



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP-322844-25

Development	Construction of 100 no. bedroom hotel consisting of 6 stories and all associated site works.
Location	49-51, Pleasants Street, Pleasants House & 5 Pleasants Lane, Dublin 8.
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB1085/25.
Applicant(s)	Red Rock Pleasants Street Ltd.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission.
Type of Appeal	Two no. Third Partys vs Grant.
Appellants	Niamh Hayes; and James Wickham on behalf of West of Camden Residents Association.
Observer(s)	Ivana Bacik T.D., Enda Winters, Peter O' Reilly, Marianne Kelly, Gerard Byrne and Sarah Pierce.

Date of Site Inspection

22nd September 2025.

Inspector

C. Daly.

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site, of area 0.074ha., consists of two no. hipped roof two storey buildings with modest setback from the street and the adjoining building line with three boarded up retail units at ground floor level and a rear flat roof element. To the side of the building adjoining the front boundary is an open fenced area used for car parking. To the rear of these buildings is a three storey flat roof building called Pleasants House which is not currently in use and which spans the full width of the site and behind it is a small open paved area. The building to the rear consists of a two storey building (no. 5 Pleasants Lane) formerly used as a house. The site is adjoined on both sides by laneways.
- 1.2. The site is a short distance to the east of Camden Street which is designated as a conservation area and which is a commercial street including mainly bars, cafes, shops and restaurants. There are a number of rear yard areas which serve the Camden Street buildings to the east from the adjacent Pleasants Lane. The adjacent western laneway is O'Neill's Lane which is enclosed by a modern three storey , Olympic House, which consists of an office building to its front and with apartments to the rear. To the east of the site there is a short two storey terrace made up of residential and commercial uses fronting onto Pleasants Street. There is a single storey shed to the north-west. The Camden Hotel, a protected structure, is located to the north-east. The buildings in the vicinity on both sides of the street are mainly two to three storeys in height.
- 1.3. Pleasants Place laneway, located south of and opposite the site, is a residential street on its west side and mainly commercial on the east side. Residential streets are located to the west including at Pleasants Street and Synge Street and the low rise dwellings on these streets include a number of protected structures which are part of a residential conservation area. Camden is within 100m to the east.
- 1.4. The site, located in the south city area, within c.450m of St Stephen's Green, is located a short distance from the radial bus routes on Camden Street, including a Quality Bus Corridor (QBC) and is within c.270m of the Luas stop on Harcourt Street.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. The proposed development, in summary, consists of the following:

- Demolition of the existing buildings (973.4sqm) on the site.
- Construction of 100 no. bedroom hotel consisting of 6 stories over basement and all associated site works.
- Reception area with ancillary café/bar/restaurant (200sqm), pedestrian access from Pleasants Street.
- Plant and other ancillary facilities at basement level.

2.2. Following further information, the development was amended such that the floor to ceiling height at ground floor level was reduced by 0.3m, the plant area was relocated to the central roof area and the layout of the cycle parking area was amended with the two previous stores joined into one store and relocated.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Dublin City Council initially decided to request further information in relation to a reduction in the scale and massing of the building particularly to the rear and the relocation of the plant from the roof area, drainage issues including Basement Impact Assessment and green roof and revised proposals for cycle parking particularly in relation to access.

Following F.I., the P.A. decided to grant permission subject to 17 no. conditions.

Notable conditions include:

- Condition no. 4 requires the lodgement of a bond/cash deposit to secure the satisfactory completion of services and infrastructure.
- Condition no. 5 requires the opening hours of the ancillary café/bar to be between the hours of 07:30 and 23:00 daily.
- Condition no. 6 requires that the ancillary bar/restaurant shall not expand into other areas of the hotel and that no outdoor seating be provided.

- Condition no. 7 requires the development be managed in accordance with the submitted management plan.
- Condition no. 8 requires external materials to be agreed prior to commencement with such material required to be in keeping with the area.
- Condition no. 9 requires all external signage to be subject to a separate planning application and individual lettering to be used for signage.
- Condition no. 10 removes exemptions for advertising signage and other projecting elements.
- Condition no. 11 requires no development above roof parapet level other than that permitted.
- Condition no. 12 requires a standard archaeological condition to ensure prior testing.
- Condition no. 13 requires secure key / fob access to internal cycle parking, the reinstatement of the public cycle parking spaces on the footpath along Pleasants Street, all external doors to open inwards except where required for emergency egress, the implementation of the measures contained in the Mobility Management Plan and details for public areas to accord with the Council's Construction Standards for Roads and Street Works.
- Condition no. 14 relates to drainage including a requirement for all internal basement drainage to be lifted via pumping to a maximum depth of 1.5m below ground level and discharged to the public sewer.
- Condition no. 16 requires the submission of a Demolition Management Plan prior to commencement.
- Condition no. 17 requires the submission of a Construction Management Plan prior to commencement.
- Condition no. 18 requires compliance with the Codes of Practice from the Council's Drainage Division, Transportation Planning Division and Noise and Air Pollution Section.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The initial Planner's Report assessment noted the Z4 zoning to provide for and improve mixed service facilities and that the area is part of an urban village. It noted the live permission (reg. ref. 3457/22) for the demolition of existing buildings and construction of a mixed use office building and café/bar/restaurant. It referenced Section 14.6 of the Development Plan in relation to policy for transitional zones to avoid abrupt transitions in scale and land-use between zones. It noted that hotel use and use as a bar/restaurant/café are permitted in principle.

It noted the submitted Tourist Accommodation Demand, Concentration and Justification Report which contends that the proposal will not result in an overconcentration of tourist accommodation in the area. In the context of impacts on residential amenities, it refers to the submitted hotel management plan and its good neighbour policy and it noted that a condition can be attached to ensure the implementation of the plan. It also noted the live permission granted where a bar/café/restaurant was granted permission as part of the development. It noted that this would provide an active use at street level and an amenity for the area and the hotel guests. It noted no issues in relation to overlooking towards the apartments in Olympic House to the west, that angled windows would be employed and no issues in relation to daylight and sunlight impacts.

In relation to demolition, the report noted the justification report from the previous application and noted that the buildings have no special architectural status or protection or listing on the NIAH. It noted that the principle for the demolition has been established previously and that this is accepted subject to the provision of a high quality replacement building in keeping with and contributing to the conservation area.

The report noted the plot ratio to be significantly in excess of that provided for the city centre area with a lack of justification noted. In relation to the height and its visual impact, the report considered that the applicant should be asked to consider a reduction in same, particularly to the rear. The report noted the submitted Mobility Management Plan and Service Management Plan and that deliveries and access could be managed and that a condition requiring implementation can be attached.

The refuse collection arrangements were considered acceptable by the Transportation section. It recommended a revised design for cycle parking provision including to provide internal access. Further information was recommended to be requested per the issues noted above in Section 3.1.

Following F.I., the second Planner's Report, in relation to the concerns about the scale and massing, it noted the contention that the proposed changes would result in greater alignment with the scale and configuration of the permitted office scheme and that the scale was considered appropriate. It noted the reduction in building volume by up to 4.87% by reference to the previous developments. It noted a reduction in scale by reference to the permitted office scheme particularly along the western elevation. It considered there would be no undue additional impact on the visual amenities of the surrounding area and that a condition could be attached in relation to the external materials. The plot ratio was considered to be justified.

In relation to surface water drainage, it considered that the previous acceptance by Drainage Division allowed for any issues to be addressed by condition. In relation to cycle parking, with revisions noted such that the number of spaces is reduced to 8 double-stack spaces and one non-standard/cargo bike space and the two previous stores would be combined into one, the Transportation Planning section had no objection subject to conditions and this item was considered to be addressed. Overall, a grant of permission was recommended subject to 18 no. conditions.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Division: Initial report requested F.I. Following F.I. no report received.
- Transportation Planning Division: F.I. recommended in relation to cycle parking design. Following F.I. no objection subject to conditions.
- Archaeology: No objection subject to condition.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- Uisce Éireann: Standard condition recommended.
- National Transport Authority: No response.

- Transport Infrastructure Ireland: Noted the site within the Section 49 light rail levy area with request for condition for this.
- Fáilte Ireland: Noted a shortfall of 9,000 tourist rooms in Dublin and consider the proposal to be a valuable addition to the tourist offering helping to address accommodation shortages.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

17 no. third party observations were received, and these can be summarised as follows:

- Concerns in relation to impacts on local families and schools.
- Concerns that the site would be better used for housing.
- Concerns in relation to anti-social behaviour in the area and the impact of the proposed café/restaurant/bar on this.
- Concerns in relation to the loss of the buildings on the site which contribute to the streetscape.
- Concerns in relation to litter on the surrounding area.
- Concerns in relation to excessive density.
- Concerns in relation to previous hotel permission and restaurant spaces having evolved into large drinking establishments with adverse impacts on local residents in terms of noise, disturbance and anti-social behaviour.
- Concerns that the hotel is unsuitable for a residential neighbourhood.
- Concerns in relation to impact on the conservation area and the impact on Pleasants Street.
- Concerns that the proposal would fail to provide a suitable transition between areas.
- Concerns in relation to loss of the food business on the site.
- Concerns that visualisations seek to minimise the impact and in relation to the increase in height by comparison with the office development.
- Concerns in relation to number of hotels in the vicinity.

- Concerns that bedrooms at ground and basement levels could be incorporated into the bar area.
- Concerns in relation to carbon cost of demolition and lack of justification.
- Concerns in relation to height and scale and visual impact on the area.
- Concerns in relation to overshadowing and overlooking of the apartments in Olympic House.
- Concerns that lack of green spaces will not be addressed.
- Concerns that the proposal does not address previous reasons for refusal.
- Concerns in relation to short stay tourism and anti-social impacts.
- If permission is granted, condition required in relation to café/bar/restaurant opening times, capacity, no outdoor seating or music.
- Concerns in relation to scale impacts on the Cash and Carry to the north of the site.
- Concerns in relation to traffic congestion and traffic safety.
- Concerns in relation to lack of set down spaces and space for delivery and refuse trucks and obstruction of pedestrian movement.
- Concerns in relation to mobility management plan and lack of cycle spaces.
- Concerns in relation to parking which is currently over-subscribed.
- Concerns in relation to lack of consultation with local residents.
- Letter of support from a hotel operator.

4.0 Planning History

3560/24: Permission refused by the P.A. and granted on appeal (ABP ref. ABP-320119-24) for demolition of buildings and construction of a 6 storey, 85 bedroom tourist hostel.

