



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-322686-25

<b>Development</b>	Protected Structure. Renovations, alterations, and refurbishment works.
<b>Location</b>	St. Joseph's R.C. Church, Summerhill Road, Glasthule, Co. Dublin, A96 FW66
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	D24A/0754/WEB
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Fr Paul Tyrrell PP
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant Permission with Conditions
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Peter Pearson Evans
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	5 <sup>th</sup> September 2025
<b>Inspector</b>	Ronan O'Connor

## Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description .....	3
2.0 Proposed Development .....	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....	4
3.1. Decision .....	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports .....	5
3.3. Prescribed Bodies .....	6
3.4. Third Party Observations .....	6
4.0 Planning History.....	7
5.0 Policy Context.....	7
5.1. Development Plan.....	7
5.2. Section 28 Guidelines .....	9
5.3. Natural Heritage Designations .....	10
5.4. EIA Screening .....	11
5.5. AA Screening .....	11
6.0 The Appeal .....	11
6.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	11
6.2. Applicant Response .....	14
6.3. Planning Authority Response.....	14
6.4. Observations.....	14
7.0 Assessment.....	14
8.0 Recommendation.....	18
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	19
10.0 Conditions .....	19
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1.1. The subject site is located at St. Joesph's Parish Church, Summerhill Road, Glasthule, Co. Dublin. The site is occupied by the church building, the sacristy and a contemporary Parish Centre building. The church is listed on the record of Protected Structures (no. 1099).

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1.1. The originally proposed development, as submitted at application stage, consisted of:

- Removal of the altar rails for the width of the main altar to new locations at the existing confessionals and the replacement of the marble step.
- Lowering of the altar floor area by one step and its extension towards the Nave.
- Re-location of the Baptismal Font from the Sanctuary to the Nave.
- Re-location of the handrails from the front of the Altar to either side of the Sanctuary.
- Replacement of the altar, ambo and presiding chair.
- Re-location of the tabernacle from the existing altar to the side of the Sanctuary.
- Modifications to the internal screens of the side entrances.
- Replacement of 10 No. pews to the front of the Nave with individual seating.
- Removal of 2 No. confessionals and the installation of 2 No. shrines and the re location of altar rails to the front of the shrines.
- Removal of inner screens, doors and parish office in the Narthex and extend new inner screens to the line of the overhead choir.
- The conversion of the Book Shop to a Reconciliation Room.
- Repairs to damaged plaster and paintwork work in the Sanctuary and the repair/replacement of adjacent leaking rainwater pipe.
- Re-painting walls and ceilings to the Nave and side aisles, excluding the Sanctuary ceiling.

- The Tree of Life reredos to be brought forward and lowered.

2.2. I note that Further Information was received on 19<sup>th</sup> April 2025 which proposed the following alterations:

- Removal of the altar rails across the width of the main altar and their relocation to the existing confessionals, along with the replacement of the marble step.
- Lowering the sanctuary podium.
- Relocating the Baptismal Font from the Sanctuary to the Main Nave.
- Moving the handrails from the front of the altar to either side of the Sanctuary.
- Replacing the altar, ambo, and presiding chair.
- Existing Tabernacle to be Removed and Ciborium to be Relocated to West Side Altar.
- Modifying the internal screens at the side entrances.
- Replacing ten pews at the front of the Nave with individual seating.
- Removing two confessionals and installing two shrines, with the relocated altar rails placed in front of them.
- Removing the inner screens, doors, and parish office in the Narthex, and replacing them with new inner screens.
- Converting the Bookshop into a Reconciliation Chapel.
- Repairing damaged plaster and paintwork in the Sanctuary and addressing adjacent leaking rainwater pipes.
- Repainting the walls and ceilings of the Nave and side aisles, excluding the Sanctuary ceiling.
- Bringing forward and lowering the Tree of Life reredos

## 3.0 **Planning Authority Decision**

### 3.1. **Decision**

3.1.1. On 7<sup>th</sup> May 2025, the Council granted permission, subject to 4 no. conditions.

## 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

The First Planner's Report is summarised below:

- Proposal acceptable in principle.
- Reference is made to the Conservation Report (see summary of same below)
- Scale of works is relatively minor
- The infill of the gallery at entrance level is not supported
- Details required as per FI request, summarised below.

### 3.2.2. Further Information was recommended in relation to the following issues:

1. Revised proposal for the Narthex.
2. Revised Architectural Heritage Assessment; engagement with the Historic Churches Advisory Committee; details of floor protection, new flooring; rationale for the proposal; Method Statement.

