standards set out under Appendix 1 and general contents of the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2020 (or updated guidance as may be in place at the time of lodgement of the planning application).’ The Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2023). (Application made prior to 9<sup>th</sup> July 2025 therefore having regard to the ‘transitional arrangements’ the 2025 Guidelines do not apply in this instance) Par. 3.39 set out that ‘*Private amenity space standards for apartments are set out in Appendix 1. For building refurbishment schemes on sites of any size or urban infill schemes on sites of up to 0.25ha, private amenity space requirements may be relaxed in part or whole, on a case-by-case basis, subject to overall design quality.*

7.4.3. Having regard to Par 3.39 of the guidelines and the text of Objective DMSO24 which has regard to relevant updated guidance, I am satisfied that the text of Objective DMSO24 is not inflexible and provides for flexibility in the provision private open space having regard to the circumstances of each particular development, on a case-by-case basis. In this instance the application of private open space standards is likely to interfere with the character and setting of the Protected Structure and would be contrary to the provisions of the Development Plan to protect the special character of and the setting of Belcamp Hall and Chapel. Therefore, I am satisfied that the lack of private open space provision is acceptable in this circumstance and compensated by the communal open space proposed and the wider amenities of the setting of the Protected Structures and community uses proposed. I am satisfied that the lack of private open space is justified in this instance, and I do not consider this to be a material contravention of the FDP 2023-2029.

## 8.0 Water Framework Directive Screening

8.1.1. The impact of the proposed development in terms of the WFD is set out in Appendix C of this report.

8.1.2. The proposed project lies within the Dublin Groundwater Body (IE\_EA\_G\_008) (EPA, 2024). Dublin Groundwater Body has ‘good’ water quality status under the WFD for the 2019-20241 monitoring period with its risk of failing to achieve the relevant WFD objectives by 2027 is ‘under review’ (EPA, 2023). Groundwater vulnerability rating beneath the site is classified as ‘low’ groundwater vulnerability (GSI, 2025)

8.1.3. The closest watercourse is the Mayne River Cuckoo Stream (MAYNE\_010/ EPA Code: IE\_EA\_09M030500) located ca. 60m south of the site. The Mayne discharges into Baldoyle Bay SAC (site code 000199). The Mayne Estuary is reported as having ‘poor’ quality status under the (WFD) for the 2018-2024 monitoring period with its risk of failing to achieve the relevant WFD objectives by 2027 is ‘under review’ (EPA, 2024).

8.1.4. The main pressure identified is urban run-off. Surface water drainage in the vicinity of the location of the proposed works, discharges downstream of the site to the Mayne (MAYNE\_010/ EPA Code: IE\_EA\_09M030500). As regards surface water management it is proposed to drain surface water from the site by gravity in a southerly direction via a series of sewers discharging to the existing lower lake south of the old School complex. The lower lake serves as attenuation and treatment for the A1 catchment. Storm water discharges to the Mayne River at a controlled rate, limited to the greenfield equivalent runoff. The attenuation proposals for the lower lake and A1 catchment have recently been constructed in 2023 under the Phase 1 planning permission F15A/0609.

8.1.5. The proposed development is designed to incorporate best drainage practice. It is proposed to incorporate a Storm Water Management Plan through the use of various SuDS techniques to treat and minimise surface water runoff from the site. The methodology involved in developing a Storm Water Management Plan for the subject site is based on recommendations set out in the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study (GDSDS) and in the SuDS Manual (Ciria C753). Based on three key elements – Water Quantity, Water Quality and Amenity – the targets of the SuDS train concept have been implemented in the design. It will be the contractor’s responsibility to implement temporary surface water drainage management systems including surface water runoff controls, if required, in order to ensure that the demolition works have no adverse impacts on water quality within the receiving environment. Therefore, strict adherence to best practice is required to prevent the risk of pollution during all work

stages. General pollution prevention measures are set out in the Outline CEMP accompanying this application.

