



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP.322522-25

Development

Construction of 66 no. apartment units in three blocks including an ancillary amenity building, demolition of buildings, car parking spaces, relocation of site entrance and associated ancillary development

Location

Terenure Synagogue, 32A
Rathfarnham Road, Rathfarnham,
Dublin 6w

Planning Authority

Dublin City Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

WEB2171/24

Applicant(s)

Granbrind Terenure Ltd.

Type of Application

Planning permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant permission with conditions

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellant(s)

Terenure Residents Association

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

13th August 2025

Inspector

Mary Kennelly

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	5
2.0 Proposed Development	6
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	8
3.1. Decision	8
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	10
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	19
3.4. Third Party Observations	20
4.0 Planning History	21
5.0 Policy Context	22
5.1. Revised National Planning Framework, 2025	22
5.2. Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning authorities (2024)	23
5.3. Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2023)	24
5.4. Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (2019)	24
5.5. Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines (2018)	24
5.6. Climate Action Plan	25
5.7. National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBAP) 2023-2030	25
5.8. Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028	25
5.9. Natural Heritage Designations	29
6.0 EIA Screening	29
7.0 The Appeal	29
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	29
7.2. Applicant Response	33

7.3. Planning Authority Response	36
7.4. Observations	36
8.0 Assessment	37
8.2. Principle of development.....	37
8.3. Principle of demolition of synagogue building	38
8.4. Density and scale.....	40
8.5. Visual and townscape impact.....	47
8.6. Residential amenity.....	50
8.7. Traffic and transport.....	54
8.8. Landscape and biodiversity.....	56
9.0 AA Screening.....	59
10.0 Water Framework Directive Screening	60
11.0 Recommendation	60
12.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	60
13.0 Conditions	62
Appendix 1 EIA Screening	74
Appendix 2 Appropriate Assessment Screening	79
Appendix 3 Water Framework Directive Screening	95

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located on the eastern side of Rathfarnham Road, approx. 140m to the south of Terenure crossroads. The existing Terenure Synagogue, a place of worship with associated buildings and parking area, occupies the site and has done so since 1952. The area is located at the edge of the commercial centre of Terenure Village and is generally mixed-use in character with predominantly residential uses in the immediate vicinity of the site. There is a bus stop outside the site on Rathfarnham Road which serves several bus routes. Rathfarnham road also forms part of the proposed Dublin BusConnects Way.
- 1.2. The roadside boundary facing Rathfarnham Road comprises a stone wall with mature hedging and trees and a gated vehicular entrance. The site is bounded to the north by mainly residential properties comprising the side elevations of a 2-storey dwelling at No. 32 Rathfarnham Road and a 3-storey apartment block at Beechlawn Mews and by the rear of a 2-storey commercial premises which forms part of an industrial estate at Beechlawn Way. The eastern boundary of the site is with a development of 3-storey residential units at Greenmount Lawns. To the south the site is bounded by a 2-storey dwelling at No. 34 Rathfarnham Road and by the side and rear gardens of 2-storey dwellings at Wasdale Park.
- 1.3. The site area is given as 0.54ha. It has 35m frontage to Rathfarnham Road, and has a depth of 115m, widening towards the rear. There are several buildings on the site. The synagogue building (c.583m²) is located towards the front of the site and is set back c.30m from the roadside boundary. It reads as a 2-storey building with a mono-pitched roof and has a distinctive façade with five windows in the shape of stars of David with a row of 10 smaller windows underneath. The northern and southern elevations incorporate stained glass windows. There is a large community building (c.486m²) in the north-eastern corner of the site, a small caretaker's cottage (c.68m²) in the south-eastern corner and a prayer room, (Mikvah facility) centrally located alongside the northern boundary. The area immediately to the east of the synagogue building is laid out as surface car parking.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. It is proposed to demolish the buildings on site (total area stated as c.1,156m²) and to redevelop the site as residential development. The proposal comprises the construction of 66 no. apartment units arranged in 3 no. blocks ranging from 3-6 storeys over basement. The proposed accommodation comprises Block A - 18 apartments, Block B - 21 apartments and Block C - 27 apartments. The proposed mix of units consists of 26 no. one-bedroomed apartments and 40. No two-bedroomed apartments.
- 2.2. It is proposed to demolish all of the buildings on site, apart from the Mikvah facility on the northern boundary, (total area stated as c.1,156m²) and to redevelop the site as residential development. The existing Mikvah facility is to be retained and will continue to be accessed via a pedestrian access from Beechlawn Way. This does not form part of the current application.
- 2.3. The proposed apartment blocks would be laid out from west to east with Block A (3-4 stories) accommodating 18 apartments, Block B, 21 apartments (3-6 stories) and Block C 27 apartments (3-5 stories). It is also proposed to construct an ancillary single-storey residential amenity building (c.59m²), to provide 43 no. car parking spaces (40 of which would be at basement level) and a substation in the south-eastern corner of the site. Provision would also be made for resident (106 no.) and visitor (40 no.) cycle parking and for motor-cycle parking. It is proposed to relocate the existing vehicular entrance further to the south and provide traffic calming with a layout designed based on the recommendations of DMURS.
- 2.4. Private amenity space is provided by means of balconies, patios and terraces. The layout also includes several areas of landscaped communal open space (total area 1,047m²) located around and between the buildings, including a playground of 102m² between Blocks B and C. Seating is also provided within the communal open space areas. No public open space will be provided but the developer has proposed to pay a contribution in lieu of open space.
- 2.5. It is proposed to connect to the existing 100mm cast iron watermain to the east of the site and also to the existing 100mm watermain located along the site's western boundary along the R114. The foul water will discharge by gravity to the existing 225mm combined sewer which runs along the site's western boundary with the

R114. A letter of confirmation of feasibility from Uisce Eireann has been supplied which confirms that both water supply and wastewater capacity is available. Surface water will be managed by means of a multi-stage attenuation system to provide for storm storage and to mirror the greenfield run-off levels.

2.6. The application was accompanied by a series of documents including the following:

- Planning Application Report
- Architectural Design Statement
- Schedule of Accommodation, a Housing Quality Assessment and a Sunlight/Daylight Assessment
- Infrastructure Design Report
- Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment
- Basement Impact Assessment
- Traffic & Transport Assessment, A Mobility Management Plan, and a DMURS Statement of Consistency
- Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment and A set of Photomontages
- Heritage Impact Assessment
- Landscape Design Rationale, An Arboricultural Assessment & Impact Report
- Appropriate Assessment Screening Report
- Ecological Impact Assessment
- A Climate Action & Energy Statement, A Sustainability & Energy Report, A Building Life Cycle Report and a Demolition Justification Report
- A Resource Waste Management Plan and an Operational Waste Management Plan and a Building Management Plan

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority decided to grant permission for a revised scheme of 60 apartment units subject to 22 no. conditions. These were generally of a standard type and included the following conditions:

- Cond 1. Plans and particulars – lodged with application and FI submitted on 21/01/25 and 20/03/25.
- Cond. 2 Development contribution €618,495.30 in accordance with the GDCS.
- Cond. 3 Development contribution of €300,000 in lieu of public open space as provided for in the GDCS.
- Cond. 4 Permission for 60 apartment units only consisting of 23 one-bedroom and 37 two-bedroom units.
- Cond. 5 Part V - Social and affordable housing.
- Cond. 6 Prior to the commencement of development, details of the materials, colours and textures of all external finishes and hard surfaces, including samples, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority. These shall include a higher quality finish, in keeping with the surrounding area, to be agreed for the setback of the top floor levels. Window finishes shall not be upvc. Construction materials and detailing shall adhere to the principles of sustainability and energy efficiency and high maintenance detailing shall be avoided.
- Reason: In the interests of orderly development and the visual amenities of the area.
- Cond. 7. Requirement to lodge the Preliminary Heritage Impact Assessment Report (or equivalent) with the Irish Architectural Archive prior to commencement of development.
- Cond. 8 Implementation of mitigation measures in Demolition Justification Report (6.0) with regard to reuse and recycling of building components.

- Cond 9 Submission for agreement details of the location and future reuse of items removed from the existing buildings including stained glass windows, memorial plaques, lighting, polished timber benches, doors to the ark, bimah and outdoor memorial stone.
- Cond. 10 No gates at the entrance – Any gates or boundary treatment to secure areas of communal open space to be subject of a separate planning application.
- Cond. 11 Landscaping
- Cond. 12 Tree protection
- Cond. 13 Management Company
- Cond. 14 Street naming
- Cond. 15 Electronic communications/digital connectivity infrastructure (ducting/internal conduits) to be provided in accordance with ‘DCC Guide to Installation of Telecoms Infrastructure in Residential and Mixed-Use Developments’.
- Cond 16. Refuse storage area requirements (specific) including requirement that receptacles are designed for reuse (except in specific circumstances), a three-bin collection system to be provided, sufficient space for dry-recyclables and wastewater drainage points in the receptacle area.
- Cond. 17 Requirements of Transportation Planning Division (combination of specific and standard requirements). Specific requirements include -
- (c) Carry out a Stage 3 Road Safety Audit for approval and completion of remedial measures prior to opening of completed development.
 - (f) Developer to liaise with NTA in relation to the interface between the BusConnects Core Bus corridor and evidence of correspondence and any agreements to be submitted to the P.A. prior to commencement of development.
 - (g) Relocation of bus shelter in front of the site to avoid impacts to visibility of drivers exiting the site – prior to occupation and at developer’s expense.

- Cond 18. Drainage Division requirements – (combination of specific and standard requirements). Specific requirements include –
- (b) connection to the public surface water sewer network only with written permission of Drainage Division
 - (c) drainage on a completely separate foul and surface water system
 - (d) To minimise the risk of basement flooding, all internal basement drainage shall be lifted, via pumping, to a maximum depth of 1.5 metres below ground level before being discharged by gravity from the site to the public sewer.
- Cond. 19 Developer to enter into a water and/or wastewater connection agreement with Uisce Eireann prior to commencement of development.
- Cond. 20 Demolition Management Plan to be submitted and agreed
- Cond 21 CEMP to be submitted and agreed.
- Cond 22 Comply with Codes of Practice for Drainage Division, Transportation Planning Division and the Noise & Air Pollution Section.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

3.2.2. The ***Initial Planning Report (12/11/24)*** assessed the proposed development under various headings, which may be summarised as follows -

- Principle/compliance with zoning – the proposal for residential development was considered to be acceptable in principle (Z1 zoning) and the density at 122dw/ha was acceptable subject to provision of an acceptable standard of residential amenity for future occupiers in accordance with the standards and provided that there would be no undue adverse impact on the residential amenities of the area. The plot ratio at 1.1 and site coverage at 26% were within the indicative ranges.
- Demolition of buildings on site – It was noted that several observers had raised concerns about the demolition of the synagogue which is a local landmark with distinctive windows to the front. A Justification Report was

submitted for the proposed demolition of the buildings on the site, which had regard to the embodied carbon of the existing structures and examined alternatives to demolition, including an analysis of the additional use of resources and energy arising from new construction compared with reuse of existing structures. Having regard to the contents of the Justification report, it was accepted that the building, although of some significance as a mid-twentieth century building, is no longer required for its existing use and could not easily be adapted to an alternative use. It was noted that the synagogue building is not a Protected Structure, on the NIAH or in a Conservation Area and has been the subject of previous planning permissions involving demolition. Should permission be granted, it was recommended that conditions be attached to ensure that a historical record of the building and its significance be maintained.

- Access and movement – It was pointed out that Rathfarnham Road is a busy arterial route to the City Centre comprising a 3-lane carriageway with an inbound bus lane and outbound advisory cycle lane and a bus shelter and bus cage outside the site. It is further noted that the road forms part of the Templeogue/Rathfarnham to city Centre BusConnects scheme which proposes widening of the carriageway to accommodate bus and general traffic lanes and the provision of segregated cycle ways and a reduced bus cage. Issues raised by the Transport Planning Division were noted including the need to relocate the bus shelter, potential conflicts and impacts on sightlines and the need for consultation with the NTA.
- Further issues included the need for a swept path analysis, improved connectivity with the surrounding area and justification for the width of the access route. Matters relating to car parking including accessible spaces, EV charging facilities and improved design of cycle parking were also noted. Further information was required in respect of a Road Safety Audit, revised proposals for servicing and deliveries, revised arrangements for long term cycle parking, E-bike charging facilities, auto tracking for emergency vehicles and substation access, a drawing showing details of areas to be taken in charge and details of phasing of the basement works.

- Compliance with residential standards - The proposed housing mix was considered to be acceptable and in accordance with the sustainable urban housing design standards for new apartments. It was noted that the housing quality assessment had demonstrated that the apartments comply with the minimum requirements for floor area, living space, aggregate bedroom area and internal storage. Private open space is provided by way of balconies and is generally compliant apart from three minor non compliances in block C. The three areas of communal open space would provide for a total area of 1,047m², which exceeds the required 410m² in the guidelines. Communal amenity building with the floor area of 59m² and the communal open space includes a children's playground landscaping and seating. It was noted that public open space will not be provided but that a financial contribution in lieu of this is proposed. This was considered to be acceptable given the limited street frontage and proximity to Bushy Park and to the Dodder linear park.
- Urban design – generally acceptable apart from lack of delineation of communal/semi-private areas whilst maintaining public frontage and permeability. Concern was also expressed regarding the lack of permeable linkages with the adjoining estates, particularly Greenmount Lawns, which should be addressed.
- Height and scale – it was generally accepted that the overall height strategy, which incorporates setbacks and steps down to reduce the impact, provides for a transition in height and scale. It is acknowledged that there would be a change in character between the existing predominantly 2-storey development on Rathfarnham Road to Block A, and again when Blocks B and C were viewed from Rathfarnham Road with an abrupt transition in scale between Beechlawn Mews and Block B. The change in character was considered to be generally acceptable, as it would provide a more urban appearance on a public transport corridor in close proximity to Terenure village. Concerns were raised regarding views from Wasdale Park, particularly from No. 1A (which has no street frontage) and from Nos. 1 and 2. Additional photomontages would be required. The proposed palette of materials was considered to be acceptable apart from the upper floors which should have an alternative finish more in keeping with the character of the area.

- Impact on residential and visual amenity – Concerns have been raised regarding separation distances and overlooking. The separation distances between Block A and No. 34 Rathfarnham Road at between 12m and 16m, is considered to be inadequate given the 4-storey height and considerable number of windows at the southern end overlooking this rear garden. The separation distance of 19.2m between Block C and Greenmount Lawns was considered sufficient to minimise direct overlooking but was considered to have an overbearing effect. In terms of Blocks Band C, it was considered that there was no direct overlooking apart from a fourth-floor bedroom window in Block B overlooking No. 1A Wasdale Park. However, it was considered that blocks B and C may have an overbearing impact on the houses on Wasdale Park due to the height and largely blank elevations on the southern side of these blocks.

Sunlight and daylight -the majority of windows in neighbouring properties would meet the required standards for daylight and all would meet the standards for sunlight. However, the most adversely affected windows in terms of reduced daylight included one FF window in No. 32 Rathfarnham Rd, one GF window in Beechlawn Mews, 3 GF windows in Greenmount Lawns and one FF window in Wasdale Park. Having regard to the loss of daylight, overlooking and overbearing impact on several properties as summarised above, the Area Planner considered that the developer should be required to revise the height, scale and massing of all three blocks and to re-examine the overlooking from Block A to the south.

- Ecology – Reference was made to the Ecological Impact Assessment Report submitted with the application. It was noted that the closest watercourse (River Dodder) is c.350m away and that there is no hydrological connection with the site. No evidence of any protected mammal species was recorded and there was no suitable habitat of any significant value for ex-situ species. A bat survey was undertaken, and no evidence of bat roosts were found. The structures on site were found to be of low suitability for roosting bats and the only evidence of bat activity was incidental in the surroundings. However, it was noted that the felling of some mature trees could potentially result in the loss of habitat to roosting bats.

3.2.3. Appropriate Assessment Screening was undertaken and it was concluded that a Stage 2 Appropriate assessment would not be required. A screening exercise for sub-threshold EIA was also carried out which concluded that the proposed development could be excluded at preliminary examination stage and that a screening determination was not required. The P.A. agreed with both of these conclusions.

3.2.4. The recommendation was for the submission of **Further Information** which was requested on 15th November 2024 and FI was received **on 21st January 2025**. The **Second Planning Report** (dated 13/02/25) assessed the response to the FI received on 21/01/25 as follows:

Item 1 – Request to revise scale and massing in order to reduce overbearing impact and potential for loss of daylight to properties at Wasdale Park, Greenmount Lawns, Beechlawn Mews and Rathfarnham Road

- The number of apartments was reduced to 61, the overall height was reduced to 5 storeys over basement and the unit mix was revised to 24 no. one-bed units and 37 no. 2-bed units. This was achieved by omitting the fourth floor of Block B (loss of 3 no. units) and the reduction in massing of the third and fourth floors at the southern side of Block C (loss of 2 no. units, one per floor). It was stated that these amendments would provide for a better transition of scale both to the north and to the south.
- The P.A. Planner's Report agreed that the proposed revisions would reduce the scale and massing of the blocks which would in turn reduce the impact on the two-storey houses in the vicinity. Although glimpses of the larger scale of development would be available, it was considered that this is not unusual in the context of Terenure Village which has a range of typologies. However, concerns remained regarding the impacts of the massing and scale on the amenities of immediately adjoining properties.
- The windows at the eastern end of south elevation of block a have been amended to high level windows. It has been pointed out that the windows at the western end of this elevation overlook the gable of no. 34 and that the existing mature vegetation on this boundary will be retained to prevent overlooking. The P.A. remained unconvinced on this issue.