### 3.2.3. Further Information was requested on 24/10/2024. Further Information was received on 14/04/2025 and included the following information:

- Cover letter from TOT Architects (dated 14<sup>th</sup> April /2025)
- Revised Architectural Design Statement (April 2025)
- Letter from the Archdiocese of Dublin (dated 25<sup>th</sup> March 2025)
- Letter from St. Joesph's Church (dated 11<sup>th</sup> November 2025)
- Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment (dated 14<sup>th</sup> April 2025)
- Revised suite of drawings detailing amendments.

### 3.2.4. The Second Planner's Report is summarised below:

- Notes revised drawings showing a reduced scale Narthex, retaining the open gallery at ground floor level
- Original entrance door of the church to be retained/existing floor tiles now to be retained, with new flooring to match exiting.
- Proposals would not detract from character of the building

- Would not adversely affect the special interest of the Protected Structure.

3.2.5. Recommends a grant of permission, subject to conditions.

#### Internal Reports

3.2.6. Conservation Division (dated 06/10/2024) –Concerns raised including a lack of an Architectural Heritage Impact Statement as well as lack of clarity in relation to the involvement of a Conservation Grade 3 Architect in the design process. Further concerns related to the lack of evidence of consultation with the Historic Churches Advisory Committee (HCAC). Specifically in relation to the works, it was considered that the removal of the internal screens to the side aisles, the confessional boxes and works to the narthex will materially affect the flooring, which was subject to a significant restoration project in 2018. It was considered that details of same was required and was set out that consideration should be given to retaining the footprint of the existing screen doors to reduce impact on the flooring. Other concerns related to the infill of the gallery at entrance level, and the status of the glass door that has been installed to the left on entry to the Church. Further Information was requested in relation to same.

Parks and Landscape Services (dated 08/10/2024) – No objection

Drainage (16/10/24) - No objection

Transport (04/11/24) - No objection subject to conditions.

3.2.7. Conditions

3.2.8. The Planning Authority have imposed 4 no. conditions. There are no conditions of particular note.

### 3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.3.1. None.

### 3.4. **Third Party Observations**

3.4.1. 1 no objection was received. The issues raised were as follows

- The proposals will undermine the relationship with the Harold School.

- Removing the confessionals will impact on the sacrament of First Holy Communion.
- The pews are of immense historical and cultural importance and significance.
- The church is a Protected Structure, and there is no rationale or reason for such unnecessary works.
- Questions the qualifications of the applicant's agent.
- Inconsistencies in the justification of the proposal.
- The proposals would render the protected interior of the church unrecognisable.

## 4.0 Planning History

006A/1250: Permission was granted for (a) Construction of a single storey Pastoral Centre comprising reception, entrance foyer, coffee dock, parish hall, meeting rooms, kitchen and toilet (b) Car parking in front of the Church, (c) Associated site works including new boundary walls to the rear and Church side of Nos. 22 and 23 Summerhill Road, all drainage works and landscaping.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028

Zoning SNI 'protect, improve and encourage the provision of sustainable neighbourhood infrastructure'.

Specific Local Objective (No. 10) – 'to retain, improve and encourage the provision of sustainable neighbourhood infrastructure facilities'.

Chapter 11 – Heritage and Conservation

Section 11.4 Architectural Heritage;

Policy Objective HER8: Work to Protected Structures –

Policy Objective HER8: Work to

Protected Structures

It is a Policy Objective to:

- i. Protect structures included on the RPS from any works that would negatively impact their special character and appearance.
- ii. Ensure that any development proposals Protected Structures, their curtilage and setting shall have regard to the 'Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities' published by the Department of the Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht.
- iii. Ensure that all works are carried out under supervision of a qualified professional with specialised conservation expertise.
- iv. Ensure that any development, modification, alteration, or extension affecting a Protected Structure and/or its setting is sensitively sited and designed, and is appropriate in terms of the proposed scale, mass, height, density, layout, and materials.
- v. Ensure that the form and structural integrity of the Protected Structure is retained in any redevelopment and that the relationship between the Protected Structure and any complex of adjoining buildings, designed landscape features, or views and vistas from within the grounds of the structure are respected.
- vi. Respect the special interest of the interior, including its plan form, hierarchy of spaces, architectural detail, fixtures and fittings and materials.
- vii. Ensure that new and adapted uses are compatible with the character and special interest of the Protected Structure.
- viii. Protect the curtilage of protected structures and to refuse planning permission for inappropriate development within the curtilage and attendant grounds that would adversely impact on the special character of the Protected Structure.
- ix. Protect and retain important elements of built heritage including historic gardens, stone walls, entrance gates and piers and any other associated curtilage features.
- x. Ensure historic landscapes and gardens associated with Protected Structures are protected from inappropriate development (consistent with NPO 17 of the NPF and RPO 9.30 of the RSES).