8.1.6. The proposed development includes the provision of standard practice construction and operational measures. Therefore, in accordance with Appendix C of this report, I conclude on the basis of objective information, the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any waterbody (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

## 9.0 **Appropriate Assessment**

9.1.1. I refer the Commission to Appendix A - Screening Determination.

### *Screening Determination Conclusion*

9.1.2. I am satisfied the potential for significant effects, as a result of surface waters generated during the demolition works, on the qualifying interests of the applicable Natura 2000 site Baldoyle Bay SAC (site code 000199) and the Baldoyle Bay SPA (site code 004016) Dublin Bay (South Dublin Bay SAC, North Dublin Bay SAC, North Bull Island SPA and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA) can be excluded having regard to the following:

- There is no terrestrial or direct hydrological or groundwater pathway between the development site and any Natura 2000 site.
- Whilst hydrological connectivity from the project site exists to this habitat, the connectivity is weak and there is no potential for the proposed works to result in likely significant effects on the 8.1km downstream habitat via the Cuckoo stream given the levels of potential contaminants the proposed project could potentially generate and given the dilution, dispersal and attenuation that would occur within the 8.1km of intervening watercourse.
- All surface water drainage will continue to discharge to the existing drainage network at the existing discharge points. As there are no changes to the buildings surface water drainage rates or drainage outfalls, no significant impacts are anticipated from drainage flow rates on the Cuckoo stream as a result of the proposed project. As such, no significant impacts from drainage flow rates are anticipated on Baldoyle Bay SAC (site code 000199) and the

Baldoyle Bay SPA (site code 004016) Dublin Bay (South Dublin Bay SAC, North Dublin Bay SAC, North Bull Island SPA and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA) following completion of the proposed project.

- Baldoyle SPA is designated for a range of wintering waders and wildfowl that frequent coastal estuaries and is also designated for the wetlands that support these species. There is no direct overlap between the proposed project and the SPA. The proposed project is sufficiently remote that there is no risk of direct disturbance to waders and wildfowl using the SPA.
- Following completion of the proposed project, no impacts on European sites are considered likely as there will be no changes to surface water drainage which is the only viable pathway from the proposed project to the downstream SAC and SPA associated with Baldoyle Bay.

9.1.3. I am further satisfied the potential for significant effects, as a result of surface waters generated during the demolition works on the qualifying interests of any Natura 2000 sites can be excluded having regard to the following:

- The distance separating the site from Natura 2000 sites;
- Lack of direct hydrological pathway or biodiversity corridor link to the conservation sites;
- The dilution effect with other surface runoff;
- No additional surface water drainage discharge volumes or significant increases in flows to existing drainage network will occur as a result of the proposed project;
- The localised nature and limited scale of the proposed development.

9.1.4. 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 demolition phase given the level of separation between the sites.

9.1.5. It is evident from the information before the Commission that on the basis of the nature and scale of the proposed development on serviced lands, the nature of the receiving environment which comprises on-going urban development in the form of new housing construction, 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 Baldoyle Bay SAC (site code 000199) and the Baldoyle Bay SPA (site code 004016) Dublin Bay (South Dublin Bay SAC, North Dublin Bay SAC, North Bull Island SPA and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA) or an European Site in view of the conservation objectives of such sites, and that a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment is not, therefore, required.

9.1.6. 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 because of any potential impact to a Natura 2000 site.

## 11.0 Conditions of the FCC Decision

The conditions included in the planning authority's decision are considered in the following table.

No.	Summary of Condition(s)	Comment
1	Documents and drawings	Standard condition to apply.
2	expire on the 28th of June 2027	Agreed. To comply with the grant of extension of duration of permission under reg. ref. F15A/0609/E1.
3	The terms and conditions of the grant of permission made by An Bord Pleanála under Ref. PL06F.248052 (Fingal Ref.	Agreed. Application relates to alterations to the previously permitted development granted under reg. ref. F15A/0609 (ABP Ref. PL06F.248052)

	F15A/0609), as amended by reg. refs. F22A/0136, F21A/0488, F21A/0401, F19A/0221, F19A/0220, and F18A/0058, and any agreements entered into thereunder...	relating to Belcamp House and Chapel.
4	Phasing	Agreed. Required to ensure restoration works carried out in Phase 1.
5	Works specified and inspected by a Conservation Architect or Conservation Professional	Agreed. However, Single condition recommended re. Conservation.
6	Rainwater goods	Agreed. However, Single condition recommended re. Conservation.
7	Environmental Protective Glazing system for the protection of the original stained-glass windows shall be used only where necessary in exceptional circumstances	Agreed. However, Single condition recommended re. Conservation.
8	Design and location of all ancillary elements within the external or internal entry points and spaces of the protected structures related to the proposed community	Agreed. However, Single condition recommended re. Conservation.
9	No development shall commence until entrance junction F15A/0609 completed.  EV charging	Agreed
10	Landscaping	Agreed