- *The P.A continued to have concerns regarding the overbearing impact on 1A Wasdale Park due to the height and proximity of Block B. In addition, the impact on daylight was considered to be unacceptable in respect of 2 no. windows in No. 32 Rathfarnham Road and 2 no. windows in Greenmount Court. In terms of overlooking, it was considered that further measures should be taken to reduce the impact from Block A on 34 Rathfarnham Road.*

Item 2 – Request to clarify the extent of public permeability through the site and to delineate between publicly accessible and private spaces

- Revised drawing No. 24104_Terenure_LP_OSP shows delineation between publicly accessible and private areas. It has been confirmed that no gates will be provided. *The P.A. was satisfied with the response.*

Item 3 – Justification for inclusion of two-bedroomed three-person apartments

- There is now just one 2-bed 3-person unit which is on the ground floor of Block A and is designed to universally accessible standards. This represents just 2% of the overall accommodation in accordance with the Apartment Guidelines (2023). *The P.A. was satisfied with the response.*

Item 4 – Request to address concerns of Transport Division –

- Road Safety Audit submitted with revisions incorporated into design. Transport Planning satisfied that relocation of bus shelter can be agreed with NTA (by condition) and requested that a Stage 3 RSA also be required by condition.
- An amended internal road layout was submitted which addressed the service/delivery issues to the satisfaction of the Transport Division. The revised auto-track drawings for refuse vehicles and emergency vehicles were also satisfactory.
- Amended cycle parking and e-bike charging details were submitted which satisfied the requirements of the Transport Division.
- It was confirmed that no part of the proposed development would be taken in charge and that the construction phasing has been revised to ensure that the entire development will be delivered in a single phase, from the basement upwards. The Transport Division was satisfied with these revisions.

3.2.5. Further **clarification** was requested on 17th February 2025 and FI was received on **20th March 2025**.

3.2.6. The **Third Planning Report** (dated 15/04/25) included an assessment of the response (20/03/25) as follows:

The overall number of apartments is now reduced to 60 (23 1-bed and 27 2-bed) which was achieved by omitting a further apartment from Block B (southern end). Revisions to fenestration and elevational treatment have also been included.

Item A – Address remaining concerns regarding overbearing impact of Block B on 1A Wasdale Park – The P.A. considered that the submitted revised sections and elevations show that the omission of the third-floor apartment closest to No. 1A Wasdale Park would help to reduce the overbearing impact. In addition, the insertion of brick panel inserts to the southern elevation of both Block B and Block C would improve the appearance of these elevations from adjoining properties.

Item B – Address discrepancies between floor plans and elevational drawings in Block C (FI submission) and submit accurate North and South Elevational drawings for this block – The P.A. was satisfied that the revised floor plans and elevations had addressed this issue.

Item C – Give further consideration to the massing of Block C which could improve the overall daylight impact on windows in Greenmount Court (especially Windows W5, W6 at GF level in Zone B3) – The P.A. was generally satisfied with the response which did not include any further alterations, but had pointed out that the impacts were very slight and that there is existing vegetation on the boundary which currently impact on the daylight to the ground floor of Greenmount Court.

Item D – Address outstanding concerns regarding overlooking impact of Block A on No. 34 Rathfarnham Road (from south-facing bedroom windows in units A-07, A-12 and A-16) – Further revisions have been made to the south-facing windows of Units 07, 12 and 16 in Block A to reduce overlooking. The amendments include stepping in of the façade to provide daylight/ventilation to windows, provision of obscure glazing to large windows. The P.A. was satisfied with this response.

3.2.7. In conclusion, the P.A. was satisfied that the proposed development could be accommodated on the site without undue impact on the residential amenities of

adjoining occupiers and provide for a sustainable density at this location. The density has been reduced to 113 dw/ha with a site coverage of 26% and a plot ratio of 0.98, both of which are below the indicative standards in the CDP.

3.2.8. Other Technical Reports

- **Drainage (22/10/24)** – no objection subject to conditions (as reflected in summary of P.A. Decision and planning reports above).
- **Archaeology (24/10/24)** – Site is not within Zone of Archaeological Constraint for any Recorded Monuments. However, prior to construction of the synagogue and associated buildings, a substantial house occupied the site and there is a high possibility that the foundational remains of this house are still present below the current ground level, which could be impacted by below ground works. As such, should planning permission be granted, a condition is recommended requiring pre-development testing and that a method statement should be submitted outlining a detailed archaeological recording strategy for potential archaeological deposits/features identified and including a photographic record and drawings, (as reflected in summary of P.A. Decision and planning reports above).
- **Environmental Health (22/10/24)** – No objections subject to conditions requiring noise control and air quality control during construction and noise control during the operational phase. In respect of construction, it was requested that a CEMP be submitted to address this issue. In terms of operational noise, it was stated that the LAeq level measured over 15 minutes (daytime) or 5 minutes (nighttime) at a noise sensitive premises when plant associated with the development is operating, shall not exceed the LA90 by 5 dB or more compared with no plant operating (from the same position).
- **Transport division (31/10/24)** – It is pointed out that the site is located along the BusConnects Templeogue/Rathfarnham to City Centre Core Bus Corridor which will require a temporary land acquisition at the front of the site to facilitate the CBC works and a resolution to the issues relating to the location of the bus stop/shelter. It is noted that the proposed layout could be impacted by the CBC in terms of effects on proposed planting, cycle parking, internal

roads and footpaths. It was therefore recommended that a Stage 1 RSA be submitted which should address the CBC scheme.

Layout of internal roads - It was noted that autotracking of most vehicles was included but that autotracking of emergency access through the development and access to the proposed substation should be clarified. Taking-in-charge details would be required and could not include areas over basements.

Servicing - Concern was expressed regarding potential conflicts between servicing/loading bays and access to the basement. The operational waste management plan was considered to be satisfactory apart from the location of the proposed staging area near the new junction with Rathfarnham Road, which should be revised.

Cycle parking - The cycle parking provision was considered adequate in terms of the number of spaces, but the location of long-term spaces was considered to be less than ideal in terms of accessibility (for Block A) and all spaces should be secure. In addition, some spaces should be located in the basement and details of e-bike charging are required.

Car parking – the max. provision for Zone 2 is 1 space per unit, with allocation of 5% motorcycle and accessible and 50% EV charging. The provision of 40 car parking spaces and the proposed layout/allocation complies with this, but some discrepancies arise in respect of quantities of spaces provided across different documents/drawings submitted which should be clarified.

Mobility Management – The MMP states that the internal road space has been designed to prioritise sustainable travel modes and outlines targets to reduce reliance on private cars. It is also proposed to appoint a mobility manager to implement the residential MMP and to undertake a baseline travel survey when the development is operational. The MMP was welcomed.

Traffic Impact – The TTA is noted. It provides analysis of the existing road junctions and the contribution of the overall development to the surrounding junctions during 3 no. scenarios, 2026, 2031 and 2041. The analysis concluded that the proposed development would generate sub-threshold impacts on these junctions.

Construction – Section 8 of the TTA considers the impact of construction traffic, which will be governed by a Construction Traffic Management Plan to be agreed prior to commencement of construction. The Outline CEMP indicates that construction access would be via the proposed new entrance to the south with staff parking and welfare accommodated within the site. A max. of 4 HGV movements per hour in one direction is expected. A condition should be attached requiring measures to avoid car use by construction staff and to time their arrivals/departures outside of peak times.

Phasing – proposed phasing into two phases but with the basement spanning both phases requires clarification.

- **Transportation Division (06/02/25)** – The Road Safety Audit submitted as FI was satisfactory, and the relocation of the bus-shelter can be addressed by means of condition. A Stage 3 Audit should be required by condition.

The revised refuse and servicing arrangements were satisfactory. The increased long-term quality of cycle parking was welcomed and the revisions to the locations and allocations were acceptable. The revised e-bike charging facilities were also acceptable.

The revised autotracking details were satisfactory. The confirmation that no part of the development was to be taken in charge and that the development would be carried out in one phase were both considered acceptable.

The Transportation Division had no objections to the revised submissions subject to conditions, which have been reflected in the summary of the planning authority decision and planning reports above.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- **Uisce Eireann (21/10/24)** – Confirmation that the applicant had engaged with Uisce Eireann via a Pre-connection Enquiry and that a Confirmation of Feasibility has been issued to the applicant advising that water and wastewater connections are feasible. It was requested that a condition be attached to any permission requiring the applicant to enter into a Connection Agreement with Uisce Eireann to provide for these service connections.

- **National Transport Authority (4/11/24)** – Reference is made to the Templeogue/Rathfarnham to city Centre Bus connects Core Bus Corridor scheme (ABP Ref. HA29N.316272), which includes a proposed temporary land-take within the subject site where landscaping is proposed by the applicant. Given the overlap between this project and the CBC scheme and in order to mitigate any conflicts during potential concurrent construction phases, in the event of a grant permission, the NTA requests that appropriate conditions are attached to ensure that the NTA are consulted prior to the construction stage. Furthermore, the NTA recommends that prior to granting permission, the local authority should be satisfied that all relevant transport assessments, including Road Safety Audits, were undertaken with the full BusConnects CBC taken into account.

3.4. Third Party Observations

Twelve observations were submitted to the planning authority which are summaries in the Initial Planning Report (15/11/24). The main topics raised are as follows:

- Contrary to Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 – apartments are not high quality, attractive or liveable. Wasdale Park is part of a Conservation Area (Z2 zone), and the proposal would not comply with the Z2 zoning objective.
- Non-compliant with Apartment Guideline Standards – does not comply with unit mix, size/layout requirements.
- Overdevelopment of site – the mass, scale and height are excessive.
- Residential Amenity – The proposed apartment blocks will result in overlooking, overbearing presence and overshadowing on adjoining properties. It will also result in increased noise and light pollution.
- Visual and Townscape Amenity – the blocks are too tall and overly dense given the location of the site in an area that is characterised by predominantly 2-storey dwelling houses.

- Synagogue of historical and social significance – designed by Wilfred Cantwell, it is an iconic building with 5 no. star of David's and stained-glass windows and is a landmark building which should not be demolished.
- Inadequate parking – number of spaces grossly inadequate for development of this size.
- BusConnects – the scheme will put added pressure on traffic movement in the area which will be compounded by the proposed development.
- Biodiversity – the proposal will result in the loss and disturbance of a long-established site with mature vegetation which forms a vital part of the local ecosystem.

4.0 Planning History

PL29S.207258 – permission granted in September 2004 for construction of a 292-seat replacement synagogue and 35 residential apartments over a basement car park. The total floor area proposed was 4,368m² and some 791m² of existing buildings were to be demolished, including the existing synagogue, but the community hall was to be retained. The proposed synagogue was proposed as a single storey building with a height of 6.8m and would have been located in the south-eastern corner of the site, adjacent to the community hall. The proposal included three apartment blocks, each of which were to be 4-storeys in height with the fourth floor set back. The Board attached conditions, of which Condition No. 1 required the following amendments to the proposed scheme:

- Reduction in height of Block 1 from 4 to 3 storeys, by omission of 2no. penthouse apartments
- Reduction in height of Blocks 2 and 3 from 4 to 3 storeys by omission of 3 no. penthouse apartments
- Relocation of the bus shelter and how it is intended to comply with the road's requirements for the new access to the site.

Condition no. 11 required the submission of a historical report relating to the existing synagogue together with survey drawings and a photographic record for archival purposes. The Board should note that at section 6.0 of the Planner's report (current application/appeal), it was stated that planning permission had been granted subject to conditions requiring amendments to the height of block 1 and the length of Blocks 2 and 3 (Condition 3) and a requirement that the pedestrian gate onto Rathfarnham Road be kept open at all times. However, these conditions were contained in the P.A. decision on that case and were not attached by the Board in its decision in September 2004. A further condition relating to the relocation of the memorial stone was attached to the Board's decision (Condition 8).

This permission has not been implemented.

P.A. Ref. 2712/01 – permission granted for construction of a new synagogue and ancillary accommodation, including the refurbishment of the existing community hall, provision of a caretaker's apartment, car parking and demolition of the existing synagogue and pre-fabricated house. The proposal also sought the relocation of the vehicular entrance. Condition 9 required the submission of a historical report relating to the synagogue together with survey drawings and a photographic record.

This permission has not been implemented.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Revised National Planning Framework, 2025

- 5.1.1. The National Planning Framework (NPF) is the Government's high level strategic plan for shaping the future growth and development of Ireland to 2040. The Revised NPF takes account of changes that have occurred since the publication of the first NPF in 2018. The NPF supports the future growth and success of Dublin as Ireland's leading global city of scale, requiring the city to grow by at least 50% by 2040 (NPO8) with 40% of future housing development to be located within the existing 'footprint' of built-up areas (NPO7). It encourages better use of under-utilised land and buildings, including infill and brownfield land, with higher housing and jobs densities, better serviced by existing facilities and public transport. It also seeks to

deliver Transport Oriented Development at scale at suitable locations, along existing and planned high-capacity public transport corridors. (NPO10)

5.2. Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning authorities (2024)

- 5.2.1. The 'Compact Settlement Guidelines' replaced the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas Guidelines (2009). They support the application of densities that respond to settlement size and to different place contexts within each settlement, recognising the differences between cities, large towns and smaller towns and villages. They also allow for greater flexibility in residential design standards. The guidelines expand on the number of density bands in the 2009 Guidelines to ensure that densities are both efficient and tailored to settlement context. The guidance supports the determination of density ranges for an urban area (Table 3.1) and then refining that density further according to certain characteristics (3.4). The factors to be considered include accessibility to services and public transport, considerations of character, amenity and natural environment.
- 5.2.2. **Table 3.1** describes the different neighbourhood types. City Urban Neighbourhoods focus mainly on the compact medium density residential neighbourhoods around the city centre that have evolved overtime to include a greater range of land uses. However, it also includes lands around existing or planned high-capacity public transport nodes or interchanges (defined in Table 3.8) – all within the city and suburbs area. These are highly accessible urban locations with good access to employment, education and institutional uses and public transport. It is a policy and objective of these Guidelines that residential densities in the range 50 dph to 250 dph (net) shall generally be applied in urban neighbourhoods of Dublin and Cork.
- 5.2.3. The relevant Specific Planning Policy Requirements (SPPRs) are as follows:
- SPPR 1 – Separation Distances which requires a minimum of 16m between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses, duplex units and apartment units, above ground floor level.
- Policy and Objective 5.1 which requires a public open space provision of between 10%-15% of net site area. A higher range may be applicable in sites that contain

significant heritage, landscape or recreational features and sites that have specific nature conservation requirements.

SPPR 3 – Car Parking which states that car parking provision for residential development in city centres and urban neighbourhoods in the five cities should be minimised, substantially reduced or wholly eliminated. The maximum rate of parking in such areas is limited to 1 no. space per dwelling (exclusive of visitor spaces).

SPPR 4 – Cycle Parking and Storage which requires a general minimum standard of 1 no. cycle storage space per bedroom (plus visitor spaces), a mix of cycle parking types, and cycle storage facilities in a dedicated facility of permanent construction (within or adjoining the residences).

5.3. Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2023)

- 5.3.1. These guidelines set out national policy and standards for apartment development in order to ensure the application of consistent standards of accommodation and also to significantly increase housing supply. The guidelines encourage apartment development in urban areas, in central areas/accessible to services and amenities and those areas served by high frequency public transport. The guidelines also provide guidance on housing mix and floor areas.

5.4. Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (2019)

- 5.4.1. DMURS sets out guidance for new and existing roads incorporating good planning design practice. It places a strong focus on the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport and on improving the safety of streets and enhancing placemaking.

5.5. Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines (2018)

- 5.5.1. These guidelines set out national policy on building height in urban areas. Consolidation and densification, with greater building heights, can be considered in appropriate locations such as city and town centre areas, sites with significant public transport capacity and connectivity, but having regard to the need to achieve very high quality in terms of architectural, urban design and public realm outcomes.

5.6. Climate Action Plan

- 5.6.1. The purpose of the Climate Action Plan is to lay out a roadmap of actions which will ultimately lead to meeting Ireland's national climate objective of pursuing and achieving, by no later than the end of the year 2050, the transition to a climate resilient, biodiversity rich, environmentally sustainable and climate neutral economy. It aligns with the legally binding economy-wide carbon budgets and sectoral emissions ceilings that were agreed by Government in July 2022. Climate Action Plan 2025 builds upon last year's Plan by refining and updating the measures and actions required to deliver the carbon budgets and sectoral emissions ceilings and it should be read in conjunction with Climate Action Plan 2024.

5.7. National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBAP) 2023-2030

- 5.7.1. The National Biodiversity Action Plan sets the biodiversity agenda for the period 2023 – 2030. The Objectives of the NBAP seek to promote biodiversity as follows:
- Objective 1 Adopt a whole of government, whole of society approach to biodiversity.
- Objective 2 Meet urgent conservation and restoration needs.
- Objective 3 Secure nature's contribution to people.
- Objective 4 Enhance the evidence base for action on biodiversity.
- Objective 5 Strengthen Ireland's contribution to international biodiversity initiatives.