Section 11.4.1.3 Policy Objective HER9: Protected Structures Applications and Documentation; Section 11.4.1.4 Policy Objective HER10: Protected Structures and Building Regulations; Section 11.4.1.5 Policy Objective HER11: Energy Efficiency of Protected Structures

## Chapter 12 Development Management

Section 12.11.2.1 Works to a Protected Structure – ‘all new work should relate sensitively to the fabric, scale, proportions, and design of the Protected Structure.... New additions/extensions should respect the significance of the building/structure, through consideration of its siting, bulk, form, scale, character, colour, textures and material.... Appropriately scaled extensions should complement, and be subsidiary to, the main structure be positioned generally to the rear elevation or less prominent elevation’.

## Chapter 12 – Development Management

Section 12.3.1 Quality Design; Section 12.11 Heritage; Section 12.11.2 Architectural Heritage – Protected Structure; Section 12.11.2.1 Works to a Protected Structure.

### 5.2. Section 28 Guidelines

#### Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Local Authorities

These guidelines were initially issued in 2004 and have since been re-issued in 2011 by the Department of Arts, Heritage & Gaeltacht.

Chapter 5 refers to Places of Public Worship. Relevant provisions are summarised below:

The heritage significance of church buildings, including their fixtures and features, lies in their central role in the community as places of public worship, usually over many generations.

Respecting liturgical requirements includes recognising that churches may wish to adapt places of public worship in the light of contemporary revisions of their worship and mission.

Legislation provides that the planning authority shall respect liturgical requirements. Careful consideration should be given to the scale and potential impact of the works on the specific character of the individual structure.

Any proposed removal or alteration/destruction of important fixtures and fittings, for example galleries, box pews or fixed seating will require careful consideration.

Internal fixtures such as box pews, confessional boxes and altar rails can be significant elements of the character of the place of public worship.

The religious authorities consulted by the Minister have agreed to establish the following bodies (which, as well as liturgy, will draw on relevant expertise in art/architectural heritage) for consultations:

Roman Catholic Church 5.3.2 The consultations will be on a diocesan basis. Historic Churches Advisory Committees (or equivalent agencies) are to be established on a diocesan or inter-diocesan basis to advise the bishop on the heritage/historical factors in a place of worship for which a declaration is requested or a planning application is made. Each Committee will advise on the necessary documentation, including liturgical requirements, which will be forwarded to the planning authority. It will also be available for consultations with the planning authority. For churches vested in religious orders, the consultations will be with the provincial or regional superior (or in some monastic communities, the abbot or abbess)

Chapter 11 relates to 'Interiors' - Protection extends to all features of quality and interest in the interior of a protected structure, not only to those features which are original.

### **5.3. Natural Heritage Designations**

- 5.3.1. None. The nearest designated site is the Dalkey Coastal Zone and Killiney Hill pNHA, which is located c113m to the north-east of the site. The nearest European Site is the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, located c1.8km to the north-west of the site.

## 5.4. EIA Screening

- 5.4.1. The proposed development does not come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA, that is, it does not comprise construction works, demolition or intervention in the natural surroundings. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

## 5.5. AA Screening

- 5.5.1. Having regard to the minor nature and scale of the proposed development, the site location outside of any protected site, the nature of the receiving environment and the proximity of the lands in question to the nearest European Site (South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, located c1.8km to the north-west of the site), it is my opinion that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise and that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, on any Natura 2000 site.

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1.1. 1 no. third-party appeal was received from Peter Pearson Evans, on 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2025. I have summarised the grounds of appeal below. There are two elements to the appeal (Part A) and Part B. Part A is the original submission to the Planning Authority (which I have summarised below) and associated photographs, and Part B relates to procedural matters, and I have also summarised same below.