4221/24: Permission refused by the P.A. and refused on appeal (ABP ref. ABP-321294-24) for amendments to the permitted office scheme (P.A. Ref. No. 3457/24 /

ABP-314353-24) comprising of an additional set-back storey together with all associated works. Permission was refused for the following reason:

The Board considered that the proposed revisions to the design of the permitted structure results in a design that does not transition in scale appropriately in this established area, the proposed increase in height results in a building the form of which appears oversized and monolithic at this location, the development therefore does not accord with the parameters set out in Dublin City Development Plan 2022- 2028, Appendix 3, table 3, Performance Criteria in Assessing Proposals for Enhanced Height, Density and Scale. The Board noted the permitted development on this site (Ref ABP 314353-22, PA Ref 3457/22), has a plot ratio greater than 3 (the indicative plot ratio for this area in the Development Plan is 2.5-3), the design of which was revised during the application process setting back the upper floor resulting in a structure that complemented the setting. The proposed increase in floor area the subject of this application by an additional set back floor, further increases the plot ratio, does not result in an appropriate transition in scale and consequently does not respect and complement the wider area. The proposed revision to the permitted development would, therefore, not be in accordance with requirement of the Dublin City Development Plan, Appendix 3.

Having regard to Policy BHA9 in the Dublin City Development Plan (2022-2028) which seeks 'to protect the special interest and character of all Dublin's Conservation Areas', it is considered that the proposed additional storey to the permitted development would result in the building appearing overly dominant when viewed from the surrounding area, in particular Pleasants Street and Synge Street which are in a residential conservation area with zoning objective 2 – 'to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas'. The proposed additional floor negates the benefit of the permitted setback of the upper floor resulting in a dominant structure that does not integration into the wider setting. The proposed amendments to the permitted development would, therefore, not accord with policy BHA9, Conservation Areas, in the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028.

3457/22: Permission granted by the P.A. and granted on appeal (ABP ref. ABP-314353-22) for the demolition of existing structures and construction of a five-storey mixed use (retail/café/restaurant and office) building and all associated site works.

2796/21: Permission refused by the P.A. for the demolition of the existing structures on site and construction of a part seven / six / five / four storey over basement building with commercial/restaurant/café use, commercial storage and residents amenity facilities at ground floor level and a “Build to Rent” residential development of 45 no. residential units at 1st to 6th floor levels. Permission was refused for the following reasons:

1. Having regard to the location of the proposed development in close proximity to a number of protected structures and the Camden Street Conservation area, it is considered that a seven storey building at this location, due to its design, height, bulk, scale and mass, would visually dominate and harm the streetscape and would represent a visually discordant feature that would be detrimental to the character of this area. The proposal does not respond to its overall built environment and does not make a positive contribution to the urban neighbourhood and streetscape and would therefore be seriously injurious to the visual amenities of the area. The proposed development would, therefore, contravene materially the provisions of the Development Plan and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. Having regard to the location of the seven storey building in proximity to boundaries on both the east and west, with windows and balconies on these boundaries, it is considered that this could cause unacceptable levels of overlooking to adjoining properties and would appear overbearing when viewed from these properties, which would seriously injure their visual and residential amenities which would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
3. Policy 16.10.17 of the Dublin City Council Development Plan 2016-2022 provides that 'the planning authority will actively seek the retention and re-use of buildings/ structures of historic, architectural, cultural, artistic and/or local interest or buildings which make a positive contribution to the character and

identity of streetscapes and the sustainable development of the city.' The modest but architecturally characterful buildings at No.'s 49-51 Pleasant's Street make a positive contribution to the character, appearance and quality of the local streetscape. The demolition of these locally significant historic buildings would therefore contravene Policy 11.1.1.2 and 16.10.17 of the Dublin City Council Development Plan 2016-2022 and the construction of a new 5-7 storey building in their place would seriously injure the amenities of the wider area.

Surrounding Sites

3883/23: Permission granted by the P.A. and granted on appeal (ABP ref. ABP-318805-24) at 12 Camden Row, for demolition of existing building and construction of a 7 storey over basement hotel with 163 bedrooms.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028 (as varied)

The site is zoned under the Z4 zoning objective (Key Urban Villages/Urban Villages) which is “*to provide for and improve mixed service facilities*”. Under this zoning, hotel, restaurant, public house and café/tearoom are permissible uses.

Chapter 3 – Climate Action

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. See Section 15.7.1 Re-use of Existing Buildings in Chapter 15 Development Standards.

CA 7 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, and to actively retrofit Dublin Council housing stock to a B2 Building Energy Rating (BER) in line with the government's Housing for All Plan retrofit targets for 2030.

Chapter 4 – Shape and Structure of the City

Section 4.5.3, Policy SC1 Consolidation of the Inner City

Consolidation of the Inner City

To consolidate and enhance the inner city, promote compact growth and maximise opportunities provided by existing and proposed public transport by linking the critical mass of existing and emerging communities such as Docklands, Heuston Quarter, Grangegorman, Stoneybatter, Smithfield, the Liberties, the North East Inner City and the south and north Georgian cores with each other, and to other regeneration areas.

Section 4.5.1, Policy SC3 Mixed Use Development

Mixed Use Development

To promote a mixed-use land use policy in the city centre, including the provision of high quality, sustainable residential development, and facilitating the conversion of both old office buildings and over shop spaces to residential.

Section 4.5.2, Policy SC9 Key Urban Villages, Urban Villages and Neighbourhood Centres

To develop and support the hierarchy of the suburban centres, including Key Urban Villages, Urban Villages and Neighbourhood Centres, in order to:

- support the sustainable consolidation of the city and align with the principles of the 15 minute city;*
- provide for the essential economic and community support for local neighbourhoods; and*
- promote and enhance the distinctive character and sense of place of these areas by ensuring an appropriate mix of retail and retail services.*

Policy SC11 Compact Growth

Compact Growth In alignment with the Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan, to promote compact growth and sustainable densities through the consolidation and intensification of infill and brownfield lands, particularly on public transport corridors, which will:

- *enhance the urban form and spatial structure of the city;*
- *be appropriate to their context and respect the established character of the area;*
- *include due consideration of the protection of surrounding communities and provide for enhanced amenities for existing and future residents;*
- *be supported by a full range of social and community infrastructure such as schools, shops and recreational areas;*
- *and have regard to the criteria set out in Chapter 15: Development Standards, including the criteria and standards for good neighbourhoods, quality urban design and excellence in architecture.*

Section 4.5.4, Policy SC16 Building Height Locations

To 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, Strategic Development Zones, Strategic Development Regeneration Areas, Key Urban Villages and other locations as identified in Appendix 3, provided that proposals ensure a balance with the reasonable protection of existing amenities and environmental sensitivities, protection of residential amenity and the established character of the area.

Policy 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.

Section 4.5.5 – Urban Design and Architecture

Policy SC20 Urban Design

Urban Design Promote the guidance principles set out in the Urban Design Manual – A Best Practice Guide and in the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (2019).

Policy 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 6 – City Economy and Enterprise

Section 6.5.6 – Key Economic Sectors

Policy CEE28 Visitor Accommodation

To consider applications for additional hotel, tourist hostel and aparthotel development having regard to:

- *the existing character of the area in which the development is proposed including local amenities and facilities;*
- *the existing and proposed mix of uses (including existing levels of visitor accommodation i.e. existing and permitted hotel, aparthotel, Bed and Breakfast, short-term letting and student accommodation uses) in the vicinity of any proposed development;*
- *the existing and proposed type of existing visitor accommodation i.e. Hotel Classification/Rating, Hostel Accommodation, Family Accommodation, Alternative Accommodation etc., in the vicinity of any proposed development;*
- *the impact of additional visitor accommodation on the wider objective to provide a rich and vibrant range of uses in the city centre including residential, social, cultural and economic functions;*
- *the need to prevent an unacceptable intensification of activity, particularly in predominantly residential areas;*
- *the opportunity presented to provide high quality, designed for purpose spaces that can generate activity at street level and accommodate evening and night-time activities – see also Chapter 12, Objective CUO38.*

Chapter 7 – The City Centre, Urban Villages and Retail

Section 7.5.3, Policy CCUV22 Intensification

To support and promote the redevelopment and intensification of underutilised sites within Key Urban Villages and urban villages including surface car parks.

Chapter 11 – Built Heritage and Archaeology

Section 11.5.1 The Record of Protected Structures

Policy BHA6 Buildings on Historic Maps

That there will be a presumption against the demolition or substantial loss of any building or other structure which appears on historic maps up to and including the Ordnance Survey of Dublin City, 1847. A conservation report shall be submitted with the application and there will be a presumption against the demolition or substantial loss of the building or structure, unless demonstrated in the submitted conservation report this it has little or no special interest or merit having regard to the provisions of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011).

Section 11.5.3 Built Heritage Assess of the City

Policy BHA9 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. Enhancement opportunities may include:

- 1. Replacement or improvement of any building, feature or element which detracts from the character of the area or its setting.*
- 2. Re-instatement of missing architectural detail or important features.*
- 3. Improvement of open spaces and the wider public realm and reinstatement of historic routes and characteristic plot patterns.*
- 4. Contemporary architecture of exceptional design quality, which is in harmony with the Conservation Area.*
- 5. The repair and retention of shop and pub fronts of architectural interest.*
- 6. Retention of buildings and features that contribute to the overall character and integrity of the Conservation Area.*

7. The return of buildings to residential use. Changes of use will be acceptable where in compliance with the zoning objectives and where they make a positive contribution to the character, function and appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting. The Council will consider the contribution of existing uses to the special interest of an area when assessing change of use applications, and will promote compatible uses which ensure future long-term viability.

Policy BHA11 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, shopfronts (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.

Chapter 14 – Land-use Zoning

Section 14.6 – Transitional Zones

...In dealing with development proposals in these contiguous transitional zone areas, it is necessary to avoid developments that would be detrimental to the amenities of the more environmentally sensitive zones...

Section 14.7.4 – Key Urban Villages and Urban Villages – Zone Z4

Proposals for development within these areas should be in accordance with these principles in addition to complying with the land-use zoning:

- *Mixed-Use: Promote an increased density of mixed-use development including residential development with diversity in unit types and tenures capable of establishing long-term integrated communities.*
- *Density: Ensure the establishment of higher density development capable of sustaining quality public transport systems and supporting local services and activities. Encourage the development/redevelopment of under-utilised sites*

and intensification of underutilised areas such as surface parking. Opportunity should be taken to use the levels above ground level for additional commercial/retail/services or residential use.

- *Transport: Ensure provision is made for quality public transport systems. Provide improved access to these systems and incorporate travel plans, which prioritise the primacy of pedestrian and cyclist movement and address the issue of parking facilities and parking overflow. Ensure that enhanced connectivity and permeability is promoted.*
- *Commercial/Retail: Promote the creation of a vibrant retail and commercial core with animated streetscapes. A diversity of uses should be promoted to maintain vitality throughout the day and evening.*
- *Community and Social Services: Encourage these centres to become the focal point for the integrated delivery of community and social services.*
- *Employment: Encourage the provision of employment uses incorporating office, work hub, live-work units, professional and financial services, and the creation of small start-up units.*
- *Built Environment: Ensure the creation of high-quality, mixed-use urban districts with a high quality public realm, distinctive spatial identity and coherent urban structure of interconnected streets and child-friendly, accessible public spaces and urban parks. Development should have regard to the existing urban form, scale and character and be consistent with the built heritage of the area.*

Chapter 15 – Development Standards

Section 15.7.1 Re-use of Existing Buildings

Where development proposal comprises of existing buildings on the site, applicants are encouraged to reuse and repurpose the buildings for integration within the scheme, where possible in accordance with Policy CA6 and CA7. Where demolition is proposed, the applicant must submit a demolition justification report to set out the rationale for the demolition having regard to the ‘embodied carbon’ of existing structures and demonstrate that all options other than demolition, such as refurbishment, extension or retrofitting are not possible; as well as the additional use

of resources and energy arising from new construction relative to the reuse of existing structures.