5.8. Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028

- 5.8.1. The site is **zoned Z1, Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods**, the objective for which is to protect, provide and improve residential amenities. It seeks to provide for a wide range of high-quality accommodation within sustainable communities where residents are within easy reach of open space, amenities and facilities such as shops, education, leisure and community services.
- 5.8.2. **Chapter 3 – Climate Action** – includes policies and objectives in line with the overall objectives of national climate action policy. Relevant policies include –

CA3 - Climate Resilient Settlement Patterns, Urban forms and Mobility – To support the transition to a low carbon, climate resilient city by seeking sustainable settlement patterns, urban forms and mobility.

CA6 – Retrofitting and Reuse of Existing Buildings - To promote and support the retrofitting and reuse of existing buildings rather than their demolition and reconstruction, where possible.

CA7 – Energy Efficiency in Existing Buildings - To support high levels of energy conservation, energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy sources in existing buildings, including retro-fitting of appropriate energy efficiency measures in the existing building stock.

5.8.3. **Chapter 4 – Shape and Structure of the City** seeks to achieve a high quality, sustainable urban environment, which is attractive to residents, workers and visitors. Relevant policies are -

SC10 – Urban Density – ensure appropriate densities and creation of sustainable communities in accordance with national guidance.

SC11 – Compact Growth – promote compact growth and sustainable densities through consolidation and intensification of infill and brownfield lands, particularly on public transport corridors subject to certain criteria.

SC16 – Building Height Locations - recognise the predominantly low-rise character of Dublin City whilst also recognising the potential and need for increased height in appropriate locations including the city centre subject to achieving a balance between reasonable protection of amenities and environmental sensitivities, protection of residential amenity and the established character of an area.

SC19 – High Quality Architecture - To promote development which positively contributes to the city's built and natural environment, promotes healthy placemaking and incorporates exemplar standards of high-quality, sustainable and inclusive urban design and architecture befitting the city's environment and heritage and its diverse range of locally distinctive neighbourhoods.

SC21 – Architectural Design - To promote and facilitate innovation in architectural design to produce contemporary buildings which contribute to the city's character, and which mitigates, and is resilient to, the impacts of climate change.

Chapter 5- Quality Housing and Sustainable Neighbourhoods – identifies the need for healthy placemaking and successful urban neighbourhoods with the efficient use of land at densities which ensure the viability of a range of facilities, amenities, services and good public transport connections. Relevant policies include

QHSN10 – Urban Density – to promote residential development at sustainable densities particularly on vacant/underutilised sites, having regard to the need for high standards of urban design and architecture and to successfully integrate with the character of the surrounding area.

QHSN11 – 15-Minute City - To promote the realisation of the 15-minute city which provides for liveable, sustainable urban neighbourhoods and villages throughout the city that deliver healthy placemaking, high quality housing and well designed, intergenerational and accessible, safe and inclusive public spaces served by local services, amenities, sports facilities and sustainable modes of public and accessible transport where feasible.

QHSN36 – High Quality Apartment Development - To promote the provision of high-quality apartments within sustainable neighbourhoods by achieving suitable levels of amenity within individual apartments, and within each apartment development, and ensuring that suitable social infrastructure and other support facilities are available in the neighbourhood.

Chapter 11- Built Heritage Chapter – recognises the importance of the city’s heritage to the collective memory of communities and the richness and diversity of its urban fabric. The overarching strategic policy is to support quality place-making and exemplar urban design, which has a clear synergy with the built heritage and archaeology. Relevant policies include -

BHA 9 – Conservation Areas - To protect the special interest and character of all Dublin’s Conservation Areas – identified under Z8 and Z2 zoning objectives and denoted by red line conservation hatching on the zoning maps. Development within or affecting a Conservation Area must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting, wherever possible.

BHA 10 – Demolition in Conservation Areas - There is a presumption against the demolition or substantial loss of a structure that positively contributes to the

character of a Conservation Area, except in exceptional circumstances where such loss would also contribute to a significant public benefit.

BHA 11 – Rehabilitation and Reuse of Existing Older Buildings

- (a) To retain, where appropriate, and encourage the rehabilitation and suitable adaptive reuse of existing older buildings/structures/features which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area and streetscape in preference to their demolition and redevelopment.
- (b) Encourage the retention and or reinstatement of original fabric of our historic building stock such as windows, doors, roof coverings, shopfront (including signage and associated features), pub fronts and other significant features.
- (c) Ensure that appropriate materials are used to carry out any repairs to the historic fabric.

5.8.4. **Chapter 15 - Development Standards** – Section 15.8 addresses Residential Development and sets out the general requirements including more specific requirements for apartments.

15.8.6 – Public Open Space – the requirement is 10% of the overall site area.

15.8.7 – Financial Contributions in Lieu of Open Space - in some instances it may be more appropriate to seek a financial contribution towards its provision elsewhere in the vicinity, such as cases where it is not feasible due to site constraints or where, having regard to the existing provision in the area, the needs of the population would be better served by the provision of a new park in the area, or the upgrading of an existing park. The details on the value of the contribution in lieu and other exemptions are set out in the Dublin City Section 48 Development Contribution Scheme and any future amendments thereof.

15.9 – Apartment Standards – the provision of high quality, attractive and liveable apartment units is essential, and apartment developments must make a positive contribution to the local area in terms of public open space and/or public realm improvements and should provide long-term living environments for future residents through quality communal amenity spaces and attractive and sustainable internal units. This section sets out the qualitative standards for apartment development and

are largely based on the standards contained in the Apartment Guidelines (2020, updated in 2023).

5.9. Natural Heritage Designations

5.9.1. The site is not located within or adjacent to any designated sites. The closest European Sites are as follows:

- South Dublin Bay SAC
- South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA

6.0 EIA Screening

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

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1. The third-party appeal has been submitted by Terenure Residents Association on behalf of the following groups, with an individual Appeal Statement from each group:

Wasdale Park Residents

Greenmount Lawns Residents

No. 32 Rathfarnham Road

Terenure Residents Association

7.1.2. Each of the groups have stated that they are not opposed to the residential development of the site but object to the scale and nature of the specific

development proposal, notwithstanding the amendments made at planning application stage.

7.1.3. The main issues arising from the appeal may be summarised as follows:

- **Contrary to Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028** – apartments are not high quality, attractive or liveable. The policies for this residential zone seek to protect existing residential amenity, promote appropriate scale in suburban areas and support climate resilience through green infrastructure.
- **Impact on Synagogue** – this landmark building with its 5 no. stars of David and stained-glass windows would be a huge loss to the history of the Jewish community living in the area.
- **Overdevelopment of site** – the mass, scale and height are excessive for this narrow site and its immediate proximity to low-rise dwellings. It would therefore result in an overbearing impact on Nos. 32 and 34 Rathfarnham Road and Nos. 1 and 2 Wasdale Park, in particular. The height and density of development are significantly higher than any other buildings in the area and would block significant light from adjoining properties. It would set an undesirable precedent for a similar scale of development in the area.
- **Residential Amenity** – The proposed apartment blocks will result in overlooking, an overbearing and intrusive presence and overshadowing on adjoining properties. It will also result in increased noise and light pollution.
- **Inadequate parking** – the number of spaces is grossly inadequate for a development of this size. When visitors are added, it will create additional pressures on parking capacity in the surrounding area, which is already subject to metering and clearways.
- **BusConnects** – planning permission has been granted for this scheme which will create massive pressure on traffic movement in the area which will be compounded by the proposed development, particularly during construction works.
- **Visual and Townscape Amenity** – the blocks are too tall and overly dense and do not adequately relate to the character of the area which is comprised of predominantly 2-storey dwelling houses. The prevailing pattern of

development is low-density suburban housing with generous front and rear gardens.

- **Biodiversity** – the proposal will result in the loss and disturbance of a long-established site with mature vegetation which forms a vital part of the local ecosystem. Mature horse-chestnut trees along the boundary would be lost. These trees are important for biodiversity, visual amenity and as a natural buffer from the development. The proposed planting is for very small saplings which would not be adequate to mitigate the impacts of the development.
- **Block A – Impact on 32 Rathfarnham Road** – The proposed development would have the following specific impacts:-
 - Loss of light - severe impact in terms of loss of light due to proximity and scale of proposed development to the ground floor windows on the southern elevation of this property. These windows and glazed patio door provide essential light to the kitchen and living areas. The sunlight and daylight assessment found that the VSC levels to these windows would be reduced to 0.77 and 0.78 of their existing values, which is below the BRE guidelines (minimum of 0.8). These openings will be permanently overshadowed, receiving no meaningful light throughout the year and would make these rooms unacceptably dark.
 - Overbearing presence – The height, bulk and scale of the building is excessive at 5-storeys and would create an overbearing and oppressive presence from their property. It fails to provide a modest, step-down interface with the adjoining properties which is contrary to planning policy and good practice.
 - Loss of privacy, noise and light pollution – The southern elevation of Block A contains numerous windows and balconies overlooking their rear garden and rear-facing rooms. Despite proposed mitigation measures, such as window cill heights and retained trees, there will be clear lines of sight into their private amenity space. The proximity of the car park ramp to their dwelling would introduce increased vehicle noise, lighting glare and traffic movements close to their dwelling.

- **Block C – Impact on Greenmount Lawns** – Residential development to east of Block C. The proposed development would have the following impacts:-
 - Block C would contravene DCC’s Prevailing Height guidelines (Appendix 3 of the CDP) as it should relate to ‘the most commonly occurring height in any given area’.
 - Block C would be located on elevated ground overlooking the adjacent 3-storey recessed apartments at Greenmount Lawns and private gardens, which would have the visual effect of a 6-7 storey apartment block. The height disparity is inaccurately represented in the Visual Impact Assessment as the photomontage is taken from ‘far away’ rather than from the immediate eastern boundary. It is requested that additional information be provided by the applicant in this regard.
 - Block C has large windows directly facing Greenmount Lawn properties with a separation distance which is 15% less than the recommended 22 metres distance recommended in the CDP (15.11.4). The actual distance from the wall to Greenmount Lawns is 8.8m, not 9.3m.
 - Block C was not included in the pre-app discussions with the planning authority.
 - A series of photomontages have been included by the appellants to demonstrate the likely impact and it is submitted that the Developer’s Visual Impact Assessment misrepresents the scale of the impact on these properties. It is requested that Block C be reduced from five storeys over basement to three storeys over basement, that the separation distance be increased to 22 metres between opposing first floor windows and to alter the design to eliminate overlooking balconies in order to safeguard and respect the prevailing landscape and privacy of Greenmount Lawns.
- **Block C – Impact on Wasdale Park** – Submission from owner/occupiers of Nos. 1 and 2 Wasdale Park, to the south of Block C. The proposed development would have the following impacts:-

- The height and scale of Block C is excessive and would have an overbearing impact on the adjoining properties to the south, notwithstanding the amendments made during the application process. A series of photomontages have been included by the appellants to demonstrate the likely impact and it is submitted that the Developer's Visual Impact Assessment misrepresents the scale of the impact on these properties. It is requested that the height be reduced such that it would be in keeping with the character and amenity of the immediately surrounding residential properties.
- Concerns expressed regarding potential for overlooking from the 'Green Space' balcony on the southern side as it is not clearly indicated that there would be an opaque screen at both ends preventing direct overlooking of Wasdale Park properties. It is requested that a 'Fin Wall' or other suitable opaque screen of sufficient height be provided at each end and that access to the green space be restricted to maintenance personnel only.
- The southern elevation (as revised) shows recessed brick panels which does not sufficiently compensate for the building's mass and overbearing impact. It is essential that semi-mature trees are planted along the boundary to help screen the proposed development. It is requested that a revised landscaping scheme incorporating semi-mature evergreen trees, such as laurel or eucalyptus be required in order to mitigate the negative impacts of Block C. It is requested that a minimum of 2 such trees be planted behind each of the houses at Nos. 1 and 2 Wasdale Park.

7.2. Applicant Response

7.2.1. The First Party response was submitted on the 10th of June 2025. The main points may be summarised as follows:

- **Planning policy** - The proposed development, which was reduced from proposed 66 no. apartments to 60 units, is consistent with current planning policy for a more compact urban form which delivers more sustainable places

for people to live and work, as set out in Appendix A of the Planning Report submitted with the application, and as updated in the response to the grounds of appeal. The policy framework strongly supports the form, height and density of development as proposed in the built-up urban area which is highly accessible to amenities and facilities and is served by existing and planned high-quality public transport.

- **Misleading photomontages** – it is strongly refuted that the photomontages and LVIA submitted with the application are misleading, as they are based on best practice methodologies as set out in the booklet of photomontages, which is enhanced in the FI submissions by further viewpoints. It is pointed out that the appellants have not provided any technical evidence or material to support these claims.
- **Scale and Massing, Loss of Privacy and Overlooking** – Block A has been carefully modulated to avoid an overbearing impact on the neighbouring properties. The fourth storey is set back c.8.8m at its closest point to No. 32 Rathfarnham Road creating an appropriate transition of scale. The windows on the northern elevation are high level (1.8m cill height) and the breaks and insets on this elevation are designed to ensure that it does not have an overbearing impact on its neighbours. It is disputed that Block C would have the visual effect of a 6-7 storey building. The elevation drawings show that the building is 4-5 storeys with the top storey set back to further reduce the scale and mass of Block C when seen from the appellants' gardens.
- **Appendix 3 of CDP** – it is pointed out that due regard has been had to compliance with Appendix 3 as set out in Appendix A of the Planning Report submitted with the planning application. An updated assessment of compliance with this guidance is provided in the response to the grounds of appeal, wherein it is set out how the proposed development achieves each of the 10 objectives of Appendix 3.
- **Loss of mature trees, habitat loss and revised landscaping to include planting of mature trees** – Reference is made to Arboricultural Drawing TTER-002-102 ARB (submitted with the planning application) and to Landscaping Plan Drg. No. 24104_Rathfarnham_LP-RFI-Landscape Plan

(submitted as FI) which shows the carefully selected landscaping elements and identifies the location of semi-mature trees to be planted on the northern, southern and western boundaries of the site. It is pointed out that the FI Landscaping Plan proposed to plant 76 trees, many of which are semi-mature, as well as shrubs, evergreen screening and hedgerows. It is submitted that the proposed development involves the loss of only 11 trees, with a replacement ratio of 9.5 trees for every tree lost. It is argued that the proposed landscaping will mitigate any negative visual impact of the proposed development and greatly improve local biodiversity.

- **Loss of daylight at No 32** – Reference is made to the Sunlight and Daylight Assessment Report submitted with the application (as amended - FI), which found that all windows passed the daylight standards assessment apart from one which marginally failed. Thus, the assertion that there would be a total loss of daylight to these windows/rooms is refuted. In addition, it is noted that all windows passed the sunlight standards.
- **Separation distances** – The CDP states that the traditional separation distance of 22m can be relaxed where the amenities and privacy of adjoining occupiers can be preserved. It was pointed out that the proposed development was amended at FI and clarification stages with the omission of a total of 6 units in order to improve the relationship with the adjoining properties. Furthermore, the new Compact Settlement Guidelines state that the traditional reliance on a 22m separation distance is incompatible with the objectives to achieve more compact urban forms and SPPR1 requires a separation distance of 16 metres. It is pointed out that the proposed development (as amended) shows a separation distance of 19.2 metres between Block C and the Greenmount Lawns properties.
- **Inappropriate design and disruption to neighbourhood character** – it is submitted that the density and scale of development is entirely consistent with the current planning policy context provided for in the NPF, the Compact Settlement Guidelines and in the City Development Plan. It is noted that the recommended density for a site in a 'City Urban Neighbourhood', which includes sites with accessibility to high-capacity public transport, defined in

the Compact Settlement Guidelines as within 500m of a BusConnects stop, is 50dph-250dph. Having regard to the proposed Density (as amended) at 113dph, the Site Coverage at 26% and the Plot Ratio at 0.98, it is submitted that the proposed development of an underutilised brownfield site in a highly accessible urban area is appropriate to the neighbourhood.

- **Increased noise and light pollution** – it is submitted that the proposal to confine the access to the parking to one location and to provide all car parking at basement level would minimise the vehicular movements above ground which in turn, would minimise disturbance in respect of noise and light pollution to neighbouring properties.
- **Significance of synagogue building** – It is pointed out that the proposed development has the full support of the Hebrew Community and congregation. Reference is made to the Preliminary Heritage Assessment, which found that the building is not of high architectural or historical significance. Reference is also made to the Demolition Justification Report which noted that the building is too large for the current Jewish community and that the synagogue is no longer in use. It was pointed out that the P.A. had accepted that the building was not suitable for re-use.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

7.3.1. A response to the grounds of appeal was submitted by the planning authority on the 10th of June 2025. It was requested that the board would uphold its decision. It was further requested that should planning permission be granted, conditions be attached regarding the following matters:

- Section 48 Development Contribution.
- Payment of a contribution in lieu of public open space.
- A social housing condition.
- A naming and numbering condition.

7.4. Observations

No observations were received.