11	Noise Insulation	Agreed.
12	Uisce Eireann Requirements	Standard Condition to apply
13	Requirement of Planning Authority	Agreed. Similar conditions shall apply
14	Damage to public roads	Construction Management Plan recommended
15	Construction hours	Agreed. Similar conditions shall apply

## 10.0 Recommendation

Having regard to the residential land use zoning of the site, the nature and scale of the proposed development, and the provisions of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the development would not detract from the character and setting of the Protected Structure, would not seriously injure the residential amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity nor would it represent a traffic safety issue. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 11.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having read the appeal and submissions on file, had due regard to the provisions of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029, site inspection carried out and all other matters arising. I recommend that permission is granted subject to the conditions set out below.

## 12.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application on the 20<sup>th</sup> May 2024 as amended by

the further plans and particulars submitted on 30<sup>th</sup> August 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. This grant of permission shall expire on the 28th of June 2027.

**Reason:** To comply with the grant of extension of duration of permission under reg. ref. F15A/0609/E1.

3. The terms and conditions of the grant of permission made by An Bord Pleanála under Ref. PL06F.248052 (Fingal Ref. F15A/0609), as amended by reg. refs. F22A/0136, F21A/0488, F21A/0401, F19A/0221, F19A/0220, and F18A/0058, and any agreements entered into thereunder, insofar as these are applicable, shall be complied with in full in the course of the development herein permitted, save for the changes permitted under this application.

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

4. The restoration works herein permitted shall comprise part of Phase 1 of the development permitted under ref. PL06F.248052 (as amended by reg. refs. F22A/0136, F21A/0488, F21A/0401, F19A/0221, F19A/0220, and F18A/0058) and shall be carried out in accordance with the phasing required under that grant of permission.

**Reason:** In the interests of clarity and to ensure the timely restoration of the Protected Structures

5. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit for the written agreement of the Planning Authority:
  - (a) Confirmation that all alterations, repairs and works to the historic built fabric and re-instatement of features to the protected structure will be specified and inspected by a Conservation Architect or Conservation Professional of extensive conservation experience and expertise. The Planning Authority shall

be notified of the details of the Conservation Professional retained/engaged.

- (b) Revised rainwater details. The rainwater goods to Belcamp House and the Chapel shall be cast-iron and shall match the original design and profile for each building. The use of cast-aluminium for missing sections of rainwater goods is not acceptable.
- (c) Elevation drawings showing the design and location of all ancillary elements within the external or internal entry points and spaces of the protected structures related to the proposed community use provider and for the residences including information on signage, building name signage, letter boxes, intercoms, utility boxes for service providers, and proposed locations for any future broadband or other service cable runs. Any proposed external service pipes or room vents are to be shown.
- (d) The proposed Environmental Protective Glazing system for the protection of the original stained-glass windows shall be used only where necessary in exceptional circumstances and subject to the written agreement of the Planning Authority in each instance.

**Reason:** In the interest of the proper conservation and restoration of the Protected Structures.

development.

6. The developer shall comply with the following requirements of the Planning Authority:
  - (a) The development shall not commence construction until such time as the entrance/junction to the proposed development from the Malahide Road, as granted permission under Ref. PL06F.248052 (Fingal Ref. F15A/0609), is fully completed, with all traffic signals commissioned and operational, all road surfacing completed, and all road line marking completed.
  - (b) EV charging points shall be provided for 20% of the proposed parking spaces and appropriate infrastructure (e.g. ducting) to allow for future fit out of a charging point shall be provided at all other parking spaces.

**Reason:** In the interest of traffic and pedestrian safety and to ensure the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

7. The submitted landscape plan (Drawing no. 300 Rev. 2) shall be implemented

in full no later than the first planting season following substantial completion of construction works on site. Any plant failures shall be replaced until such time as the planting scheme has become established.