#### Part A

- Appealing against all aspects of the proposed development
- Is unnecessary and unjustifiable alterations and destruction, of a Protected interior and Protected Artefacts. which are of National Importance.
- As experts in ecclesiastical matters, and architecture, have examined Father Tyrells proposals in detail.
- Avenue leading to Saint Joseph's Church from the Harold School allows children to walk to and connect directly with, St Joseph's Church.

- The Harold School has an inextricable, relationship, and interaction with St Joseph's Church, with the school children attending there, for First Holy Communion, Confirmation, Confession, and other Church and community services.
- The proposals will possibly determine and undermine the important and solemn relationship between the Harold School, and St Joseph's Church.
- The proposal to eliminate, and remove the confessionals from St Joseph's Church, will impact on the Sacrament of First Holy Communion.
- Applicant did not seek the necessary consent from the Arch Diocese.
- Proposal also shows the removal of the five rows of historic pews, that face the sanctuary.
- These pews have been used by the pupils of the Harold School, since 1901 and are of immense historical, and cultural importance and significance.
- St Joseph's Church is a Protected Structure, and as such the protection covers "The inside of the Structure, and All Fixtures and Features, forming part of the interior, and exterior of the Protected Structure or any Structure on the grounds attached to it .'
- All 14 Fixtures, and Features, for which Father Tyrell proposes dramatic Interference, alterations, and or removals , are Protected Features and Fixtures
- Applicant did not express any rationale, or reason, why he wishes to carry out such unnecessary and culturally and historically unacceptable works .
- Agents for the applicants refer to a ' dwindling Congregation', as justification.
- This contradicts the National Census of 2022, which shows an increase in the Catholic Population since the Previous of 2016 of 8%.
- Appellant has studied the Architectural Heritage and Impact Assessment in detail and comment as follows.
- OSA and Associates do not express how they are qualified in the Field of Ecclesiastic Architecture and Heritage, nor has their assessment report been signed.

- Refer to St Joseph's Church being dedicated by The Rev, Father George Harold, in 1869, whereas it was dedicated by Cardinal Paul Cullen, in 1869.
- Note that there are six confessionals in St Michaels Church Dun Laoghaire, where Father Tyrell is also PP.
- Dismayed at OSA and Associates assertion that ' Traditional confessionals have been made redundant '
- OSA and Associates state that there are 'no transepts' in St Joseph's Church, whereas as illustrated in the attached photographs B, and C, there is a North and South Transept.
- They have also failed to note the 19th Century Confessional Bastions, to the North and South of the Church Structure.
- Attempt to justify enlarging the main entrance Narthex, as being not capable of accommodating 'wedding parties etc'- despite earlier in their report attempting to justify the proposed alterations, as being necessary because of a 'dwindling congregation'.
- Applicant proposes to carry out 14 very radical and in our professional opinion, Unnecessary, and destructive alterations, to a protected structure, that is of Immense, cultural, historical, educational, and artistic importance, and of National Importance and significance.
- Have not submitted any justification whatsoever for the proposals.
- Would opinion render the Protected Interior of St Joseph's Church, to being unrecognizable.
- Consent should have been sought from the Arch Diocese.

#### Part B

- Appellant was not notified of the Planning Authority's request for Further Information nor was the appellant advised of the receipt of same.
- Was excluded from making a response to same.
- This was in contravention of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2000 (as amended).

- Have referred the matter to John T. Gibbons SC who has advised on this matter and has submitted a relevant Supreme Court Decision dated 10/6/2004. Maud White and Michael White vs Dublin City Council and The Attorney General, a Copy of which is enclosed.
- Given the considerable volume of information submitted, and changes submitted, that the provisions of Significant additional information should have been applied by The Planning Authority, i.e. notifications to objectors, site and public planning notices.
- Submit that Planning Decision made by The Planning Authority is invalid.

## 6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1. None.

## 6.3. Planning Authority Response

6.3.1. The PA made a submission on 19<sup>th</sup> June 2025 wherein it is stated that the original planner's report should be referred to.

## 6.4. Observations

6.4.1. None.

## 7.0 Assessment

7.1.1. The main issues raised in the appeal are as follows:

- Impact on the Protected Structure/Architectural Heritage
- Procedural Issues

### 7.2. Impact on the Protected Structure/Architectural Heritage

7.2.1. The Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Record of Protected Structures, RPS Ref. No. 1099, includes the following structures on site:

- Saint Joseph's Church, Presbytery and Parochial House - Church and Presbytery.