8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. It is considered that the main issues arising from the third-party appeal are as follows:

- Principle of development
- Principle of demolition of synagogue building
- Density and scale
- Visual and townscape impact
- Residential amenity
- Traffic and transport
- Landscape and biodiversity

8.2. **Principle of development**

- 8.2.1. The National Planning Framework (Revised) and the Compact Settlement Guidelines seek to encourage better use of under-utilised land and buildings, including infill and brownfield land, with higher housing and jobs densities, better serviced by existing facilities and public transport. The NPF also seeks to deliver Transport Oriented Development, at scale, at suitable locations, along existing and planned high-capacity public transport corridors. The Compact Settlement Guidelines also seek to strive for more compact urban forms, particularly in areas which are highly accessible and there is good access to high quality public transport.
- 8.2.2. The site is located in an established built-up area with a range of existing services, facilities and amenities within walking distance of the site. It is situated on an arterial route which is characterised by mature residential development intermixed with commercial and community uses. Rathfarnham Road has recently been the subject of a successful planning application for a BusConnects Bus Priority corridor and there is an existing bus stop outside the property boundary. The site is underutilised with a synagogue building which is currently not in use and a number of associated buildings, with on-site parking. It can be described as a large infill site currently at a very low density, which is located in an established built-up area which is highly accessible to existing amenities and by planned high-capacity public transport, which

is suited in principle to redevelopment for residential purposes, and at a higher density, such as apartment development.

- 8.2.3. The proposed development involves a change of use from a community facility to residential. The site is Zoned Z1 whereby such a change of use is permissible in principle. The submitted documents indicate that the Dublin Hebrew community are supportive of the application as the size of the Jewish congregation is declining and the synagogue building is too large for their needs. I note from the planning history that this has been the case for about twenty years. The planning authority had examined the possibility of the building being repurposed and had concluded that it was not suitable for alternative community uses.
- 8.2.4. Having regard to the planning policy context, the underutilised nature of the site and its location in close proximity to existing amenities and public transport services, it is considered that the proposed development of the site as an apartment scheme is considered to be acceptable in principle.

8.3. Principle of demolition of synagogue building

- 8.3.1. I would refer the Board to the Preliminary Heritage Impact Assessment and the Justification for Demolition, both of which were submitted with the planning application. It is noted that the synagogue building is not a Protected Structure or included in the NIAH database. It was constructed in 1952 on the site of a large suburban house close to the centre of Terenure village. It is a detached building sitting in the centre of the site with a mono-pitched roof sloping towards the rear. The front elevation is distinctive with a row of 5 no. Star of David windows, underneath which lies a further row of 10no. small square windows. There is a porch over the front door. Large stained-glass windows were added in 1968 into the northern and southern walls.
- 8.3.2. The Statement of Significance concluded that the architectural design is clearly an example of modern architectural ideas prevalent in the mid-20th century. It is described as having Local Architectural and Social Significance but would not be considered a work of high architectural or historical significance. It was acknowledged that some of the features of the building will have significance to its congregation and will be removed from the structure for possible reuse in its

replacement synagogue. Those features are stated to include the stained-glass windows, memorial plaques, lighting, polished timber benches, the doors to the ark and the bimah at the centre of the synagogue.

- 8.3.3. The Dublin City Development Plan (15.7.1) and policies CA6 and CA7 encourages the re-use of buildings for integration into a development scheme in preference to their demolition. Where demolition is proposed, it is required that a demolition justification report be submitted to set out the rationale for demolition having regard to the 'embodied carbon' of existing structures and to demonstrate that all alternative options have been examined. Where demolition is proposed, it is further encouraged that existing building materials are incorporated and utilised in the new design proposals where feasible, together with a clear strategy for the reuse and disposal of the materials following demolition.
- 8.3.4. The Justification for Demolition Report identified the buildings required to be demolished as the Synagogue, the Community Hall and the Caretaker's Lodge to facilitate the development. Each of these buildings is constructed with concrete frames, masonry walls, concrete purlins and roof tiles as well as asbestos roof tiles. The synagogue building is described as requiring urgent repairs, that the fascia and soffits are in poor condition and that there is evidence of rainwater penetration through the roof. The structures added later on site are not of any architectural merit and are also in a poor condition.
- 8.3.5. It was concluded that the re-use of the structures for the proposed development was unsuitable as the existing structure is designed as a worship space, comprising of steel and concrete portal frames, with a massive single pitched roof, which is not easily adaptable to residential use. Likewise, the community hall is a large warehouse style structure which does not lend itself to adaptation to residential use. The demolition of all of the structures on site would facilitate the redevelopment of the site as a high-quality residential development in the heart of Terenure village. The deconstruction will be carried out such that a portion of the materials will be salvaged for re-use and recycling. Furthermore, the building is now too large for the declining Jewish congregation and is no longer in use. In relation to embodied carbon, mitigation measures are proposed, including the reuse and recycling of materials as well as pre-demolition audits, use of salvage yards and re-use of materials on and off the site.

- 8.3.6. Having regard to the examination and conclusions of these two reports, and to the conclusions in the P.A. planning reports and associated conditions, I would agree that the demolition of these buildings is appropriate. In particular, it is noted that it is not a protected structure and has not been assessed as being of architectural or historical significance and is unsuitable for re-purposing and reuse. It is welcomed that it is intended that the stained-glass windows will be re-used in a future synagogue site and it is accepted that they would not be suitable for use in other community buildings.
- 8.3.7. It is noted from the planning history that previous permissions relating to the redevelopment of the site had accepted the demolition of the synagogue and associated buildings on site and had sought specific measures (by condition) such as the relocation of the memorial stone and the lodgement of records (survey drawings/photographs etc.) with the Irish Architectural Archives, and that the P.A. decision had included similar conditions.
- 8.3.8. In conclusion, it is considered that the demolition of the buildings is considered to be acceptable in light of the information provided as it would facilitate the redevelopment of the site for the benefit of the community. Should the Board be minded to grant permission, however, conditions requiring the salvage of materials and lodgement of records with the Irish Architectural Archives would be considered appropriate.

8.4. **Density and scale**

- 8.4.1. As noted above, the proposed development is generally consistent with national and local policy in terms of seeking to provide for an increased density of residential development on this site. The Compact Settlement Guidelines (3.3) sets out the recommended density range for each type of neighbourhood and encourages further refinement in accordance with the criteria in 3.4 of the guidelines. The recommended density range for City-Urban Neighbourhoods is **50 to 250dph**. This neighbourhood type includes areas within cities and suburbs with 'lands around existing or planned high-capacity public transport nodes or interchanges'. These are described as highly accessible urban locations with good access to employment, education and institutional uses and public transport. One of the exceptions to this density range is

the case of very small infill sites that are not of sufficient scale to define their own character and density (3.3.6(c)). In such instances, it will be necessary to respond to the scale and form of surrounding development, to protect the amenities of surrounding properties and to protect biodiversity, which may take precedence over the densities set out in the guidelines.

- 8.4.2. In terms of refining density, consideration should be given, firstly, to the **proximity and accessibility of the site to services and public transport** (3.4.1) and secondly, to the **character, amenity and the natural environment** (3.4.2). Having regard to Table 3.8, it is considered that the site of the proposed development falls into the 'High-Capacity Public Transport' location as it is situated on Rathfarnham Road, which is served by several frequent bus services and is also a planned BusConnects Bus Priority Corridor, with a bus stop immediately adjacent to the site. In addition, the site is within easy walking distance of Terenure Village with all the amenities and facilities available there.
- 8.4.3. Considerations of character (3.4.2(a)) state that the focus should be on matters such as the prevailing scale and mass of buildings, urban grain and architectural language and the capacity of the area for change. It is stated that
- “While it is not necessary to replicate the scale and mass of existing buildings, as most urban areas have significant capacity to accommodate change, it will be necessary to respond in a positive and proportionate way to the receiving context through site responsive design.”
- 8.4.4. The strategic approach set out in Appendix 3 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, (CDP), is similar as it states clearly that the highest densities should be located at the most accessible locations, that an urban design and quality led approach to creating sustainable development will be promoted and that density should respect the existing character, context and urban form of an area and seek to protect existing and future residential amenity. Where a scheme proposes buildings and densities that are significantly higher and denser than the prevailing context, however, it will be necessary to apply the performance criteria set out in Table 3 (Appendix 3) of the CDP.
- 8.4.5. Indicative density ranges, plot ratios and site coverage values are set out in Table 1 and Table 2 of Appendix 3 (CDP). The indicative density range for the Outer

Suburbs is 60-120dph, while for Former Z6 lands, it is 100-150dph. The indicative plot ratio is 1.0-2.5 and site coverage of 45-60% for Outer Employment and Residential Areas. The recommended height for the Outer suburbs is 3-4 storeys as a minimum with greater heights considered on a case-by-case basis. The proposed development, as amended by FI and Clarification of FI has a density of 113dph, a plot ratio of 0.98 and a site coverage of 26%. The height has been reduced from 3-6 storeys to 3-5 storeys. The density and scale of the proposed apartment scheme is, therefore, within or below the thresholds set out in both the CDP and the Compact Settlement Guidelines for areas served by existing or planned high-quality public transport.

8.4.6. The appellants consider that the prevailing context is markedly different to the proposed development in terms of density, scale and height of development. In such circumstances, both the Compact Settlement Guidelines and Appendix 3 of the CDP require an assessment of the specific context in order to determine the appropriate density as refined by the character and nature of the area.

8.4.7. **Table 3 (CDP- Appendix 3)** sets out **10 performance criteria** against which the proposed development is now assessed.

1. To promote development with a sense of place and character

The layout and design of proposed development, which provides for the 60 apartments over three separate blocks, interspersed by landscaped open space areas and for the planting of c.76 trees respects the established surrounding urban structure by avoiding a monolithic block and by providing for landscape screening to help assimilate the development into the site. The introduction of a 3-4 storey apartment block facing Rathfarnham Road, which is set back from the neighbouring properties is generally respectful of the character and scale of the area and contributes positively to the creation of a sense of place and character. The contemporary design and use of materials which are commonly found in the vicinity, together with the siting of Block A closer to the roadside boundary, would also help to integrate the development into the site. The additional height and scale of the proposed development is modulated by the setting back of upper floors which provides a transition in

scale to the boundaries of the site. It is considered that this objective would be met.

2. To provide appropriate legibility

It is considered that the architectural design, scale and use of materials helps to integrate the new infill building fronting Rathfarnham Road into the streetscape and simultaneously introduces a new contemporary design which would contribute positively to the legibility of both the street and the proposed development. In addition, the proposed layout with the provision of a new access and internal street and a significant increase in the level of access through the development, is likely to enhance permeability. It is considered that this objective would be met.

3. To provide appropriate continuity and enclosure of streets and spaces

The proposed development would provide an enhanced urban design context by introducing a new internal street with landscaped open space areas. This would open up a currently impenetrable site which is closed off to the surrounding community. The layout has also been designed in accordance with DMURS which prioritises safe pedestrian access. It is considered that this objective would be met.

4. To provide well connected, high quality, active public and communal spaces

The proposed development would contribute to the enhancement of the public realm which would prioritise pedestrians, cyclists and access to public transport. The proposed location of the majority of the car parking in the basement with a single access point and the provision of adequate amounts of cycle parking facilities would also help to achieve this objective. It is considered that this objective would be met.

5. To provide high quality, attractive and useable private spaces

The design of the building incorporates attractive and useable private open space in the form of patios, terraces and balconies. The layout of the site also ensures that buildings are separated by landscaped open spaces which provide for an attractive outlook from the private spaces. It is considered that this objective would be met.

6. To promote a mix of use and diversity of activities

The proposed development does not provide for a mix of uses. However, it would provide for a residential development which would be located within walking distance of the existing services and facilities available at Terenure Village and would therefore provide for sustainable development in terms of the 15-minute city initiative. It is considered that this objective would be met.

7. To ensure high quality and environmentally sustainable buildings

The buildings have been designed to take advantage of solar gain and to ensure that plentiful levels of natural daylight and sunlight will reach habitable rooms and associated external spaces. The application was also accompanied by a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment (as amended) which will be discussed further below.

Reports have been submitted outlining the energy sustainability and embodied carbon impacts of the proposed development. These include the Demolition Justification Report, the Climate Action and Energy Statement, the Sustainability and Energy Report and the Building Life Cycle Report. It is noted that the proposed development with a BER of A3 compares favourably to the estimated E rating for the existing buildings on site, thereby ensuring a significant decrease in energy consumption and associated carbon emissions. In addition, the proposed development has been designed to comply with Part L of the Building Regulations 2022 (Dwellings) in that it will achieve NZEB (Nearly Zero Energy Buildings) by employing the latest energy efficient technology in all aspects of the building design, technology and layout. Mitigation measures to minimise the embodied carbon emissions are also proposed such as reusing and recycling materials.

The Infrastructure Design Report and Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment Report also provide details of the surface water management strategy for the site, including nature-based SUDs solutions and public surface water infrastructure provision.

It is considered, therefore, that the proposed development has been designed to ensure that the proposed buildings are of a high quality and are

environmentally sustainable and that this objective would be met by the proposed development.

8. To secure sustainable density, intensity at locations of high accessibility

As previously noted, the site is located in a very accessible location on an arterial route that is served by several frequent bus routes and a planned BusConnects corridor and is also on the edge of Terenure Village with a wide range of amenities available. It is considered, therefore, that the proposed development meets this objective.

9. To protect historic environments from insensitive development

The site is not located within a conservation area and does not include any Protected Structures or buildings on the NIAH of National Monuments. However, the site is considered to be of cultural importance as one of the main Jewish synagogues in Dublin and contains several culturally important artefacts. The cultural importance of the site is outlined in the Preliminary Heritage Assessment and the Justification for Demolition documents submitted with the application. It is noted that the Memorial Stone (to the victims of the Holocaust), which sits in a landscaped setting within the grounds will be moved to a secure location, in preparation for siting it within a new synagogue setting. Similarly, other elements of cultural importance will be stored for reuse in the new synagogue.

It is acknowledged that Wasdale Park is part of a Conservation Area (Z2 zoning) and that it abuts part of the site to the rear. However, the proposed development, as revised with a reduced mass and scale and modulation of the buildings, has been designed to respect the character of the adjoining areas. In addition, existing and proposed landscape screening will help to mitigate any adverse impacts on the conservation area. The impacts on this area will be discussed further below. It is considered that the proposed development meets this objective.

10. To ensure appropriate management and maintenance

A management plan has been submitted which addresses matters of security, management of public and communal areas, waste management and

servicing of the development. This is set out in the submitted report entitled Operational Management Statement and this issue is also addressed in other documents submitted with the application and FI such as the Building Management Plan and the Resource Waste Management Plan. It is considered that this objective would be met.

Conclusions regarding height, Scale and Density of development

- 8.4.8. In conclusion, it is considered that the site is strategically located in a highly accessible location on brownfield lands on an arterial route within easy walking distance of Terenure Village (a Key Urban village) which provides a wide range of services, facilities and amenities. As such, this is a location that would be favoured for increased height and density in the Compact Settlement Guidelines, the Urban Development Building Height Guidelines (SPPR 3, Scale of the City) and as a key location in the P.A.'s Building Height Strategy (Appendix 3 of the CDP).
- 8.4.9. At the scale of the neighbourhood, it is considered that whilst the prevailing scale and mass is generally of a low density with mainly 2-storey dwellings, many of which are set within generous plots and screened by mature landscaping, the overall character of the area is one of mixed building typologies with no predominant architectural style or building form along this section of Rathfarnham Road. In addition to a range of dwelling house styles, there are many other forms of development present such as the 3-storey Beechlawn apartments and the Lidl store to the north, the 3-storey duplex apartments at Greenmount to the east, and several commercial buildings in the vicinity as the village is approached. In this context, the neighbourhood is one which has evolved over many decades with varying styles and scales of development, which makes it more amenable to absorb change.
- 8.4.10. At the scale of the site, it is noted that the site area is relatively large at 0.54ha, is well screened and is bounded by a variety of building typologies. It is also currently unoccupied and is under-utilised relative to the intensity of development on surrounding sites and that would be expected in an urban location with excellent accessibility, at the edge of Terenure village. It is considered, therefore, that the nature and character of the site and the area are such that there is a reasonable capacity for change and to absorb a development with a slightly higher density than that prevailing in the immediate environs.

8.5. Visual and townscape impact

Proposed development

- 8.5.1. The proposed development, as initially submitted, introduced three blocks ranging in height from 3 to 6 storeys, from west to east though the site. Block A, fronting onto Rathfarnham Road, at 3-4 storeys in height, aligns with the building line of the neighbouring properties and retains the mature trees on the southern boundary with No. 34 Rathfarnham Road. The tallest Block (B), at 4-6 storeys, is centrally positioned, with landscaped courtyards to the east and west, in order to provide a gradual transition in scale. Block C is sited to the rear, at 3-5 storeys, and retains the mature treeline along the eastern boundary. The design strategy was to provide for a transition of scale relative to the existing residential development to the north and south, fronting Rathfarnham Road by stepping the height of Block A from 3 to 4 storeys, with increasing scale through the site towards the east. At the rear, the transition would be achieved between Block C and Greenmount Lawns, which comprises mainly 3-storey blocks of units and would be separated by 19.2 metres. The P.A., however, was not satisfied that Blocks B and C were sufficiently modulated to create a reasonable transition in scale with the existing surrounding development, which is mainly 2-storey with some 3-storey and 4-storey development.
- 8.5.2. The revised scheme (FI 21/01/25) reduced the scale and massing of Block B by removing the proposed fourth floor, thereby omitting 3 no. apartments. This resulted in the lowering of the overall height of this Block by one floor and the setting back of the top floor on the northern and southern sides. The scale of this Block was further reduced in the Clarification of FI (CFI 20/03/25) by the omission of a further apartment on the southern side facing No. 1A Wasdale Park. It is considered that these revisions have resulted in a much-improved transition of scale between Block B and the existing development to the north and south. The revised scheme (FI 21/01/25) also reduced the scale and mass of Block C by removing two apartments, one on each of the third and fourth floors on the southern side of the building, which has improved the transition in scale where it faces the rear of Nos. 1 and 2 Wasdale Park (to south) and Greenmount Lawns (to east). The CFI (20/03/25) also introduced changes to elevations of the blocks where they faced existing residential properties, such as revised fenestration and articulation with insert panels.

