



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP-323399-25

Development

The development will consist of the construction of a 2 bed 3 person self-contained apartment with own hall door access at first floor level above existing single storey hair salon with pedestrian and cycle access from the public footpath at 84 Highfield Road. This proposal also includes for new external brick finish to the existing four plastered ground floor elevations and redesign of salon front elevation (door and window surrounds)

Location

84 Highfield Road, Dublin 6 D06 RF97

Planning Authority

Dublin City Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

WEB2168/25

Applicant(s)

Douglas Gleasure

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Refuse permission

Type of Appeal	First party
Appellant(s)	Douglas Gleasure
Observer(s)	Dermot Comerford Mary Burke Fionnuala Cooney Ciara McGovern Victor Mahon Michael Hughes Gerard Mahon Larry Brennan
Date of Site Inspection	11 October 2025
Inspector	Killian Harrington

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	4
2.0	Proposed Development	4
3.0	Planning Authority Decision.....	5
4.0	Planning History	6
5.0	Policy Context	7
6.0	EIA Screening	11
7.0	The Appeal	12
8.0	Assessment.....	14
9.0	AA Screening	18
10.0	Water Framework Directive	19
11.0	Recommendation	20
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	20
13.0	Conditions	21
	Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	25
	Appendix B: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination	27

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1 The subject site at 84 Highfield Road consists of a single storey flat roof commercial unit (hair salon) with 2 no. car parking spaces within the grounds of a residential apartment complex (Woodleigh) and directly accessible off Highfield Road, east of Rathgar village. Woodleigh is divided into 3 apartment blocks (Woodleigh Elm, Woodleigh Oak and Woodleigh Ash) and each one is three storeys in height. The subject commercial unit is located to the south of the apartment building Woodleigh Ash with a distance of approximately 1.5 metres from 2 no. windows of a ground floor apartment. The single storey standalone building is currently in use as a hair salon and storage. The subject site has a stated area of 160 sqm and a gross floor area of approximately 73 sqm. The surrounding built environment is suburban and residential with a mix of red brick apartment buildings on the north side of Highfield Road and large red brick two-storey dwellings on the south side.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1 The proposed development comprises the following:

- Construction of a 2 bed 3-person self-contained apartment with own hall door access at first floor level above existing single storey hair salon with pedestrian and cycle access from the public footpath
- New external brick finish to the existing four plastered ground floor elevations and redesign of salon front elevation (door and window surrounds)
- 3 no. bicycle storage spaces
- 20 sqm roof private open space at first floor
- All other associated site works.
- The proposal is car-free and all existing car parking spaces and access on site will be maintained

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1 Decision

Refuse permission for the following reason:

1. Having regard to the Z1 zoning objective, which seeks to protect, provide and improve residential amenities, the proposed additional storey, by way of its design, scale and massing, would result in the building being unduly obtrusive and out of character when viewed in the context of the existing streetscape along this part of Highfield Road. In addition, the proposal raises concerns in terms of impact for neighbouring residential properties, specifically Woodleigh apartment complex, in terms of loss of outlook, overshadowing and the overbearing impact of the proposal, which would be contrary to the residential development standards set out in the 2022-2028 City Development Plan and would be seriously injurious to the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties of the area. The development would therefore, by itself and by the precedent it would set for other similar undesirable development in the vicinity, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.1.1. Planning Authority Reports

The planner's report had concerns in relation to overshadowing, the overbearing impact and the loss of outlook that the proposal would have for the occupants of the apartment complex (Woodleigh Elm and Woodleigh Ash in particular) to the rear of the site due to the scale and close proximity of the proposal to the neighbouring apartments. The report acknowledged that whilst the applicant had taken measures to try and address concerns raised at pre-application stage including a reduction in height, these issues would result in a detrimental impact to the residential and visual amenity that the proposal would have within the surrounding area. In relation to overshadowing, the report concluded that given the very real likelihood of overshadowing issues, the shadow analysis drawings were considered to be somewhat limited and that concerns would remain in that regard, particularly in terms of impact for the occupants at ground floor level of Woodleigh

Ash. The proposal would also set an undesirable precedent for similar style developments within the surrounding streetscape.

