



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-321497-24

Development	Permission for change of use from function room to aparthotel and construction of 2 new floors, together with all associated site works.
Location	Boomers Pub, Knockmitten Neighbourhood Centre, Dutch Village, Clondalkin, Dublin 22
Planning Authority	South Dublin County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	SD24A/0080W
Applicant(s)	Honeybridge Ltd.
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Honeybridge Ltd.
Observer(s)	Helen Henry Terry Murphy John Kearns Shauna Fitzpatrick

Kieran John Kearns
Andrea Canning
Ruth Perry
AnneMarie Worthington
Lynsay Kearns
Declan Murphy
Sean Fitzpatrick
Woodford Garth Residents

Date of Site Inspection

19th February 2024

Inspector

Emma Nevin

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site, with an area of 0.0682ha is located outside Clondalkin Village Centre within the Dutch Village Shopping Centre. The site is bounded by residential developments of Woodford Garth to the west, Woodford villas to the north, Woodford grove to the east and green space to the south. The subject site is currently occupied by a bar, lounge, function room, restaurant / takeaway and retail unit. Additional retail units are located just north of the proposed development site, with the Church of the Presentation located immediately west of the site.
- 1.2. At time of site inspection, works were being carried out to the ground floor bar/lounge area.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The development comprises:
- Change of use of part first floor from function room to Aparthotel (354 sq. m).
 - Construction of 2 new floors over first floor complete (at second (687 sq. m.) and third (687 sq. m.) floor levels) to provide aparthotel (22 no. rooms) and ancillary accommodation.
 - Existing roof over first floor to be removed to facilitate the development.
 - Reduction in size of ground floor area to provide separate stairs and lift to serve aparthotel rooms on the floors above (35 sq. m.).
 - New external door entrance to the stairs/lift area.
 - Internal alterations at ground and first floor level.
 - Roof top garden provided on the fourth floor.
 - Overall increase in building height from 10.22 metres to 16.6 metres.
 - Alterations to the existing building elevations and finishes.
 - Connection to all services and all ancillary site development works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. The Planning Authority refused permission, following further information request and clarification of further information request, on 20th November 2024, for the following reasons:

“1. The proposed development by way of scale, mass, bulk and overall height is considered out of character with the site and surrounding area, and if permitted, would interfere with the quality and character of the urban landscape. The applicant has also failed to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Local Authority how the design responds to the character and overall context of the site, and if supported, would set an undesirable precedence for other such inappropriate design responses elsewhere in the County. As currently proposed, the development would be contrary to the zoning objective of the site, which seeks to protect, improve and provide for the future development of Local Centres as well as Policy QDP1 Objective 4, Policy QDP1 Objective 5, Policy QDP3 Objective 1, Policy QDP3 Objective 3, Policy QDP7, Policy QDP9 Objective 1 of the South Dublin County Development 2022-2028. As such the proposals would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. As currently proposed, the applicant has failed to adequately address car parking issues on the site, more particularly the development fails to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority that there is either sufficient car parking (both standard and mobility impaired) available on site and within the applicant's control to support the development OR to alternatively justify why a reduction in the car parking standards below those set out in the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028 is acceptable. As such the proposals are considered contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area”.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. Planning Reports dated 10th June 2024 and 20th November 2024 have been provided.

- 3.2.2. This planning application was assessed under the South Dublin County Development Plan, 2022 – 2028.
- 3.2.3. The first planners report considered it necessary to seek further information on the following items:
- To provide the following additional supporting documents: (a) A design statement indicating compliance with Section 12.5.2 of the Plan, Policy QDP2 Objective 1, Policy QDP7 Objective 1, Policy QDP8 Objective 1, 12.5.3 Density and Building Heights, Policy QDP8 Objective 8, Appendix 10 of the Plan, (b) CGI's and photomontages that accurately reflect the floor plans and that demonstrate how the proposal would look from key viewpoints. (c) Full details of all materials, signage (including materials and illumination) and boundary treatments. (d) To demonstrate through their building height contextual analysis that the proposed development has an acceptable impact on the adjacent commercial properties. (e) An Economic / Commercial Impact Assessment Report, outlining if a type of tourism is being promoted by the development, the economic benefits to the local economy and the requirement for such a development. (f) A structural engineers report to determine the integrity of walls / structure to be retained and confirming that the proposed works are capable of being supported.
 - To demonstrate compliance with Development Plan policies: - EDE1 Objective 6 - 12.5.1 Universal Design - 12.10.1 Energy Performance in New Buildings.
 - To submit revised plans which show the overall mass, bulk and height of the building reduced in scale and which include references to the more traditional design elements found within the existing buildings both on site and within the immediately surrounding area, and to review all CGIs, elevations and floor plans for inconsistencies and use of appropriate and correct scales.
 - To provide a supporting written assessment of the existing / proposed shadow study images, including the conclusion and alignment with the BRE guidelines.
 - To submit details in relation to the design and layout of car parking and bicycle parking, EV charging to comprise a minimum of 20% of the total

parking spaces provided, A Traffic and Transport Assessment and to submit a revised layout of not less than 1:200 scale showing the location and number of parking spaces to be provided at the development. Please refer to Table 12.25: Maximum Parking Rates – from the SDCC County Development Plan 2022-2028.

- To detail waste storage facilities with regard to the proposed development are to be submitted.
- To provide details of the advertisement and materials used in construction should be provided in accordance with the 'South Dublin County Council Shopfront Design Guidelines.
- To submit a report detailing surface water attenuation calculations, and provide drawings showing in plan and cross section, SuDS features to deal with surface water run-off and clarify if there is a watercourse adjacent to the site or not and to Submit a drawing showing a revised surface water layout and attenuation for the proposed development site and detail the existing and proposed surface water layout for the site.
- To provide a letter of consent from the landowner confirming that this land can be relied upon for access. If the applicant has the appropriate consent, the metal fence line currently obstructing egress from this door to the adjoining open space should be removed. If a letter of consent is not possible, revised plans should be submitted revising the location of this access to another equally suitable location within the applicant's ownership.

3.2.4. The planners report concluded that *“Having regard to the provisions of the South Dublin County Council Development Plan 2022- 2028 and the overall design of the development proposed and its location within a Local Centre, with regard to national, regional and local policies and objectives, it is considered that the development would represent overdevelopment on an already constrained site located in what is a residential location within Clondalkin, where the applicant has not provided sufficient justification for the provision of an aparthotel. The proposed design also provides an inadequate response to the local neighbourhood and architectural styles, with the scale, mass and bulk of the proposed development being at odds with the immediate local area. Parking issues on the site also require further consideration and*

resolution and are not adequately addressed in the development as currently proposed. As such, it is considered that the development would not be in the interests of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. The application should therefore be refused". Accordingly, permission for retention was refused for the reason set out in Section 3.1.1 above.