- 8.5.3. The overall design of the scheme with 3 individual blocks, which are set within high quality landscaped open spaces with minimal overground parking, together with a stepped progression in scale towards the rear and large upper floor setbacks which allow the building heights to taper down towards the boundaries, is considered to be an appropriate design response for this sensitive infill site which is bounded by a variety of building typologies many of which are of a lower scale and density. The site layout facilitates maximum penetration of sunlight and daylight to the apartments and also breaks up the mass of the development when viewed from adjoining properties.
- 8.5.4. The combination of design amendments provides for a significantly improved transition in scale and massing between the proposed apartment blocks and the adjoining developments, which helps the proposed development to integrate successfully into the existing environment. The increased height and elevational treatment of Block A facing Rathfarnham Road adds visual interest to the streetscape. The existing vegetation along the boundaries most of which is to be retained, together with the proposed tree planting and high-quality landscaping scheme, will also help with the transition between the old and new development and to integrate the development into the streetscape. As such, it is considered that the proposal, as amended, successfully maximises the potential of the site while seeking to minimise the impact on the adjoining properties. The impacts on residential amenity will be discussed below.

Townscape and visual impact

- 8.5.5. The application was accompanied by a Landscape (Townscape) and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) as well as a series of photomontages and an Architectural Design Statement. The subsequent amendments to the design of each block included in revised documents and photomontages which were submitted as FI/CFI.
- 8.5.6. The Townscape Impact Assessment considered the sensitivity of the townscape to be 'Medium', with a 'Medium' magnitude of change and the significance of the townscape effects was found to be 'Moderate' overall. I would agree with this assessment given the underutilised nature of the site, which is of limited architectural or townscape value and does not integrate particularly well into the surrounding vibrant urban environment, and the policy context of seeking more sustainable and

higher density of development at such locations. The proposed development would introduce apartment buildings of a contemporary urban style on an infill site which would consolidate urban development and add visual interest to the streetscape and help to rejuvenate the area.

- 8.5.7. The Visual Impact Assessment took account of the susceptibility of the receptor to changes in views and the value attached to the views. The assessment evaluated the impact of the proposed development of 13 representative viewpoints (subsequently increased to 15 no.) from the public domain. It is considered that the scheme as originally submitted would have had a greater impact on the visual amenity of the area when viewed from certain locations such as those represented by VP2, VP11 and VP13 (from Rathfarnham Road to the NE) and from VP7 (Greenmount Lawns). It is considered, however, that the revisions to the design which resulted in a reduction in the height, scale and mass of the blocks, would result in much improved views from these locations, whereby the scale of the buildings would sit more comfortably into the townscape and relate better to the existing built form. I would therefore agree that the proposed development would not give rise to significant negative townscape or visual impacts.
- 8.5.8. Some of the appellants have questioned the accuracy and adequacy of the LVIA and in particular, the photomontages submitted by the applicant. Some of the third-party submissions include 3D images purporting to represent the impact of the proposed development from various locations in the Wasdale Park and Greenmount Lawns area. The first party, in its response to the grounds of appeal, stated that the appellants have not provided any technical evidence or material that supports their contention, whereas the submitted LVIA and associated photomontage views and locations were based on 'best practice methodologies by qualified experts who have extensive experience in undertaking these assessments'. Notwithstanding this, it is pointed out that an additional photomontage was submitted at FI stage, VP14, from Wasdale Park looking north, which indicated that there would be a glimpse of Block B in the gap between the houses.
- 8.5.9. I would agree that the images submitted with the third-party appeal should be treated with some degree of caution as they are not verified by accepted technology and best practice methodologies for presenting such information. The LVIA viewpoint locations for the photomontages are within the public domain and are representative

of views available from main thoroughfares, pedestrian areas or key viewpoints in the area. For this reason, the views of the proposed blocks from Wasdale Park and Greenmount Lawns are screened, or largely screened, by the existing houses/apartment blocks at these locations. This would be normal practice in the creation of photomontages as part of an LVIA as the objective is to assess the potential impacts on the character and visual amenity of the surrounding townscape. It is considered that the concerns raised by the third-parties in respect of the adequacy of the photomontages appear to relate more to the potential impact on residential amenity in terms of creating an overbearing presence and loss of outlook rather than an assessment of the visual impact of the development on the character and visual amenity of the area. This matter will be discussed further below.

- 8.5.10. Notwithstanding the conclusions on townscape and visual impacts as set out above, I would agree with the planning authority's concerns regarding the material proposed for the cladding of the upper floors. It is considered that an alternative material or colour or would help to reduce the mass and bulk of the buildings. Should the Board be minded to grant permission therefore, a condition similar to that attached to the P.A.'s decision should be included.

8.6. Residential amenity

- 8.6.1. In terms of the future occupiers, it is noted that the design of the apartment scheme has sought to achieve maximum daylight and sunlight to the proposed apartments with good sunlight available to all amenity spaces and that a separation distance has been achieved between Blocks A and B of 18.8m and between Blocks B and C of 19.8m. This is in accordance with the 16m separation distance set out in the Compact Settlement Guidelines. The proposed units would also be provided with high quality landscaped communal areas located between and around the blocks. The proposed apartments also comply with the BRE sunlight and daylight standards. I note that the planning authority was satisfied that the residential amenity of the future occupiers of the proposed apartments would be acceptable and I am in agreement with this view.
- 8.6.2. The third-party appellants have raised a number of issues relating to an overbearing and intrusive presence of both Block A and Block C on the adjoining properties to the

north and to the south and east, respectively, as well as concerns regarding overlooking/loss of privacy and of overshadowing of adjoining residential units.

- 8.6.3. Block A – I note that the appellant at No. 32 Rathfarnham Road believed that the proposed development was excessive ‘reaching up to 5-storeys’. However, Block A, which immediately adjoins No. 32, is in fact 3-4 storeys in height, and tapers down to 3 stories immediately adjacent to No. 32. In addition, the closest part of Block A is the small section that extends northwards which faces a blank gable wall at No. 32. The remainder of the northern elevation of Block A is set back c.8.8m from the common boundary and c.12.4-13m from the side (southern) elevation of No. 32, and the windows in this elevation are high level (1.8m cill height).
- 8.6.4. The revised Sunlight and Daylight Assessment (SDA, 21/01/25) points out that the neighbouring buildings are built close to their boundaries with the appeal site, meaning that they are heavily reliant on the subject site for daylight, and that the BRE makes allowances for such a situation in Appendix F. In such situations, the targets for these windows may be set for those of a ‘mirror-image’ building. I note that the first party had refuted the claims that all of the ground floor windows would be permanently overshadowed by Block A, as all but one of these windows had passed the daylight standards assessment and this was only a minor infringement. The SDA (21/01/25) had indicated that one of the ground floor windows (B1/F0/W3) was marginal (ratio of 0.77), but when assessed using the mirror test, it passed (ratio 1.10). I note that all windows had passed the annual sunlight assessment (ASPH).
- 8.6.5. It is considered that the proposed Block A, as amended, has been designed to avoid overlooking and has been modulated to minimise any overbearing impact. I note from my site inspection that there is mature vegetation on this boundary also and that the orientation of the house is primarily towards the east and is very close to its southern boundary. I would agree, on the basis of the information submitted with the application and appeal, that the proposed development is not likely to result in any significant loss of light, outlook or privacy to No. 32 Rathfarnham Road.
- 8.6.6. I note that the proposed fenestration on the southern gable of Block A, combined with the proposal to retain the mature trees on the southern boundary would also protect the amenities of No. 34 Rathfarnham Road.

- 8.6.7. Block C – Residents of Greenmount Lawns and Wasdale Park had expressed concern that Block C would be constructed ‘on elevated ground giving the appearance of a 6-7 storey building’, that the southern elevation was unattractive with large blank sections and recessed panels and that the separation distance is 15% less than the recommended 22m in the CDP. It was also considered that it would have an overbearing presence, and it was sought that a revised landscaping plan with additional semi-mature trees be provided. The developer has refuted these claims and has referred the Board to Drg. No. 2316-PA.12-CFI Block C – Elevations which shows Block C as a four and five storey apartment block and that the fifth floor is set back to further reduce the scale and mass of Block C when seen from adjoining properties. It was further pointed out that 22 metre separation distances are no longer required, as SPPR1 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines requires a 16-metre separation distance. The separation distance between Block C and the opposing building at Greenmount Lawns is stated as 19.2 metres, which exceeds the 16-metre separation distance in the Compact Settlement Guidelines.
- 8.6.8. In terms of the overbearing presence, it is considered that in assessing this, the potential for overshadowing and overlooking is of relevance. I note that in the SDA (21/01/25), Greenmount Lawns is assigned the label B3 and that of the 21 windows assessed, 4 were found initially to either fail (W5, W6 on ground floor) or marginally fail (W4, W7 on ground floor), with ratios ranging from 0.69-0.72. All other windows passed the daylight test. Once the ‘Mirror test’ was applied, all four of these windows passed (ratios ranging from 8.1-0.86). All of the windows on the Greenmount Lawns property also passed the annual and winter sunlight tests (APSH). Notwithstanding this, the P.A. sought further clarification on the basis of remaining concerns regarding the reduction in VSC levels (25% and ratio of 0.69) to ground floor windows (W5 and W6). A supplementary analysis was submitted as CFI (20/03/25), which found that when the mirror image test was applied, all windows complied. It was noted that the analysis is based on impacts without considering vegetation, in accordance with best practice.
- 8.6.9. I noted from my site inspection and from the submitted documents that there is a line of tall, mature trees on the eastern boundary of the site, which are very close to the windows of the opposing apartment block. The Supplementary Light Analysis

(20/03/25) points out that while this mature boundary planting has not been included, it would be disingenuous to ignore the same. It is pointed out that

‘Even in winter, this intervening vegetation is substantial and the space between the existing apartment block and the rear wall of the proposed development is filled with vegetation, much of which is evergreen and terraced space’ (photos included in document).

8.6.10. I would agree that the nature and extent of existing vegetation along the common boundary, which it is proposed to retain, is such that it currently blocks a significant amount of sunlight and daylight to the ground floor windows of the adjoining block and is also likely to block light to the upper floor windows. As such, it is difficult to see how there would be any significant reduction in daylight or sunlight to the west-facing windows of the adjoining block. In addition, this vegetation, which will be augmented by additional tree planting closer to Block C, will provide for a good level of visual screening between the eastern elevation of Block C and the existing Greenmount Lawns.

8.6.11. Concerns were also raised by the appellants from Wasdale Park to the south regarding the elevational treatment and overbearing nature of Block C and to potential overlooking from the ‘greenspace balcony on the southern side’. As previously noted, the proposals to significantly reduce the mass and bulk of Block C by modulating the height of the building and setting back the upper floors have successfully addressed the issue of overbearance. I would agree that the southern elevation is somewhat austere, but the previously proposed blank façade with a series of high-level windows would have been even more unattractive. It is considered that the brick insert panels, together with the setback sedum roof, would improve the view from the south. However, I would agree that some additional semi-mature trees could be planted to the rear of the adjoining properties at Wasdale Park, which would further mitigate this issue. (This issue is discussed further below).

8.6.12. I do not accept that there would be any potential for overlooking from the ‘Greenspace’. I note from the submitted drawings that it is proposed to provide a sedum roof at the southern end of Block C at both third floor and fourth floor levels. These roofs are not intended as residential amenity spaces but as ‘Green/Blue’ roofs which are designed to facilitate enhanced biodiversity and sustainable drainage.

Access to these spaces is purely for maintenance purposes and no access is proposed from individual apartments. No other communal terraces are proposed at Block C which would overlook the adjoining properties, as the proposed communal amenity area is on the northwestern corner of the building.

- 8.6.13. In conclusion, it is considered that the proposed development has been designed to minimise the potential impacts on the residential amenities of adjoining properties in terms of overlooking, overshadowing and outlook.

8.7. Traffic and transport

- 8.7.1. Concern was raised by third parties regarding the combined impact of the construction of the proposed development with the BusConnects scheme, for which planning permission has recently been granted. It is noted from the Outline CEMP submitted with the application, at Section 4, it is stated that the impact of the construction period on traffic and transportation will be temporary and that HGV movements are not expected to exceed 4 vehicles per hour in one direction during the busiest period of the construction works. It is noted that the proposed entrance will be relocated to the southern end of the roadside boundary and that this new entrance will also be used by construction traffic, with staff parking and welfare accommodated within the site. construction traffic will be governed by a Construction Traffic Management Plan, which is to be agreed prior to commencement of construction.
- 8.7.2. A Traffic and Transport Assessment was also submitted with the application which provides analysis of the existing road junctions and the contribution of the overall development to the surrounding junctions during 3 no. scenarios, 2026, 2031 and 2041. The analysis concluded that the proposed development would generate sub-threshold impacts on these junctions. In addition, a Mobility Management Plan has been submitted which prioritises sustainable travel modes and outlines targets to reduce reliance on private cars. It is also proposed to appoint a mobility manager to implement the residential MMP and to undertake a baseline travel survey when the development is operational. Notwithstanding this, I would agree with the P.A. that a condition should be attached requiring measures to avoid car use by construction staff and to time their arrivals/departures outside of peak times.

- 8.7.3. Reference is made by the P.A.'s Transport Division to the NTA's Templeogue/Rathfarnham to City Centre BusConnects Core Bus Corridor scheme (ABP Ref. HA29N.316272), which it notes includes a proposed temporary land-take within the subject site where landscaping is proposed by the applicant. The proposed site boundary has been set back to cater for the scheme which will involve the provision of a dedicated bus lane in each direction along Rathfarnham Road and the relocation of the existing bus stop/shelter outside the site. No objections were raised in respect of the two projects, apart from the need to relocate the existing bus shelter which is likely to cause difficulty. However, the Transport Division considered that the developer should liaise with the NTA prior to the commencement of construction of the project in order to manage the relocation of the bus shelter and to ensure that there are no traffic conflicts. A condition to this effect is attached to the P.A. decision, which seems reasonable.
- 8.7.4. The NTA also stated that, given the overlap between this project and the CBC scheme and in order to mitigate any conflicts during potential concurrent construction phases, in the event of a grant permission, it is requested that appropriate conditions are attached to ensure that the NTA are consulted prior to the construction stage. Furthermore, the NTA recommends that prior to granting permission, the local authority should be satisfied that all relevant transport assessments, including Road Safety Audits, were undertaken with the full BusConnects CBC taken into account. It is noted that during the course of the application, a Stage 1 Road Safety audit was submitted, and the recommendations were incorporated into the revised scheme. The P.A. has attached a condition to its decision requiring the submission of a Stage 3 Road Safety Audit, to address any remedial safety issues, which is considered to be reasonable.
- 8.7.5. Third party appellants have raised concern regarding the proposed parking provision, which is considered to be grossly inadequate for a development of this size. Furthermore, it is stated that when visitors are added, it will create additional pressures on parking capacity in the surrounding area, which is already subject to metering and clearways. The proposed development provides for 43 car parking spaces, of which 40 are located in the basement with 3 surface set-down spaces to the rear of Block A. It is noted that the proposed parking provision has remained the same notwithstanding the reduction in the number of proposed apartments from 66

to 60. The CDP standards state that the max. provision for Zone 2 is 1 space per unit, with allocation of 5% motorcycle and accessible and 50% EV charging. The provision of 40 car parking spaces and the proposed layout/allocation (as amended) complies with these requirements. The proposed cycle parking provision also complies with the CDP standards and the number of spaces has not been reduced following the reduction in the number of apartments.

8.7.6. The proposed parking provision is also consistent with the guidance in the Compact Settlement Guidelines which states that in order to meet the targets set out in the National Sustainable Mobility Policy 2022 and in the Climate Action Plan 2023 for reduced private car travel it will be necessary to apply a graduated approach to the management of car parking within new residential development (5.3.4). It is stated that the approach should take account of proximity to urban centres and to sustainable transport options and car parking ratios should be minimised, substantially reduced or wholly eliminated at locations that have good access to urban services and to public transport. In such locations, SPPR3 states that the maximum rate is 1 space per dwelling in city centres and urban neighbourhoods of the five cities and in accessible locations, the maximum provision is 1.5 spaces per dwelling.

8.7.7. In this case, the site is served by several frequent bus services and on the planned BusConnects corridor (with the bus stop outside the site). It is also within approx. 5-minutes walking distance of Terenure village and within easy walking distance of a number of other urban centres in the wider area. As such, it is considered that the proposed parking provision is appropriate and in accordance with national and local policy provisions.