Existing building materials should be incorporated and utilised in the new design proposals where feasible and a clear strategy for the reuse and disposal of the materials should be included where demolition is proposed.

Section 15.14.1 Hotels and Aparthotels

To ensure a balance is achieved between the requirement to provide for adequate levels of visitor accommodation and other uses in the city such as residential, social, cultural and economic uses, there will be a general presumption against an overconcentration of hotels and aparthotels.

Pending the outcome of an analysis of the supply and demand for tourism related accommodation in the Dublin City area (to be carried out by Dublin City Council), hotels and aparthotels will be considered on a case by case basis having regard to the location of the site and existing hotel provision in the area.

In all instances, where the planning authority deems there to be an overconcentration of such facilities in an area, the applicant will be requested to submit a report indicating all existing and proposed hotel and aparthotel developments within a 1km catchment providing a justification that the development will not undermine the principles of achieving a balanced pattern of development in the area, and demonstrating that the proposed development fully complies with the criteria set out in Policy CEE28 and in Section 15.14.1.1 and 15.14.1.2 below.

Section 15.14.1.1 Hotel Development

Hotel developments are encouraged to provide for publically accessible facilities such as café, restaurant and bar uses to generate activity at street level throughout the day and night. Hotels are also encouraged to provide a mix of publically accessible uses vertically throughout the building such as roof terrace restaurant and bars to further generate activity.

Applications for roof top uses will be assessed having regard to the impact on neighbouring properties in terms of noise levels and overlooking.

Hotel development should also be accompanied by operational management plans that demonstrate how the hotel will be serviced and traffic / drop off managed. All

loading, waste collection and servicing must be provided off road in a designated loading area where feasible. Pick up and drop off services can be accommodated on street subject to adequate space being provided.

Hotel room size and layout should be designed and to ensure a high level of amenity is obtained to accommodate both short and long stay durations. Adequate provision should also be provided for the storage of laundry facilities and materials. Appendix 3 – Density and Height, Site Development Standards

Table 2 sets out plot ratio and site coverage standards. For the city centre area the indicative plot ratio is 2.5 to 3.0.

Appendix 5: Transport and Mobility: Technical Requirements

- Section 2.5 Car Parking and Cycle Management
- Table 1 – Cycle Parking Standards

For a hotel, the provision is 1 space per 5 staff for long stay and short stay this is to be determined by the P.A. on a case by case basis.

5.2. National Policy

Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities, Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, (2024).

Climate Action Plan 2025 and Climate Action Plan 2024, Government of Ireland.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

In relation to designated sites, the subject site is located:

- c.0.6km north of the Grand Canal Proposed Natural Heritage Area (PNHA) (site code 002104).
- c.2.1km south-west of the Royal Canal PNHA (site code 002103).
- c.3.5km west of North Dublin Bay PNHA (site code 000206).
- c.3.5km west of South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA) (site code 004024).
- c.3.5km west of South Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (site code 000210).
- c.5.9km south-east of Liffey Valley PNHA (site code 000128).

- c.6.2km south-west of North Bull Island SPA (site code 000406).
- c.6.2km south-west of North Dublin Bay SAC (site code 000206).
- c.7.8km south-west of North-West Irish Sea SPA (site code 004236).

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of the two no. third party appeals by Niamh Hayes and James Wickham on behalf of West of Camden Residents Association can be summarised as follows:

Proposed Restaurant / Café / Bar

- The size of the café/bar is not necessary and the conditions around the opening and use of it should be further restricted.
- Further conditions should be added if permission is granted, for example the conditions applied at Camden Row including in relation to construction management, sound levels, fumes and odours, building work hours, construction noise and to keep street clear of building debris.
- The hotel has no support locally and if granted the developer should be required to set up regular community meetings.
- The hotel is designed for short stays with minimal facilities and will contribute to the transformation of Camden Street from an urban village high street to a night-time drinking venue.
- The night-time use of Camden Street undermines daytime uses as well as leading to anti-social behaviour in the surrounding streets.
- The concerns of the third party submissions should be noted including in the context of a crisis in childcare provision.
- Permissions for café/restaurants in the Camden Street area have become large-scale drinking emporiums and this precedent results in expanded drinking provision creating anti-social behaviour which could result on the site.
- The café/bar/restaurant should be restricted completely to a café with daytime opening hours only.

Visual Impact on Pleasants Street Conservation Area

- The site faces a designated Z1 – Sustainable Residential Neighbourhood area and is adjacent to the Z2 Residential Conservation Area.
- The visualisations do not address the impact on Pleasants Place where there are 9 houses and at least 4 apartments.
- The development is architecturally incompatible with the neighbourhood of small scale attractive 19th century design and front gardens.
- The proposal is for a significant increase in height over the office block permitted and it will change the character of the streetscape with this area becoming an extension of the Camden Street commercial area rather than a transition area and it would be monolithic and dominating.
- The proposal with visibility from Synge Street and (west) Pleasants Street directly undermines the architectural integrity of the conservation area.
- The refusal grounds by the Board in relation to visual dominance from the conservation area under the additional storey under reg. ref. 4221/24 apply to this case.

Oversupply of tourist accommodation

- The report submitted in relation to the number of hotels in the area fails to take account of the planned hotel for Camden Row and the claimed under-supply of hotels does not constitute an automatic justification for hotels in the area.
- The facilitating of hotels is squeezing out local business such as a local café.
- The expansion of tourism is undermining more locally rooted enterprises and this undermines the quality of life for residents.
- Facilitating a hotel misallocates capital, skill and labour resources and tackling the housing and infrastructure crisis becomes more difficult and expensive.

Tourist Accommodation and Housing Need

- There is a need for new housing on Pleasants Street and not a new hotel which offers no community gain.

- The proposal would remove several residential units and prevent the use for housing at a time of a housing crisis and the use of the site for a hotel increases the site value reducing the potential supply of affordable housing.

Deliveries

- There is regular blocking of the street by deliveries and refuse trucks with a need for further loading bays, further commercial bin truck activity will exacerbate matters and the traffic generated would not be negligible.

Climate

- The demolition and construction ensures the continued contribution of the construction sector to Ireland's national carbon emissions. The carbon budget should be spent on housing and infrastructure instead.
- The proposal does not contribute towards increasing the city's resilience to climate change with every single square metre of the site paved over amid a shortage of green spaces.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

The P.A. requested that its decision be upheld and that if permission is granted that conditions requiring the payment of a Section 48 development contribution, Section 49 Luas cross city development contribution and a condition requiring the payment of a bond be required.

6.3. Applicant Response

The response on behalf of the applicant can be summarised as follows:

Visual Impact on Pleasants Street Conservation Area

- The site is not located within a conservation area and is situated comfortably within the Z4 zoning lands and is not transitional in that sense.
- The height is aligned with the existing and permitted precedent heights in the area and there is a setback at fifth floor level along the south and east elevations.
- The development will be sufficiently screened from the conservation area of Camden Street and the careful modulation of the southern elevation ensures

the proposal successfully integrates with the established height and receiving environment.

- The setback from the building line ensures no significant impact on the setting and character of the conservation areas and their streetscapes.
- The height and visual impact was further reduced at F.I. stage via the redesign of the roof plant area and reduced floor to ceiling heights of all levels.
- There would be no abrupt transition in land-use noting surrounding uses in the area and the site is not located at the edge of a land use zone.
- The proposal remains sensitive to the area designation through its mixed uses and modest height, scale and massing.
- The high quality brick finishes echo the rusticated bases typical throughout the city and the alternating levels create significant visual interest and avoid monolithic design.
- The design provides for variety, animation and visual interest through the white brick and powder coated aluminium panelling.
- The height of the building is similar to the permitted office development at c. 19.1m although c.0.3m taller as reduced floor to ceiling heights have been employed.
- The increase in height is de minimis and not significant noting the overall high quality design.
- The proposed scale and massing seeks to mirror that of the permitted office development and will not undermine the architectural integrity of the adjacent conservation areas.

Oversupply of tourist accommodation

- The submitted Tourist Accommodation Demand, Concentration and Justification Report found only 16 hotels within a 500m radius that are both Fáilte Ireland approved and open to the public and there is a significant under-provision of high-quality, purpose-built hotel accommodation in the immediate

area and this would represent a c.1.8% increase of hotel bedrooms in the area such that there is no over-concentration in the area.

- The argument that the size or number of bedrooms is linked to the target audience is unreasonable and unsubstantiated and there are many small-scale hotels offering high quality services.
- In relation to the recently permitted Camden Row hotel, the Inspector noted it would not result in an overconcentration of such facilities in the area.
- The application cannot be deemed invalid as a result of the Camden Row permission.
- The justification report noted 5 hotels proposed/permitted within a 500m radius and a further 15 proposals within 1km.
- It is not reasonable to assume that all of the permitted/proposed hotels will be constructed due to economic and other factors.
- In the Foley Street case (reg. ref. 5022/23) the rationale of the justification report in relation to a modest increase of accommodation was accepted.
- There are no hotels to the south and west for c.45% of the catchment area which adds to the requirement to address the accommodation deficit.
- The report demonstrates that there would be no negative impact on the surrounding area from a planning, social and/or visual perspective or otherwise.

Tourist Accommodation vs Housing Need

- The principle of residential development on the site and the Camden Row site has previously been refused by the P.A. and rejected by third parties including one of the appellants and cannot be a more sustainable approach.
- The proposal would be more advantageous to the city area through increased tourism, a new café/bar/restaurant for daytime public use and spin-off economic benefits for local businesses.
- The principle of demolition has been previously accepted by the Commission and the Demolition Justification sets out why the buildings are not suited to building over, under or extension.

- In relation to climate resilience, the hotel will include green sedum and blue roofs for sustainability purposes to reduce peak storm runoff and promote increased biodiversity within the site.
- The proposal will be energy efficient.

Proposed Restaurant / Café / Bar

- The proposal will not contribute to late night entertainment or create a significant negative increase in noise, disturbance of anti-social activity.
- The submitted Operational Management Plan includes a section on the prevention of anti-social behaviour.
- The P.A. attached conditions on the hours of the café/bar/restaurant, that it shall not expand its floor area, no outdoor seating and that it be managed in accordance with the submitted management plan, and these are acceptable to the applicant.
- It is reasonable for a hotel to offer food and beverages that will contribute a new public amenity to the community.
- The Commission should reject the request to sterilise the applicant's ability to further develop or seek to develop the site as they wish and this would be unlawful.