**Reason:** In the interest of proper planning and orderly development and to ensure the provision of amenity afforded by appropriate landscape design.

8. The development shall be provided with noise insulation to an appropriate standard, where appropriate to the fabric and character of the Protected Structures and having regard to the location of the site within Noise Zone C associated with Dublin Airport. Details shall be submitted to and agreed with the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.

**Reason:** In the interest of public health and to comply with Objective DAO11 of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029.

9. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall enter into Connection Agreements with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for service connections to the public water supply and wastewater collection network.

**Reason:** In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water and wastewater facilities.

10. 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 and surface water management

11. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer or any agent acting on its behalf, shall prepare a Resource Waste Management Plan (RWMP) as set out in the EPA's Best Practice Guidelines for the Preparation of Resource and Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects (2021) including demonstration of proposals to adhere to best practice and protocols. The RWMP shall include specific proposals as to how the RWMP will be measured and monitored for effectiveness; these details shall be placed on the file and retained as part of the public record. The RWMP must be submitted to the planning authority for written agreement prior to the commencement of development. All records (including for waste and all resources) pursuant to the

agreed RWMP shall be made available for inspection at the site office at all times.

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

12. The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development.

**Reason:** In the interest of environmental protection, residential amenities, public health and safety, and environmental protection.

13. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Friday inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

**Reason:** In order to safeguard the amenities of property in the vicinity.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion of 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.

---

Irené McCormack  
Senior Planning Inspector  
2<sup>nd</sup> December 2025

## Appendix 1 – Appropriate Assessment Screening

---

<b>Screening for Appropriate Assessment</b> <b>Test for likely significant effects</b>	
<b>Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics</b>	
<b>Brief description of project</b>	Alterations to the previously permitted development granted under reg. ref. F15A/0609 (ABP Ref. PL06F.248052) relating to Belcamp House and Chapel including additional external and internal reconstruction, replacement, refurbishment, repair and conservation works; change of use of the basement and ground floors of Belcamp House to provide for community uses; reconfiguration of the first and second floors of Belcamp House to provide 4 apartment units and all associated works necessary to facilitate the development
<b>Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 1 of the AA screening report sets out that the development site is not located within or directly adjacent to any Natura 2000 site (SAC or SPA). This part of north Dublin is a built-up residential zone and is predominantly composed of surfaces that are sealed with tar macadam and concrete. In 2015 Fingal County Council granted permission for the development of residential homes on these lands. This work has commenced and so the site is currently a combination of cleared ground with adjacent open areas of grassland.</li> <li>• The closest European site to the proposed development is Baldoyle Bay SAC/SPA. 3.5km from the development site, followed by North Dublin Bay SAC/SPA. 3.7km from the development site and the South Dublin Bay and Tolka Estuary SPA 5.3km from the development site.</li> <li>• The River Mayne is located 6c.0m south of the site boundary.</li> <li>• The proposed new water supply will be taken from the Uisce Eireann network.</li> <li>• Foul drainage will be routed to Ringsend Wastewater Treatment Plant, which ultimately discharges to Dublin Bay.</li> </ul>
<b>Screening report</b>	Yes
<b>Natura Impact Statement</b>	No
<b>Relevant submissions</b>	I refer the Commission to section 3.0 of the main report.

## **Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model**

### Zone of Influence

The AA screening report sets out that there are 18no. European sites within the potential ZOI of the project. Fig. 4 of the AA screening report sets out Approximate 15km radius around the proposed development. The subsequent text establishes the QIs of the European sites in the vicinity of the proposed development. 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](http://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.

### Annex 1 Habitats

Following site surveys carried out by Openfield since 2015 (as part of ecological surveys for planning applications across the Belcamp lands, and augmented by sites visits on June 21st, 2020, April 13th, 2021, and March 12th 2022, the AA screening reports states that '*it can be confirmed that there are no habitats which are examples of those listed in Annex I of the Habitats Directive. The development site is composed of a combination of buildings and artificial surfaces and bare ground. These are highly modified habitats with low biodiversity value.*'

### Surface Water

There is no direct surface hydrological pathway from the development site to any Natura 2000 site. The Mayne River provides a direct, surface, hydrological connection to Natura 2000 sites in Baldoyle Bay however this water course is c.60m from the development site boundary. There may therefore be an indirect pathway to the river via surface run-off during both the construction and operational phases.