8.8. Landscape and biodiversity

8.8.1. Third party appellants raised concerns that the proposal would result in the loss and disturbance of a long-established site with mature vegetation which forms a vital part of the local ecosystem. It was also stated that mature horse-chestnut trees along the boundary would be lost, that these trees are important for biodiversity, visual amenity and as a natural buffer from the development and that the proposed planting is for very small saplings which would not be adequate to mitigate the impacts of the

development. It is considered that these issues have been considered in the submitted documentation with the application, (as amended by FI submissions), and I would refer the Board in particular to the Landscape Design Rationale, the Arboricultural Report and the Ecological Impact Assessment Report.

- 8.8.2. The Ecological Impact Assessment Report assesses the potential effects of the proposed residential development on habitats and species, particularly those protected by national and international legislation. The assessment was based on a combination of desktop studies (including the NBDC) and ecological walkover surveys as well as bat roost and bat emergence surveys and invasive species surveys.
- 8.8.3. The site is mainly composed of man-made surfaces with some minor areas of amenity grassland. The habitats on site were generally of low ecological value apart from treelines (WL2) and Scattered Trees and Parkland (WD5). There are no waterbodies on or near the site. No evidence of any protected mammal species was recorded within the site. The NBDC 2km grid square includes records of several species including badger, red squirrel, house mouse. Otter has also been recorded along the River Dodder, but as there are no watercourses within the site, there is no suitable habitat for otter. In general, the site is not considered to be suitable for foraging habitat for mammal species or birds, apart from common passerine birds. There is no connectivity to sites of nature conservation interest.
- 8.8.4. Each of the buildings and structures on the site were examined externally and internally for evidence of bat presence. No droppings or evidence of bat presence were recorded within the site and none of the existing buildings were deemed suitable for potential bat roosts. The bat emergence surveys indicated a very low level of bat activity with no bats emerging from the buildings or in the vicinity of the mature trees. A number of mature trees were identified in the south-western corner of the site adjacent to the Rathfarnham Road, which were investigated for the presence of potential roost features (PRFs). It was noted that some of the horse chestnut trees were covered in ivy which inhibited identification of PRFs but several PRFs were identified on the ash, sycamore and horse chestnut trees. However, the Ecological Assessment Report noted that these trees are all proposed to be retained, as is the tree line along the eastern boundary. Notwithstanding this, a

precautionary approach will be taken in terms of the potential for trees in the south-western corner to contain suitable roosting habitat for bats.

- 8.8.5. The Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA) considered that the proposed development will result in the disturbance and loss of some minor areas of suitable habitat for mammals, some potential nesting habitat for passerine birds and some minor foraging habitats for bats as well as the potential for the removal of suitable bat roosting habitat. Mitigation measures are outlined in Section 6 of the EcIA. These include standard good construction practice measures and the limiting of the removal of suitable nesting vegetation to the period outside the main bird nesting season. Biosecurity measures will also be employed throughout the construction phase.
- 8.8.6. In addition, no demolition of any buildings will take place between April and September unless such works are preceded by a bat emergence survey, and should any bats be present, a derogation licence will be applied for prior to works. Similarly, the felling of any mature trees in the west of the site will be limited to April-September (as bats are capable of flight at this time) and be preceded by a bat emergence survey on the night before any such felling. All such activity will be supervised by an appropriately qualified ecologist.
- 8.8.7. In response to the concerns regarding the loss of mature trees and inadequate provision for new planting, the first party response points out that only 11 trees will be lost, 3 of which are of poor quality and value, yet the proposed landscaping plan includes the planting of 76 trees, many of which are semi-mature, throughout the site. Reference is made to the revised landscaping plan (24104_Rathfarnham_LP-RFI) and to the Arboricultural Report and Drawing TTER-002-102 ARB IMPACT to support their assertions that the proposed development would not only have a limited impact in terms of biodiversity loss, but it would greatly improve local biodiversity.
- 8.8.8. Having inspected the site, I can confirm that although it appears from the street and externally that it contains mature landscaping with a rich biodiversity, the site is in fact largely covered in man-made surfaces and disused buildings with only small pockets of areas where good biodiversity may be present. I note from the submitted drawings that only one tree is to be removed on the eastern boundary and that the majority of the trees to be felled are to facilitate the construction of Block A in the west of the site. The loss of trees in the western part of the site, close to the road,

will result in a loss of mature soft landscaping and biodiversity. However, the proposed development will introduce a considerably enhanced landscaped environment throughout the site with new trees, hedgerows, shrubs and wildflower planting, which is likely to result in significant biodiversity gain to the local area.

- 8.8.9. I would refer the Board to the Landscape Design Rationale (20/09/24), the revised Landscaping Plan submitted on 21/01/25 (as referenced above), as well as the Soft Landscaping Plan submitted on 20/09/24, (24104_Terenure_LP_B_SLP), which provides a comprehensive level of detail of the planting schedule including the tree species, sizes and specifications. I note that the trees to be planted along the southern boundary with Wasdale Park are Oaks, Birches, Hazel and Cherry trees, which are generally 'semi-mature' with a girth of 18-20cm. Notwithstanding this, I would agree with the third party appellants that some additional trees should be planted to the rear of Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 1A Wasdale Park in order to help provide a more robust screen of the proposed buildings from these adjoining residential properties. Should the Board be minded to grant planning permission, a condition to this effect should be attached to any such permission.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. See Appendix 3 of this report for Appropriate Assessment Screening Determination. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development, individually or in combination with other plans or projects, would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the South Dublin Bay SAC (site code 000206) or any other European site, in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not therefore required.
- 9.2. This determination was based on:
- The nature and scale of the proposed works and the lack of impact mechanisms that could significantly affect a European site.
 - The distance and lack of any potential pathway for effects between the site and any European sites.

No mitigation measures aimed at avoiding or reducing impacts on European sites were taken into account in reaching this conclusion.

10.0 Water Framework Directive Screening

- 10.1.1. The Water Framework Directive requires that the water quality in all surface and ground water bodies is protected and improved with the aim of achieving 'good status' by 2027 at the latest, and that new development does not compromise this requirement. I have carried out a Stage I Screening Assessment of the proposed development in terms of whether it is likely to compromise WFD objectives or cause a deterioration in the status of any waterbodies. (Refer to Appendix 3)
- 10.2. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development, subject to mitigation measures set out in the CEMP, the Infrastructure Design Report and the Site Specific flood Risk Assessment Report, submitted by the applicant, 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.

11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1. I recommend that permission be **granted** for the reasons and considerations and subject to the conditions set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 12.1. In coming to its decision, An Coimisiún Pleanála had regard to:

- (a) The Revised National Planning Framework (2025)
- (b) The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024),
- (c) The Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2018)
- (d) The Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines (as amended)

- (e) The Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028,
- (f) The highly accessible location of the site in close to the centre of Terenure Village, which is served by a high-quality public transport network,
- (g) The townscape character and established pattern of development in the vicinity of the site,
- (h) The underutilised nature of the site and its previous planning history,
- (i) The Appropriate Assessment Screening Report,
- (j) The submissions and observations made in connection with the planning application and appeal, and
- (k) The report and recommendation of the Planning Inspector

12.2. It is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would provide for a compact and sustainable form of urban development at a highly accessible location, would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenities of the area, would not adversely impact the character of the area and would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the national and local policies for the area and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.3. The Board performed its functions in relation to the making of its decision, in a manner consistent with Section 15(1) of the Climate and Low Carbon Development Act 2015, as amended by Section 17 of the Climate Action and Low Carbon Development (Amendment) Act 2021, (consistent with the Climate Action Plan 2024 and the Climate Action Plan 2025 and the relevant provisions of the national long term climate action strategy, national adaptation framework and approved sectoral adaptation plans set out in those Plans and in furtherance of the objective of mitigating greenhouse gas emissions and adapting to the effects of climate change in the State).

13.0 Conditions

1.	The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 21st day of January 2025 and the 20th day of March 2025, 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 development hereby permitted is for 60 residential units only, comprising 23 one-bedroom units and 37 two-bedroom units. Reason: In the interest of clarity.
3.	The proposed development shall be amended as follows: (a) The recessed upper floors on each of Blocks A, B and C shall be clad in an alternative material or a material of an alternative colour to that shown on the submitted drawings. (b) Additional semi-mature trees shall be planted along the southern boundary with Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 1A Wasdale Park. The revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development. Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.
4.	Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed buildings shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure an appropriate high standard of development.

5.	The mitigation measures set out in the Demolition Justification Report in relation to the reuse and recycling of materials and building components following demolition works shall be implemented in full. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall address the following matters: (a) Lodge the Preliminary Heritage Impact Assessment or equivalent report including details, survey drawings and a photographic survey of the existing Synagogue building on the site with the Irish Architectural Archive for archival purposes. (b) Details of the location and future reuse of items removed from the existing buildings on the site including the Holocaust Memorial Stone, the stained-glass windows, memorial plaques, lighting, polished timber benches, doors to the ark and bimah shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority. Reason: To provide an appropriate record of the structure, to ensure the preservation of items of historical and cultural interest and in the interests of sustainable development.
6.	Prior to commencement of development, the applicant or other person with an interest in the land to which the application relates shall enter into an agreement in writing with the planning authority in relation to the transfer of a percentage of the land, to be agreed with the planning authority, in accordance with the requirements of section 94(4) and section 96(2) and 96(3)(a), (Part V) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and/or the provision of housing on lands in accordance with the requirements of section 94(4) and section 96(2) and 96(3) (b), (Part V) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, unless an exemption certificate has been granted under section 97 of the Act, as amended. Where such an agreement cannot be reached between the parties, the matter in dispute (other than a matter to which section 96(7) applies) shall be referred by the planning authority or any other prospective party to the agreement, to An Coimisiún Pleanála for determination.

	Reason: To comply with the requirements of Part V of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and of the housing strategy in the development plan for the area.
7.	No gates shall be provided at the entrance to the development. Any gates or other boundary treatments to secure areas of communal open space within the development shall be the subject of a separate planning application. Reason: To ensure permeability and the creation of active streets and spaces.
8.	(a) The developer shall liaise with the National Transport Authority in relation to the interface with the BusConnects Templeogue/Rathfarnham to City Centre Core Bus Corridor Scheme. Evidence of correspondence and any agreements with the NTA regarding this matter shall be submitted to the planning authority prior to commencement of development. (b) Relocation of the existing bus shelter in front of the site, to avoid impacts to visibility of drivers exiting the site, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development. Any required works shall be implemented prior to occupation of the first residential unit. Reason: In the interests of road safety and sustainable transportation
9.	A Stage 3 Road Safety Audit for the development shall be carried out by an independent approved and certified auditor, a copy of which shall be submitted to the planning authority, and all remedial measures identified in the report shall be implemented prior to commencement of development. Reason: in the interests of road safety
10.	(a) The internal road network serving the proposed development including turning bays, junctions, parking areas, footpaths, and kerbs, loading bays and access to the underground car park shall comply with the detailed construction standards of the planning authority for such works and design standards outlined in Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS).

	(b) Car parking for the development shall be provided in accordance with the submitted parking layout. Prior to the occupation of the development a Car Park Management Plan shall be prepared for the development and shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority. This plan shall provide for the permanent retention of the designated residential parking spaces and shall indicate how these and other spaces within the development shall be assigned and how the car park shall be continually managed. (c) All the communal parking areas serving the development shall be provided with functional electric vehicle charging points, and all of the car parking spaces serving individual residential units shall be provided with ducted to facilitate future cabling to serve charging points for electric vehicles. Details of how it is proposed to comply with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. (d) Safe and secure bicycle parking spaces shall be provided within the site in accordance with the submitted layout. Provision should be made for a mix of bicycle types including cargo bicycles and individual lockers, with electric charging points at accessible locations. Details of the layout and marking demarcation of these spaces shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. (e) The development shall be carried out and operated in accordance with the provisions of the Mobility Management Plan (MMP) submitted to the planning authority. The developer shall undertake an annual monitoring exercise to the satisfaction of the planning authority for the first 5 years following first occupation and shall submit the results to the planning authority for consideration and placement on the public file. Reason: In the interest of amenity, of traffic and pedestrian safety and of sustainable transportation.
11.	A detailed construction traffic management plan shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. The plan shall include details of arrangements for routes for

	construction traffic, parking during the construction phase, the location of the compound for storage of plant and machinery and the location for storage of deliveries to the site. Reason: In the interest of sustainable transport and safety.
12.	The management and maintenance of the proposed development following its completion shall be the responsibility of a legally constituted management company. A management scheme providing adequate measures for the future maintenance of public open spaces, roads and communal areas shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Reason: To provide for the satisfactory future maintenance of this development in the interest of residential amenity.
13.	(a) A plan containing details for the management of waste (and, in particular, recyclable materials) within the development, including the provision of facilities for the storage, separation and collection of the waste and, in particular, recyclable materials and for the ongoing operation of these facilities shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, the waste shall be managed in accordance with the agreed plan. (b) This plan shall provide for screened communal bin stores, the locations and designs of which shall be included in the details to be submitted. Reason: To provide for the appropriate management of waste and, in particular recyclable materials, in the interest of protecting the environment.
14.	Proposals for an estate/street name, house/apartment numbering scheme and associated signage shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, all estate and street signs, and house/apartment numbers, shall be provided in accordance with the agreed scheme. The proposed name(s) shall be based on local historical or topographical features, or other alternatives acceptable to the planning authority. No advertisements/marketing signage relating to the name(s) of the

	development shall be erected until the developer has obtained the planning authority's written agreement to the proposed name(s). Reason: In the interest of urban legibility [and to ensure the use of locally appropriate placenames for new residential areas].
15.	The attenuation and disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority. Reason: In the interest of public health.
16.	Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall enter into a Connection Agreement (s) with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for a service connection(s) to the public water supply and wastewater collection network. Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water/wastewater facilities.
17.	Public lighting shall be provided in accordance with a scheme which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development. The scheme shall include lighting along pedestrian routes through open spaces and shall take account of trees within the landscaping scheme. Such lighting shall be provided prior to the making available for occupation of any residential unit. Reason: In the interest of amenity and public safety.
18.	All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground. Ducting shall be provided by the developer to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development. Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.
19.	The landscaping scheme shown on drawing number 24104_Terenure_LP_B_SLP as submitted to the planning authority on the

	20th day of September, 2024 as amended by Drawing No. 24104_Terenure_LP_C submitted to the planning authority on the 21st day of January 2025, shall be carried out within the first planting season following substantial completion of external construction works. . All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of five years from the completion of the development shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority. Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity.
20.	. The areas of communal open space shown on the lodged plans shall be reserved for such use. These areas shall be soiled, seeded, and landscaped in accordance with the landscaping scheme submitted to the planning authority on the 21st day of January 2025. This work shall be completed before any of the dwellings are made available for occupation unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority. Reason: In order to ensure the satisfactory development of the communal open space areas, and their continued use for this purpose.
21.	. A schedule of landscape maintenance shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to occupation of the development. The schedule shall cover a period of at least three years and shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation. Reason: To provide for the satisfactory future maintenance of this development in the interest of visual amenity.
22.	. All trees within and on the boundaries of the site shall be retained and maintained, with the exception of the following: (a) The trees specified on Drawing Nos. TTER-002-101 and TTER-002-103 the removal of which is necessitated to facilitate development. (b) Trees which are agreed in writing by the planning authority to be dead,

	dying or dangerous through disease or storm damage, following submission of a qualified tree surgeon's report, and which shall be replaced with agreed specimens. (c) Prior to commencement of development, all trees, groups of trees, hedging and shrubs which are to be retained shall be enclosed within stout fences not less than 1.5 metres in height. This protective fencing shall enclose an area covered by the crown spread of the branches, or at minimum radius of two metres from the trunk of the tree or centre of the shrub, and to a distance of two metres on each side of the hedge for its full length, and shall be maintained until the development has been completed. (d) No construction equipment, machinery or materials shall be brought onto the site for the purpose of the development until all the trees which are to be retained have been protected by this fencing. No work shall be carried out within the area enclosed by the fencing and, in particular, there shall be no parking of vehicles, placing of site huts, storage compounds or topsoil heaps, storage of oil, chemicals or other substances, and no lighting of fires, over the root spread of any tree to be retained. Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to protect trees and planting during the construction period.
23.	The Mitigation measures set out at Section 6.0 of the Ecological Impact assessment shall be implemented in full. Details of the timing of the demolition of buildings, felling of trees and clearance of vegetation shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development on site. Reason: In the interests of biodiversity and wildlife protection.
24.	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:

	.(a) Location of the site and materials compound(s) including area(s) identified for the storage of construction refuse .(b) Location of areas for construction site offices and staff facilities .(c) Details of site security fencing and hoardings .(d) Details of on-site car parking facilities for site workers during the course of construction .(e) Details of the timing and routing of construction traffic to and from the construction site and associated directional signage, to include proposals to facilitate the delivery of abnormal loads to the site. .(f) Measures to obviate queuing of construction traffic on the adjoining road network .(g) Measures to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble or other debris on the public road network .(h) Alternative arrangements to be put in place for pedestrians and vehicles in the case of the closure of any public road or footpath during the course of site development works .(i) Details of appropriate mitigation measures for noise, dust and vibration, and monitoring of such levels .(k) Containment of all construction-related fuel and oil within specially constructed bunds to ensure that fuel spillages are fully contained. Such bunds shall be roofed to exclude rainwater .(l) Off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste and details of how it is proposed to manage excavated soil .(m) Means to ensure that surface water run-off is controlled such that no silt or other pollutants enter local surface water sewers or drains. .(n) A record of daily checks that the works are being undertaken in accordance with the Construction Management Plan shall be available for inspection by the planning authority.
--	--

	Reason: In the interest of amenities, public health and safety and environmental protection
25.	Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority. Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.
26.	Prior to commencement of development, a Resource Waste Management Plan (RWMP) as set out in the EPA's Best Practice Guidelines for the Preparation of Resource and Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects (2021) shall be prepared and submitted to the planning authority for written agreement. The RWMP shall include specific proposals as to how the RWMP will be measured and monitored for effectiveness. All records (including for waste and all resources) pursuant to the agreed RWMP shall be made available for inspection at the site office at all times. Reason: In the interest of reducing waste and encouraging recycling.
27.	Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company, or other security to secure the provision and satisfactory completion of roads, footpaths, watermains, drains, open space and other services required in connection with the development, coupled with an agreement empowering the local authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory completion of any part of the development. 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 Coimisiún Pleanála for determination. Reason: To ensure the satisfactory completion of the development.