- 7.2.2. The Commission will note that a Protected Structure, unless otherwise stated, includes the interior of the structure, the land lying within the curtilage of the structure, any other structures lying within that curtilage and their interior and all fixtures and features which form part of the interior or exterior of that structure. As such, the fixtures and features located within this church form part of the Protected Structure.
- 7.2.3. I refer to the revised Architectural Design Statement (April 2025) submitted at Further Information stage. The revised Architectural Design Statement sets out a history of the building and it described various alterations that have taken place over time. Section 1. 3 of same sets out a detailed photographic survey of the interior. Section 2.1 sets out the list of alterations, noting the proposals were revised at Further Information. Section 2.2 sets out a justification for each element of the proposal, having regard to liturgical requirements. The remainder of the documents set out the proposals in more detail.
- 7.2.4. I note that Conservation Officer raised concerns in relation to the originally submitted application, as summarised in Section 3.2.2 of this report. This included a lack of an Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment, as well as lack of clarity in relation to the involvement of a Conservation Grade 3 Architect in the design process. Further concerns related to the lack of evidence of consultation with the Historic Churches Advisory Committee (HCAC). Specifically in relation to the works proposed, it was considered that the removal of the internal screens to the side aisles, the confessional boxes and works to the narthex will materially affect the flooring, which was subject to a significant restoration project in 2018. It was considered that details of same was required and was set out that consideration should be given to retaining the footprint of the existing screen doors to reduce impact on the flooring. Other concerns related to the to the infill the gallery at entrance level, and the status of the glass door that has been installed to the left on entry to the Church. Further Information was requested in relation to same.
- 7.2.5. The applicant submitted Further Information on 14<sup>th</sup> April 2025 and this included *inter alia* an Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment (April 2025) [AHIA], and revised drawings which sought to respond to the concerns above. In relation to the proposals for the Narthex, Dwg. 2377-PA-200 shows that the main entrance inner screens and doors are to be removed and replaced, with Dwg. 2377-PA-201 indicating that new

timber inner screens, wall timber linings, doors and floor tiles. The footprint of the existing inner screen doors is retained, whereas this was not the case with the originally submitted drawings. In relation to the flooring Dwg. 2377-PA indicates that a new timber floor to match the confessional permitter is to be installed. While no follow up Conservation Report was received, the report of the Planning Officer expressed satisfaction with the revised proposal. I would concur with same, noting that each of the concerns as set out in the Conservation Officer's report, has been addressed in the revised documentation, as submitted at Further Information Stage, noting the revised proposals for the Narthex, and the revised proposals for the flooring.

- 7.2.6. Of note is that, when assessing an application such as this one, the Commission is required to respect liturgical requirements (as per s.57(6) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 as amended) and the Guidelines clarify that this includes recognising that churches may wish to adapt places of public worship in the light of contemporary revisions of their worship and mission. In relation to same, and in response to the Further Information request from the Planning Authority (Item 2d of same), a cover letter from the church (dated 11<sup>th</sup> November 2024) is included with the Further Information submission and this sets out the specific liturgical requirement for each element of the works proposed, as does the revised Architectural Design Statement (April 2025). In relation to same, I am satisfied that each element of the proposed works has been justified, and I am satisfied that the works are in line with liturgical requirements.
- 7.2.7. Specifically in relation to the remaining points made in the appeal submission I note the following.
- 7.2.8. In relation to the relationship between the church and Harold School, specifically the walkway between the two, I am satisfied that the proposals will have no material impact on same, noting the alterations are internal to the church, and noting the location of the Harold School, which is approximately 135m to the south of this site.
- 7.2.9. In relation to the removal of the confessionals, the removal of same has been justified within the application documentation, specifically in the cover letter from the church (dated 11<sup>th</sup> November 2024). In summary, it is set out that in place of traditional confessionals, the use of reconciliation rooms is now preferred. In relation

to consent from the Arch Diocese, I note that a letter of support from same (dated 26<sup>th</sup> March 2025) was submitted with the Further Information submission, which expresses support for the proposed works.