3.2.5. Other Technical Reports:

- Parks – No objection, subject to conditions
- Roads – Additional Information Requested, followed by report requesting clarification of additional information, following recommendation for refusal.
- Water Services – Additional Information Requested. Following review of further information, no objection subject to condition.
- Architectural Conservation Officer – Additional Information Requested. Following review of further information, no objection subject to condition.
- Housing Officer – No objection subject to condition.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- EHO - Additional Information Requested.
- Uisce Eireann – No objection subject to condition.
- National Transport Authority – No response.
- Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII) - No objection.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. Thirty three (33 no.) third party submission were received, the issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- Traffic concerns – hazard and increased traffic, lack of parking and existing development is at parking capacity, concerns regarding the use of adjoining roads for parking.
- Noise concerns.

- Overshadowing on the small shopping centre which currently exists at this location.
- The aparthotel will alter the look of the area and the people who exist there at present.
- Aparthotel is not required in a residential estate like Woodford, with 4 hotels located within a 5minute drive of the development.
- Anti-social behaviour.
- Overlooking residential properties will have an overbearing effect and be visually intrusive.
- The aparthotel will visually detract from the area and will compromise the historical and cultural integrity of the surrounding area.
- Transient occupants will damage the community due to relationships with the area not being built.
- Increase demand for public services in an already constrained area.
- Economic rationale is questioned when weighed against the community which exists.
- The visual impact is out of character with the area, with implications of materials used, scale and design. It would disrupt the distinctive character of the area.
- Concern raised about the roof garden which will generate additional noise and will overlook residential properties in the area.
- The development may increase surface water drainage issues in the area.
- Proposed development will breach the SDCC Heritage Plan.
- The provision of an additional 2 storeys would appear excessive in a 1-2 storey residential area.
- Construction period of the proposed development will cause additional noise, car parking disruption as well as rise in dust etc.

- Crowd control barrier placed along the southern boundary, adjacent to the green space, have remained despite complaints to SDCC.
- Planning application does not appear to be signed.
- The application would create an undesirable precedence in the area.
- Architectural design of the building is not in keeping with its surroundings.
- No waste management plan included with the application.
- The building is not sustainable and does not provide any additional measure for heating etc.
- Site location map appears to be incorrect scale.
- No direct bus between town and the location in the future.
- The development does not follow directions set within the South Dublin County Development Plan or the Landscape Character Assessment.
- Hotel purpose does not support tourism.
- Devaluation of property.
- Detrimental to business which currently operate next to this building.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. The following recent planning history relates to the appeal site:

- SD21A/0205: Retention and permission granted by South Dublin County Council on 8th December 2021 for the removal of the ground floor internal courtyard with canopy over as per Planning Ref SD013A/0047; and permission for reduction in size of lounge floor area, kitchen extension within part of previous lounge area, relocation of off licence area, change of use of previous off licence and internal layout changes.
- SD13A/0047: Permission granted by South Dublin County Council on 14th May 2013 for the retention of 2 canopies above roof level, over new ground floor; internal courtyard and new first floor rooftop terrace.

- SD12A/0031: Permission granted by South Dublin County Council on 3rd April 2012 for the retention of timber shopfront & fascia to car park side & roadside elevations.
- SD08A/0419: Permission granted by South Dublin County Council on 13th August 2008 for the retention of timber & glass canopy structure on the front elevation of the building facing the public road and planting boxes on top of the boundary wall facing the public road, in lieu of the awning structure as per previous grant of Planning Permission SD05A/0543:

4.2. Relevant adjoining planning history to the east and west of the appeal site:

- SD18A/0221 - Permission granted by South Dublin County Council on the 9th of August 2018 for the change of use of an existing building from office to retail shop, with associated internal reconfigurations and ancillary office use; and associated advertising and ancillary site works.
- SD14A/0009 - Permission granted by South Dublin County Council on the 24th of April 2014 for change of use from office use to airsoft/recreational use and ancillary retail use (1,652sqm).
- SD17A/0432 - Permission granted by South Dublin County Council on the 6th of February 2018 for change of use from office use to fitness/recreational use.
- SD14A/0214 - Permission granted by South Dublin County Council on the 6th of March 2015 for Single storey extension to the front and side of the existing store of 363sq.m and signage.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. South Dublin County Development Plan 2022 – 2028

5.1.1. The appeal site is subject to zoning objective ‘objective “LC’ – “To protect, improve and provide for the future development of Local Centres”.

5.1.2. Relevant Development Plan Sections and Objectives

- Policy CS5: Lands for Employment Ensure that sufficient serviced lands continue to be available in the right place for employment generation over the lifetime of the Development Plan.

- Table 14: RSES Settlement Hierarchy relating to South Dublin County Council
- Chapter 4 Green Infrastructure - Section 4.1 Methodology
- Policy GI1: Overarching
- GI1 Objective 4: To require development to incorporate GI as an integral part of the design and layout concept for all development in the County including but not restricted to residential, commercial and mixed use through the explicit identification of GI as part of a landscape plan, identifying environmental assets and including proposals which protect, manage and enhance
- GI resources providing links to local and countywide GI networks.
- Section 4.2.1 Biodiversity
- GI2 Objective 4: To integrate GI, and include areas to be managed for biodiversity, as an essential component of all new developments in accordance with the requirements set out in Chapter 12: Implementation and Monitoring and the policies and objectives of this chapter.
- Section 4.2.2 Sustainable Water Management
- Policy GI3: Sustainable Water Management
- Policy GI4: Sustainable Drainage Systems
- GI4 Objective 1: To limit surface water run-off from new developments through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) using surface water and nature-based solutions and ensure that SuDS is integrated into all new development in the County and designed in accordance with South Dublin County Council's Sustainable Drainage Explanatory Design and Evaluation Guide, 2022.
- GI4 Objective 3: To require multifunctional open space provision within new developments to include provision for ecology and sustainable water management.
- Chapter 5 Quality Design and Healthy Placemaking
- Section 5.2.1 The Delivery of Sustainable Neighbourhoods 'The Plan Approach' QDP2 Objective 1: To ensure that applications for new development are accompanied by a statement from a suitably qualified

person detailing how 'The Plan Approach' has been taken into consideration and incorporated into the design of the development including the materials and finishes proposed and demonstrating how the overarching principles for the achievement of successful and sustainable neighbourhoods have been integrated as part of the design proposal.

- Section 5.2 Successful and Sustainable Neighbourhoods
- QDP1 Objective 4: To reinforce the network of urban centres as the appropriate locations for new mixed-use development, ensuring that the existing context including identified built and natural assets, urban design, integration and potential for connectivity fully informs development.
- QDP1 Objective 5: To promote the re-development of underutilised Local Centres within the County as new mixed use neighbourhood hubs continuing to provide for local retail and services in a manner which respects and consolidates the existing urban character of these areas ensuring adherence to the eight key design principles in 'The Plan Approach' including quality of design, integration, accessibility and connections to the surrounding areas.
- Section 5.2.2 Context
- Policy QDP3: Neighbourhood Context Support and facilitate proposals which contribute in a positive manner to the character and setting of an area.
- QDP3 Objective 1: To ensure new development contributes in a positive manner to the character and setting of the immediate area in which a proposed development is located taking into consideration the provisions set out in Chapters 3 and 4 of this Plan and having regard to the requirements set out in Chapter 12: Implementation and Monitoring in relation to design statements.
- QDP3 Objective 3: To promote and adhere to design standards and densities in village centres that are informed by the surrounding village and historic context and enhance the specific characteristics of each town or village in terms of design, scale, form and external finishes.
- Section 5.2.3 Healthy Placemaking

- Policy QDP3: Neighbourhood Context Support and facilitate proposals which contribute in a positive manner to the character and setting of an area.
- QDP4 Objective 2: To promote a high standard of building and urban design, creating public spaces that are distinctive, safe, universally accessible and facilitate social and cultural diversity and interaction.
- Section 5.2.6 High Quality and Inclusive Development
- Policy QDP7: High Quality Design – Development General Promote and facilitate development which incorporates exemplary standards of high-quality, sustainable and inclusive urban design, urban form and architecture.
- QDP7 Objective 2: To actively promote well-designed streets and public spaces that provide for active frontages and 'live' edges that feel safe, secure and attractive for all to use.
- QDP7 Objective 2: To require a high quality of design and finish for new and replacement shopfronts, signage and advertising, having regard to the requirements set out in Chapter 12: Implementation and Monitoring.
- QDP7 Objective 4: To ensure that the principles of good shopfront design as set out in South Dublin County Council Shopfront Design Guidelines (2019) (or any superseding guidelines) are adhered to.
- QDP7 Objective 6: To ensure that development provides an integrated and balanced approach to movement, healthy placemaking and streetscape design in accordance with the requirements of the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets, DTTAS and DEHLG (2019).
- Policy QDP7: High Quality Design – Adaptability and Inclusivity QDP7
- Objective 8: To promote and support a Universal Design Approach to residential and non-residential development – having regard in particular to the universal design principles and guidance in relation to Buildings for Everyone, Housing and Shared Space as promoted by the Centre for Excellence in Universal Design at the National Disability Authority – ensuring that all environments are inclusive and can be used to the fullest extent possible by all users regardless of age, ability or disability consistent with

RPO 9.12 and 9.13 of the RSES. (See also Chapter 8: Community Infrastructure and Open Space).

- Policy QDP8: High Quality Design – Building Height and Density Guide (BHDG) QDP8 Objective 1: To assess development proposals in accordance with the Building Height and Density Guide set out in Appendix 10 of this Development Plan and associated planning guidelines. In this regard, all medium to large scale and complex planning applications (30 + residential units, commercial development over 1,000 sq. m or as otherwise required by the Planning Authority) shall be accompanied by a ‘Design Statement’. The Design Statement shall include, inter alia, a detailed analysis of the proposal and statement based on the guidance, principles and performance-based design criteria set out in South Dublin County’s Height and Density Guide. Any departures within the proposed development from the guidance set out in the Building Height and Density Guide for South Dublin County (Appendix 10) shall be clearly highlighted in the Design Statement. (See Chapter 12: Implementation and Monitoring).
- QDP8 Objective 2: In accordance with NPO35, SPPR1 and SPPR3, to proactively consider increased building heights on lands zoned Regeneration (Regen), Major Retail Centre (MRC), District Centre (DC), Local Centre (LC), Town Centre (TC) and New Residential (Res-N) and on sites demonstrated as having the capacity to accommodate increased densities in line with the locational criteria of Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2020) and the Urban Design Manual – Best Practice Guidelines (2009), where it is clearly demonstrated by means of an urban design analysis carried out in accordance with the provisions of South Dublin County’s Building Height and Density Guide that it is contextually appropriate to do so.
- Policy QDP9: High Quality Design - Building Height and Density Apply a context driven approach to building heights in South Dublin, as supported by South Dublin’s Building Heights and Density Guide.
- QDP9 Objective 1: To require that designers and applicants demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority that applications for landmark type

buildings or for amplified heights akin to a landmark, are contextually appropriate and that the proportionate function of the landmark justifies it, having regard to the primary, secondary and local landmark classifications.

- Policy H8: Public Open space
- Policy H9: Private and Semi-Private Open space
- Policy H14: Residential Extensions Support the extension of existing dwellings subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities.
- Policy SM2: Walking and Cycling
- Section 7.10 Car Parking
- Policy SM7: Car Parking and EV Charging
- SM7 Objective 7: To design and manage parking to ensure the efficient turnover of spaces within town, district and village centres and higher density development areas by applying the following measures: - Ensuring that car parking is predominantly provided on-street and within communal and undesignated spaces, except in areas identified as tourist and food destination locations where additional widening of pedestrian areas is desirable necessitating the removal of on-street parking to facilitate; - Placing restrictions on longer term parking.
- Policy COS5: Parks and Public Open space – Overarching
- Section 9.4.2 Retail Hierarchy - Table 9.1 Retail Hierarchy
- Section 9.4.4 Additional Retail Floorspace and Sequential Growth
- Policy EDE8: Retail - Overarching Seek to ensure adequate retail provision at suitable locations in the County, having regard to the sequential approach, and protect the vitality and viability of existing centres in accordance with the retail framework provided by the Retail Planning Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2012, or any superseding guidelines) and EMRA RSES Retail Hierarchy
- EDE8 Objective 1: To have regard to the Retail Planning Guidelines for Planning Authorities, DOECLG (2012) and the EMRA RSES Retail Hierarchy

(or subsequent guidance) in defining the role of retail centres and in determining planning applications for retail development.

- EDE8 Objective 3: To support new retail provision in the County to meet the needs of the County's population and to direct new retail floor space into designated retail centres in accordance with the County Retail Hierarchy, so that centres can maintain and expand their retail offer.
- EDE8 Objective 4: To support the viability and vitality of the existing retail centres in the County, in particular in town, village and district centres and to facilitate a competitive and healthy environment for the retail industry, while reinforcing sustainable development.
- Policy EDE14: Retail – Local Centres
- EDE14 Objective 1: To support the development and enhancement of local centres as sustainable, multifaceted, retail led mixed use centres, enhancing local access to daily retail needs, which do not adversely impact on or draw trade from higher order retail centres. Section 9.9 Tourism and Leisure
- Policy EDE19: Tourism Infrastructure
- EDE19 Objective 1: To support the development of tourism infrastructure, attractions, activities, accommodation and facilities at appropriate locations subject to sensitive design and demonstrated environmental safeguards.
- EDE19 Objective 2: To primarily direct tourist facilities into established centres, in particular town and village centres, where they can contribute to the wider economic vitality of urban centres.
- IE7: Waste Management
- IE7 Objective 5: To ensure the provision of adequately sized public recycling facilities in association with new commercial developments and in tandem with significant change of use / extensions of existing commercial developments where appropriate.
- Section 11.1: Water Supply and Wastewater
- Policy IE2: Water Supply and Wastewater Ensure that water supply and wastewater infrastructure is sufficient to meet the growing needs of the

population and to support growth in jobs over the lifetime of the Development Plan facilitating environment protection and sustainable growth.

- IE2 Objective 1: To work in conjunction with Irish Water to protect existing water and drainage infrastructure and to promote the ongoing upgrade and expansion of water supply and wastewater services to meet the future needs of the County and the Region.
- Section 11.2: Surface Water and Groundwater
- Policy IE3: Surface Water and Groundwater Manage surface water and protect and enhance ground and surface water quality to meet the requirements of the EU Water Framework Directive.
- Section 11.3: Flood Risk Management
- IE4: Flood Risk Ensure the continued incorporation of Flood Risk Management into the spatial planning of the County, to meet the requirements of the EU Floods Directive and the EU Water Framework Directive and to promote a climate resilient County.
- Section 12.3.1 Appropriate Assessment
- Section 12.3.3 Environmental Impact Assessment
- Section 12.4.2 Green Infrastructure and Development Management
- Section 12.5.1 Universal Design
- Section 12.5.2 Design Considerations and Statements
- Section 12.5.3 Density and Building Heights
- Section 12.5.4 Public Realm: (At the Site Level)
- Section 12.5.6 Shopfront Design Development proposals for new or amended shopfront(s) should address the following design criteria: - Relate to the architecture of the building of which it forms part of and respect the scale and proportions of the streetscape; - Maintain the existing grain of development along the street by respecting the appropriate plot width; - The scale of windows and frequency of openings should seek to maximise activity and surveillance to the adjacent street; Utilise materials, colours and textures that complement the architectural character of the building and integrate with the

overall visual unity of the streetscape; - Architecturally integrate signage that is of a high standard of design, finish and installation; - Take a balanced approach to the design of security measures to ensure that the need to secure the premises does not conflict with visual amenity. For this reason, the use of roller-shutters will be restricted; - Ensure canopies, outdoor seating and displays add to the attractiveness and vibrancy of an area and do not disrupt movement along footpaths. - Proposals for shopfronts, should have regard to the guidance set out in the South Dublin County Council Shopfront Design Guide (2019), which provides guidance in relation to the overall form of shopfronts and individual elements including materials, signage, lighting and security arrangements.

- Section 12.5.7 Signage - Advertising 12.7.2 Traffic and Transport Assessments
- Section 12.7.3 Travel Plans - Table 12.24
- Section 12.7.1 Bicycle Parking / Storage Standards
- Section 12.7.4 Car Parking Standards – Table
- Section 12.25
- Section 12.9.5 Retail Development
- Section 12.10.1 Energy Performance in New Buildings
- Section 12.11.1 Water Management
- Section 12.11.3 Waste Management
- Section 12.11.4 Environmental Hazard Management

5.2. **Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines**

5.2.1. Section 28 Guidance:

- Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Urban Development and Building Heights (2018).
- Urban Design Manual - a Best Practice Guide (2009, DoEHLG).

- Appropriate Assessment of Plans and Projects in Ireland - Guidance for Planning Authorities (2009).
- Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2007.

5.2.2. Other Relevant Guidance

- Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (2013, DoTTS).

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

5.3.1. The subject site is not located within any designated European Sites.

5.4. EIA Screening

5.4.1. I refer the Board to the completed Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendix 1.

5.4.2. Having regard to the nature, size, and location of the proposed development and to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations, I have concluded at preliminary examination that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. EIA, therefore, is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. A first party appeal has been received by the applicant's agent against the decision of South Dublin County Council (SDCC) to refuse permission under Reg. Ref. SD24A/0080W. The appeal includes a detailed report on the local authority decision and can be summarised as follows:

- The use of the extension to the building as an aparthotel was acceptable to the local authority.
- The Development Plan states that guesthouse is permitted in principle, and aparthotel is open for consideration.
- Guest house which is permitted in principle does not need to be domestic in design or scale.

- The existing design is from the late 1980's which is very architecturally dated.
- The applicant developed the Dutch Village Shopping Centre and has supported the village centre and community in corporation with the church where communal parking facilities are located as confirmed by the planning application documentation.
- The existing building would benefit from redesign and scale.
- The Dutch Village Shopping Centre is located in a landscape setting at the foot of a hill below the highest point in Clondalkin, which is marked by the Water Tower.
- The land contours lend themselves to taller buildings against a sloping ground with trees and public parkland to the north.
- The extension will not break the skyline or affect the parkland backdrop.
- There is no material intensification of use by providing overnight accommodation in a neighbourhood centre.
- The collocation, public transport and service base in the heart of the community means that car parking demand assessments should be on a minimised basis with bicycle parking/walking safety emphasised.
- There is a regular bus service with a stop next to the Dutch Village Shopping Centre.
- Cooperation agreements with Dublin City Council (which existed at the time before SCDD was established) may have been forgotten in the mists of time but the only continuous presence at the location for c. 40 years has been the applicant who can verify what cooperation agreements existed and still exist today.
- The applicant bought the land in 1984 to provide a neighbourhood centre which has been delivered and successfully run in cooperation with SDCC, the church, the retailers and service providers and provides a valuable service to the community.
- The original public house was amended c. 20 years, and a financial contribution was paid to further enhance the community infrastructure in the

area. Current reporting by SDCC does not reflect these prior agreements or communal provision in the centre.

- This financial contribution was towards additional car parking that the local authority could construct on open space lands.
- The proposal will significantly improve the presentation and identify as a focal centre for the neighbourhood and the proposed use is complimentary, does not cause intensification of use or increased traffic circulation or parking demand.
- The design is appropriate for this site.
- The use is an appropriate addition to the centre, and it is evident that this trend to accommodation in conjunction with public houses is an accepted and common pattern of compatible land use.
- Government Guidelines advocate the increased heights in context with 4-storeys as a generally accepted scale and both the increase heights and the distinctive built form of the extended building within the subject site can be accommodated at this location.

In response to Reason for refusal 1 the following additional comments are made:

- Detailing compliance with the following policy objectives - Policy QDP1 Objective 4, Policy QDP1 Objective 5, Policy QDP3 Objective 1, Policy QDP3 Objective 3, Policy QDP7, and Policy QDP9 Objective 1.
- The further information stage the applicant complied with the Council's request to include staggered building lines, recessed upper floors setbacks, recessed third floor external walls, with new finish to third floor recessed walls, a reduction of 3 no. aparthotel bedrooms from 10 to 7no. and a reduction in third floor area of 139 sq. m.

In response to Reason for refusal 2 the following additional comments are made:

- There is no reduction in car parking.
- The proposed development is location close to public transport.

- The car park is for the mutual benefit for all patrons and is owned, maintained (financially) and run by the applicant and has been in existence for the last 40 years.
- The adjoining retail units and church acknowledge the ongoing relationship with the applicant with regards to the shared use of the communal car parking areas and the maintenance of same.
- The proposal includes the removal of the function room which will reduce the intensification of use of the car parking area, reduce the number of persons in the area and reduce noise.
- The car park is served by a height barrier to restrict large vehicles entering the car park.
- The site is well served by footpaths/pedestrian routes.
- A Traffic and Transport Assessment was submitted as part of the further information request.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

- 6.2.1. Report received 13th January 2025 stating that “*The Planning Authority confirms its decision. The issues raised in the appeal have been covered in the Chief Executive Order*”.

6.3. Observations

12 no. observations were received from Ms. Helen Henry, Mr. Terry Murphy, Mr. John Kearns, Ms. Shauna Fitzpatrick, Mr. Kieran John Kearns, Ms. Andrea Canning, Ms. Ruth Perry, Ms. AnneMarie Worthington, Ms. Lynsay Kearns, Sean Fitzpatrick, Woodford Garth Residents and Mr. Declan Murphy.

One public representation was received from Cllr. Trevor Gilligan.

The main issues raised have been summarised as follows:

- The development is classified as an aparthotel, not a guest house.
- The proposal is not permitted in principle.

- The presence of existing residential properties in the vicinity demonstrate incompatibility with the neighbourhood character.
- Negative impacts on neighbouring properties light access and residential amenity.
- No supporting documentation in relation to any agreement with respect to corporation agreements.
- The primary function of development contributions is to partly fund the provision of essential public infrastructure.
- The applicant's proposal to utilise public green space for private parking requirements is inappropriate and conflicts with the intended use of public amenities.
- The proposed use differs fundamentally from the existing character of the area and would introduce a transient occupancy.
- The proposal is overbearing and out of character.
- No evidence of permission to use church owned land for parking.
- Hotels in the area have been shown to have accommodation.
- The applicants' response to further information requests were incomplete and the applicant failed to provide complete documentation packages and adequate responses to queries.
- The location of the hotel does not support tourism.
- The area does not exhibit any apparent demand for short-term accommodation.
- The removal of the function room will impact negatively on the local community.
- The development would set a dangerous precedent for similar speculative developments in neighbourhood centres, threatening their role as a community hub.
- The current transport links are insufficient.

- Devaluation of property.
- Design and Visual Impact – the proposal does not suit the location and is disproportionate to the size of the surrounding buildings.
- Environmental concerns – increased surface water drainage issues and impact on local biodiversity.
- Overlooking of adjoining park and children's play.
- Overlooking and privacy issue of adjoining residents.
- Loss of light and overshadowing.
- Impact on parking, access, and increased parking congestion.
- The proposal will negatively impact on vulnerable community members, including elderly residents.
- The proposal will impact negatively on the community character.
- Disruption from construction and traffic access issues during construction.
- Impact on areas visual character due to height of proposal.
- Noise pollution and anti-social behaviour.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. From my reading of the file, inspection of the site and assessment of the relevant policy provisions, I conclude that the key issues raised by the appeal are:

- I. Principle of Development
- II. Scale, Mass, Height, and Design – Reason for Refusal 1
- III. Car parking – Reason for Refusal 2
- IV. Impact on Adjoining Amenities
- V. Water Framework Directive
- VI. Appropriate Assessment, and
- VII. Other Matters.

7.2. Principle of Development

- 7.2.1. The appeal site is located within an established village shopping centre in a predominately residential area outside of Clondalkin Village Centre, on lands zoned as 'LC', which seeks to protect, improve and provide for the future development of Local Centres. The proposed development includes the change of use to aparthotel and extension to form an aparthotel and ancillary accommodation. Guest house is a use permitted in principle under this land use zoning objective, whereas Hotel/Hostel are listed as uses open for consideration under this land use zoning objective.
- 7.2.2. Having regard to the zoning objective, the established use on site, and the location of the site relative to the village, I am satisfied that the principle of this development would be acceptable, subject to other issues including scale, height and design, parking, and amenity, which will be assessed in the following assessment.

7.3. Scale, Mass, Height, and Design – Reason for Refusal 1

- 7.3.1. The first reason for refusal considers that the scale, mass, bulk, and overall height of the proposal is considered out of character with the site and surrounding area and would as a result interfere with the quality and character of the urban landscape. It is also considered that the design fails to respond to the character and overall context of the site and as such is contrary to the zoning objective and Policy QDP1 Objective 4, Policy QDP1 Objective 5, Policy QDP3 Objective 1, Policy QDP3 Objective 3, Policy QDP7, Policy QDP9 Objective 1 of the South Dublin County Development 2022-2028.
- 7.3.2. Concern has also been raised by the observers in respect to the proposed design and the potential impact that this will have on the areas and the community setting.
- 7.3.3. The appellant has presented a response to the stated policy objectives referenced in the reason for refusal, which can be summarised:
- The use of the Dutch Village Shopping Centre, which supports the requirements for the surrounding community in line with QDP1 Objective 4.
 - The proposal is for an extension to an existing building in a retail complex that the centre is architecturally dated and again does the multi-purpose community based neighbourhood centre facility which supports the surrounding community in line with QDP1 Objective 5.

- In line with QDP3 Objective 1 and QDP3 Objective 3, it is further considered that the site is located in a landscape setting at the foot of a hill below the highest point in Clondalkin, and that the extension in height will not break the skyline or affect the parkland backdrop. The land contours lend themselves to taller buildings. The height of the building appears visually to be reduced by the setting back of the top floor and by using a different material / colour to provide a secondary massing element.
- Due to the site's positioning and setting the extended building will remain as a focal point and a landmark structure and that the height appears to be visually reduced by the setting back of the top floor and the use of materials it is in compliance with QDP7.
- In respect of QDP9 Objective 1, the appellant referenced Government Guidance which advocates increased height in context and again notes the position and setting of the building and that the building will remain as a focal point and landmark structure, which will not break the skyline.

7.3.4. The appellant further notes the further information response which complied with the Planning Authority request.

7.3.5. Following my site inspection, I note that the existing neighbourhood centre is comprised of a mix of single and two storey commercial units, with traditional pitched roofs. The existing public house comprises of a two-storey building with a third storey feature adjoining the road and comprises a mix of brick and render finish. This is a prominent and visible site given its location and while I acknowledge that the existing building is dated and does not contain any significant architectural features, I do consider that any proposed development at this prominent and visible site should have an appropriate design which represents some regard to the existing and surrounding built form.

7.3.6. I also consider that the site could incorporate an increased height, given its location, however, noting the extent of the building, in particular as viewed from the northern and southern elevations, any height should in my opinion include a staggered form and be broken up by setbacks to ensure that it will not result in an overly dominant appearance on the streetscape.

- 7.3.7. As part of the further information request the applicant was requested to submit a Design Statement and revised plans indicating the overall mass, bulk and height reduced with reference to more traditional design elements. As part of the response the applicant reduced the floor area of the proposal at third floor level of 139 sq. m. with the third floor walls recessed and staggered building heights. Cladding is proposed to the third floor recessed walls. Revised plans were submitted detailing the revisions. However, as part of the revised proposal the overall height of the tower element increased to 16.6 metres. I also note that a Design Statement was not submitted. The planning authority considered that the detail submitted does not justify how the proposed development has evolved and no detailed analysis of the existing context and how the proposed height increase in contextually appropriate was provided.
- 7.3.8. Whilst I acknowledge the revisions made by the applicant, I share similar concerns to that of the planning authority in respect to the bulk, mass and scale of the proposed development and the potential negative visual impact it would have on the existing neighbourhood centre, in particular when viewed from the adjoining roadway (northern and eastern elevations) and area of open space (southern elevation).
- 7.3.9. While I would welcome increased height to the site, I do not consider that the revised proposal submitted as part of the further information request has sufficiently reduced the visual impact and dominance of the proposal on the existing structure, which in turn will appear visually dominant when viewed from the immediately adjoining surrounds. Moreover, I consider that a contemporary design approach could be accommodated at this location, however, the appeal does not include a robust justification in respect to the proposed design approach at this prominent location, in particular its integration to the immediate setting at this location.
- 7.3.10. In respect to the proposed height of the building, the appellant referenced the Government Guidelines, which advocate increased height in context, with 4 storey as a generally accepted scale. While this is noted, I reference the guidelines, which state *“these guidelines require that the scope to consider general building heights of at least three to four storeys, coupled with appropriate density, in locations outside what would be defined as city and town centre areas, and which would include suburban areas, must be supported in principle at development plan and development management levels”*.

7.3.11. Referencing the South Dublin County Development Plan, Section 12.5.3, the Plan states *“In line with the provisions of the South Dublin Building Height and Density Guide, development proposals for increased building heights and densities shall be accompanied by a contextual analysis by which the suitability or otherwise of different density and height levels can be assessed with reference to the receiving environment of the proposed development”*. While I do consider that this site could absorb an increase in height, this needs to be appropriately designed and scaled appropriately to provide a transition between the existing and proposed development at this location. I am not satisfied that the current proposal has adequately considered its receiving environment in respect to scale and height.

Conclusion:

7.3.12. Having regard to the foregoing, I consider that the proposed development in its current form is unacceptable and the bulk, scale and height and in the lack of any justification for the proposed design approach, its integration at this location, and the proposed height, as such the development as proposed is contrary to Policy QDP1 Objective 4, Policy QDP1 Objective 5, Policy QDP3 Objective 1, Policy QDP3 Objective 3, Policy QDP7, Policy QDP9 Objective 1 of the South Dublin County Development 2022-2028. Therefore, I concur with the planning authority and recommend that permission be refused in this regard.

7.4. Car parking – reason for refusal 2

7.4.1. In respect to the second reason for refusal, the planning authority expressed significant concerns over the spaces identified by the applicant as part of the further information response in particular the proposed 3 no. mobility impaired spaces which are located outside of the redline planning application boundary, 2 no. spaces are within the blue line boundary. In addition, the planning authority considered that there is inadequate car parking to support the proposed intensification of use at this site. Moreover, it was noted that the applicant is relying on a private car park outside of its control to support the proposed development.

7.4.2. Concern has been raised in the observations in respect to increased parking congestion at this site and the impact on parking access. Concerns were also raised in relation to the construction traffic associated with the building works.

- 7.4.3. The appellant considers that there is no reduction in car parking standards as per the Development Plan, and that the car parking is for the mutual benefit of all patrons and has been in place for the past 40 years. It is contended that the removal of the function room associated with the public house will reduce the intensification of use. It is stated, based on the Traffic and Transport Assessment submitted as part of the further information stage, that the amount of parking required by the new development and existing public house, restaurant and retail units is 57 spaces and there are currently 67 spaces available. Car parking is provided for mobility impaired users, EV charging space and bicycle spaces, all in accordance with the Development Plan standards.
- 7.4.4. The appellant further states that there is a dependable regular bus service with a stop next to the Dutch Village Shopping Centre, so visitors can access the site by means other than a car.
- 7.4.5. Following my site inspection, which took place midweek, late morning, I acknowledge the concerns raised by the observers in respect to the traffic congestion and available parking at this particular location. The car park currently serves several existing retail units and the existing public house. I noted the adjoining car park, which is associated with the church, which as outlined by the planning officer in their assessment, and as evident from the submitted site plan (DRG NO 400/113 A), is outside of the applicant's ownership. As such, I agree with the planner's assertion that the adjoining church car park cannot be included in the overall total car parking spaces available to serve the proposed development, notwithstanding any agreement from the Church in relation to parking. No letter of consent in this regard accompanies the first party appeal.
- 7.4.6. Therefore, the number of car parking spaces within the applicants control to serve the proposed development and the existing retail units on site amounts to approximately 35 no. spaces (DRG NO 400/113 A). However, following my site inspection, I consider that a number of these spaces are inaccessible due to the location of bin storage associated with the existing retail units.
- 7.4.7. I also note that the total number of parking spaces required, as detailed by the applicant in the submitted Traffic and Transport Assessment, is 57 spaces as follows:

As such it sets out the following Car Parking Standards:

Table 2 - South Dublin County Development Plan Car Parking Standards

Type of Development	Car Parking Standard	GFA of Development (m ²)	Max Parking Permitted
Bar & Lounge	1 space per 30sqm	254	8
Restaurant	1 space per 15sqm	206	14
Retail	1 space per 30sqm	468	16
Hotel	1 space per bedroom	19no.	19

The amount of parking required by the development is 57 spaces. There are currently 68no. existing spaces available.

7.4.8. However, Section 12.7.4 of the Development Plan details car parking standards, with Tables 12.25 and 12.26 setting out the maximum parking rates for non-residential and residential development. Table 12.25 is relevant to this appeal as follows:

Table 12.25: Maximum Parking Rates (Non-Residential)

Category	Land-Use	Zone 1	Zone 2
Accommodation	Hotel ⁷	1 per bedroom	0.5 per bedroom
	Mobile Home Park ⁸	1 per unit	1 per unit
	Nursing Home Retirement Home	1 per 4 residents	1 per 8 residents
	Student Accommodation	1 per 10 bed spaces	1 per 20 bed spaces

Retail and Retail Service	Café Restaurant	1 per 15 sq m GFA	1 per 20 sq m GFA
	Bar Club ¹⁰	1 per 30 sq m	1 per 40 sq m
	Retail Convenience	1 per 15 sq m	1 per 25 sq m
	Retail Comparison	1 per 25 sq m	1 per 35 sq m
	Retail Warehousing	1 per 50 sq m	1 per 50 sq m
	Vehicle Service Station	1 per 250 sq m GFA	1 per 250 sq m GFA

7.4.9. As noted in Table 2 of the Traffic and Transport Assessment above the applicant has incorrectly calculated the 'retail' type of development as 1 space per 30 sq. m. resulting in a total of 16 no. spaces required to serve the existing development.

- 7.4.10. Based on the County Development Plan requirements, retail comparison would require 1 space per 15 sq. m., which based on the existing retail element of 468 sq. m. would require 31 no. spaces, increasing the overall car parking spaces required to serve the proposed and existing uses on site to 72 spaces.
- 7.4.11. I acknowledge the loss of the function room associated with the public house, which may result in the reduction of traffic, and the proximity of the site to public transport. While some reduction in the required car parking provision may be acceptable, however, based on the forgoing, and following my site inspection, I consider that inadequate car parking provision has been provided within the applicants site to cater for the proposed development, in conjunction with the existing retail uses adjoining the site.
- 7.4.12. I also note that the applicant has only indicated 2 no. mobility impaired spaces within their ownership, which is not in accordance with Development Plan requirements.
- 7.4.13. I share similar concerns to that of the planning authority in respect to the use of this car park to cater for the existing and proposed development and the potential loss of car parking provision at the church as a result, which could result in an unacceptable parking arrangement on the subject site and adjoining sites/roads resulting in traffic safety concerns at this location.
- 7.4.14. Moreover, the proposed bicycle shelter, while a welcome addition to the area, is located outside the red line planning application boundary. Given the layout and the movement of cars within this site, in particular entering and exiting the dedicated parking spaces, these movements would be in close proximity to the proposed bicycle shelter and would in my opinion result in a potential unsafe cyclist access to the external bicycle spaces at this location. This should be reconsidered by the applicant and any proposed works in this regard included within the redline planning application boundary.
- 7.4.15. In relation to construction traffic associated with any redevelopment at this site, I am satisfied that matters pertaining to construction management can be appropriately dealt with prior to construction by way of condition should the Coimisiún be inclined to grant planning permission in this instance and requesting the Applicant to prepare/submit a Construction Management Plan.

Conclusion:

7.4.16. Having regard to the foregoing, I consider that the proposed parking provision to be insufficient to serve both the proposed development, which will result in an intensification of use at this site, and the existing retail uses adjoining the site. I am not satisfied that the use of the adjoining car park, which is in private ownership, and the proximity to a bus stop would warrant such a reduction in the required parking provision to serve the proposed development and could result in an unacceptable parking arrangement on the subject site and adjoining sites/roads resulting in traffic safety concerns at this location. Moreover, all proposed site works have not been included in the planning application red line boundary, and therefore I am not satisfied that the location of the proposed bicycle shelter can be adequately and safely accommodated given the layout and configuration of the parking spaces relative to the bicycle parking. Therefore, I concur with the planning authority and recommend that permission be refused in this regard.

7.5. Impact on Adjoining Amenities

7.5.1. Concerns have been raised in the observations regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on residential amenity, in particular overlooking and overbearing.

7.5.2. As part of the further information response the applicant submitted a shadow impact analysis, which indicated that the proposed development would not represent a material change on the existing situation and as such would not create any adverse overshadowing or overbearing impact on adjacent buildings. The nearest separation distance to the adjoining residential dwellings is some 32.5 – 50 metres. Therefore, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not result in excessive overshadowing or overbearing on adjoining residential amenity.

7.5.3. In terms of overlooking, I acknowledge the existing use of the building and note that the existing building overlooks the adjoining neighbourhood centre and the existing open space to the rear. The stated separation distances are again noted. As such I do not consider that the proposed development would impact on adjoining residential amenity by reason of overlooking. In addition, I consider that overlooking of the adjoining park, creates passive surveillance at this location.

7.5.4. Whilst I acknowledge the concerns of the observers in respect to noise disturbance, I note that the appeal site is currently in use as a public house, and is located within a

neighbourhood centre, adjoining an area of public open space. As noted above, the nearest separation distance to the adjoining residential dwellings is some 32.5 – 50 metres. I am satisfied that the development would not unduly diminish the residential amenity of properties within the vicinity of the appeal site, by reasons of noise and disturbance. Notwithstanding, in the event that the Coimisiún considers that the proposed development should be granted, a condition regarding the control of operational noise should be included.

- 7.5.5. Similarly in respect to anti-social behaviour, I also note the existing use on site and the neighbourhood centre location of the appeal site. I am satisfied the proposal could be managed accordingly to rule out anti-social behaviour. Notwithstanding, issues in relation to antisocial behaviour are not a matter for An Coimisiún Pleanála.

Conclusion:

- 7.5.6. Having regard to the existing use and structure on site, and the separation distances to the nearest adjoining residential dwelling, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not negatively impact on the adjoining residential amenity.

7.6. Water Framework Directive

- 7.6.1. The subject site is located not proximate to any waterbodies and is located in an urban area in close proximity to Clondalkin village.
- 7.6.2. The proposed development comprises the change of use from function room to aparthotel and construction of 2 new floors, together with all associated site works.
- 7.6.3. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 7.6.4. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status, and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.
- 7.6.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows [insert as relevant]:
- Nature of works e.g. small scale and nature of the development.

- Lack of hydrological connections.

Conclusion:

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

7.7. Appropriate Assessment

7.7.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of S177U the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

7.7.2. The subject site is not located within or adjacent to any European Site.

7.7.3. The proposed development is located within an urban area and comprises the change of use from function room to aparthotel and construction of 2 new floors, together with all associated site works.

Conclusion:

7.7.4. Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment for the reason that it could not have any appreciable effect on a European Site.

7.7.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The scale and nature of the proposed development.
- The location of the development in a serviced rural area, distance from European Sites and absence of ecological pathways to any European Site.

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

7.8. Other Matters

7.8.1. Legal and Procedural Issues:

The appellant refers to historic cooperation agreements with the applicant and Dublin City Council. Reference is also made to financial contributions paid by the application, to further enhance the community infrastructure in the area, additional parking and that the Local Authority could construct on adjoining open space lands. The appeal states that no reference to these prior agreements or communal provision in this centre in the council reporting.

In terms of the legal interest, I am satisfied that the applicants have provided sufficient evidence of their legal interest for the purposes of the planning application and decision. Any further consents that may have to be obtained are essentially a subsequent matter and are outside the scope of the planning appeal.

7.8.2. Environmental Issues:

The observer references impact on surface water drainage and impacts on biodiversity.

In respect to surface water, following further information request, the applicant clarified that *“the that the development is restricted to the footprint of the existing building and does not include the various existing car parks. There is no increase in run off as the development comprises the provision of additional floors over an existing building footprint. On this basis the only practical option in respect of the requested Suds and stormwater attenuation is the installation of a blue green roof at the main high-level roof area. The higher level “tower “roof areas will drain onto the larger upper roof and the lower level set back roofs will be green roofs to minimise the volume of run off. These roof areas will be unattenuated as they are very small”*. This is considered acceptable and final details can be agreed by way of compliance condition should permission be granted by the Coimisiún.

I also note that Uisce Eireann has no objection to the proposal in respect to water and wastewater, subject to conditions, which can be included should permission be granted by the Coimisiún.

As noted in Section 7.7 above, the subject site is not located within or adjacent to any European Site, and therefore, the conclusion above is noted.

7.8.3. Devaluation of property:

I note the concerns raised in the observations in respect of the devaluation of neighbouring property. However, having regard to the assessment, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area to such an extent that would adversely affect the value of property in the vicinity.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend that planning permission should be refused as set out below, for the following reasons and considerations.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 9.1. The proposed development by reason of its design, scale, bulk and overall height, would be out of character with the existing neighbourhood centre setting and would appear visually dominant when viewed from the surrounding area and in the absence of a justification for the proposed design approach and increased height in the context of its receiving environment, the proposed development would therefore, be contrary to Policy QDP1 Objective 4, Policy QDP1 Objective 5, Policy QDP3 Objective 1, Policy QDP3 Objective 3, Policy QDP7, Policy QDP9 Objective 1 of the South Dublin County Development 2022 – 2028. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 9.2. Adequate car parking provision has not been provided within the curtilage of the site. The lack of sufficient on-site car parking spaces to serve the proposed development and adjoining retail units, would be seriously deficient and inadequate to cater for the parking demand generated by the proposed development and existing units, and would therefore not be in accordance with Section 12.7.4 of the South Dublin County Development Plan, 2022-2028. As a consequence of these deficiencies in layout and space available within the curtilage of the site for necessary parking and servicing movements, it is considered that the proposed development would lead to conditions which would be prejudicial to public safety by reason of traffic hazard and safety. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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

31st July 2025

Appendix A - Form 1

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP-321497-24
Proposed Development Summary	Permission for change of use from function room to aparthotel and construction of 2 new floors, together with all associated site works.
Development Address	Boomers Pub, Knockmitten Neighbourhood Centre, Dutch Village, Clondalkin, Dublin 22
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	N/A
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed	N/A

<p>type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	N/A
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	<p>Class 10 Infrastructure Projects (b) (i)</p> <p>Proposed development for aparthotel associated with an existing public house, therefore sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required.</p>

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

Inspector: _____ Date: 31st July 2025

Appendix A - Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ABP-321397-24
Proposed Development Summary	Permission for change of use from function room to aparthotel and construction of 2 new floors, together with all associated site works.
Development Address	Boomers Pub, Knockmitten Neighbourhood Centre, Dutch Village, Clondalkin, Dublin 22
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	<p>The development involves the change of use from function room to aparthotel and construction of 2 new floors, all on land located in an urban area.</p> <p>During the construction phase, the proposed development would generate waste during excavation and construction.</p> <p>However, given the moderate scale of the proposed development, I do not consider that the level of waste generated would be significant in the local, regional, or national context.</p>
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	<p>The site is not located in or immediately adjacent to any European site.</p>
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration,	<p>Localised construction impacts will be temporary. The proposed development would not give rise to waste, pollution or nuisances beyond what would normally be deemed acceptable.</p>

cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	N/A
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	N/A

Inspector: _____ Date: 31st July 2025