28.	The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme. Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.
29.	The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution of €5,000 (five thousand euro) per unit as a contribution in lieu of the public open space requirement in respect of public open space benefitting the development in the area of the planning authority is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the adopted Development Contribution Scheme made under Section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to the commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under Section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

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.

.Mary Kennelly
Senior Planning Inspector

26th August 2025

Appendix 1 EIA Screening

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening - No EIAR Submitted

Case Reference	ABP.322522.25
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of buildings and construction of 66 no. Apartments, provision of car parking spaces and relocation of the site entrance.
Development Address	No. 32A Rathfarnham Road, Rathfarnham, Dublin 6
	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)	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	☐ 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)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
☒ 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?	
☐ 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. No Screening required.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
☒ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold Schedule 5, Part 2 - Class 10(b)(i) Residential development where the mandatory threshold is 500 dwelling units and Class 10(b)(iv) Urban Development where the mandatory thresholds are 2ha, 10ha or 20ha depending on location Class (dd) All private roads which would exceed 2000 metres in length. The proposed development is for 66 dwelling units (reduced to 60 in P.A. decision) and the site area is 0.54ha. Thus, the proposed development is sub-threshold in respect of both the number of units and the site size. The proposed internal road serving the development is significantly below the threshold length of 2km and is therefore subthreshold in respect of this class also.

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 ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ABP.322522.25
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of buildings, including a former synagogue and construction of 66 no. Apartments, an ancillary single-storey communal amenity building, provision of car parking spaces and relocation of the site entrance.
Development Address	Terenure Synagogue, 32A Rathfarnham Road, Rathfarnham, Dublin 6
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).	Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed. The proposed development comprises the construction of 66 apartments (reduced to 60 in the P.A. decision) and a communal amenity building, car parking (mostly basement) and the relocation of the site entrance further to the south. The apartments would be in the form of 3 no. blocks of 3-6 storeys in height (reduced to 5 storeys). It is a residential development of a brownfield site in a built-up urban area and is located at the edge of the urban centre of Terenure Village. The proposed development is not considered to be exceptional in the context of the built-up area. The construction phase will involve the demolition of several buildings on the site which will generate waste. However, the waste material will be re-used or recycled where possible and the waste to be transported off site will be minimised. Given the moderate size of the proposed development, it is considered that the level of waste generated would not be significant in the regional or national context. No significant waste, emissions or pollutants would be produced during the construction or operational phases of the development. The proposed development will involve site excavations for foundations and to form a basement. The application was accompanied by a Basement Impact Assessment and a Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment. It is considered that the potential impacts are site-specific and would have a localised impact which can be addressed by standard mitigation measures.

	The proposed development would not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster and is not vulnerable to climate change.
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).	Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed The site is located in a built-up, serviced urban area and is not located within or adjoining any environmentally sensitive sites or protected sites of ecological importance, or any sites of known cultural, historical or archaeological importance. The site comprises the former Terenure Synagogue which is acknowledged as being of cultural importance to the local Jewish community and to the local area. Documents were submitted which assessed the heritage significance of the building(s) on site and the justification for demolition and concluded that the proposed development would not result in the loss of a building of significant cultural importance and that the artefacts of importance within the site will be stored and relocated to the site of a new synagogue. The closest European site is the South Dublin Bay SAC which is located 5.2km from the site. There are no hydrological or ecological connections between the subject site and this European site and there are no connections with any of the other European sites in the vicinity of the site. As there is no potential pathway for effects, the conclusions of the Appropriate Assessment Screening in my report are that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect on any European site. It is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant cumulative effects having regard to other existing and/or permitted projects in the area.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration,	Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development on an urban infill site, which is removed from any sensitive habitats/features, the likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of the

cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	effects, and the absence of in-combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the P&D Act 2000 (as amended).
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.

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

DP/ADP: _____ **Date:** _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

Appendix 2 Appropriate Assessment Screening

Screening for Appropriate Assessment

Screening Determination – Test for likely significant effects

Step 1. Description of the project and local site characteristics

Case file: ABP.322522-25

Brief Description of project

Construction of 66 apartments in three blocks on site of former Terenure Synagogue, Rathfarnham Road, Rathfarnham, Dublin 6

Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms

I refer to Section 1.0 and 2.0 of this report above where the site location and proposed development are described.

The proposed development involves the demolition of the synagogue building and associated buildings, construction of 66 apartments in three blocks ranging in height from 3-6 storeys, communal amenity building, a substation and basement parking and relocation of site entrance.

1. The appeal site

The appeal site, the former Terenure Synagogue, with a site area of 0.54 hectares is a brownfield, infill site which is located on the edge of Terenure Village in Dublin 6. The site is bounded on all sides by existing development comprising residential development to the north, east and south, commercial development to the northeast and Rathfarnham Road to the west.

The subject is fully located outside of any European sites and there are no European sites within the immediate surrounding area. The closest European site to the proposed development is over 5 kilometers distant - South Dublin Bay SAC and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. All other European sites are greater than 7 km distant from the proposed development site.

The site comprises largely man-made structures and hard surfaces (BL3). There are three structures within the development site boundary, the synagogue, a community hall and a single-storey flat roof dwelling. There are areas of

landscaped grounds in the west of the site comprising ornamental planting (WS3) and amenity grassland (GA2). There are a number of mature trees (comprising Horse chestnut, Elm, Sycamore and Ash) adjacent to the Rathfarnham Road (WD5) and there is a treeline of Sycamore trees (WL2) along the eastern boundary of the site. The habitats within the site do not conform to any habitats listed in Annex II of the Habitats Directive. While the subject site comprises some minor areas of amenity grassland, it is not suitable for foraging habitat for the designated overwintering waterbird species of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA or any other European sites. Thus, the site is not capable of supporting any Qualifying Interest of Special Conservation Interest species from any European sites on an ex-situ basis.

There are no waterbodies within or adjacent to the site. The closest watercourse to the site is the River Dodder, which is situated approx. 350m to the south, and is separated from the site by a built-up environment. There is no potential for any surface waters to directly enter any watercourse and there is no hydrological connectivity between the subject site and the River Dodder.

No evidence of bat droppings or bat roosts were noted within the site. Bat activity was very limited. No bats which are on listed on Annex 2 of the EU's Habitats Directive were recorded on site.

2. The Proposed Development

The proposed development (as amended) will consist of the construction of a new 3-5 storey over basement development in 3 no. Blocks (Block A, Block B and Block C2), the construction of a single-storey ancillary residential amenity building to provide for 66 no. residential units. The scheme was amended by way of further information whereby the total number of units proposed was reduced to 60. The scheme will necessitate the demolition of all buildings on the site and also includes the relocation of the site entrance from the northern to the southern end of the site, hard and soft landscaping, boundary treatment works, the provision of communal open space, public lighting, car parking at basement and surface levels, secure bicycle parking at surface level and a substation. Further details are provided in Section 2.0 above.

Surface / Storm Water – the existing surface water drainage in the area comprises of a 525mm diameter concrete sewer located on the opposite side of Rathfarnham Road and a 225mm vitrified clay combined sewer which runs along the western boundary with Rathfarnham Road (R114). The proposed surface water drainage system will collect storm water runoff from the proposed residential development via a traditional pipe work and manhole system and runoff from hard standing areas will be collected via collectors. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) will be incorporated to reduce runoff volumes and improve runoff water quality and include green roofs, permeable paving, tree pits and filter drains

leading to an attenuation storage system. Green blue roof technology would be incorporated into the development which will reduce the surface runoff from the roof while also improving the quality of water.

Surface water from the development will discharge via an attenuated outlet to the existing 525mm diameter public surface water sewer on the opposite side of Rathfarnham Road, which in turn discharges to the River Dodder. In accordance with the recommendations of the GDSDS, it is proposed to provide a multi-stage attenuation system aimed at providing storm storage facilities, enhance the quality of surface water runoff and to mirror greenfield run-off rates of existing catchments by restricting and maintaining the outflow. Given that the existing development site is predominantly composed of buildings and hard surfacing, these measures will result in a net improvement to surface water run-off characteristics. The planning authority decision included a condition (18(c)) which requires the development to be drained on a completely separate foul and surface water system with surface water discharging to the public surface water sewer network.

Foul Water Management – the proposed development will discharge by gravity to the existing 225mm combined sewer which runs along the site's western boundary with the R114 towards the Grand Canal. This in turn discharges to the existing 3660mm trunk sewer located in Parnell Road and runs parallel to the Grand Canal and ultimately discharges to the Ringsend Wastewater Treatment Plant. The Ringsend plant is licensed to discharge treated effluent by the EPA (licence number D0034-01) and is managed by Irish Water. A letter from Uisce Eireann is enclosed with the application (dated 01/12/23) confirming that capacity is available to serve the proposed development subject to the applicant entering into a connection agreement. The planning authority decision included a condition (18(c)) which requires the development to be drained on a completely separate foul and surface water system with surface water discharging to the public surface water sewer network.

Water Supply - Water supply for the development will be via a mains supply. It is proposed to connect to the existing 100mm diameter cast iron water main to the east of the site and to the existing 100mm diameter watermain to the west of the site. Uisce Eireann has confirmed the feasibility of this connection, based on a pre-connection enquiry that was submitted to Uisce Eireann to assess the capacity available in the network, subject to a valid connection agreement. The Uisce Eireann confirmation of feasibility letter (dated 1st December 2023) has been included with the application.

Flood Risk – A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) was carried out for the proposed development. The site was assessed in accordance with the OPW Flood Risk Management Guidelines. The site is in Flood Zone C and is at a low risk of tidal, fluvial and groundwater flooding, but at a medium risk of pluvial flooding and

human/mechanical error. There is no increased risk to any nearby properties or developable land as the runoff rate will be attenuated to greenfield runoff levels.

A new surface water drainage system will be constructed to accommodate surface water runoff which will be in accordance with the GDSDS and will include SUDS. The surface water network, attenuation storage and site levels are designed to accommodate a 100-year storm event and to include climate change provisions, (allowance for 20% increase in rainfall intensities). Floor levels of all buildings are set above the 100-year flood levels by a minimum of 0.5m and are also set above the 1000-year flood level. For storms in excess of 100 years, the development has been designed to provide overland flood routes towards the open space areas and the basement in extreme storm events. The proposed drainage system will also be maintained on a regular basis to prevent blockages. These measures were considered appropriate to mitigate any risk from pluvial flooding.

The FRA concludes that the flood risk mitigation measures, once fully implemented, are sufficient and that the proposed development is deemed appropriate and that a justification test is not required.

Preliminary Construction Management Plan – Details of the construction phase as well as environmental pollution control measures are presented in the Preliminary Plan (Aug 2024) submitted with the application. It is submitted that this document will be reviewed and updated / revised as necessary throughout the construction phases. The Preliminary CEMP describes the proposed stages of work in detail, starting with pre-commencement activities, followed by enabling works, development of site compound, phased based construction, traffic management, civil activities and landscaping. Environmental control measures are provided with regards to noise, dust, light, litter (waste) and control measures to prevent impacts upon soils, ground water and surface water.

The submitted AA Screening information report does not identify specific consultations with prescribed bodies but does refer to a desktop review of published documents and information. Field surveys were carried out on 11th April and 18th April 2024. There are no submissions received from any prescribed bodies recorded on the planning file that refer to matters in relation to AA.

3. *Potential Impact Mechanisms*

The site is not within or adjoining any European sites and there is no hydrological connection with any European sites. There is no potential, therefore, for any direct impacts such as habitat loss or fragmentation, direct emissions or species mortality or disturbance.

However, potential indirect impacts could arise from the proposed development during both construction and operational phases.

Construction Phase

- Uncontrolled release of silt, sediments and/or other pollutants to air due to earthworks.
- Surface water run-off containing silt, sediments and/or other pollutants into nearby waterbodies.
- Surface water run-off containing silt, sediments and/or other pollutants into the local groundwater.
- Waste generation during the Construction Phase comprising soils, construction and demolition wastes.
- Increased noise, dust and/or vibrations as a result of construction activity.
- Increased dust and air emissions from construction traffic.
- Increased lighting in the vicinity as a result of construction activity.

Operational Phase

- Surface water drainage from the Site of the Proposed Development.
- Foul water from the Proposed Development leading to increased loading on wastewater treatment plant
- Increased lighting in the vicinity emitted from the Proposed Development; and
- Increased human presence in the vicinity as a result of the Proposed Development

Step 2. Identification of European sites using the source-pathway-receptor model

The site is not within or adjoining any Natura 2000 sites. I do not consider that there is potential for any direct impacts such as habitat loss, direct emissions, or species mortality/disturbance. However, indirect effects could potentially arise from the proposed development during both construction and operational phases on sites within the Zone of Influence, provided that a Source-Pathway-Receptor link exists between the subject site and any European site.

A total of 15 European sites were examined in the AA Screening Report, as set out below.

European site	Qualifying Interests and Conservation Objectives	Distance from site	Ecological connections	Consider further in Screening Y/N
Special Areas of Conservation				
South Dublin Bay SAC (000210)	Tidal mudflats and sandflats [1140] Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210] Salicornia Mud [1310] Embryonic sifting dunes [2110] Conservation objectives NPWS 2013 https://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation_objectives/CO000210.pdf Statutory Instrument No. 525/2019 (22/10/19) https://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation_objectives/CO000210.pdf	5.2km	No potential pathways for effects and therefore no likelihood of significant effects occurring from the proposed development alone or in combination with other plans or projects	N
Wicklow Mountains SAC (002122)	Oligotrophic waters containing very few minerals [3110] Natural dystrophic lakes and ponds [3160] Northern Atlantic wet heaths with Erica tetralix [4010] European dry heaths [4030] Alpine and Boreal heaths [4060]	7.7km	No potential pathways for effects and therefore no likelihood of significant effects occurring from the proposed development alone or in combination	N

	Calaminarian grasslands of the <i>Violetalia calaminariae</i> [6130] Species-rich <i>Nardus</i> grasslands, on siliceous substrates in mountain areas [6230] Blanket bogs (* if active bog) [7130] Siliceous scree of the montane to snow levels [8110] Calcareous rocky slopes with chasmophytic vegetation [8210] Siliceous rocky slopes with chasmophytic vegetation [8220] Old sessile oak woods with <i>Ilex</i> and <i>Blechnum</i> in the British Isles [91A0] <i>Lutra lutra</i> (Otter) [1355] Conservation objectives 31/07/17 https://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation_objectives/CO002122.pdf SI No. 465 of 2023 https://www.irishstatutebook.ie/eli/2023/si/465/made/en/pdf		with other plans or projects	
Glenasmole Valley SAC (001209)	Orchid rich calcareous grassland [6210] Molina meadows [6410] Petrifying springs [7220] Conservation Objectives NPWS 2023	7.8km	No potential pathways for effects and therefore no likelihood of significant effects occurring from the proposed development	N

	https://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation_objectives/CO001209.pdf		alone or in combination with other plans or projects	
North Dublin Bay SAC (000206)	Tidal mudflats and sandflats [1140] Annual vegetation of drift lines [1220] Salicornia Mud [1310] Atlantic salt meadows [1330] Mediterranean salt meadows [1410] Embryonic sifting dunes [2110] Marram dunes (white dunes) [2120] Fixed dunes [2130] Humid dune slacks [2190] Petalworth [1395] Conservation Objectives 06/11/13 https://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation_objectives/CO000206.pdf SI No. 524/2019 https://www.irishstatutebook.ie/eli/2019/si/524/made/en	8.8km	No potential pathways for effects and therefore no likelihood of significant effects occurring from the proposed development alone or in combination with other plans or projects	N
Knocksink Wood SAC (000725)	Petrifying springs [7220] Old sessile oak woods with Ilex and Blechnum in British Isles [91A0] Alluvial forests [91E0] Conservation objectives https://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation_objectives/CO000725.pdf	11.6km	No potential pathways for effects and therefore no likelihood of significant effects occurring from the proposed development alone or in combination with other	N

	sites/conservation_objectives/CO000725.pdf SI no. 93/2019 https://www.irishstatutebook.ie/eli/2019/si/93/made/en		plans or projects	
Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (003000)	Reefs [1170] Phocoena phocoena (Harbour porpoise) [1351] Conservation objectives 07/05/2013 https://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation_objectives/CO003000.pdf SI no. 94/2019 https://www.irishstatutebook.ie/eli/2019/si/94/made/en	12.8km	No potential pathways for effects and therefore no likelihood of significant effects occurring from the proposed development alone or in combination with other plans or projects	N
Ballyman Glen SAC (000713)	Petrifying springs [7220] Alkaline fens [7230] Conservation objectives (17/07/19) https://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation_objectives/CO000713.pdf SI No. 92/2019 https://www.irishstatutebook.ie/eli/2019/si/92/made/en	13.5km	No potential pathways for effects and therefore no likelihood of significant effects occurring from the proposed development alone or in combination with other plans or projects	
Howth Head SAC [000202]	Vegetated sea cliffs [1230] European dry heath [4030] Conservation objectives (06/12/16)	14km	No potential pathways for effects and therefore no likelihood of significant effects	N

	https://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation_objectives/CO000202.pdf Sl. No. 524/2021 https://www.irishstatutebook.ie/eli/2021/si/524/made/en/pdf		occurring from the proposed development alone or in combination with other plans or projects	
Baldoyle Bay SAC (000199)	Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140] Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310] Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritima) [1330] Mediterranean salt meadows (Juncetalia maritimi) [1410] Conservation Objectives 19/11/12 https://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation_objectives/CO000199.pdf Sl. No. 472 of 2021 https://www.irishstatutebook.ie/eli/2021/si/472/made/en/pdf	14.3km	No potential pathways for effects and therefore no likelihood of significant effects occurring from the proposed development alone or in combination with other plans or projects	N