Waste / Deliveries

- The Servicing Operational and Waste Management Plan shows there will be no increased negative impact on traffic congestion. The refuse storage area to the rear will avoid the need to utilise the public street for most of the time.
- The adjacent lanes, streets and loading bay at Pleasants Street are sufficient to cater for set down and pick-up by car and the Traffic/Transport Assessment (TTA) found a negligible change in vehicular traffic generated.

Impact on Pleasants Place

- The response refers to View No. 5 of the CGI booklet and the Visual Impact Comparison Assessment noted the visual change would be low and with slight and neutral effect for this view.

Proposed Conditions

- The development is already conditioned in relation to hours of construction and noise generation. The applicant would welcome within reason further conditions in relation to noise and odour pollution.

Public and Community Support

- While the development has been subject to appropriate community consultation, noting the third party observations, the Operational Management Plan includes a section on community liaison with a proactive approach to be taken and condition no. 7 provides for management in line with this plan.

6.4. Planning Authority Response

No response received.

6.5. Observations

6 no. third party observations were received from Ivana Bacik T.D., Enda Winters, Peter O' Reilly, Gerard Byrne and Sarah Pierce; and Niamh Moran on behalf of Grantham Street Residents Association and these can be summarised as follows:

- Concerns in relation to proposed hotel rather than housing at the site given the housing crisis and an increase in supply is vital.
- The area has an over-provision of tourist accommodation and under-provision of long-term housing.
- Development in the area should provide community gain through housing, green spaces or community sports facilities.
- There is an over-concentration of licensed premises in the area and if this continues it will be more difficult to keep people living in the city.
- Protections are required to ensure that the hotel does not become another pub/bar.
- Strict scrutiny in relation to ventilation systems, service management plans and bin storage is required if permission is granted.
- Concerns in relation to loss of direct sunlight, particularly morning light, which would be substantially reduced to apartments to the west at Olympic House.

- There is a lack of daylight and sunlight assessment and the previous assessment found adverse effects on surrounding residences.
- Modifications should be considered that mitigate the loss of natural light to existing residences.
- Without any reference to guest capacity there is a significant risk of multi-bed or dorm-style occupancy such that there is no condition that prevents the use as a hostel.
- The permissions at 1-5 Camden St Upper and 16 Camden St Lower show that bar/restaurant permissions can be transformed into sizeable bars and an occupancy condition is required for the café/bar/restaurant.
- A seating-only condition is required to limit late-night intensification.
- A noise condition is required similar to reg. ref. 3599/24.
- At a minimum, a condition is required to ensure the bar operates strictly as a residents facility for hotel guests only.
- There is no community or public support for the proposal.
- Many de facto pubs in the area are only licensed as cafes / restaurants but attract all the anti-social behaviour associated with pubs in and around Camden Street.
- The café/pub will encourage drinkers to enter Pleasants Street and increase anti-social behaviour and fail to retain the character of the area
- Enforcement has always been inadequate to deal with anti-social behaviour.
- The Code of Behaviour is inadequate to deal with anti-social behaviour and unenforceable.
- Questions the applicant's commitments to environmental goals in relation to cycle parking provision.
- The parking provision in the area is totally inadequate and the cycle parking will not address that the development will generate significant car traffic and parking requirements.

- There is no precedent for the height proposed on the street and it will tower over the adjacent Olympic House and the street.
- The multiple applications are an attempt to get approval for the least harmful proposal and overwhelm residents and the authorities.
- Residential development would support the local economy and community fabric.
- The proposal is incompatible with the architectural character of the surrounding residential conservation areas and this has been acknowledged in previous refusals particularly in relation to Policy BHA 9.
- Maps submitted to show a significant concentration of hotels in the area including to the south and the approval of the Camden Row hotel shows the case for another hotel is substantially weakened.
- The type of hotel is aimed at the short-stay market and the nightlife economy.
- The proposal fails to consider cumulative impacts and is incompatible with the goals of sustainable urban living.
- Due to anti-social behaviour and expansion concerns, a condition should be included to prohibit an alcohol license, reject any layout changes, prohibit alcohol sales, ensure robust enforcement mechanisms and provide for an explicit and enforceable management plan.
- The proposal makes tackling the infrastructure deficit more difficult due to the shortage of construction workers.
- This will ensure the construction sectors continued high emission contribution.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Land Use and Amenity.

- Design and Heritage.
- Servicing and Management.
- Transportation.
- Drainage.
- Other Matters.

7.2. Land Use and Amenity

Land Use

- 7.2.1. The site is zoned under the Z4 zoning objective (Key Urban Villages/Urban Villages) which is “*to provide for and improve mixed service facilities*”. Under this zoning, hotel, restaurant, public house and café/tearoom are permissible uses. Noting this and the live permission on the site for a tourist hostel development, I am satisfied that the proposed uses on the site accord with the Z4 zoning objective.
- 7.2.2. I note the appellants have raised various concerns in relation to the housing crisis and that the site should be used for housing instead of a hotel, particularly at a time of acute housing shortage. However, in my opinion it is not the role of the Commission to disapply the zoning provisions made for the site because of a housing crisis or otherwise. I also note the statutory duty of the P.A. to zone sufficient land for housing based on its housing strategy and the current instructions from the Department to review whether such zonings are sufficient as part of the plan making process. In this context and in the statutory and planning policy context, I note that the Commission’s role is to operate by current planning policy as represented by the CDP and other policies where relevant. In the context of the Z4 zoning objective for the site, I do not consider there to be a rationale to disapply the zoning objective and related policies for the site whereby the proposed uses are permitted in principle for the site.
- 7.2.3. Section 14.6 of the CDP in relation to policy for transitional zones seeks to avoid abrupt transitions in scale and land-use between zones and to avoid developments that would be detrimental to the amenities of the more environmentally sensitive zones. In relation to the appropriateness of the hotel and other land uses proposed, I note the position of the site within the Z4 zoning between Camden Street to the east and the residential Z2 zoning to the west. In this context, I note that the site is

positioned circa midway between Camden Street and the residential zoning to the west such that there is a significant area of Z4 lands between the site and the Z2 residential lands. In this context, given that the site is not close to the edge of the Z4 zoning area, I consider that there is scope for a degree of flexibility in relation to the transition in scale between the land Z4 and Z2 land uses and I will assess design impacts and impacts on local amenities separately below in this report.

- 7.2.4. Concerns have been raised in relation to an over-concentration of hotel accommodation in the area. CDP Policy CEE28 is relevant in this regard. When considering hotel applications, this requires regard to be had to the character of the area, the existing levels of visitor accommodation in the vicinity, the existing and proposed type of visitor accommodation, the impact on the objective to provide a rich and vibrant range of uses in the city centre, the need to avoid an unacceptable intensification of activity in predominantly residential areas and the opportunity to provide for high quality spaces that generate street activity.
- 7.2.5. Section 15.14.1 of the CDP states that there is a general presumption against an overconcentration of hotels and aparthotels and requires the submission of a report details all existing and proposed hotels and aparthotels within 1km to justify hotel developments. I note that the P.A. have not prepared an analysis of tourist accommodation supply. I note that the CDP does not refer to any quantitative method by which an overconcentration of tourist accommodation is to be established. In this case, the P.A. do not consider there to be such an overconcentration and this appears to be based on the applicant's submitted analysis of same.
- 7.2.6. I note the observation from Fáilte Ireland which refers to a shortfall of tourist rooms in Dublin and which welcomes the proposal as it would help to address the shortage. I note the submitted Tourist Accommodation Demand, Concentration and Justification Report prepared by John Spain Associates. The report emphasises the accessibility to public transport and found there to be 16 hotels and two hostels within a 500m radius of the site with no guesthouses or aparthotels noted within this area. It noted a further 33 hotels, 5 guesthouses, 5 aparthotels and 5 hostels within a 500m to 1km radius. It considered that 16 hotels that are both Fáilte Ireland approved and open to the public representative of an under-provision of high quality tourist accommodation in the immediate area.

- 7.2.7. The appellants have contested this stating that there is a significant concentration of hotels in the area including to the south and also noting the Camden Row hotel permission (Reg. Ref. 3883/23 (7 storey over basement hotel with 163 bedrooms)). I also note the Camden Hotel adjacent to the site. However, the CDP refers to a 1km radius of the site and not just the immediate environs. I also note that both of these hotels would not be located on Pleasants Street and their operations would have limited impact on the street and surrounding area in this context.
- 7.2.8. I note the applicant's argument that it cannot be assumed that all of the permitted hotel developments in the area will be built given economic and other factors and I consider this reasonable. However, making some allowance for the Camden Row permission, I nevertheless consider while the increase in hotel bedrooms in the area would likely be somewhat in excess of the c.1.8% increase referred to by the applicant and that such increase would not be significantly large as to result in an over-concentration of hotels in the area. I note the Fáilte Ireland submission regarding what it considers to be a shortfall of tourist rooms in the city, that the P.A. were satisfied that the CDP criteria were met, the extant permission on the site for tourist accommodation and the site zoning "*to provide for and improve mixed service facilities*" where hotel use is permitted in principle. Noting the character of the area and the opportunity to provide activity at street level as well as the existing visitor accommodation in the area, I consider that the proposal would result in a modest increase in accommodation, and I am satisfied that this would accord with Policy CEE28 and Section 15.14.1 of the CDP and would result in a balanced pattern of development in the area.

Local Amenity

- 7.2.9. Concerns have been raised by appellants and third parties in relation to impacts associated with the café/bar/restaurant part of the proposed development particularly in relation to potential anti-social behaviour from an establishment serving drinks, in the context of the night-time function of Camden Street, and in relation to the potential for this part of the development to become a large drinking establishment. In this regard, the appellants' have referred to a number of hotel and drinking establishments effectively permitted in the area including at 1 to 5 Camden Street Upper (Keavan's Port) and 16 Camden Street Lower. The appellants suggest that the type of rooms and hotel with lack of facilities is effectively designed to attract

groups staying for the nightlife and who would exacerbate anti-social behaviour in the area. I note that despite the concerns of the third parties, the proposed hotel would provide a bar/restaurant/café area and kitchen facilities typical for this scale of development.

7.2.10. I note the submitted Hotel Management Plan, as required under 15.14.1.1 of the development plan, prepared by OpLiv, the hotel manager, which details the planned staffing and operational processes for the hotel and guest facilities. The stated plan is for a safe, clean, well-run hotel to provide a comfortable environment for guests and to respect the rights of neighbouring residents and businesses to a quiet environment and to work in a way that ensures this. It states that it will comply with Fáilte Ireland's hotel standards. It provides for guests to sign a code of behaviour to respect neighbouring residents which is part of the booking terms and conditions. It plans to actively manage any observed anti-social behaviour observed by staff. There is provision for local residents and business to input into a good neighbour policy. The plan is that the hotel will be staffed 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

7.2.11. The Planner's Report noted that ancillary bar and restaurant type use is encouraged at ground floor level as it generates street activity and provides a community amenity. It considered that a balance should be struck between public access and preserving residential amenity. It recommended conditions restricting opening hours (up to 11pm) of the bar/restaurant to the public, restricting the expansion of this space within the building and a restriction on outdoor seating. I also note that the operation of licenced premises are subject to regulation under other codes including according to licensing laws.

