



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Addendum Report 321966-25

---

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

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1. This report is the second addendum report to my original report dated the 16<sup>th</sup> day of June 2025. The first addendum report was dated the 27<sup>th</sup> of June 2025. Both reports relate to a third-party appeal against a notification of decision to grant permission issued by South Dublin County Council for the upgrade works to the existing T-junction at Fortfield Road and College Drive.
- 1.2. At a meeting held on the 1<sup>st</sup> of July 2025 the Commission decided to defer consideration of the case and to address a particular matter in my addendum report. The Commission noted that the content of my addendum report of the 27<sup>th</sup> of June and requested that I specifically address the *'in-combination of the two applications (ABP Ref. 321966 & 322106) as the two applications constitute one project for the purpose of Environmental Assessment (AA and EIA)'*.

## 2.0 AA Screening

- 2.1. The proposed works the subject of this appeal were screened for AA under the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The results of the screening exercise are contained in Section 8 of my original report and state that, *'...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.'*
  - 2.1.1. As noted in my original report, the proposed 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 Commission (**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.
- 2.2. The public notice for the subject development states that, *'The proposed upgrade works are to facilitate a concurrent Large-Scale Residential Development (LRD)*

*planning application proposed by the Applicant on adjoining lands within the functional administrative area of Dublin City Council (DCC).'*

- 2.3. The public notices for the LRD states that, *'The development will also include the upgrading of the existing Fortfield Road and College Drive junction to a 4-arm signalised junction (in conjunction with a separate, concurrent planning application to South Dublin County Council Reg. Ref. SD24A/0268W).'*
- 2.4. A Natura Impact Statement was prepared for the LRD development under *'on a strictly precautionary basis'*.
- 2.5. As per my original conclusion on the Appropriate Assessment (AA) screening, I am satisfied that the works proposed under the subject application, which relate to the upgrading of a junction in the public road, would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects and AA (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required. The in-combination reference includes the proposed LRD project. I am also satisfied that the public consultation requirements in relation to AA have been met in the public notices for the proposed development.
- 2.6. The LRD project comprises 284 no. residential units (consisting of 19 no. 4-bed, 2-3 storey houses and 265 no. Apartments within 4 blocks ranging in height up to 6 storeys) with a creche, community culture and arts space and a residential amenity space. As per the public notices, a Natura Impact Statement was prepared for the entire project, including the subject works to upgrade part of the junction outside of the administrative area of the LRD. The assessment concluded that, *'No significant effects are likely on European sites, their features of interest or conservation objectives'*. On this basis, I am satisfied that the subject proposal for roadworks has been included in the overall LRD project and that both applications have been assessed as one overall project. Therefore, the in-combination effects of the LRD in the DCC administrative area, and the roadworks in the SDCC administrative area, have been appropriately screened for AA. The entire project, and any in-combination effects with other plans or projects, will also form part of a separate examination exercise by the Commission as part of the LRD project under **ABP-322106-25** in relation to AA.

- 2.7. In my view, the Commission are seeking clarification as to whether the subject application should have been accompanied by the NIS submitted with the LRD application. The location of the development presents an unusual situation whereby two separate competent authorities are involved in the consent process at planning authority level. Given the extent of the limited works limited proposed in the SDCC administrative boundary, DCC were the appropriate planning authority to carry out the Appropriate Assessment for the entire project, as advertised in the public notices. For this reason, I am satisfied that the scope of the works in the SDCC area can be screened out for AA.
- 2.8. The Commission are in the unique position to consider both applications in tandem and to avoid the duplication of assessments for the limited works within the SDCC administrative boundary. I am satisfied that an AA can be screened out of the subject application and considered as part of the one application using the NIS submitted with the LRD. The public notices for both applications were clear that the individual works formed part of one wider project and third-party rights were not prejudiced. I am also satisfied that the Commission can carry out an Appropriate Assessment on the whole project based on the information submitted under **ABP-322106-25**.

### 3.0 EIA Screening

- 3.1.1. The proposed works, the subject of this appeal, were screened for EIA in my initial assessment of the appeal and the results are contained in Section 3 of the Inspectors Report and in Form 1 – EIA Pre-Screening, Appendix 1. I concluded that, *‘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.’*
- 3.1.2. As per the request from the Commission, I have amended Form 1 (renamed Form 1A) to consider the subject works as part of the LRD application. I note that the public notices for the LRD application include the proposed works as part of the

overall project, the application for which includes an EIA Screening Report and Schedule 7A information.

- 3.1.3. Whilst the subject works are not a class of development that is listed in Parts 1 or 2 of Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended), the overall LRD project could be considered under the following classes,
- Class 10 (b)(i) – Construction of more than 500 dwelling units and,
  - Class 10(b)(iv) - Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere. (In this paragraph, “business district” means a district within a city or town in which the predominant land use is retail or commercial use.)
- 3.1.4. The development proposed as part of the LRD application is sub-threshold for both classes of development. The EIA Screening Report submitted with the LRD included the proposed upgrade works to the surrounding road network and concluded that, *‘It is considered that view of the size, location and nature of the proposed development, the criteria specified in Schedule 7 PDR, and the assessment that the proposed development will not cause any significant effect on the environment, it is submitted that no EIA is required’*.
- 3.1.5. The subject works are not classified as a class of development listed under Parts 1 or 2 of Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations (2001). The LRD development is sub-threshold under Classes 10(b)(i) and 10(b)(iv) of Schedule 5. As the public notices for the LRD include the subject works I am satisfied that project splitting has not occurred. I am also satisfied that the environmental impact of the entire project, including the roadworks, and any in-combination effects from other plans or projects, have been assessed in the EIA Screening Report for the LRD.
- 3.1.6. I note that both applications represent sub-threshold development I am satisfied that an EIAR is not required for the element of the project that I have assessed under the subject appeal. Given the minor element of the project in this case, I am satisfied that a Schedule 7A document is not required.

## 4.0 **Recommendation**

- 4.1. The outcome of my original assessment has not changed, and I recommend that planning permission is granted.

## Form 1A - EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	ABP-321966-25
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Road works to upgrade a junction in the public road and to provide an extension and connection to existing watermain which would facilitate the development of an LRD for 284 units in a separate administrative area.
<b>Development Address</b>	College Drive and Fortfield Road, Terenure, Dublin 6W
<b>In all cases check box /or leave blank</b>	
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>  (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.
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.  <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<b>3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?</b>	

<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.  <b>No Screening required.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.  <b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b>	<b>Class and relevant threshold</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.	<p>The entirety of the LRD project can be considered under the following classes,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Class 10 (b)(i) – Construction of more than 500 dwelling units and,</li> <li>• Class 10(b)(iv) - Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere. (In this paragraph, “business district” means a district within a city or town in which the predominant land use is retail or commercial use.)</li> </ul>

**Inspector:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

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

23<sup>rd</sup> of July 2025