Rye Water Valley/ Carton SAC (001398)	Petrifying springs with tufa formation (Cratoneurion) [7220] Vertigo angustior (Narrow-mouthed Whorl Snail) [1014] Vertigo moulinsiana (Desmoulin's Whorl Snail) [1016] Conservation Objectives (22/12/21) https://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation_objectives/CO001398.pdf SI. No. 494/2018 https://www.irishstatutebook.ie/eli/2018/si/494/made/en	14.9km	No potential pathways for effects and therefore no likelihood of significant effects occurring from the proposed development alone or in combination with other plans or projects	N
---------------------------------------	--	--------	---	---

Special Protection Areas

South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024)	Light-bellied Brent Goose (Branta bernicla hrota) [A046] Oystercatcher (Haematopus ostralegus) [A130] Ringed Plover (Charadrius hiaticula) [A137] Grey Plover (Pluvialis squatarola) [A141] Knot (Calidris canutus) [A143] Sanderling (Calidris alba) [A144] Dunlin (Calidris alpina) [A149] Bar-tailed Godwit (Limosa lapponica) [A157] Redshank (Tringa totanus) [A162] Black-headed Gull (Chroicocephalus ridibundus) [A179]	5.2km	No potential pathways for effects and therefore no likelihood of significant effects occurring from the proposed development alone or in combination with other plans or projects	N
---	--	-------	---	---

	Roseate Tern (<i>Sterna dougallii</i>) [A192] Common Tern (<i>Sterna hirundo</i>) [A193] Arctic Tern (<i>Sterna paradisaea</i>) [A194] Wetland and Waterbirds [A999] Conservation Objectives (09/03/15) https://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation_objectives/CO004024.pdf SI No. 212/2010 https://www.irishstatutebook.ie/2010/en/si/0212.html			
North Bull Island SPA (004006)	Light-bellied Brent Goose (<i>Branta bernicla hrota</i>) [A046] Shelduck (<i>Tadorna tadorna</i>) [A048] Teal (<i>Anas crecca</i>) [A052] Pintail (<i>Anas acuta</i>) [A054] Oystercatcher (<i>Haematopus ostralegus</i>) [A130] Golden Plover (<i>Pluvialis apricaria</i>) [A140] Grey Plover (<i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>) [A141] Knot (<i>Calidris canutus</i>) [A143] Sanderling (<i>Calidris alba</i>) [A144] Dunlin (<i>Calidris alpina</i>) [A149] Black-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa limosa</i>) [A156] Bar-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa lapponica</i>) [A157]	6.6km	No potential pathways for effects and therefore no likelihood of significant effects occurring from the proposed development alone or in combination with other plans or projects	N

	Curlew (<i>Numenius arquata</i>) [A160] Redshank (<i>Tringa totanus</i>) [A162] Turnstone (<i>Arenaria interpres</i>) [A169] Black-headed Gull (<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>) [A179] Shoveler (<i>Spatula clypeata</i>) [A857] Wetland and Waterbirds [A999] Conservation Objectives (09/03/15) https://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation_objectives/CO004006.pdf SI No. 211/2010 https://www.irishstatutebook.ie/2010/en/si/0211.html			
Northwest Irish Sea SPA (004236)	Red-throated Diver (<i>Gavia stellata</i>) [A001] Great Northern Diver (<i>Gavia immer</i>) [A003] Fulmar (<i>Fulmarus glacialis</i>) [A009] Manx Shearwater (<i>Puffinus puffinus</i>) [A013] Cormorant (<i>Phalacrocorax carbo</i>) [A017] Shag (<i>Phalacrocorax aristotelis</i>) [A018] Common Scoter (<i>Melanitta nigra</i>) [A065] Black-headed Gull (<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>) [A179] Common Gull (<i>Larus canus</i>) [A182]	9.7km	No potential pathways for effects and therefore no likelihood of significant effects occurring from the proposed development alone or in combination with other plans or projects	N

	Lesser Black-backed Gull (<i>Larus fuscus</i>) [A183] Herring Gull (<i>Larus argentatus</i>) [A184] Great Black-backed Gull (<i>Larus marinus</i>) [A187] Kittiwake (<i>Rissa tridactyla</i>) [A188] Roseate Tern (<i>Sterna dougallii</i>) [A192] Common Tern (<i>Sterna hirundo</i>) [A193] Arctic Tern (<i>Sterna paradisaea</i>) [A194] Guillemot (<i>Uria aalge</i>) [A199] Razorbill (<i>Alca torda</i>) [A200] Puffin (<i>Fratercula arctica</i>) [A204] Little Gull (<i>Hydrocoloeus minutus</i>) [A862] Little Tern (<i>Sternula albifrons</i>) [A885] Conservation Objectives NPWS (19/09/23) https://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation_objectives/CO004236.pdf			
Dalkey Islands SPA (004172)	Roseate Tern (<i>Sterna dougallii</i>) [A192] Common Tern (<i>Sterna hirundo</i>) [A193] Arctic Tern (<i>Sterna paradisaea</i>) [A194] Conservation objectives NPWS (29/10/24) https://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation_objectives/CO004236.pdf	12.9km	No potential pathways for effects and therefore no likelihood of significant effects occurring from the proposed development alone or in combination with other	N

	sites/conservation_objectives/CO004172.pdf SI No. 238/2010 https://www.irishstatutebook.ie/2010/en/si/0238.html		plans or projects	
Baldoyle Bay SPA (004016)	Light-bellied Brent Goose (<i>Branta bernicla hrota</i>) [A046] Shelduck (<i>Tadorna tadorna</i>) [A048] Ringed Plover (<i>Charadrius hiaticula</i>) [A137] Golden Plover (<i>Pluvialis apricaria</i>) [A140] Grey Plover (<i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>) [A141] Bar-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa lapponica</i>) [A157] Wetland and Waterbirds [A999] Conservation objectives NPWS (27/02/13) https://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation_objectives/CO004016.pdf SI No. 275/2010 https://www.irishstatutebook.ie/2010/en/si/0275.html	14.3km	No potential pathways for effects and therefore no likelihood of significant effects occurring from the proposed development alone or in combination with other plans or projects	N

Step 3 Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site

I conclude that the proposed development (alone or in combination with other plans and projects) would not result in likely significant effects on European sites. No further assessment is required for the project.

No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions

Screening Determination

Finding of no significant effects

In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA Screening, I conclude that the proposed development, individually or in combination with other plans or projects, would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the South Dublin Bay SAC or the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, or any other European site, in view of the Conservation Objectives of those sites and appropriate Assessment (and submission of an NIS) is not therefore required.

This determination is based on:

- Scientific information provided in the Screening Report
- The scale of the development on fully serviced lands
- The distance from and lack of any connections to the European sites
- No ex-situ impacts on wintering birds

No direct or indirect impacts arising from the proposed development alone or in combination with other plans/projects are likely to arise due to the considerable distance from any European site and the lack of an ecological link between the site of the proposed development and any European site.

No mitigation measures aimed at avoiding or reducing impacts on European site were required to be considered in reaching this conclusion.

Appendix 3 Water Framework Directive Screening

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Bord Pleanála ref. no.	322522-25	Townland, address	32A Rathfarnham Road, Rathfarnham, Dublin 6
Description of project		Demolition of synagogue and associated buildings on site and construction of 66 no. apartment units in 3 blocks ranging in height from 3-6 storeys, with parking at surface and basement levels, and relocation of site entrance. The proposal was modified prior to the P.A. decision to grant permission in that the number of units was reduced to 60 and the overall height was reduced to 5 storeys. The proposal will include the construction of a single-storey communal amenity building, bicycle storage, hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatment works. The proposed development will discharge wastewater to the public wastewater sewer which runs along Rathfarnham Road adjoining the site to the west and will discharge surface water following a multi-stage attenuation to the 525mm public surface water sewer on the opposite side of Rathfarnham Road.	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,		The site (0.54ha) is a brownfield site located on Rathfarnham Road, at the edge of Terenure village, and is surrounded by existing development to the north, east and south. The site is very flat with levels ranging from 44.5m to 45.5m OD. It is comprised	

	of man-made surfaces and buildings, with some small areas of amenity grassland and some mature trees in the west/southwest of the site and a treeline along the eastern boundary. There are no surface water features within the site, the closest watercourse being the River Dodder, c.350m to the south.
Proposed surface water details	Surface water drainage in the area comprises of a 525mm diameter concrete sewer located on the opposite side of Rathfarnham Road and a 225mm vitrified clay combined sewer which runs along the western boundary with Rathfarnham Road (R114). The proposed surface water drainage system will collect storm water runoff from the proposed residential development via a traditional pipe work and manhole system and runoff from hard standing areas will be collected via collectors. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) will be incorporated to reduce runoff volumes and improve runoff water quality and include green roofs, permeable paving, tree pits and filter drains leading to an attenuation storage system. Green blue roof technology would be incorporated into the development which will reduce the surface runoff from the roof while also improving the quality of water. Surface water will be discharged from the site following attenuation at greenfield rates to the 525mm public surface water sewer which discharges to the River Dodder.
Proposed water supply source & available capacity	Uisce Eireann mains water connection. Letter from Uisce Eireann confirming available capacity.

Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues	Wastewater will be discharged from the proposed development by gravity to the existing 225mm combined sewer which runs along the site's western boundary with the R114 towards the Grand Canal. This in turn discharges to the existing 3660mm trunk sewer located in Parnell Road and runs parallel to the Grand Canal and ultimately discharges to the Ringsend Wastewater Treatment Plant. The Ringsend plant is licensed to discharge treated effluent by the EPA (licence number D0034-01) and is managed by Irish Water. A letter from Uisce Eireann is enclosed with the application (dated 01/12/23) confirming that capacity is available to serve the proposed development subject to the applicant entering into a connection agreement.
Others?	

Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection						
Identified water body	Distance to (m)	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk	Identified pressures on that water body	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater)
River Waterbody	350m	River Dodder_050 IE_EA_09D01 0900	Moderate	At risk	Urban wastewater Urban run-off	Yes - Hydrological connection to waterbody via 525mm public surface water sewer which discharges to the River Dodder Screened in
Transitional	6km	Lower Liffey Estuary IE_EA__090_0 300	Moderate	At risk	Urban Wastewater Nutrients	Yes – Hydrological link via wastewater sewer - discharges to Ringsend WWTP Screened in

Transitional	6km	Tolka Estuary IE_EA_090_02 00	Poor	At Risk	Urban Wastewater Nutrients	Yes – Hydrological connection via wastewater sewers which discharge to Ringsend WWTP Screened in
Coastal Waters	6km	Dublin Bay Coastal WB IE_EA_090_00 00	Good	Not At risk	Not identified	Yes – Hydrological connection via wastewater sewers which discharge to Ringsend WWTP Screened in
Groundwater body	Underlying site	Dublin GW Body IE_EA_G-008	Good	Under Review	Not identified	Yes – drainage to groundwater – Screened in

Step 4: Detailed description of any component of the development or activity that may cause a risk of not achieving the WFD Objectives having regard to the S-P-R linkage.							
CONSTRUCTION PHASE							
No.	Component	Waterbody receptor (EPA Code)	Pathway (existing and new)	Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact	Screening Stage Mitigation Measure*	Residual Risk (yes/no) Detail	Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2.
1.	Site clearance, Demolition and Construction	River Dodder _050 IE_EA_09D01 0900	Surface water discharged to watercourse via public surface water sewer	Sedimentation, Siltation due to earthworks, vegetation clearance, demolition. Hydrocarbon spillages/leaks from machinery, plant	Standard construction practice CEMP & SUDS which will reduce run-off volumes and improve run-off water quality	No – Mitigation measures will protect water quality and reduce run-off volumes.	Screened out

2.	Site clearance, demolition, construction	Dublin groundwater Body IE_EA_G_008	Drainage to ground water as it underlies the site	Sedimentation, Siltation due to earthworks, vegetation clearance, soil/subsoil stripping and stockpiling. Hydrocarbon spillages/leaks from machinery, plant	Standard construction practice CEMP Infrastructure Report states that discharge of groundwater to public drainage network may be permitted during the construction stage	No – Mitigation measures will protect water quality and minimise recharge volumes.	Screened out
OPERATIONAL PHASE							
1.	Surface water run-off	River Dodder _050 IE_EA_09D01 0900	Surface water discharged to watercourse via public surface water sewer	Deterioration in water quality from pollution of surface water run-off	Discharges to surface water sewer and ultimately to the watercourse will be controlled by SUDS and green-blue roofs and other standard mitigation measures set out in the	No – Proposed mitigation measures will protect water quality.	Screened out

					Infrastructure Report which will ensure that water quality is protected.		
2.	Wastewater discharge	Lower Liffey Estuary IE_EA_090_03 00	Wastewater from proposed development will be discharged to the 225mm public sewer to the west of the site, which in turn discharges to the 3660mm trunk sewer which travels alongside the Grand Canal and discharges to the Ringsend WWTP at Dublin Bay via the Lower Liffey Estuary	Uisce Eireann has confirmed that there is available capacity within the Ringsend WWTP and there is a planned upgrade underway. The proposed connection is deemed acceptable without upgrades.	The annual Environmental Report for Ringsend WWTP 2023 stated that the WWTP, which discharges to the river Liffey, was non-compliant with emission limit values for BOD, COD, TSS, Total P and Total N due to overloading. It is stated at 2.1.3.1 (Ambient Monitoring summary for the Treatment Plant discharge...) that the primary discharge from the WWTP	No - No mitigation required	Screened out

					does not have an observable negative impact on the Water Framework Directive status in the Liffey Estuary. No mitigation required.		
3.	Wastewater discharge	Tolka Estuary IE_EA_090_02 00	Wastewater from proposed development will be discharged to the 225mm public sewer to the west of the site, which in turn discharges to the 3660mm trunk sewer which travels alongside the Grand Canal and discharges to the Ringsend	Uisce Eireann has confirmed that there is available capacity within the Ringsend WWTP and there is a planned upgrade underway. The proposed connection is deemed acceptable	The annual Environmental Report for Ringsend WWTP 2023 stated that the WWTP, which discharges to the river Liffey, was non-compliant with emission limit values for BOD, COD, TSS, Tota P and Total N due to overloading. It is stated at 2.1.3.1 (Ambient Monitoring summary for the Treatment Plant	No - no mitigation required	Screened out

			WWTP at Dublin Bay	without upgrades.	discharge...' that the primary discharge from the WWTP does not have an observable negative impact on the Water Framework Directive status in the Liffey Estuary. No mitigation required.		
4.	Wastewater discharge	Dublin Bay Coastal waterbody IE_EA_090_0000	Wastewater from proposed development will be discharged to the 225mm public sewer to the west of the site, which in turn discharges to the 3660mm trunk sewer which travels alongside the Grand Canal and discharges to	Uisce Eireann has confirmed that there is available capacity within the Ringsend WWTP and there is a planned upgrade underway. The proposed connection is deemed	The annual Environmental Report for Ringsend WWTP 2023 stated that the WWTP, which discharges to the river Liffey, was non-compliant with emission limit values for BOD, COD, TSS, Tota P and Total N due to overloading. It is stated at 2.1.3.1	No - No mitigation required.	Screened out

			the Ringsend WWTP at Dublin Bay	acceptable without upgrades.	(Ambient Monitoring summary for the Treatment Plant discharge...' that the primary discharge from the WWTP does not have an observable negative impact on the Water Framework Directive status in the Liffey Estuary. No mitigation required.		
3.	Groundwater discharge	Dublin groundwater body IE_EA_G_008	Seepage to groundwater which underlies site	Reduction in groundwater quality	Standard mitigation measures including attenuation on site will protect water quality and minimise recharge volumes	No - quality and volume of groundwater will be protected by proposed mitigation measures.	Screened out