3.1.2 Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Division – no objections subject to conditions
- Transport Planning Division – no objections subject to conditions

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None

3.4. Third Party Observations

8 no. submissions referred to the following concerns:

- Negative impacts on neighbouring residential amenity, specifically daylight/sunlight, outlook, privacy, overshadowing, overbearing, oppressive
- Land ownership issues
- Out of character with the surrounding area
- Refuse provision
- Construction management
- Scale of proposal
- Unsympathetic finish
- Site notice description and location
- Proximity of proposal to existing apartment block

4.0 Planning History

4.1 Subject site

Reg. Ref. 3534/99 – Planning permission refused for two 750 x 1500 signs one at each end of existing single storey shop premises.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

The subject site is subject to land use zoning Z1 'Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods' under the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028. The objective of Z1 is 'to protect, provide and improve residential amenities'. The following Dublin City Development Plan policy objectives have specific relevance to this appeal:

Section 15.9 Apartment Standards

This section provides details on a range of standards which relevant developments will be assessed under in conjunction with Section 28 apartment guidelines.

Section 15.13.6 Living over the Shop

Dublin City Council will actively encourage the development of residential accommodation over existing commercial premises. It is acknowledged that there is a considerable amount of vacancy and underutilised floorspace on the upper floors of commercial premises that have the capacity to contribute significantly to the housing stock of the city. Applications for the refurbishment and reuse of these buildings for residential accommodation will, therefore, be supported and actively pursued subject to suitability of location and standard of accommodation provided. Residential accommodation should seek comply with the relevant standards for apartments as set out in Section 28 guidelines. However, in certain instances and where a building is a protected structure, relaxations of these standards will be considered.

Policy QHSN6 Urban Consolidation

To promote and support residential consolidation and sustainable intensification through the consideration of applications for infill development, backland

development, mews development, reuse/ adaption of existing housing stock and use of upper floors, subject to the provision of good quality accommodation.

Policy QHSN10 Urban Density

To promote residential development at sustainable densities throughout the city in accordance with the core strategy, particularly on vacant and/or underutilised sites, having regard to the need for high standards of urban design and architecture and to successfully integrate with the character of the surrounding area.

Policy QHSNO4 Densification of Suburbs

To support the ongoing densification of the suburbs and prepare a design guide regarding innovative housing models, designs and solutions for infill development, backland development, mews development, re-use of existing housing stock and best practice for attic conversions.

Policy QHSN37 Houses and Apartments

To ensure that new houses and apartments provide for the needs of family accommodation with a satisfactory level of residential amenity in accordance with the standards for residential accommodation.

Appendix 16 – Sunlight and Daylight

The appendix provides specific metrics for assessing daylight and sunlight in new developments. Key requirements include targets for daylight factor and vertical sky component (VSC) to ensure adequate light for new and existing properties. For example, a minimum average daylight factor of 5% is recommended for predominantly daylit appearances, and minimum values of 2% for kitchens, 1.5% for living rooms, and 1% for bedrooms are also specified. Proposals will continue to be assessed on a case-by-case basis depending on site specific circumstances and location

5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

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

SPPR 2

The following minimum apartment floor areas shall apply:

- Studio apartment (1 person) = 37 sqm
- 1-bedroom apartment (2 persons) = 45 sqm
- 2-bedroom apartment (4 persons) = 73 sqm
- 3-bedroom apartment (5 persons) = 90 sq.m

SPPR 5

Ground level apartment floor to ceiling heights shall be a minimum of 2.7m and shall be increased in certain circumstances, particularly where necessary to facilitate a future change of use to a commercial use. For building refurbishment schemes on sites of any size or urban infill schemes on sites of up to 0.25ha , planning authorities may exercise discretion on a case-by-case basis, subject to overall design quality.