7.2.12. I note concerns in relation to potential intensification that could result in hostel use. I also note the extant hostel permission for 85 bedrooms which, as amended, provided for a total of 267 bedspaces and which provided for a café/bar/restaurant area. However, in my view a standard condition requiring adherence to the plans and particulars submitted would address any potential intensification of bedspaces without the need for a separate condition.

7.2.13. I note the operational plan submitted includes provision for managing anti-social behaviour. I agree with the Inspector under ABP-320119-24 for the permitted hostel development where he noted that the area has a closer contextual relationship to the

Camden Street and eastern area than with the residential area to the west. I note that the location of the proposed hotel and café/bar/restaurant would be to the west of the Camden Street nightlife area such that any hotel occupants engaging in the nightlife would likely walk directly between the hotel and Camden Street to the east with minimal potential for transiting through the residential streets to the south and west of the hotel.

- 7.2.14. Noting this, that such hotel café/bars tend to cater for hotel residents in the main, the extant permission which includes provision for a similar ground floor café/bar/restaurant area and the conditions that the P.A. attached to its grant of permission, I do not see a rationale for further conditions given that in my opinion these conditions would be reasonable to address any potential anti-social behaviour or bar expansion on the site. I note that the P.A. conditions have not been appealed or objected to by the applicant

7.3. Design and Heritage

- 7.3.1. In relation to the proposed demolition of the existing structures on the site, I note that this has previously been accepted by the Commission for the hostel development. I note the submitted Conservation Comment report prepared by a Conservation Architect for the applicant. This report concludes that none of the extant buildings would merit inclusion on the record of protected structures and that the buildings cannot be said to be of any particular architectural, historic, cultural or social value that would warrant their retention and, having visited the site, I agree with this viewpoint which was accepted by the Board in the previous appeal.
- 7.3.2. I note the submitted Engineering Infrastructure Report prepared by MMOS Engineers. Section 3.0 relates to its demolition justification. This notes that the re-use of the buildings on the site would not be possible due to the basement excavation and given that the expected loads could not support the proposed building. It considered the existing buildings to be small in scale and would not be suitable for building over. It also noted that modern construction would be preferable to demolition and would constitute a welcome replacement for the dated buildings on the site. In relation to design and heritage, having regard to the justification provided and the planning history on the site, I accept this rationale for demolition of existing structures.

Climate Policy

- 7.3.3. In relation to the justification for the proposed demolition as it relates to the requirements of Section 15.7.1 of the CDP, this requires that applicants “*must submit a demolition justification report to set out the rational for the demolition having regard to the ‘embodied carbon’ of existing structures and demonstrate that all options other than demolition, such as refurbishment, extension or retrofitting are not possible; as well as the additional use of resources and energy arising from new construction relative to the reuse of existing structures*”. I do not consider that the demolition justification under Section 3.0 of the Engineering Infrastructure Report fully meets the requirements of this policy given its failure to outline details in relation to the embodied carbon of the existing structures and to detail the additional resources and energy required for the construction of the development.
- 7.3.4. Noting this, I note that the requirements of this section of the CDP are mandatory such that, in this context, I consider that a material contravention of this section of the CDP would arise. Per Section 37(2)(a) of the 2000 Act, I note that the Commission may decide to grant permission even where a proposed development materially contravenes the development plan. In this context, I consider that there is a sufficient planning rationale to do so in this case.
- 7.3.5. I note this in the context the submitted Energy and Sustainability Report prepared by EDC Progressive Engineering and the building regulations (Part L) which require a standard of construction to achieve a near zero energy rating. I note that the existing buildings and their configuration on the site can reasonably be considered to be an underutilisation of the site by comparison with the proposed floor plate and CDP policy which generally encourages intensification of such brownfield type sites in close proximity to public transport and within the city.
- 7.3.6. Given also the unsuitability and impracticality of converting the existing buildings while intensifying the use of the site and the planning history of the site where demolition and intensification has been recently permitted, I consider that there is no reasonable practical alternative to the proposed demolition of the existing buildings in order to achieve a significant intensification of development on the site and

efficient land use. In my opinion this is justified while noting CDP policies CA6 (Retrofitting and Reuse), CA7 (Energy Efficiency in Existing Buildings) and Section 15.7.1 (Re-use of Existing Buildings).

- 7.3.7. In my opinion such intensification of development, while requiring demolition of existing buildings with embodied carbon, represents sustainable compact development in an accessible city centre area, efficient use of such land and with SUDS measures for climate resilience. I consider this to be consistent with the climate policies of the CDP, in relation to the climate sectoral limits for the construction sector and to be consistent with the Climate Action Plan 2024 and Climate Action Plan 2025 notwithstanding that it could result in a temporary failure to contribute towards a reduction in the emissions of the construction sector in Ireland.
- 7.3.8. Accordingly I have performed this assessment in a manner consistent with Section 15(1) of the Climate Action and Low Carbon 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 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.

Local Amenity

- 7.3.9. The appellants have raised concerns in relation to the height and scale of the development and its negative visual impact on the amenities of the area particularly on the residential conservation area to the west, its impact on Pleasants Street and on residences and streets in the vicinity. I note that, at F.I. stage, the height of the development was reduced through reduced floor to ceiling height and a redesign of the plant area at roof level such that the plant is relocated to the central area of the roof. The effect of this is that the proposed height at c.19.1m would be c.0.3m taller than the permitted height on the site.
- 7.3.10. The F.I. response stated that the design changes would ensure the scale and massing aligns with the permitted office development under reg. ref. 3457/22. I note the P.A., following F.I., considered that the amended design would reduce the visual impact of the proposal. Noting the permitted office development and transitional

location, it considered that it would not unduly impact on the visual amenities of the area and recommended the attachment of a condition in relation to proposed materials.

- 7.3.11. I note the design provides for a setback from Pleasants Street consistent with the existing varying building line at this point on Pleasants Street. I also note that above ground floor level there would be some setback from the western laneway and from Olympic House. I note the Revised Verified Views Booklet prepared by 3D Design Bureau submitted at F.I. stage and the Technical Note on the Visual Effects prepared by AECOM which notes that *“The height of the building reduces noticeably in the comparison viewpoints / photomontages located at Synge Street (VP 7), Pleasants Street (VP 9) Heytesbury Street (VP 9) and Arnott Street (VP12) which are included in the accompanying photomontage booklet. The change in building height is particularly noticeable in the rear area in views from St. Kevin’s Park (VP 11) to the north of the Proposed Development. It becomes evident that scale of the Proposed Development becomes similar to the Permitted Development. This is illustrated in wirelines images showing the outline of the Permitted Development, the Previously Proposed Development and the building line of the Proposed Development”*.
- 7.3.12. Having reviewed the submitted drawings and associated reports, including the above referenced reports and verified views submitted at F.I. stage, which I consider accurately reflect the proposed development, I agree with the above quoted assessment. I consider that the visual impact of the proposed development would be similar to that of the permitted office development under reg. ref. 3457/22 and from VM7 it would appear marginally less bulky. The applicant has drawn attention to the following quote from the Inspector’s Report (ABP-314353-22) for the office permission, *“The proposed building will provide for a modern insertion in this streetscape, which is of a scale and design appropriate to the site/neighbouring properties and will not significantly detract from the visual amenity of this area or the Pleasants Street streetscape”*.
- 7.3.13. Noting the proposed height and scale, and the design to vertically break up the elements of the facades, particularly that facing Pleasants Street, I consider that the proposed hotel building represents an appropriate design that would sufficiently integrate with the site, the street and the surroundings, including the residential

conservation areas to the west, such that would be in keeping with the character of the area while also appropriately enclosing the street and adding some visual interest to the street. Given its significant remove from protected structures and the residential conservation areas in the vicinity, I do not consider that there would be any heritage impacts of significance. Should permission be granted, similar to the P.A., I recommend a condition to restrict signage on the building to avoid visual clutter.

7.3.14. In relation to plot ratio, Appendix 3 Table 2 of the CDP sets out an indicative plot ratio of 2.5 to 3.0 for the area and, following F.I., the revised plot ratio is stated to be 4.55. Given the significant exceedance of the indicative plot ratio, Appendix 3, Table 2 of the CDP notes that higher plot ratio and site coverage may be permitted in certain identified circumstances. In this regard, noting

- the location within close walking distance (c.55m) of the QBC radial corridor at Camden Street,
- that it would facilitate the redevelopment of a site I consider would benefit from urban renewal,
- that the plot ratio would be similar to that permitted at Camden Row under reg. ref. 3883/20 and similar to that previously permitted for the hostel and office developments on this site, and
- that it would have a volume similar to those previous permissions, I am satisfied that it meets the criteria for increased plot ratio.

For these reasons, I am satisfied that the proposed development would represent a form of compact urban development consistent with Policies SC11 and SC16 of the CDP.

7.3.15. The below table is my assessment of the requirements of Table 3, Appendix 3 of the CDP.

Table 1: Assessment of Table 3 Criteria from Appendix 3 of the CDP

	Objective	Performance Criteria Assessment for Enhanced Height, Density and Scale
1	<i>To promote development with a sense of place and character</i>	As noted elsewhere in this assessment I consider that the proposed design as it relates to the street and surrounding context would sufficiently respect and not be out of character with the setting and built heritage of the area. The building design that would enclose the street, animate it at ground floor level and would have sufficient vertical emphasis through the window design and other elements to not appear monolithic.
2	<i>To provide appropriate legibility</i>	The distinctive design with vertical emphasis, enclosure and 6 storey height facing the street would mark the site appropriately and emphasise the hotel location and would aid street users in reading and navigating the street.
3	<i>To provide appropriate continuity and enclosure of streets and spaces</i>	While the continuity of the street would be somewhat broken up by the change in height, I note that the height and scale in the area, particularly to the north, is evolving in the direction of increased height and scale. I consider the building would provide an appropriate level of enclosure for this part of Pleasants Street without appearing excessively scaled and overbearing, which would be aided by the setback from the adjacent building line.
4	<i>To provide well connected, high quality and active public and communal spaces</i>	The proposal would not significantly compromise the use of the street for pedestrians and cyclists and would result in increased use by such modes given the absence of car parking provision.

		I note elsewhere in this assessment daylight and sunlight impacts on open spaces in the vicinity have been considered acceptable. I consider the site would be well connected to the street network in the vicinity.
5	<i>To promote high quality, attractive and useable private spaces</i>	N/A
6	<i>To promote mix of use and diversity of activities</i>	In an area with significant residential and commercial uses. I consider the hotel typology appropriate noting I have found no undue concentration of such accommodation uses in the area. The hotel use and the ground floor café/restaurant/bar would add more diverse activities to the street.
7	<i>To ensure high quality and environmentally sustainable buildings</i>	I note the building would be required to be constructed to the near zero energy rating required by the current building regulations such that it would be sustainable in energy use terms. High quality external material would be used and the provision of a compact development and efficient land use would be sustainable at this location given its proximity to the city centre and in relation to public transport services.
8	<i>To secure sustainable density, intensity at locations of high accessibility</i>	I consider that the layout would constitute very efficient use of the site and that it would be within a short walking distance from a high quality radial quality bus corridor with frequent services such that this would be sustainable.