The AA screening reports sets out that the ecological status of the River Mayne and Baldoyle Bay are both failing to meet required standards. This is believed to be from nutrient sources/urban run-off. Although the exact cause of this is unknown, this may arise from misconnections whereby effluent from homes is discharging straight to the environment rather than the foul sewer. Unattenuated surface run-off may also be a contributing factor.

### Wastewater

The foul water from the site will then be pumped to Ringsend Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) where it will be treated and discharged to the Dublin Bay. There is, therefore, also an indirect pathway from the proposed development to the designated European sites at Baldoyle Bay SAC (00199), Baldoyle Bay SPA (004016), Dublin Bay (South Dublin Bay SAC, North Dublin Bay SAC, North Bull Island SPA and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA).

### Conclusion on the extent of the Zone of Influence

The zone of influence of the proposed project therefore includes those European sites with potential indirect connectivity through the following pathways:

- Hydrological – effects from surface water quality and quantity.

Due to potential hydrological connectivity from the proposed project to Baldoyle Bay, the following European sites are subject to further assessment below; Baldoyle Bay SAC (site code: 0199) and SPA (site code: 4016), South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (site code: 4024), the South Dublin Bay SAC (site code: 0210), the North Bull Island SPA (site code: 4006), the North Dublin Bay SAC (site code: 0206). All other European Sites can be screened out, due to a lack of any source-pathway-receptor connection with the proposed development. The site of the proposed development supports no suitable ex-situ habitat for SCI bird species listed for any of the SPAs located within the precautionary ZOI of the Site. Furthermore, it is not deemed to be located in proximity to any important ex-situ feeding sites.

In applying the 'source-pathway-receptor' model, in respect of potential indirect effects, I would accept that all sites outside of Dublin Bay including the North West Irish Sea SPA can be screened out for further assessment

at the preliminary stage based on a combination of factors including the intervening minimum distances and the lack of direct hydrological pathway or biodiversity corridor link to these conservation sites and the dilution effect with surface water runoff.

Furthermore, in relation to the potential connection to sites in the outer Dublin Bay area, I am satisfied that the distance to the boundary of the North Dublin Bay SAC, Malahide Estuary SAC, Rogerstown Estuary SAC & SPA, Lambay Islands SAC & SPA, Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC, the North Bull Island SPA, Howth Head Coast SPA, South Dublin Bay SAC and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA AND Dalkey Islands SPA given the nature and scale of the proposed development, the insignificant loading in terms of surface water, the intervening distances and the significant marine buffer and dilution factor that exists between the sites. I conclude that it is reasonable to conclude on the basis of the available information that the potential for likely significant effects on these sites can be excluded at the preliminary stage.

Having regard to the foregoing, my screening assessment will focus on the impact of the proposal on the conservation objectives of the European Sites and their qualifying interests as summarised in the table 1 below. I am satisfied that no other European Sites fall within the possible zone of influence.

**Table 1- European Sites within the Zone of Influence**

European Site (code)	Qualifying interests Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections	Consider further in screening - Y/N
Baldoyle Bay SAC (00199)	<a href="http://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/synopsis/SY000199.pdf">www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/synopsis/SY000199.pdf</a>	c.3.5km	Via surface water discharges at construction and operational stages to Mayne River, and subsequent downstream connections to Dublin Bay via.	Yes
Baldoyle Bay SPA (004016)	<a href="http://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation-objectives/CO004016.pdf">www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation-objectives/CO004016.pdf</a>	c.3.5km	Via wastewater discharge to Ringsend and subsequent outfall to Dublin Bay.  Because of this significant distance separating these areas there is no pathway for indirect loss or disturbance of habitats within any Natura 2000 sites or other semi-natural habitats that may act as ecological corridors for important species associated with their qualifying interests; there is no potential for ex-situ impacts associated with any SPA qualifying interest species.	
South Dublin Bay SAC (000210)	<a href="http://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation-objectives/CO000210.pdf">www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation-objectives/CO000210.pdf</a>	c.8km		
North Dublin Bay SAC (000206)	<a href="http://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation-objectives/CO000206.pdf">www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation-objectives/CO000206.pdf</a>	c.3.7km		
South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024)	<a href="http://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation-objectives/CO004024.pdf">www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation-objectives/CO004024.pdf</a>	c5.3km		