- 7.2.10. In relation to the removal of the pews, again this is justified having regard to liturgical requirements, as set out in the cover letter from the church (dated 11<sup>th</sup> November 2024, and the removal of same will facilitate additional comfort, participation and allow for flexibility in seating arrangements.
- 7.2.11. In relation to the qualifications of the applicant's architects, I would accept that the principal architects (TOT Architects) have not set out their qualifications in relation to Conservation. Notwithstanding, I would note that the applicant has submitted an Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment, which has been prepared by O'Shaughnessy + Associates, Conservation Architects, with the report prepared by a Conservation Grade 3 Accredited Architect. As such, I am satisfied that there has been sufficient input from a Conservation Grade 3 Accredited Architect, as required by the Planning Authority in their Further Information request.
- 7.2.12. In relation to the Narthex, the size of same was reduced at FI stage, as described above.
- 7.2.13. In relation to consultation with the appropriate church body, the Guidelines refer to the need for appropriate consultation with the relevant church bodies, and for Catholic Churches, consultations on such applications which will be on a diocesan basis. Historic Churches Advisory Committees (or equivalent agencies) are to be established on a diocesan or inter-diocesan basis to advise the bishop on the heritage/historical factors in a place of worship for which a declaration is requested or a planning. In relation to same, there is a letter of support on from the Diocesan Commission for Sacred Art and Architecture and Historic Churches (dated 26<sup>th</sup> March 2025) which expresses the Commission's agreement with the proposed works. I am satisfied that sufficient consultation with the relevant church body has been undertaken, with the Diocesan Commission for Sacred Art and Architecture and Historic Churches being an equivalent agency to Historic Churches Advisory Committees, noting also that the letter is issued under the Archdiocese of Dublin.
- 7.2.14. In conclusion then, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not negatively impact the special character and appearance of the church, and the

special interest of the interior of the church has been respected, noting the relatively minor scale of the works proposed, and noting the liturgical requirements for the alterations as proposed. As such, I am satisfied that the proposed development is in with the policies and objectives of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Development Plan, as relates to Protected Structures (in particular HER 8: Works to Protected Structures), and is in line with the provisions of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Local Authorities (2011).

### **7.3. Procedural Issues**

- 7.3.1. The appellant has set out that he was not notified of the Planning Authority's request for Further Information nor was the appellant advised of the receipt of same, and therefore he was excluded from making a response to same. The appellant sets out that this was in contravention of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2000 (as amended). The appellant is of the view that, given the considerable volume of information submitted, and changes submitted, that the provisions of Significant additional information should have been applied by The Planning Authority, i.e. notifications to objectors, site and public planning notices. Relevant case law is referred to be the appellant in relation to same. The appellants submits that the planning decision made by the Planning Authority is therefore invalid.
- 7.3.2. In relation to same, I would note that the decision made by the planning authority, as to whether the information submitted by the applicant at Further Information Stage, constituted 'Significant' Further Information (with regard to art.35 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, as amended) is within the remit of the Planning Authority to make, and this decision cannot be revisited with the framework of this appeal. Notwithstanding, I would note the appellant has had the opportunity, within the framework of this appeal, to comment on the revised proposals, and I am satisfied that sufficient opportunity has been provided to raise any specific concerns in relation to the information submitted.

## **8.0 Recommendation**

Having regard to the above assessment, I recommend that permission be GRANTED, for the development, as proposed, in accordance with the said plans and

particulars based on the reasons and considerations under and subject to the conditions set out below

## 9.0 Reasons and Considerations

It is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not negatively impact the special character and appearance of the Protected Structure, and the special interest of the interior of the Protected Structure has been respected, noting the relatively minor scale of the works proposed, and noting the liturgical requirements for the alterations as proposed. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 10.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars submitted on the 14<sup>th</sup> April 2024, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions.

**Reason:** In the interest of clarity.

2. The material finishes of the proposed new chapel and conference centre shall be as per the submitted drawings, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development.

**Reason:** In the interest of visual amenity.

3. All works to the Protected Structure shall be as per the submitted Method Statement. Prior to commencement of development, the applicant shall engage an Architect accredited in Conservation. Should unforeseen issues arise on 'opening up' the structure or during works, that result in any change of scope, the Planning Authority shall be notified and works agreed prior to their commencement.

**Reason:** To protect the special interest of the Protected Structure.

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.

---

Ronan O'Connor  
Senior Planning Inspector

9<sup>th</sup> September 2025

### Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	ABP-322686-25
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Protected Structure. Renovations, alterations, and refurbishment works.
<b>Development Address</b>	St. Joseph's R.C. Church, Summerhill Road, Glasthule, Co. Dublin, A96 FW66
<b>In all cases check box /or leave blank</b>	
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>  (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes,  - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.  <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	State the Class here
<input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<b>3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2,	

<p>Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p><b>No Screening required.</b></p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p><b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b></p>	<p><b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b></p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p><b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b></p>	<p><b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b></p>

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

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