9	<i>To protect historic environments from insensitive development</i>	As noted in the visual amenity section of my assessment, I consider that the setting of the conservation area would be sufficiently protected having regard to CDP policy and the established precedents for previous developments on the site and in the area.
10	<i>To ensure appropriate management and maintenance</i>	Should permission be granted, I have recommended conditions in relation to the management of the hotel to seek to avoid undue negative impacts on residential amenity and to ensure no significant disruption to the area.

7.3.16. Based on my above assessment of the Table 3 criteria, I consider that overall the proposed height and density of development for this site is acceptable based on CDP policy.

7.3.17. I note the setback of the western elevation above ground floor level. In relation to potential overlooking impacts, I note no concerns to the south, east and north where there are no residences within a close distance that could be significantly impacted. To the west, the apartments to the rear of Olympic House would be protected from direct undue overlooking and loss of privacy as the windows above ground floor level would be angled to not directly face them. Accordingly, I am satisfied that there would be no undue overlooking from the proposed development.

7.3.18. Concerns have been raised by third parties in relation to significant loss of daylight and sunlight and overshadowing. I note the submitted Daylight and Sunlight Assessment Report prepared by 3D Design Bureau. This provides an impact assessment on the surrounding receiving buildings in line with the BRE guidance (3rd edition). It provides an assessment of daylight (Vertical Sky Component (VSC)) at The Camden (commercial), 79-81 Camden St Lwr (residential), The Courtyard (residential), Olympic House (commercial and residential); 48, 46A Pleasants St and 82 Pleasants Lane (commercial and residential) and the Camden Row granted hotel. Effect on sunlight (Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH)) was also analysed for

these properties except for The Courtyard as it faces north. Effect of Sun on Ground (SOG) was analysed for the Olympic House rooftop garden.

- 7.3.19. The report notes that *“as noted in the inspector’s report from July 2023 (ABP-314353-22) regarding the permitted office scheme, the exceedance of the recommendations in the BRE Guidelines was deemed acceptable given the urban site context and the planning policy framework, which promotes the intensified redevelopment of such sites near public transport. Given the similar scale of the proposed development, 3DDB is of the opinion that the associated impacts are broadly consistent with those of the previously approved scheme and, therefore, should be considered acceptable”*.
- 7.3.20. In relation to VSC impacts, it noted that by comparison with the permitted office building that the number of residential windows where there would be a moderate adverse impact increased from 4 to 8 and there were commensurate (two each) reductions in impacts on the negligible and minor adverse impact categories and otherwise no changes. These 4 new impacts relate to the impact on one of the ground floor apartments opposite the site where the VSC falls by 1.23% to 15.3%, two of the first floor apartments where the VSC values fall by 0.55% and 0.75% to 13.24% and 15.11% respectively and one second floor apartment at Olympic House towards the rear side where the VSC changes by 1.4% from 19.48% to 18.08%. There were no VSC changes noted otherwise in relation to the residential or commercial premises. The report notes the proposed design results *“in a maximum additional VSC reduction of 1.69% for any residential window in the existing surrounding context analysed”*. This, it states, is as a result of the protruding angled windows required to address overlooking concerns.
- 7.3.21. In relation to APSH, the only change noted by comparison with the permitted office building was that one minor adverse effect on a commercial premises window changes to one major adverse effect. In relation to Winter Probable Sunlight Hours (WPSH) effects, no significant changes were noted by comparison with the permitted office building. The opinion of the report authors in relation to the effect on the existing properties in relation to APSH and WPSH is that the level of effect is slight. I note that by comparison with the granted scheme, the reductions noted in APSH are generally considered negligible given the modest reductions (for example from 0.32% to 2.98% in the case of effects on The Camden with only one adverse effect

noted and in that case the reduction is noted to be 0.48% by comparison with the granted scheme. In relation to WPSH, I note the effects are mostly negligible although there is a major adverse effect at 46A Pleasants Street where the WPSH is reduced by 0.21% from 0.99% to 0.78% In relation to the permitted hotel at Camden Row, the opinion in the report is that *“the transient nature of the hotel use and the minimal material differences observed (0.39% for H2b and 0.62% for H2a) further support the acceptability of the impacts”*. It further notes no changes in relation to SOG were noted with a negligible impact remaining.

7.3.22. I note that the daylight and sunlight impacts, including the adverse impacts, were previously considered acceptable for the Inspector’s assessment of the permitted office building on the basis that it was considered appropriate to *“exercise the discretion afforded under Section 3.2 of the Building Height Guidelines, regarding the requirements of the daylight provisions, having regard to wider planning objectives including achieving compact urban development and/or effective urban design/streetscape presentation”* (Section 7.4.15, Inspector’s Report, ABP-314353-22). By reference to the permitted office development, in my opinion the proposed impacts in terms of daylight and sunlight would be modest. Having regard to CDP policy on densification and compact development, I consider overall that the impacts in relation to daylight and sunlight would not of such magnitude as to merit refusal of permission given the wider benefits of the scheme including its contribution towards compact development, enhanced streetscape enclosure, animation, activity and passive surveillance that would result.

7.4. Servicing and Management

7.4.1. The appellants have raised concerns in relation to access to and from the development including for bin trucks, hotel guests, deliveries, taxis and parking. Concerns have been expressed in relation to the operational management plan and its enforceability. In relation to general deliveries, taxi access and other vehicular access and the concerns around blocking the street or lack of on-street parking, I note the submitted Traffic Transport Assessment including Preliminary Travel Plan and Servicing and Management Plan prepared by NRB Consulting Engineers.

- 7.4.2. This report states that the local road network is adequate to cater for the vehicular, servicing and pedestrian traffic associated with the proposed hotel and that it would operate in an appropriate manner.
- 7.4.3. I note the absence of a formal set down area to the front of the hotel building. Noting the high quality public transport provision in the area I do not have significant concerns in relation to general access and parking. Significant impacts would not arise over and above what would generally be expected in such a city centre area. Accordingly, I am satisfied in relation to general vehicular access arrangements in and around the hotel.
- 7.4.4. In relation to waste management, I note the submitted Operational Waste Management Plan prepared by AWN Consulting. It states that the collection will be from the waste storage area to the rear (west) of the ground floor by the licensed waste contractors and that no waste receptacles will be staged on public footpaths at any point. Auto tracking drawings have been submitted in relation to bin collection vehicles which would access the building along its eastern side. Given the waste storage area is located on the western side of the building, this appears to be an error. Given the width of that laneway, in my opinion collection from the western laneway would not result in significant disruption during operations similar to if collection was from the eastern side of the building. I note that such arrangements are common within the city and similar arrangements were proposed for the permitted schemes. Bin collection by its nature results in unavoidable short-term disruption in its vicinity and the collection would be managed by the hotel staff in a reasonable manner. Should permission be granted, I recommend a condition to require a revised Operational Waste Management Plan to ensure the best practice measures outlined therein are implemented.
- 7.4.5. In relation to cycle parking, I note that at F.I. stage amendments were made such that this would be located adjacent to the western rear side of the building at ground floor level. This would provide 8 standard cycle spaces via stacking over two tiers and one cargo bike space would be provided. The F.I. submission notes that two staff spaces would be required given no more than 10 staff would be on duty in the hotel at any one time. It states that the remaining 6 spaces will be for hotel guests and visitors. Access will be separate from the main hotel entrance and would be towards the rear. The F.I. response noted that hotel visitors would be more likely to

walk, use public transport or bike share schemes. It is noted that 8 bike spaces will also be retained along the public realm at the front of the street.

- 7.4.6. The Council's Transportation Department noted no objections subject to conditions in relation to requiring secure key fob access to the internal cycle parking area, the retention of the public cycle spaces on the footpath, that internal doors open inwards, that parts of the monitoring and management plan be implemented as well as the Mobility Management Plan and standard taking in charge construction standards be applied. Should permission be granted, I recommend that a similar condition to the P.A. condition be applied noting that the cycle parking provision would accord with Table 1 of Appendix 5 of the CDP and with the Cycle Design Manual.

7.5. Other Matters

- 7.5.1. In relation to drainage matters, I note the submitted Basement Impact Assessment prepared by MMOS consulting civil and structural engineers. This report concludes that the basement can be built safely without causing detrimental change to the ground and surrounding local hardstanding and building stability, ground water conditions or to local surface water conditions and it considered the basement to be acceptable in terms of groundwater flow. The report included mitigation measures to be implemented in the design. The P.A. raised concerns at F.I. stage including in relation to measures for the management of surface water drainage.
- 7.5.2. The applicant provided an updated Basement Impact Assessment in response. It noted that full surveys would be undertaken prior to development and that SUDS including blue/green roofs at 5th floor and roof level with below ground attenuation provision would be provided. The Planner's Report noted no response from its Drainage division, it noted that for the tourist hostel permission the division noted no objection subject to conditions. Given the similarities with the previous permission the P.A. recommended that permission could be granted as any outstanding issues could be resolved by condition. I concur with this assessment based on the similarities with the previous permissions, I consider that subject to standard drainage conditions that such issues can be resolved with the Council's Drainage Division prior to commencement of development.
- 7.5.3. In relation to demolition and construction impacts, I note the submitted Construction Management Plan prepared by Vision Contracting. This includes, inter alia, an

outline construction programme, measures in relation to access and egress, parking, site working hours, noise, dust, vibration, waste management, off-site disposal, fuel and hydrocarbon management, concrete washout and site hoardings. Based on this, I recommend that should permission be granted a standard construction management condition be applied to ensure the appropriate standards practices are followed and implemented. In my opinion, there is no requirement to copy the construction conditions provided for the Camden Row hotel grant of permission as I consider the above approach to be adequate.

- 7.5.4. I note the appellants' arguments in relation to the potential mis-allocation of capital and labour away from housing development in the context of a housing crisis. However, I do not consider that the Development Plan or planning policy in general provides for the public management of the allocation of capital and labour in the way suggested by the appellants and I am satisfied that no significant planning issue arises in this regard.
- 7.5.5. In relation to external lighting, I note the submitted External Lighting Report prepared by EDC Progressive Engineering. This proposes to control obtrusive lighting. I note that no concerns were raised by the P.A. and subject to a standard public lighting condition, I consider the proposals satisfactory.
- 7.5.6. In relation to archaeology, I note the site location outside the zone of influence of recorded monuments. I note the submitted Archaeological Assessment prepared by IAC Archaeology. This report recommends archaeological testing be carried out across the site and, depending on the results, that preservation in-situ or by record or monitoring may be required. This recommendation was made due to the medieval church and historic routeway in proximity to the site. The P.A. had no significant concerns subject to condition requiring building surveys and ground testing. Should permission be granted I recommend a condition similar to that of the P.A. condition to require such testing.

8.0 EIA Screening

- 8.1. See Appendices 1 and 2 for detailed screening. Having regard to: -
1. the criteria set out in Schedules 7 and 7A, in particular

(a) the limited nature and scale of the proposed hotel development, in an established urban area served by public infrastructure,

(b) the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity,

(c) the location of the development outside of any sensitive location specified in article 109(4)(a) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended);

2. the results of other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment submitted by the applicant,

3. the features and measures proposed by the applicant envisaged to avoid or prevent what might otherwise have been significant effects on the environment.

I conclude that the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment, and that an environmental impact assessment report is not required.

9.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening

9.1. See Appendix 3 for detailed AA Screening. 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 South Dublin Bay SAC, South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, North Bull Island SPA, North Dublin Bay SAC and North-West Irish Sea SPA in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

9.2. This determination is based on:

- The brownfield nature of the site and its location within a serviced urban area with available capacity noted at Ringsend WWTP.
- The distance to the European sites and the urban intervening landscape and habitats .
- The nature and scale of the development.
- The screening determination of the Planning Authority.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The subject site is located in a serviced area of Dublin city at a significant remove from surface water bodies. It is above the Dublin groundwater body (code IE_EA_G_008) noted to be of “good” status. The proposed development comprises a 6 storey hotel building with basement (refer to section 2.0 of this report above).
- 10.2. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.
- 10.3. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The nature of the development on a brownfield serviced site.
 - The measures included in the Construction Management Plan.
- 10.4. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission is granted, subject to conditions.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, including the Z4 land use zoning objective for the site and immediate surrounds and to Policy CEE28 ‘Visitor Accommodation’, and having regard to the scale, height, form, and design of the proposed hotel development, the planning history of the site,

the location of the site and pattern and nature of development in the area, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would provide for and improve mixed-services facilities in this area, would not result in an undue concentration of visitor accommodation in the area and would not seriously injure the character and amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity and would not result in the obstruction of adjoining streets or the creation of a traffic hazard. The proposed development would, therefore, accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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 30th day of April 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 ancillary café/bar/restaurant shall not expand into any adjoining areas within the permitted hotel building and no outdoor seating shall be provided unless a separate grant of permission is obtained.

Reason: To protect existing residential amenities.

3. The hotel and ancillary café/bar/restaurant shall be managed in accordance with the details set out in the Hotel Management Plan submitted to the Planning Authority on the 17th day of January 2025 with the application.

Reason: To protect adjoining residential amenities.

4. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the hotel building 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. Any additional external signage shall be the subject of a separate grant of permission. Such signage shall consist of individual lettering mounted or hard painted on the fascia, with the lettering to be of a high quality material such as stainless steel, with a height not exceeding 0.4m and any illumination to consist of backlighting.

Reason: To clarify the scope of the permission, and in the interest of visual amenity.

6. No advertisement or advertisement structure, the exhibition or erection of which would otherwise constitute exempted development under the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended), shall be displayed or erected on the building exterior or inside the windows without a prior grant of planning permission.

Reason: To allow further assessment of the impact of advertising on the amenities of the area in the interest of visual amenity.

7. Other than as permitted, no additional development shall take place above roof parapet level, including lift motor enclosures, air handling equipment, storage tanks, ducts or other external plant, telecommunications aerials, antennas or equipment, unless authorised by a further grant of planning permission.

Reason: To protect the residential amenities of property in the vicinity and the visual amenities of the area.

8. The applicant shall implement the following:
- a) Secure key / fob access to internal cycle parking shall be provided. Cycle parking shall be in place and ready for use prior to occupation of the development.
 - b) Prior to commencement of development, details shall be submitted for the agreement of the Planning Authority with regard to the retention or reinstatement of public cycle parking spaces on the public footpath along Pleasants Street, to include the timing of such works.
 - c) All external doors shall open inwards, except where required for emergency egress or sub-station access.
 - d) A finalised 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 shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, the agreed waste facilities shall be maintained and waste shall be managed in accordance with the agreed plan.
 - 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 on the 17th day of January 2025. The developer shall undertake an annual monitoring exercise to the satisfaction of the planning authority for the first two years following occupation of the development and shall submit the results to the planning authority for consideration and placement on the public file.
 - f) Details of the materials proposed in public areas shall be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.
Reason: In the interests of orderly development and sustainable transportation.
9. 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.

10. Prior to the commencement of development the developer shall enter into Connection Agreements with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for a service connection(s) to the public water supply and/or wastewater collection network.

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

11. (a) Prior to the commencement of development, a Demolition Management Plan and Demolition Waste Management Plan shall be submitted for the written agreement of the planning authority. This plan shall be implemented in full during the course of demolition and construction of the development;
- (b) Prior to commencement of works, the developer shall submit to, and agree in writing with the planning authority, a Construction Management Plan, which shall be adhered to during construction. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise and dust management measures, construction traffic, and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.

Reason: In the interest of public safety and amenity.

12. The developer shall engage a suitably qualified licence eligible archaeologist (licensed under the National Monuments Acts) to carry out pre-development archaeological testing in areas of proposed ground disturbance and to submit an archaeological impact assessment report for the written agreement of the planning authority, following consultation with the National Monuments Service, in advance of any site preparation works or groundworks, including site investigation works/topsoil stripping/site clearance/dredging/underwater works and/or construction works. The report shall include an archaeological impact statement and mitigation strategy. Where archaeological material is shown to be present, avoidance, preservation in-situ, preservation by record,

archaeological excavation and/or monitoring may be required. Any further archaeological mitigation requirements specified by the planning authority, following consultation with the National Monuments Service, shall be complied with by the developer. No site preparation and/or construction works shall be carried out on site until the archaeologist's report has been submitted to and approval to proceed is agreed in writing with the planning authority. The planning authority and the National Monuments Service shall be furnished with a final archaeological report describing the results of any subsequent archaeological investigative works and/or monitoring following the completion of all archaeological work on site and the completion of any necessary post-excavation work. All resulting and associated archaeological costs shall be borne by the developer.

Reason: To ensure the continued preservation either in situ or by record of places, caves, sites, features or other objects of archaeological interest.

13. Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company, or such other security as may be acceptable to the planning authority, to secure the reinstatement of services/infrastructure currently in the charge of Dublin City Council which may be damaged by the construction of the development and by the transport of materials to the site, coupled with an agreement empowering the planning authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory reinstatement of the services/infrastructure. 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: In the interest of traffic safety and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

14. 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.

15. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of Luas Cross City St. Stephen's Green to Broombridge Line in accordance with the terms of the Supplementary Development Contribution Scheme made by the planning authority under section 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 Supplementary Development Contribution Scheme made under section 49 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.

Ciarán Daly

Planning Inspector

26th September 2025

Appendix 1

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-322844-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of 100 no. bedroom hotel consisting of 6 storeys over basement.
Development Address	49-51, Pleasants Street, Pleasants House & 5 Pleasants Lane, Dublin 8.
	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.	
☒ 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	
☒ 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)	Class 10(iv) – Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district. Site area is 0.0745ha within a business district of the city.

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:** _____

Appendix 2

Form 3 – EIA Screening Determination Form

A. CASE DETAILS		
An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ACP-322844-25	
Development Summary	Construction of 100 no. bedroom hotel consisting of 6 storeys and basement.	
Yes / No / N/A	Comment (if relevant)	
1. Was a Screening Determination carried out by the PA?	Yes	This determined that an EIAR was not required.
2. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?	Yes	EIA Screening Report prepared by Verde (December 2024).
3. Has an AA screening report or NIS been submitted?	Yes	Screening Report for Appropriate Assessment prepared by Openfield (January 2025).
4. Is a IED/ IPC or Waste Licence (or review of licence) required from the EPA? If YES has the EPA commented on the need for an EIAR?	No.	
5. Have any other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment which have a significant bearing on the project been carried out pursuant to other relevant Directives – for example SEA	No.	SEA has been undertaken for the Dublin City Development Plan. The application was also accompanied by: An Energy & Sustainability Report under the EU Energy performance in Buildings Directive 2010/31/EU Operational Waste Management Plan under the Waste Framework Directive

B. EXAMINATION	Yes/ No/ Uncertain	Briefly describe the nature and extent and Mitigation Measures (where relevant) (having regard to the probability, magnitude (including population size affected), complexity, duration, frequency, intensity, and reversibility of impact) Mitigation measures –Where relevant specify features or measures proposed by the applicant to avoid or prevent a significant effect.	Is this likely to result in significant effects on the environment? Yes/ No/ Uncertain
This screening examination should be read with, and in light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith			
1. Characteristics of proposed development (including demolition, construction, operation, or decommissioning)			
1.1 Is the project significantly different in character or scale to the existing surrounding or environment?	No.	The proposed height is broadly consistent with two previous permissions granted for the site. The 6 storey height would be similar to that of buildings to the north. The building would be higher than buildings to the west and south but not significantly taller in the context of the totality of the surrounding environment.	No.
1.2 Will construction, operation, decommissioning or demolition works cause physical changes to the locality (topography, land use, waterbodies)?	No.	The site with existing mainly commercial buildings would be replaced by a 6 storey hotel on a brownfield site.	No.
1.3 Will construction or operation of the project use natural resources such as land, soil, water, materials/minerals or energy, especially resources which are non-renewable or in short supply?	No.	The potential loss of natural resources would not be significant in the context of the wider receiving environment noting that there would be excavation of the site and that materials used for construction would be similar to that of such type of urban development.	No.

1.4 Will the project involve the use, storage, transport, handling or production of substance which would be harmful to human health or the environment?	No.	The use of harmful materials likes hydrocarbons and other substances would be required similar to other construction sites. Impacts associated would be temporary and controlled on the site noting the submitted Construction Management Plan and the Operational Waste Management Plan. I do not envisage significant operational impacts arising.	No.
1.5 Will the project produce solid waste, release pollutants or any hazardous / toxic / noxious substances?	No.	Construction may require the disposal of potentially harmful substances, e.g. fuel or chemical pollutants. This is standard on construction sites. It is likely there would be dust and noise emitted during construction. The impacts would be temporary and local. The measures in the Construction Management Plan would mitigate such potential impacts. No significant operational emissions are anticipated	No.
1.6 Will the project lead to risks of contamination of land or water from releases of pollutants onto the ground or into surface waters, groundwater, coastal waters or the sea?	No.	During construction and operation stages, through the use of the Construction Management Plan measures there would be sufficient mitigation of potential release of pollutants onto the ground and onwards. There would be separate on-site facilities for foul and storm water and it is proposed to connect to mains services on completion of the construction stage.	No.
1.7 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	No.	Construction activity generally causes noise and vibration release and these would be temporary, local and would be mitigated through the measures outlined in the Construction Management Plan.	No.