Section 3.37/Appendix 1 – Private Amenity Space

A minimum depth of 1.5 metres is required for balconies, in one useable length to meet the minimum floor area requirement under these guidelines. According to Appendix 1, minimum floor areas for private amenity space is as follows:

- Studio = 4 sqm
- One bedroom = 5 sq m
- Two bedrooms (3 person) = 6 sqm
- Two bedrooms (4 person) = 7 sqm
- Three bedrooms = 9 sqm

Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities, (2024)

SPPR 1 – Separation Distances

It is a specific planning policy requirement of these Guidelines that statutory development plans shall not include an objective in respect of minimum separation distances that exceed 16m between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses, duplex units or apartment units above ground floor level. There shall be no specific minimum separation distance at ground floor level or to the front of houses, duplex units or apartment units in statutory development plans and planning applications shall be determined on a case by case basis to prevent undue loss of privacy.

SPPR 3 – Car Parking

It is a specific planning policy requirement of these Guidelines that:

- (i) In city centres and urban neighbourhoods of the five cities, defined in Chapter 3 (Table 3.1 and Table 3.2) car-parking provision should be minimised, substantially reduced or wholly eliminated. The maximum rate of car parking provision for residential development at these locations, where such provision is justified to the satisfaction of the planning authority, shall be 1 no. space per dwelling.
- (ii) In accessible locations, defined in Chapter 3 (Table 3.8) car- parking provision should be substantially reduced. The maximum rate of car parking provision for residential development, where such provision is justified to the satisfaction of the planning authority, shall be 1.5 no. spaces per dwelling.
- (iii) In intermediate and peripheral locations, defined in Chapter 3 (Table 3.8) the maximum rate of car parking provision for residential development, where such provision is justified to the satisfaction of the planning authority, shall be 2 no. spaces per dwelling

Section 5.37 Daylight

This section states that planning authorities do not need to undertake detailed technical assessment in relation to daylight performance in all cases. It should be

clear from the assessment of architectural drawings (including sections) in the case of low-rise housing with good separation from existing and proposed buildings that undue impact would not arise, and planning authorities may apply a level of discretion in this regard.

In cases where a technical assessment of daylight performance is considered by the planning authority to be necessary regard should be had to quantitative performance approaches to daylight provision outlined in guides like A New European Standard for Daylighting in Buildings IS EN17037:2018, UK National Annex BS EN17037:2019 and the associated BRE Guide 209 2022 Edition (June 2022), or any relevant future standards or guidance specific to the Irish context. In drawing conclusions in relation to daylight performance, planning authorities must weigh up the overall quality of the design and layout of the scheme and the measures proposed to maximise daylight provision, against the location of the site and the general presumption in favour of increased scales of urban residential development

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

The subject site is c. 5 km from South Dublin Bay proposed NHA, Booterstown Marsh proposed NHA and European sites South Dublin Bay SAC & South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA

6.0 EIA Screening

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

7.0 The Appeal

7.1 Grounds of Appeal

The first party appeal includes the following grounds

- Daylight/sunlight - Because of the separation distance between the proposed development and the nearest apartment building, there will be no serious loss of amenity as a result of loss of sunlight. A revised design is proposed, reducing the apartment to 1 no. bedroom and increasing the set back from Woodleigh Ash apartment block from 6 metres to 7.5 metres, which would further reduce any impacts or loss of sunlight by an increased separation distance from the existing building. There will be no loss of access to daylight to such a degree to result in an adverse impact. A revised design is proposed which would further reduce any impacts on loss of daylight by an increased separation distance from the existing building.
- Overbearing impact - Based on this changed design it is considered that the proposed development will not result in serious injury to residential amenity as a result of overbearing impact. Having regard to the urban context of the site location and the increased separation distance in the proposed revised design, it is considered that any loss of outlook from existing apartment windows will not result in serious loss of amenity.
- Overlooking - The revised drawings submitted with this appeal response address any issues relating to loss of privacy by reason of overlooking.
- Visual impact - While the proposed development will raise the level of the existing building to a two storey height, having regard to the width of the road with footpath and the fact that the height will be below that of the apartment buildings to the rear, it is considered that the impact on the streetscape will not be detrimental. A planning permission for the proposed development will not create a precedent because there are no other existing buildings in front of the building line of the Woodleigh blocks of apartments.