North Bull Island SPA (004006)	<a href="http://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protect_ed-sites/conservation_objectives/CO0406.pdf">www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protect_ed-sites/conservation_objectives/CO0406.pdf</a>	c.3.7km		
--------------------------------	--	---------	--	--

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

#### Habitat Loss

The development site is approximately 3.5km from the boundary of the nearest Natura 2000 site. Having regard to the intervening land is occupied by urban development and combined with the separation there is no pathway for loss or disturbance of habitats in any Natura 2000 site, or other semi-natural habitats that may act as ecological corridors or stepping stones for important species associated with the qualifying interests of Natura 2000 sites. No significant effects are likely to arise to Natura 2000 sites from this source.

#### Habitat Disturbance/Ex situ impacts

The development site is approximately 3.5km from the boundary of the Baldoyle Bay SAC/SPA, and over 3.8km to the North Dublin Bay SAC/North Bull Island SPA. There is no pathway for indirect loss or disturbance of habitats within any Natura 2000 site or other semi-natural habitats that may act as ecological corridors for important species associated with their qualifying interests.

#### Hydrological Impacts - wastewater

There is an indirect pathway between the development site and Natura 2000 sites in Dublin Bay. While the issues at Ringsend wastewater treatment plant are being dealt with in the medium-term evidence suggests that some nutrient enrichment is benefiting wintering birds for which SPAs have been designated in Dublin Bay. Additional loading to this plant arising from the operation of this project are not significant as there is no evidence that pollution through nutrient input is affecting the conservation objectives of any of the Natura 2000 sites in Dublin Bay. No significant effects are likely to arise to Natura 2000 sites from this source.

#### Hydrological Impacts – surface water during operation

The AA screening report sets out, and I would agree that the integration of SUDS into the project design will ensure that no changes will occur to the quantity or quality of surface water run-off. These are standard measures which are included in all development projects and are not included here to avoid or reduce an effect to any Natura 2000 site. There are therefore not mitigation measures in an AA context. No significant effects can occur to Natura 2000 sites from this source.

#### Hydrological Impacts – surface water during construction

During the construction phase there will be earth works however the likelihood of sediment, or other construction pollutants entering the River Mayne is low due to the fact that the lands are already largely composed of hard surfaces, and so significant quantities of soil will not be disturbed. No works are to be undertaken at the River Mayne. No significant effects are likely to arise to Natura 2000 sites from this source.

**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**

### **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 cumulative / in-combination impacts in pages 43-44 of the AA screening report.

A Planning Search was carried out and key developments within the vicinity of the site, in addition the AA screening report notes that this development can be seen in combination with continued suburban style development on the Belcamp lands and it is noted that further developments are planned for the area. In addition, the AA screening report notes that the catchment of the Mayne River has been substantially transformed in the past 15-20 years from farmland to built development. The area is currently a combination of open farmland with significant built development including residential and retail uses. The Santry/Mayne River catchment has been identified as 'priority area for restoration' by the EPA.

The cumulative effects of this type of urban growth can arise from replacing permeable ground with hard surfaces. This can result in deterioration of water quality, primarily from the run-off of particulate matter and hydrocarbon residues (Mason, 1996). To combat this effect the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study was published in 2005. This aims to ensure that new developments integrate sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) to maintain natural, or 'green field' rates of surface water run-off while also improving water quality in rivers. This development is fully complaint with these SUDS principles. The first River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) was published under the EU's Water Framework Directive in 2010. This set out to attain 'good ecological status' of all water bodies by 2027 at the latest. It included a 'programme of measures' that was to address point or diffuse pressures on water quality. The Mayne River is currently assessed as 'poor' while Baldoyle Bay is 'moderate'. Under the second RBMP 2018-2021 the Mayne River is identified as one of 190 'priority areas for action'

The development is considered unlikely to have any cumulative impact on any Natura 2000 sites in the context of the existing infrastructure and associated activities taking place at this site. The statement is supported by:

- The distance separating the site from Natura 2000 sites;
- Lack of direct hydrological pathway or biodiversity corridor link to the conservation sites;
- The dilution effect with other surface runoff;
- No additional surface water drainage discharge volumes or significant increases in flows to existing drainage network will occur as a result of the proposed project;
- The localised nature and limited scale of the proposed development.

The Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 include a range of objectives intended to protect and enhance the natural environment, including those relating to European Sites, wastewater management, and surface water management. These objectives have themselves been subject to Appropriate Assessments, which have concluded that their implementation would not adversely affect the integrity of European sites.

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 Baldoyle Bay SAC (site code 000199) and the Baldoyle Bay SPA (site code 004016) Dublin Bay (South Dublin Bay SAC, North Dublin Bay SAC, North Bull Island SPA and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA) 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.

I am satisfied the potential for significant effects, as a result of surface generated during the construction and operational stages, on the qualifying interests of the applicable Natura 2000 site, Baldoyle Bay SAC (site code 000199) and the Baldoyle Bay SPA (site code 004016) Dublin Bay (South Dublin Bay SAC, North Dublin Bay

SAC, North Bull Island SPA and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA) or any European site can be excluded having regard to the following:

- There is no terrestrial or direct hydrological or groundwater pathway between the development site and any Natura 2000 site.
- During the construction stage best practice standards, environmental guidelines and mitigation measures will be adhered to in order to avoid impacts on surface water.
- Should a pollution event occur during the construction phase, due to the accidental spillage or release of contaminants, this would not be of such magnitude so as to have a significant adverse effect on downstream water quality due to the level of separation and the dilution arising from the volume of water between the sites.
- There will be an improvement in surface water run-off during the operational phase, relative to the existing situation, as surface water will be attenuated/ part treated within the site.
- There is no potential for impacts on the qualifying interests due to noise and other disturbance impacts during construction and operational phases given the level of separation between the sites. While there is a potential risk of noise and disturbance during construction to ex-situ qualifying species, no significant effects are predicted as it is unlikely that the qualifying species will use habitats within the subject lands and in any case the proposed development is not likely to result in a significant increase in noise and disturbance over the existing levels.

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 given the level of separation between the sites. While there is a potential risk of noise and disturbance during construction to ex-situ qualifying species, no significant effects are predicted as it is unlikely that the qualifying species will use habitats within the subject lands and in any case the proposed development is not likely to result in a significant increase in noise and disturbance over the existing levels.

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

## Appendix 2 - EIA Pre-Screening

### Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	321119-24
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Alterations to the previously permitted development granted under reg. ref. F15A/0609 (ABP Ref. PL06F.248052) relating to Belcamp House and Chapel
<b>Development Address</b>	Lands at Belcamp Hall (a protected structure), Malahide Road, Belcamp, Dublin 17.
<b>In all cases check box /or leave blank</b>	
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, no further action required.
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in <b>Part 1</b> . <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<b>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?</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed	<i>Not of a Class</i>

type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.	

**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 type="checkbox"/>	<b>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</b>
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</b>

## Appendix 3 - Water Framework Directive Screening Determination

<b>WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING</b>			
<b>Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality</b>			
<b>An Coimisiún Pleanála ref. no.</b>	<b>321119-24</b>	<b>Townland, address</b>	Lands at Belcamp Hall (a protected structure), Malahide Road, Belcamp, Dublin 17.
<b>Description of project</b>		Alterations to the previously permitted development granted under reg. ref. F15A/0609 (ABP Ref. PL06F.248052) relating to Belcamp House and Chapel.	
<b>Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,</b>		The application site is located c60m to the north of the Mayne River.	
<b>Proposed surface water details</b>		<p>SUD's Measures</p> <p>It is proposed to drain surface water from the site by gravity in a southerly direction via a series of sewers discharging to the existing lower lake south of the old School complex. The lower lake serves as attenuation and treatment for the A1 catchment. Storm water discharges to the Mayne River at a controlled rate, limited to the greenfield equivalent runoff. The attenuation proposals for the lower lake and A1 catchment have recently been constructed in 2023 under the Phase 1 planning permission F15A/0609.</p> <p>The proposed development is designed to incorporate best drainage practice. It is proposed to incorporate a Storm Water Management Plan through the use of various SuDS techniques to treat and minimise surface water runoff from the site. The methodology involved in developing a Storm Water Management Plan for the subject</p>	