1.8 Will there be any risks to human health, for example due to water contamination or air pollution?	No.	Construction activity generally causes noise and vibration release as well as dust release and these would be temporary, local and would be mitigated through the measures outlined in the Construction Management Plan. Dust, for example, can be suppressed, monitored and abated. The connection to mains water is such that no impacts are anticipated at operation stage.	No.
1.9 Will there be any risk of major accidents that could affect human health or the environment?	No.	The type of works for the hotel building would not include substances or elements that would create a risk of major accidents.	No.
1.10 Will the project affect the social environment (population, employment)	No.	There would be a negligible impact on employment and population increase would be temporary and negligible in the wider area context.	No.
1.11 Is the project part of a wider large scale change that could result in cumulative effects on the environment?	No.	The EIA Screening refers to cumulative impacts noting various permitted developments and I do not envisage any significant cumulative impacts.	No.
2. Location of proposed development			
2.1 Is the proposed development located on, in, adjoining or have the potential to impact on any of the following: - European site (SAC/ SPA/ pSAC/ pSPA) - NHA/ pNHA - Designated Nature Reserve - Designated refuge for flora or fauna	No.	The site is not subject to any protected designations and is c.3.5km west of the closest European sites with the intervening urban landscape in between.	No.

- Place, site or feature of ecological interest, the preservation/conservation/ protection of which is an objective of a development plan/ LAP/ draft plan or variation of a plan			
2.2 Could any protected, important or sensitive species of flora or fauna which use areas on or around the site, for example: for breeding, nesting, foraging, resting, over-wintering, or migration, be affected by the project?	No.	The brownfield sites includes a commercial building in a built-up urban area where no species, protected or otherwise, have been noted to be on the use or using the site per the application details	No.
2.3 Are there any other features of landscape, historic, archaeological, or cultural importance that could be affected?	No.	The site is proximate to the zones of influence for two recorded monuments. Conditions in relation to archaeology are recommend to provide sufficient mitigation. There are protected structures and a residential conservation area within a short distance of the site. Significant effects on these structures or their setting, or on the character of the area can be ruled out.	No.
2.4 Are there any areas on/around the location which contain important, high quality or scarce resources which could be affected by the project, for example: forestry, agriculture, water/coastal, fisheries, minerals?	No.	This is a brownfield site in a built-up urban area.	No.
2.5 Are there any water resources including surface waters, for example: rivers, lakes/ponds, coastal or groundwaters which could be affected by the project,	No.	The site is entirely brownfield in nature. There are no waterbodies on or in close proximity to the site.	No.

particularly in terms of their volume and flood risk?			
2.6 Is the location susceptible to subsidence, landslides or erosion?	No.	There is nothing in the application to suggest the site is subject to subsidence.	No.
2.7 Are there any key transport routes (e.g. National primary Roads) on or around the location which are susceptible to congestion or which cause environmental problems, which could be affected by the project?	No.	No key transport routes are located on or around the site or likely to be affected by the development.	No.
2.8 Are there existing sensitive land uses or community facilities (such as hospitals, schools etc) which could be affected by the project?	No.	I have not identified any such sensitive land uses in the area or community facilities that would be affected given the type of hotel development proposed.	No.
3. Any other factors that should be considered which could lead to environmental impacts			
3.1 Cumulative Effects: Could this project together with existing and/or approved development result in cumulative effects during the construction/ operation phase?	No.	Per section 4.3.2 of the submitted EIA Screening, cumulative effects have been considered and I concur that no effects are envisaged.	No.

3.2 Transboundary Effects: Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects?	No.	The development within Dublin city at a significant remove from other jurisdictions is such that transboundary effects are highly unlikely.	No.
3.3 Are there any other relevant considerations?	No.	None identified.	No.
C. CONCLUSION			
No real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	Agreed	EIAR Not Required	
Real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.		EIAR Required	
D. MAIN REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS			
Having regard to: - 1. the criteria set out in Schedules 7 and 7A, in particular (a) the limited nature and scale of the proposed hotel development, in an established urban area served by public infrastructure, (b) the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity, (c) the location of the development outside of any sensitive location specified in article 109(4)(a) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) 2. the results of other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment submitted by the applicant, 3. the features and measures proposed by applicant envisaged to avoid or prevent what might otherwise have been significant effects on the environment. I conclude that the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment, and that an environmental impact assessment report is not required.			

Appendix 3

AA Screening Determination Template Test for likely significant effects

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects				
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics				
Brief description of project	Construction of 100 no. bedroom hotel consisting of 6 storeys and basement.			
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	Demolition of existing buildings, new 6 storey hotel building with basement on a brownfield site.			
Screening report	Y - Screening Report for Appropriate Assessment prepared by Openfield (January 2025).			
Natura Impact Statement	None.			
Relevant submissions	None.			
Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model				
European Site (code)	Qualifying interests ¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections ²	Consider further in screening ³ Y/N
South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 0000210).	Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140] Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210] Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310] Embryonic shifting dunes [2110].	c.3.5km	Indirect potential connection via public sewers connecting to Dublin Bay and Ringsend WWTP.	Yes

	Conservation Objectives , NPWS, 22 nd August 2013.			
South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 0004024).	Light-bellied Brent Goose (<i>Branta bernicla hrota</i>) [A046] Oystercatcher (<i>Haematopus ostralegus</i>) [A130] Ringed Plover (<i>Charadrius hiaticula</i>) [A137] 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] Bar-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa lapponica</i>) [A157] Redshank (<i>Tringa totanus</i>) [A162] Black-headed Gull (<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>) [A179] Roseate Tern (<i>Sterna dougallii</i>) [A192] Common Tern (<i>Sterna hirundo</i>) [A193] Arctic Tern (<i>Sterna paradisaea</i>) [A194]	c.3.5km	Indirect potential connection via public sewers connecting to Dublin Bay and Ringsend WWTP.	Yes

	Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]. Conservation Objectives , NPWS, 9 th March 2015.			
North Bull Island SPA (Site Code 0004006).	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]	c.6.2km	Indirect potential connection via public sewers connecting to Dublin Bay and Ringsend WWTP..	Yes.

	Curlew (Numenius arquata) [A160] Redshank (Tringa totanus) [A162] Turnstone (Arenaria interpres) [A169] Black-headed Gull (Chroicocephalus ridibundus) [A179] Shoveler (Spatula clypeata) [A857] Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]. Conservation Objectives, NPWS, 9th March 2015.			
North Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 0000206).	Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140] Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210] Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310] Atlantic salt meadows (Glaucopuccinellietalia maritima) [1330] Mediterranean salt meadows (Juncetalia maritimi) [1410] Embryonic shifting dunes [2110] Shifting dunes along the shoreline with	c.6.2km	Indirect potential connection via public sewers connecting to Dublin Bay and Ringsend WWTP.	Yes.

	<i>Ammophila arenaria</i> (white dunes) [2120] Fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation (grey dunes) [2130] Humid dune slacks [2190] <i>Petalophyllum ralfsii</i> (Petalwort) [1395]. Conservation Objectives, NPWS, 6th November 2013.			
North-West Irish Sea SPA (Site Code 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]	c.7.8km	Indirect potential connection via public sewers connecting to Dublin Bay and Ringsend WWTP. However significant distance to SPA and intervening area of Dublin Bay such that any emissions would be too diffuse for significant impacts to arise.	No

	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, 19th September 2023.			
¹ Summary description / cross reference to NPWS website is acceptable at this stage in the report ² Based on source-pathway-receptor: Direct/ indirect/ tentative/ none, via surface water/ ground water/ air/ use of habitats by mobile species				

³if no connections: N

Step 3. Describe the likely effects of the project (if any, alone or in combination) on European Sites

AA Screening matrix

Site name Qualifying interests	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*	
	Impacts	Effects
Site 1: South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 0000210). Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140] Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210] Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310] Embryonic shifting dunes [2110].	Direct: None. Indirect: Potential surface water run-off and dust run-off during construction. Potential foul water network impact at operation stage.	Noting the contained nature of the site (serviced, defined site boundaries, the absence of direct ecological connections or pathways) the absence of a significant increased loading to Ringsend WWTP and distance from receiving features connected to the European site make it highly unlikely that the proposed development could generate impacts of a magnitude that could affect habitat quality within the site for the SCI listed. Conservation objectives would not be undermined.
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?	
	Impacts	Effects
Site 2: South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 0004024). Light-bellied Brent Goose (Branta bernicla hrota) [A046] Oystercatcher (Haematopus ostralegus) [A130]	Direct: None. Indirect: Potential surface water run-off and dust run-off during construction. Potential foul water network impact at operation stage.	Noting the contained nature of the site (serviced, defined site boundaries, the absence of direct ecological connections or pathways) the absence of a significant increased loading to Ringsend WWTP and distance from receiving features connected to the European site make it highly unlikely that the proposed development could generate impacts of a magnitude that could affect habitat quality within the site for the SCI listed. Conservation

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] Roseate Tern (Sterna dougallii) [A192] Common Tern (Sterna hirundo) [A193] Arctic Tern (Sterna paradisaea) [A194] Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]. Conservation Objectives, NPWS, 9th March 2015.		objectives would not be undermined..
Site 3: North Bull Island SPA (site code 000406)	Direct: None. Indirect:	Noting the contained nature of the site (serviced, defined site boundaries, the absence of direct ecological connections or pathways) the absence of a significant increased loading to

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] Curlew (<i>Numenius arquata</i>) [A160] Redshank (<i>Tringa totanus</i>) [A162] Turnstone (<i>Arenaria interpres</i>) [A169]	Potential surface water run-off and dust run-off during construction. Potential foul water network impact at operation stage.	Ringsend WWTP and distance from receiving features connected to the European site make it highly unlikely that the proposed development could generate impacts of a magnitude that could affect habitat quality within the site for the SCI listed. Conservation objectives would not be undermined.
--	---	---

Black-headed Gull (<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>) [A179] Shoveler (Spatula clypeata) [A857] Wetland and Waterbirds [A999].		
Site 4: North Dublin Bay SAC (site code 000206) Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140] Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210] Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310] Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritimae) [1330] Mediterranean salt meadows (Juncetalia maritimi) [1410] Embryonic shifting dunes [2110] Shifting dunes along the shoreline with <i>Ammophila arenaria</i> (white dunes) [2120] Fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation (grey dunes) [2130]	Direct: None. Indirect: Potential surface water run-off and dust run-off during construction. Potential foul water network impact at operation stage.	Noting the contained nature of the site (serviced, defined site boundaries, the absence of direct ecological connections or pathways) the absence of a significant increased loading to Ringsend WWTP and distance from receiving features connected to the European site make it highly unlikely that the proposed development could generate impacts of a magnitude that could affect habitat quality within the site for the SCI listed. Conservation objectives would not be undermined.

Humid dune slacks [2190]		
Petalophyllum ralfsii (Petalwort) [1395].		
Conservation Objectives, NPWS, 6th November 2013.		
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?	
Step 4 Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site		
I conclude that the proposed development (alone) would not result in likely significant effects on South Dublin Bay SAC, South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, North Bull Island SPA, North Dublin Bay SAC and North-West Irish Sea SPA. The proposed development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on any 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 likely 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 South Dublin Bay SAC, South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, North Bull Island SPA, North Dublin Bay SAC and North-West Irish Sea SPA in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- The brownfield nature of the site and its location within a serviced urban area with available capacity noted at Ringsend WWTP.
- The distance to the European sites and the urban intervening landscape and habitats.
- The nature and scale of the development.
- The screening determination of the Planning Authority.

--