- Construction - The applicant would accept conditions requiring construction in accordance with the revised drawings that have been enclosed and to agree prior to construction a Construction Management Plan to minimise impacts on the car parking facilities and residential amenities during construction period.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

The planning authority request that the Commission uphold their decision to refuse permission. If permission is granted, the following conditions should apply:

- A condition requiring the payment of a Section 48 development contribution
- A naming and numbering conditions

7.3. Observations

There were 8 no. observations submitted outlining the following concerns:

- The changes to the proposal are still unacceptable and will still have negative impacts on streetscape, neighbouring residential amenity, specifically daylight/sunlight, outlook, privacy, overshadowing
- The density of the area is already very high and the proposal would be contrary to good planning and the sustainable development of the area
- The proposal does not respect the existing building line or architectural heritage
- The applicant does not have legal ownership of land
- The scale and unsympathetic design and out of character with the surrounding area
- There is concern around traffic congestion and construction management
- The proposal could affect the value of property

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Following a review of the file, assessment of the relevant planning policies and inspection of the site, I conclude that the primary concerns in this appeal is (1) Design Matters and (2) Neighbouring Residential Amenity. I will assess both the proposal that is the subject of this appeal and any revised proposals contained in the appeal.

Design matters

8.2 The principle of an additional residential unit accords with 'Z1' zoning objective for the site. The planning application proposed to construct a two-bedroom apartment at first floor level over the existing single storey hair salon with provision to be made for pedestrian and cycle access from the public footpath on Highfield Road. The ground floor would be reclad in brick to complement the materials and colours of neighbouring buildings with the proposed residential unit to take the form of a cuboid finished in a beige render. The first-floor element would overhang the existing ground floor unit on the east and west ends and would be near flush with the existing front building line onto Highfield Road. The proposal would be car-free. I note that the proposal is also in compliance with Development Plan standards on apartments and meets all minimum spatial standards internally and externally.

8.3 In their decision, the planning authority determined that the proposed additional storey would result in the building being unduly obtrusive and out of character due to its design, scale and massing when viewed in the context of the existing streetscape along this part of Highfield Road.

8.4 The subject site is not located within an Architectural Conservation Area or immediately adjacent any protected structures. It is noted from the application that the existing commercial unit predates the Woodleigh apartment complex. In this context, I am of the view that the unit in appearance and function forms an integral part of the existing street character and the proposal does not deviate from that character to any significant degree. Although of contemporary design, the scale

and massing is not above what currently exists in the area on either side of Highfield Road and the proposed materials of brick and render reflect the surrounding built heritage. The proposed height is just under 7 metres and the Woodleigh Ash building is just under 10 metres in height. I would be satisfied that although differing visually from the Woodleigh complex, it would not be obtrusive in design, scale and massing and would be in keeping with the character of Highfield Road. I therefore see no significant visual impact arising from the proposal.

- 8.5 As part of the first party appeal, a revised design is now proposed, reducing the apartment to a 1 no. bedroom unit with a reduction in scale and massing which notably takes 1.5 metres from the length of the building. The re-designed structure also increases the set back from Woodleigh Ash apartment block from 6 metres to 7.5 metres. The height is unchanged. It is noted that this redesign would push the gable wall of the apartment further to the west giving a more pronounced overhang over the commercial unit in order to move away from the apartment block. The revised proposal in this appeal meet the minimum standards for apartments set out in Section 5.0 and private policy compliant private amenity space and bike and refuse storage.
- 8.6 The revised design presented in this appeal takes the same contemporary approach as the original and utilises the frame of the commercial unit to create a now smaller, proportionate box structure on top. It is considered that the more pronounced overhang in the redesign would have a negligible effect on streetscape and would also not impact on residential amenity.
- 8.7 The materials (red brick and render) reflect those of the existing built environment and are harmonious with the red brick buildings on both sides of Highfield Road, thus the appearance from street level would not appear incongruous.

Neighbouring Residential Amenity

- 8.8 In their decision, the planning authority determined that there were concerns specifically for the Woodleigh apartment complex, in terms of loss of outlook, overshadowing and the overbearing impact of the proposal, which would be

contrary to the residential development standards set out in the 2022-2028 City Development Plan and would be seriously injurious to the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties of the area. The development would therefore, by itself and by the precedent it would set for other similar undesirable development in the vicinity.

- 8.9 In terms of overshadowing impacts, the submitted shadow analysis is limited and only seems to show impacts on June 21st and this is insufficient to gauge overall impact. I agree with the conclusions of the planning authority that, without any evidence to the contrary, there would be a high likelihood of significant overshadowing issues due to the 6 metre distance and length of the structure. It could set an undesirable precedent in that regard. In addition there is concern around daylight and the sense of enclosure experienced by residents at ground and first floor. I conclude that there would likely be an overbearing effect in terms of outlook from the Woodleigh Ash windows as a result of the proposal.
- 8.10 Following the revised design in the first party appeal submission, I am satisfied that the revised shadow analysis document shows a full consideration of overshadowing at various times of the year. It is clear from the analysis that the existing commercial unit, being south of the apartment blocks, causes some minor overshadowing at certain times of the day at certain times of year to Woodleigh Ash and Woodleigh Elm. As a result of the revised proposal for a 1 bed apartment on top of the commercial unit, it is clear that the block to the west, Woodleigh Elm would receive new overshadowing impacts on ground floor windows but this would be limited to certain times in March and September according to the assessment. It is also clear that first floor windows in the nearest block, Woodleigh Ash would be impacted at certain times during the winter whereas previously it was just ground floor apartments.
- 8.11 Overall, any new impacts are intermittent, in line with the urban setting and in light of the prevailing conditions, would not be considered substantial or detrimental to residents. I am satisfied that the revised proposal has reduced the massing sufficiently (1.5 metre reduction in length) and has moved towards Highfield Road to reduce shadowing affects in as much as is possible.

- 8.12 In terms of impacts on neighbour's daylight, the revised set back of 7.5 metres and reduction of the massing by 1.5 metres is considered reasonable in an urban setting and marks an improvement in the amenity level of Woodleigh residents. Although a daylight assessment was not conducted, it is considered that any loss of vertical sky component would not be a detrimental loss due to the distance from the windows of numbers 8 and 9 Woodleigh Ash allowing it to pass the general 45 degree guideline where the structure does not intrude on a 45 degree line if taken from the centre of the windows at this elevation. In addition, the building would now be shorter, allowing more daylight intake.
- 8.13 Whilst the proposal would be visible from these windows, it would not create any new sense of enclosure, especially to apartment numbers 8 or 9 on the first floor. A quantitative daylight analysis is therefore not warranted in this case. As there are no opposing windows on the northern elevation, the privacy of existing residents would also be protected.
- 8.14 In other matters raised in observations, the appellant's agreement to submit a Construction Management Plan to address resident's concerns about construction works is noted and this can be conditioned in the event of a grant of permission. The proposal would be car free, would provide sufficient bin storage for a 1 bed apartment and the provision for 1 no. cycle storage space as per the revised drawings complies with the requirement set out in Section 15.13.1.4 in the Development Plan. I note that the issue of land ownership was raised in some observations. I am satisfied that the applicant has provided sufficient evidence of their legal intent to make a planning application. Any further legal dispute is a civil matter. Any concerns about devaluation of property is only to be considered if there is clear evidence for such a finding and I am satisfied that the proposal would not seriously injure the amenities of the area to such an extent that would adversely affect value of property in the vicinity. All other concerns raised have been dealt with in this report.
- 8.15 Overall, whilst I consider the original proposal to have no detrimental visual impact, the likelihood of overshadowing was a concern and there would have been an unacceptable loss of outlook for residents of Woodleigh Ash owing to the proximity