	<p>site is based on recommendations set out in the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study (GDSDS) and in the SuDS Manual (Ciria C753). Based on three key elements – Water Quantity, Water Quality and Amenity – the targets of the SuDS train concept have been implemented in the design, providing SuDS devices for each of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Source Control – permeable paving, filter drains</li> <li>o Site Control -Trees &amp; planting,</li> <li>o Regional Control – lower lake at Belcamp is the designated area for attenuation for the A1 catchment. Levels will raise by approximately 1.1m and flow control is provided by the lower weir into the Mayne River by means of a new hydrobrake, all covered under Phase 1 permission (Reg. ref. F15A/0609 ABP Ref. PL06F.248052)</li> </ul>
<b>Proposed water supply source &amp; available capacity</b>	<p>Connection to the public network identified.</p> <p>A review of the Uisce Eireann Capacity website on 26/11/2025 indicated that <i>Potential Capacity Available - LoS improvement required = Potential Capacity Available to meet 2034 population targets - Level of service (LoS) improvement required</i>.</p>
<b>Proposed wastewater treatment system &amp; available capacity, other issues</b>	<p>Connection to the public network identified.</p> <p>The Commission will note that a review of the Uisce Eireann Capacity website on 26/11/2025 indicated spare capacity available at the Ringsend WWTP.</p>
<b>Others?</b>	N/A

Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection						
Identified water body	Distance to (m)	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g. at risk, review, not at risk	Identified pressures on that water body.	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater)
River Waterbody	60m south of site	IE_EA_09M03 0500-The Mayne	Poor	At Risk	Urban Run off	Surface water will be discharged.
Groundwater body	Underlying Site	IE_EA_G_008 (Dublin)	Good	Not at Risk	None identified	Via the overlying soil and water features.
Transitional	c.3km	IE_EA_080_01 00 -Mayne Estuary (Baldoyle)	Poor	At Risk	Urban Run-Off	Surface water impacts as above via the Mayne. Wastewater discharge via Ringsend WWTP
Coastal	c.4km	Irish Sea Dublin (HA 09)	Good	Not at Risk	None identified	Surface water impacts as above via the Mayne.

		(IE_EA_070_000)					Wastewater discharge via Ringsend WWTP
<b>Step 4: Detailed description of any component of the development or activity that may cause a risk of not achieving the WFD Objectives having regard to the S-P-R linkage.</b>							
<b>CONSTRUCTION PHASE</b>							
No.	Component	Water body receptor (EPA Code)	Pathway (existing and new)	Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact	Screening Stage Mitigation Measure*	Residual Risk (yes/no) Detail	Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2.
1.	Surface	IE_EA_09M0 30500-The Mayne IE_EA_080_0100 -Mayne	Surface water disposal via the Mayne. The Mayne flows downstream to Estuary (Baldoyle),	Hydrocarbon spillage / pollution associated with surface water.	SUDs features and storm water management.	No	Screened out

		Estuary (Baldoyle)  Irish Sea Dublin (HA 09) (IE_EA_070_ 0000)	and the Irish Sea.				
2.	Clearance works/ Construction	IE_EA_G_00 8 (Dublin))	Via the overlying soil and water features.	Siltation, pH (Concrete), hydrocarbon spillages	Standard construction practices/conditions	No	Screened out
<b>OPERATIONAL PHASE</b>							
3.	Surface water run-off	IE_EA_09M0 30500-The Mayne  IE_EA_080_ 0100 -Mayne Estuary (Baldoyle)	Surface water will be discharged to Mayne and further downstream to Mayne Estuary (Baldoyle), and the Irish Sea	Hydrocarbon spillage / pollution associated with surface water.	Standard construction practices/conditions	No	Screened out

		Irish Sea Dublin (HA 09) (IE_EA_070_ 0000)					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

4.	Discharges to ground	IE_EA_G_0 08 (Dublin))	Surface water disposal	None	SUDs features	No	Screened out
<b>DECOMMISSIONING PHASE</b>							
5.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA