



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-321966-25

Development	Road and water services upgrade works on Fortfield Road and College Drive.
Location	College Drive and Fortfield Road, Terenure, Dublin 6W
Planning Authority	South Dublin County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	SD24A/0268W
Applicant(s)	1 Cellbridge West Land Limited.
Type of Application	Planning Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission.
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Gregory O'Toole.
Observer(s)	Terenure West Residents Association.
Date of Site Inspection	20 th of May 2025.
Inspector	Elaine Sullivan

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
1. Decision.....	4
2. Planning Authority Reports	4
3. Prescribed Bodies	6
4. Third Party Observations	6
4.0 Planning History.....	7
5.0 Policy Context.....	8
1. Development Plan	8
2. Natural Heritage Designations.....	9
3. EIA Screening.....	9
6.0 The Appeal	9
1. Grounds of Appeal.....	9
2. Applicant Response.....	11
3. Planning Authority Response	13
4. Observations	13
7.0 Assessment.....	14
8.0 AA Screening.....	20
9.0 Recommendation.....	20
10.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	21
11.0 Conditions.....	21
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

1. The subject site is located at the junction of College Drive and Fortfield Road in the suburb of Terenure, South County Dublin. It comprises an area within the public road and on the public footpath. Fortfield Road is a two-way, local distributor road which connects Tempelogue Road (R137) to the south with Wainsfort Road (R817) to the north. It is suburban in nature with many individual driveways opening onto the road and access to several residential housing estates. It is a single-lane, two-way carriageway with footpaths on both sides of the road and bus stops on either side. The centre line of Fortfield Road marks the administrative boundary between Dublin City Council (DCC) and South Dublin County Council (SDCC).
2. College Drive is a two-way residential street which connects Fortfield Road with Wainsfort Road. Apart from St. Pius X Roman Church, the street is flanked with individual driveways and local access roads. The development area is located at the T-junction of Fortfield Road and College Drive and comprises a section of the public carriageway on College Drive and a section of the north-bound carriageway (to the centreline) on Fortfield Road. Works to the adjoining footpaths on either side are also proposed. The existing junction is not signalised and there are no road markings currently in place. A speed ramp is in place on College Drive, approximately 8m from the Fortfield Road carriageway. Directly to the north of the site is a small public park with open access from Fortfield Road to College Drive and Wainsfort Grove. There is a signalised pedestrian crossing directly adjacent to the Fortfield Road access to the park and approximately 25m to the north of the College Drive junction. A Dublin Bus stop (ID.2410) is located at the front of the park and to the north of the pedestrian crossing. Greenlea Road is on the eastern side of Fortfield Road and is approximately 60m from the College Drive junction.
- 1.2.1. Directly to the east of the subject site is the Terenure College playing pitches which are bounded by a blockwork wall along the site boundary with Fortfield Road. This site is within the administrative area of DCC and is subject to a separate application for a Large-Scale Residential Development (LRD) which is currently on appeal to the Board, (Ref. **ABP-322106-25**). Works proposed as part of the LRD application will include a new vehicular entrance directly opposite the College Drive junction, along

with upgrades to the footpath and public realm at this location. These works are within the DCC administrative area.

2.0 Proposed Development

1. The proposed development comprises upgrade works to the existing T-junction at Fortfield Road and College Drive. The works would include components of a signalised four-arm junction at Fortfield Road / College Drive / Terenure College on lands which are within the administrative boundary of SDCC.
2. Works to the road would involve the provision of road markings, a signalised pedestrian crossing, improvement and realignment of footpaths and infrastructure to support traffic lights. It is also proposed to connect the existing 180mm watermain on College Drive to a proposed 150mm watermain to service the proposed LRD on the Terenure College lands.
3. The existing signalised pedestrian crossing on Fortfield Road would also be removed.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

1. Decision

- 3.1.1. Planning permission was granted by the Planning Authority (PA) subject to 8 no. planning conditions which are standard in nature.

2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. Planning Reports

The decision of the Planning Authority (PA) was informed by the report of the Planning Officer (PO) dated the 6th of December 2024 which includes the following,

- The administrative boundary between DCC and SDCC is noted. The junction upgrade and watermain extension is required to facilitate a concurrent LRD proposed for 284 residential units (**ABP- 322106-25**, DCC planning Reg. Ref. **WEBLRD6058/24- S3**) that is wholly within the DCC administrative area.

- A letter of consent has been provided from the Traffic, Maintenance, Parking and Road Safety Department of SDCC.
- The development site is predominantly on unzoned land as it forms part of the public road which it 'taken in charge' by SDCC. A small portion of land comprising a section of grass verge, a tree and footpath, is zoned objective 'RES', which seeks, *'To protect and/or improve residential amenity,'*
- The *South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028* (SDCCDP) does not specify use classes which may be permitted on unzoned lands. Regarding lands zoned 'RES', 'Public Services' are 'permitted in principle'. The PO considers the proposal to be acceptable.
- The applicant has not provided a Construction Method Statement for the construction of the watermain, but the PO considers this can be addressed by condition.
- The development would not result in any changes to the road layout. Additional works would be provided as part of the overall LRD to upgrade footpaths and provide a new entrance on the opposite side of Fortfield Road as part of the LRD.
- A Confirmation of Feasibility from Uisce Éireann was submitted with the application and is noted by the PO.
- No works are proposed to the part to the north of the site and no trees will be removed as part of the works.
- The PO recommends that permission is granted for the development.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Roads Department – No objection. The proposal will not alter the road layout, and all road surfaces should be reinstated in line with SDCC standards following construction works.
- Environmental Health Department – The proposal is acceptable subject to standard construction management conditions.

- Public Realm Department – The report of the PO refers to a report from the Public Realm Department which recommends that the applicant submit an Arborists Report detailing the impact on any trees and proposals for mitigating the loss of any trees due to the works required. The PO considered that this could be addressed by condition. This report was not forwarded as part of the appeal file and is not available on the public record on the PA's website.

3. **Prescribed Bodies**

- Uisce Éireann – No objection in principle subject to compliance with standards conditions.

4. **Third Party Observations**

A total of 45 third party submissions were received during the public consultation process. Many of the issues raised related to the LRD on the adjacent site at the former Terenure Rugby Club lands and include the following,

- Lack of consultation
- Additional traffic
- Removal of pedestrian crossing
- Changes to the traffic layout from other projects / BusConnects
- Flooding
- No cycling provision
- Lack of capacity on public transport
- Lack of parking / overspill parking
- Lack of existing services
- Loss of green space
- Scale and height of the LRD

4.0 Planning History

1. **ABP-322106-25 (PA Ref. WEBLRD6058/24-S3)** – Planning appeal currently before the Board for an LRD comprising 19 no. houses and 265 no. apartments, creche and associated works to include a new site access from Fortfield Road along with a four-way signalised junction at the site access, Fortfield Road and College Drive. At the time of writing, a decision is pending on this appeal.
2. **ABP-314390-22, (DCC Ref. LRD6004/22-S3)** – Planning permission refused on the 2nd of February 2023 for an LRD development comprising 21 no. houses and 364 no. Build-to-rent apartments on pitches associated with Terenure College. The site is directly opposite the subject site and included the site as part of the overall development. The application was submitted to Dublin City Council with a letter of consent from South Dublin County Council for works to the road within their administrative area. The Inspectors Report noted that, *‘...the laying out of the new junction would require significant works on the public road on lands in the functional area of the South Dublin County Council which have been included within the boundary of the site. Providing a safe access in the proposed manner is an integral part of the proposed development, but it could not be authorised by a grant of permission under the current application and appeal because it could only apply to the area of the planning authority to which the application was made, which is Dublin City Council.’*
3. Planning permission was refused for the following three reasons which relate to the following,
 - The applicant did not demonstrate that the site is not needed for its established educational and recreational use and would not be in accordance with Section 14.7.14 of the *Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028* (DCDP) as it relates to Z15 lands.
 - The development would involve the construction of housing on lands partially in Flood Zone B which is not in accordance with the Section 3.5 of the Planning System and Flood Risk Management for Planning Authorities (Guidelines) and Section 4.5.2.1 of Volume 7 of the DCDP.

- The density proposed is above that recommended for the outer suburbs in Table 1 of Appendix 3 of the DCDP and is not justified by the available capacity of current public transport facilities as required in the Design Standards for New Apartments.

5.0 Policy Context

1. Development Plan

The *South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028* (SDCDP) is the operative Development Plan for the site.

Most of the site is on unzoned lands as it is within the public road. A small portion of the site is zoned 'RES' – Existing Residential, which seeks '*To provide and/or improve residential amenity*'. This portion of the site is within the public realm and comprises a small area of green space adjacent to a footpath. The proposed works relate to the provision of 'Public Services' which is listed as 'Permitted in Principle' within the RES zoning objective.

There are no specific map-based objectives which relate to the site.

Chapter 7 – Sustainable Movement

Policy SM5 – Street and Road Design

SM5 Objective 1: To ensure that all streets and street networks are designed to passively calm traffic through the creation of a self-regulating street environment that promotes active travel modes and public transport.

SM5 Objective 2: To design new streets and roads within urban areas in accordance with the principles, approaches and standards contained within the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (2013; updated 2019).

Policy SM6 – Traffic and Transport Management-

SM6 Objective 1: To effectively manage the flow of through traffic along the strategic road network and maximise the efficient use of existing road resources.

SM6 Objective 3: To minimise the impact of new development on the County's road and street network through prioritising active travel and public transport and implementing appropriate traffic and transport management measures.

SM6 Objective 10: To prioritise traffic calming measures, where appropriate, and works needed to improve safety at road crossings.

2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

- 5.2.1. The subject site is not designated as a Natural Heritage Area or a proposed Natural Heritage Area.

3. **EIA Screening**

- 5.3.1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

6.0 **The Appeal**

1. **Grounds of Appeal**

The grounds of appeal include the following,

- There was no engagement by South Dublin County Council, (SDCC), with local residents. The development is a direct result of the LRD application WEBLRD6058/24-S3. There is no evidence of engagement with DCC regarding the proposed works.
- The appellant considers that no proper consultation was undertaken with local residents and facilitated by the two local authorities regarding BusConnects and the impact on traffic in the area.
- The application does not consider the dynamics and traffic build-up at this junction. Fortfield Road has significant traffic overspill at all times of the week. The traffic plan does not reference the implications of the junction change.

- Dublin Express also uses the site of the junction as a hub for their buses, yet this is not referenced.
- The historic flooding at the junction has not been addressed. Intervention by DCC was required in the past to deal with flooding.
- The pedestrian crossing at Fortfield Road is heavily used. There are implications for travel patterns by moving the junction and traffic lights that may cause pedestrians and school children to 'jay-walk' and result in a hazard.
- The public park to the north of the junction is well used in the summer and access to and from the park is not addressed in the application. The proposal would impact on local schools, services and a range of recreational facilities.
- The location of the new traffic lights results in a longer journey for pedestrians to access the bus stops. Reference is made to cycle lanes and potential bus lanes on Fortfield Road, but it is not clear how these would work in the context of the junction and local schools.
- Access to the PA's online portal was not available for a period of time and the appellant argues that this restricted third party participation in the application process.
- Gas works to the junction are referenced in the application, but details are not provided.
- A 36-month period of construction is proposed for 12-hour periods Monday to Friday, which is excessive and not explained.
- As part of the BusConnects traffic changes, Fortfield Road will be the last left turn for traffic going into the city, which will increase traffic on the road. Although the application references the new BusConnects F spine, it does not mention the increased associated traffic. The traffic report also references a 2022 figure of c. 30% working from home which is most likely out of date.
- Additional changes to traffic will include a right-turning ban from Fortfield Road onto Greenlea Road, which will also impact on traffic flows and movements.

- As permission has been refused for the LRD, the development is no longer required.

2. Applicant Response

A response was received from the application on the 11th of April 2025 and includes a technical response from the applicant's engineering consultants. The response includes the following,

- The proposed works to upgrade the existing junction and water services are to facilitate the development of lands at Terenure College. A concurrent application for a Large-Scale Residential Development (LRD) was lodged with the Dublin City Council and is currently on appeal with An Bord Pleanála.
- The applicant is satisfied that all statutory requirements for public engagement have been met in full and in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act and Regulations. They had also separately engaged with local residents and had held two public open meetings.
- Both Dublin City Council (DCC) and South Dublin County Council (SDCC) are fully aware of the concurrent applications for each administrative area.
- The previous LRD application to DCC (**Ref.LRD 6004/22-S3**) included a letter of consent from SDCC to carry out the roadworks proposed to the junction. The subsequent appeal to An Bord Pleanála (Ref. **ABP-314390-22**) noted that the proposal would include substantial works to the road within the functional area of SDCC and as such required consent under that administrative area.
- In the current LRD application (**ABP- 322106, PA Ref. WEBLRD6058/24-S3**) only one entrance is proposed in response to the previous reason for refusal from DCC. However, the applicant does not consider this detail to be relevant to the subject application for upgrade works to the junction.
- The applicant disagrees with the claims that the proposal will result in traffic build up and notes that the photographs sent with the application indicate unauthorised overspill parking rather than traffic. This will be addressed

through formalisation of the junction and will address concerns regarding Dublin Express bus parking.

- The broader LRD application for the adjacent site includes a proposal to relocate Bus Stop 2397 (on the eastern side of Fortfield Road) approximately 60m to the south and to replace it with a covered bus shelter with seating. This proposal is supported by the NTA and a letter to that effect has been submitted with WEBLRD6058/24-S3.
- Flooding concerns are noted and the applicant states that the proposed works are for improvements to the Uisce Éireann underground network and to provide a safer pedestrian environment. There is no additional built environment work proposed. If Uisce Éireann were carrying out the works, no application would be required and SDCC believed the works could be completed under a road opening licence. A Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment was prepared for the LRD application. It acknowledges flooding concerns and outlines measures to address them as part of the development.
- The appellant disagrees that relocating the pedestrian crossing point will lead to jaywalking. The proposed 4-arm junction will improve the pedestrian environment by narrowing the crossing at College Drive and by providing tactile paving to assist vulnerable road users and providing signalised crossing points.
- Access to the park will be unaffected by the development and the existing footpath will be straightened.
- Technical issues regarding submissions of observations to SDCC are not within the control of the applicant. However, the applicant notes that third party submissions were lodged during the observation period.
- The applicant refutes the claims that the implication of BusConnects were not considered. A Residential Travel Plan was submitted as part of the application and a Traffic and Transport Assessment (TTA) was submitted with the LRD application. The TTA found that the proposed LRD site access and the existing junctions have sufficient capacity to accommodate the development-generated traffic. The claim that the junction will result in unlawful right-turn

movements at the College Drive / Fortfield Road junction is unfounded and not supported by the TTA.

- The response confirms that no works are proposed to upgrade the gas network.
- The 36-month timeline contained in the Outline Construction Management Plan is for the entire LRD project rather than the timeline for construction of the junction upgrade. These works will take approximately 2 weeks to complete.

3. **Planning Authority Response**

- A response was received from the planning authority (PA) on the 12th of March 2025. The PA confirms its decision and considers the issues raised in the appeal were covered in the Chief Executive Order.

4. **Observations**

One observation received from Terenure West Residents Association (TWRA). The TWRA represent residents in Greenlea Road and Parkmore Drive and adjacent roads. The observation includes the following,

- No impact survey was carried out on the implications of losing the pedestrian crossing. A survey was carried out by the third party and included observations from a 40-minute period between 12 and 1pm on Friday the 21st March. The observations included 15 crossings with half the crossings occurring at pedestrian lights and the remainder at 'unofficial' points adjacent to Greenlea Road.
- Driver behaviour on Fortfield Road tends towards speeding. The current traffic lights have a clear line of sight which gives notice of cars to stop.
- The existing pedestrian crossing should be retained as it has been in place for a long time and was realigned to ensure that it lines up with the park access.
- The proposed location of the crossing will impact on the accessibility of the existing 'inbound' bus stop (Bus Stop 2410) beside the park. Pedestrians

may not be willing to walk the additional distance to the new crossing point which could result in unsafely crossing the road.

- The implementation of Bus Connects will result in more traffic on Fortfield Road which would necessitate the retention of the pedestrian crossing at this location.
- The removal of the pedestrian crossing / traffic light is contrary to the provisions of the City Council and South Dublin County Council which seek to protect the safety of all road users and to promote place making etc.
- The proposed arrangement goes against the hierarchy of road users as it would put private vehicles above pedestrians.

7.0 **Assessment**

1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all the submissions received in relation to the appeal, and inspected the site, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Procedural Issues
- Impact on Traffic
- Impact on Pedestrians
- Other Issues

2. **Principle of Development**

- 7.2.1. The proposed development is for minor works to the public road to facilitate a four-way junction at College Drive / Fortfield Road and to the Terenure College lands on the eastern side of Fortfield Road. An extension and connection to an existing watermain on College Drive is also proposed under the subject application.
- 7.2.2. The works are required to facilitate the future development of the Terenure College lands on the eastern side of Fortfield Road. The development site at Terenure College is subject to an LRD application to Dublin City Council (DCC) (**PA Ref.**

WEBLRD6058/24-S3) and is currently on appeal to the Board (**ABP-322106-25**). A separate application for the LRD was required as the administrative boundary between DCC and SDCC runs along the centreline of Fortfield Road.

7.2.3. The grounds of appeal consider the works to be unnecessary as the LRD application has been refused. Although the application for the LRD was refused by DCC, it is currently on appeal to the Board. As such it is still part of the planning consent process. I am satisfied that the proposed works can be considered independently as they are within a different planning administrative area to the LRD and whilst they will facilitate the LRD, they would also be required as part of the future development of the lands. I note that the report of the PO states that the PA believed the works could have been carried out under a road opening licence but, in the interests of completeness and transparency, the applicant submitted a separate application. The applicant also states that a planning application would not be required, if the works were to be carried out by either Uisce Éireann or the PA.

7.2.4. The works would be mostly carried out within the public road which is unzoned land. A letter of consent has been provided by SDCC to allow the applicant to make the application. A portion of the site is zoned 'RES' - residential development, within which 'Public Services' are 'Permitted in Principle'. I am satisfied the proposed works are acceptable in principle and can be assessed accordingly.

3. **Procedural Issues**

7.3.1. The grounds of appeal state that the applicant did not engage with residents and that online participation in the planning process was restricted for third parties for a period of time. This is disputed by the applicant who states that all statutory requirements for public consultation in the planning process were met. In addition, two public meetings were held for the wider LRD development, one on the 31st of July 2024 and the other on the 29th of January 2025. I note that the PA validated the planning application and, on that basis, were satisfied that all statutory obligations had been complied with. Whilst the online submission function may have been restricted for a period of time, other options were available to third parties to lodge an observation. I note that a total of 45 third party observations were received by the PA during the public consultation stage of the application.

- 7.3.2. Although the proposed works are required to facilitate the wider development of lands as part of an LRD, they are minor in nature and relate only to lands within the public road and the public realm. The PA validated the application and were satisfied that the applicant carried out their statutory functions regarding public consultation. I note that 45 observations were received by the PA during the public consultation phase of the application and I am satisfied that third party rights were not prejudiced by lack of access.
- 7.3.3. Third parties also considered that there was a lack of public consultation regarding changes to traffic because of the BusConnects project. BusConnects is a separate project, subject to an independent planning process which is outside the control of the applicant. There is no obligation for the applicant to facilitate or be involved with public consultation on this matter.

4. Impact on Traffic

- 7.4.1. Concerns were raised by third parties that the proposed works to facilitate a signalised junction would increase traffic in the area and have a negative impact on traffic flows. It was also noted that the Fortfield Road / Greenlea Road junction was very busy and would benefit from being signalised.
- 7.4.2. No changes to the road layout are proposed as part of the application. The grounds of appeal submitted photographs of overspill parking on Fortfield Road and on College Drive and contends that the development will exacerbate this situation. In their response the applicant notes that the rules around parking are governed by the Road Traffic Acts (1961-2019) and by by-laws issued by the local authorities. It is illegal to park a private car 15 metres before or 5 metres after a pedestrian crossing or traffic lights, or 5 metres before or after any junction. The applicant argues that the formalisation of the signalised junction will be a safeguard against illegal parking and will improve general road safety. This also applies to the parking of the Dublin Express Bus which the appellant has shown on Fortfield Road.
- 7.4.3. I am satisfied that the works proposed as part of this application will not result in any additional traffic on College Drive and Fortfield Road. However, the works are required to facilitate the development of an LRD on lands to the east of Fortfield Road, which will generate additional traffic. This development is subject to a

separate planning application and is currently on appeal to the Board (**ABP-322106-25, PA Ref. WEBLRD6058/24-S3**). The traffic implications for this development will be assessed fully under this process. A Traffic and Transport Assessment (TTA) was carried out for the LRD application and forms part of the public record for this development. A Residential Travel Plan (RTP) was submitted with the subject application and was informed by the TTA for the LRD. The RTP addresses the travel demand from the future LRD development and how that will be managed through encouraging the use of sustainable transport options.

7.4.4. Whilst the BusConnects project and the LRD development are subject to separate planning processes; the impact of both developments was raised in the grounds of appeal. The 'Templeogue / Rathfarnham to City Centre' BusConnects corridor travels along Tempelogue Road to the south of the development. Although the bus corridor will not travel along Fortfield Road, it would involve alterations to the traffic flows in the area, including a ban on right turning traffic to Greenlea Road from Fortfield Road. A traffic impact assessment was carried out as part of the BusConnects 'Environmental Impact Assessment' (EIA). (Chapter 6 of the EIA report at www.templeoguerathfarnhamscheme.ie). Section 6.4.6.2 of the EIA found that *"overall, there will be no significant deterioration in the general traffic environment in the study area as a consequence of meeting the scheme objectives of providing enhanced sustainable mode priority along the direct study area."* On this basis the TTA for the LRD determined that the *'BusConnects scheme is unlikely to have any long-term negative impacts on traffic along Fortfield Road and/or on the road network in the close vicinity of the Proposed Development.'* Section 8.1.4 of the TTA for the LRD concluded that, *'The results show that the proposed development signalised junction and the adjacent junctions can cater for the existing traffic growth as well as the full development traffic predicted.'*

7.4.5. Whilst the subject development is for minor works to the College Drive / Fortfield Road junction and would not result in any additional traffic or changes to the existing road layout, they would facilitate additional development on the eastern side of Fortfield Road. The application for the LRD was accompanied with a TTA which found that the existing junctions on the road network would have capacity to cater for the proposed development. Likewise, the traffic studies carried out for the BusConnects project found that there would be no significant deterioration in the

general traffic environment as a result of the project. I note to the Board that the information referenced above does not form part of the subject proposal which is for minor works and is referenced only in the context of the wider development of the area which was raised in the grounds of appeal. Both the LRD and BusConnects are subject to separate planning processes and will be fully assessed as part of that process. Regarding the subject development, I am satisfied that the minor works would not result in any significant impacts on the existing traffic environment in the area and would not result in significant delays at existing traffic junctions on Fortfield Road. The issue of overspill parking is a regulatory in nature and the formalisation of the junction would discourage haphazard on-street parking.

- 7.4.6. Third parties submit the existing junction at Greenlea Road and Fortfield Road is busy and unsafe. The TTA for the LRD assessed the capacity of this junction and found that it would be within capacity following the delivery of the LRD. However, I note to the Board that the junction is outside the scope of the subject application and that no changes are proposed in the subject application that would impact the Greenlea Road / Fortfield Road junction.

5. Impact on Pedestrians

- 7.5.1. The grounds of appeal raised a concern that the pedestrian environment would be negatively impacted by the removal of the existing pedestrian crossing which is directly adjacent to the entrance to the park. The appellant contends that the removal of the crossing will result in unsafe pedestrian movements such as 'jaywalking' which could result in accidents. The crossing point would also be further from the 'inbound' bus stop adjacent to the park and from Greenlea Road which has a range of services. Pedestrians travelling to and from College Drive can currently cut through the park and directly access the existing pedestrian crossing.
- 7.5.2. In their response, the applicant disagrees with the appellant and states that the pedestrian environment would be improved by a reduction in the distance of the crossing at College Drive, the introduction of tactile paving and traffic signals. An inter-visibility zone of 2.5m would also be provided in accordance with *The Geometric Layout of Signal-Controlled Junctions (DN-GEO-03044)*.

- 7.5.3. It is not efficient or reasonable to retain the existing signalised crossing and to provide two signalised crossing points within 30 metres of each other. The new signalised junction would allow for four safe crossing points instead of one and would be just 25 metres to the south of the existing crossing. The proposed development does not involve any works to the park and would not restrict access to the park. I am satisfied that the relocation of the pedestrian crossing will not impede residents or local groups from using the park.
- 7.5.4. I consider the relocation of the pedestrian junction to a point approximately 25m to the south to be a minor alteration to the existing pedestrian environment. The distance is not excessive and access to the park and the existing bus stop will not be impeded by the works. I note the concerns raised by third parties regarding the junction at Greenlea Road. However, this is outside the scope of this application and is not within the control of the applicant.

6. **Other issues**

- 7.6.1. The historic instances of pluvial flooding at the site are acknowledged by the applicant. Whilst the works proposed are minor in nature, flood measures are proposed as part of the LRD at Terenure College. A pluvial flood retention basin would be provided as part of the development, which the applicant argues would address the issue of historic flooding on Fortfield Road and College Drive. The works proposed are not of a sufficient nature or scale to address pluvial flooding at the site in any material manner. However, the development of the wider site will include measures to address flooding and would be facilitated by the subject proposal.
- 7.6.2. A query was raised in the appeal regarding the length of the construction programmes for the works which is stated as 36 months in the Outline Construction Management Plan. The applicant has clarified the 36-month construction programme is for the entire LRD project and not just the works proposed to the junction, which are expected to take approximately two weeks to complete. The applicant has also clarified that no works will take place to the existing gas network as part of the proposed development.

8.0 AA Screening

1. I have considered the [title of project] in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located in the public road in the urban area of Terenure, Dublin 6W and is approximately 6.5km from the nearest European Sites which are South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024).
2. The proposed development comprises road works to upgrade an existing junction and to facilitate the provision of a four-arm, signalised junction, realignment of footpaths and road opening works to provide an extension and connection to an existing watermain. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
 - The small-scale nature of the development and the nature of the works proposed.
 - The location of the site and its distance from nearest European site and lack of connections.
4. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, 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. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

9.0 Recommendation

I recommend that planning permission is granted for the development.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development for upgrade works to an existing T-junction on the public road and for works within the public realm, it is considered that the proposal would be in accordance with the provisions of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028, would not endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard, would not injure the residential or visual amenity of property in the vicinity and would, therefore, accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application on the 6th day of December 2024, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The 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, including how the construction of the proposed water service pipe would be managed and constructed on site.

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

3. The developer shall comply with the following requirements of the Roads Department of the planning authority,
 - (a) All items and areas for taking in charge shall be undertaken to a taking in charge standard. Prior to development the applicant shall submit construction details of all

items to be taken in charge. No development shall take place until these items have been agreed in writing with the planning authority.

(c) Any road marking proposed and or to be installed shall comply with most up to date version of the Traffic Signs Manual.

(d) No vehicle shall be allowed to park, intrude or obstruct public footpaths/cycle line during the construction and operational stage unless agreed through the construction and traffic management plan.

(e) The applicant, owner or developer shall submit a method statement outlining how the location of undergrounds services will be managed.

Reason: In the interests of traffic, pedestrian and public safety.

4. Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company, or such other security as may be acceptable to the planning authority, to secure the reinstatement of public roads which may be damaged by the transport of materials to the site, coupled with an agreement empowering the planning authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory reinstatement of the public road. The form and amount of the security shall be as agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of agreement, shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.

Reason: To ensure that the public road is satisfactorily reinstated, if necessary.

5. Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall submit an Arborists Report for the written agreement of the planning authority and completed by a suitably qualified arborist detailing the impact on any trees this application may have and proposals for mitigating the loss of any trees due to the works required, The developer shall ensure the protection of the existing street tree to be retained through the installation of suitable tree protection fencing for the duration of the construction works. Commencement of development should not be permitted without adequate protective fencing being in place in line with BS 5837. This must be installed prior to any plant, vehicle, or machinery access on site. Fencing must be clearly signed 'Tree Protection Area – No Construction Access'. No Excavation, plant vehicle movement, materials or soil storage is to be permitted within the fenced tree protection areas indicated on plan.

Reason: In the interest of tree protection and the retention of green infrastructure.

6. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays 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 residential amenities of property in the vicinity.

7. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall enter into a Connection Agreement with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for a service connection to the public water supply and/or wastewater collection network. All works shall be carried out in accordance with the requirements of Uisce Éireann.

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

8. (a) All works undertaken shall ensure the protection of the existing 225mm surface water sewer along College Drive and ensure that required separation distance of proposed watermain to same are maintained.

(b) All works shall comply with the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works.

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

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.

Elaine Sullivan
Planning Inspector

16th June 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP-321966-25
Proposed Development Summary	Road works to upgrade a junction in the public road and to provide an extension and connection to existing watermain.
Development Address	College Drive and Fortfield Road, Terenure, Dublin 6W
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

<p>development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	<p>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</p>
<p><input 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>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</p>

Inspector: _____ Date: _____