and bulk and massing of the proposal. I am satisfied that the revisions to the proposal presented in the appeal (namely reduction of length by 1.5m and increase of setback by 1.5m) reduce the bulk and massing sufficiently and as a result it would not cause substantial harm to residential amenity of neighbouring apartments. The submitted shadow analysis also demonstrates no substantial harm in terms of shadow impacts. It is clear that a 7.5 metre set back from the south facing wall of Woodleigh Ash apartments and a shorter building is a reasonable outcome considering the urban setting and the low height of the proposed addition relative to its surroundings. The existing commercial unit is an integral part of the streetscape and, as with the original design, the proposal would not cause any significant harm to the character or the visual amenity of the area. The proposal therefore complies with the 'Z1' (Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods) zoning objective, the policy objectives contained in the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 namely Policy Objectives QHSN04, QHSN06 and QHSN10 and Section 15.9 (apartment standards) in addition to the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments (2023) and Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024)

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located in an established residential area c. 5 km west of South Dublin Bay SAC & South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA.
- 9.2. The proposed development comprises the construction of a 2 bed 3 person self-contained apartment with own hall door access at first floor level above existing single storey hair salon with pedestrian and cycle access from the public footpath at 84 Highfield Road. This proposal also includes for new external brick finish to the existing four plastered ground floor elevations and redesign of salon front

elevation (door and window surrounds) as per Section 2.0 of this report. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

9.3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Nature of works
- Location in an established residential area
- Lack of connections to nearest European sites

9.4. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. The subject site is located at 84 Highfield Road, Dublin 6 D06 RF97 approximately 700 metres north of the River Dodder.

10.2 The proposed development comprises the construction of a 2 bed 3 person self-contained apartment with own hall door access at first floor level above existing single storey hair salon with pedestrian and cycle access from the public footpath at 84 Highfield Road. This proposal also includes for new external brick finish to the existing four plastered ground floor elevations and redesign of salon front elevation (door and window surrounds). No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

10.3 I have assessed the 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. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Nature of works
- Location-distance from nearest water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections

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

11.1. I recommend that planning permission be granted subject to conditions

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

12.1 Having regard to residential zoning of the site, the infill nature of the development, the residential character of the area, the design, scale and massing of the proposed apartment and the residential standards contained in the Dublin City Development Plan, it is considered that the proposed development would not be injurious to the amenities of neighbouring residential properties, would not cause any harm to the visual amenity of the area and would be in keeping with the residential character of the area, thereby according with the provisions of the

Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and 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 An Coimisiún Pleanála on the 15th of August 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 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: To prevent flooding and in the interests of sustainable drainage

- 3.** 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 and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.

Reason: In the interest of public safety and amenity

4. The developer shall ensure that the development is served by adequate water supply and/or wastewater facilities and shall enter into a connection agreement with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for a service connection(s) to the public water supply and/or wastewater collection network prior to commencement of development.

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

5. Proposals for an estate/street name, house numbering scheme and associated signage shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, all estate and street signs, and house numbers, shall be provided in accordance with the agreed scheme. The proposed name(s) shall be based on local historical or topographical features, or other alternatives acceptable to the planning authority. No advertisements/marketing signage relating to the name(s) of the development shall be erected until the developer has obtained the planning authority's written agreement to the proposed name(s).

Reason: In the interest of urban legibility [and to ensure the use of locally appropriate placenames for new residential areas].

6. Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 7:00 am to 6:00pm Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 8:00am to 2:00pm on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these

times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.

7. 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.

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.

Killian Harrington
Planning Inspector
20 October 2025

Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-323399-25
Proposed Development Summary	The proposed development comprises the construction of a 2 bed 3 person self-contained apartment with own hall door access at first floor level above existing single storey hair salon with pedestrian and cycle access from the public footpath at 84 Highfield Road. This proposal also includes for new external brick finish to the existing four plastered ground floor elevations and redesign of salon front elevation (door and window surrounds).
Development Address	84 Highfield Road, Dublin 6 D06 RF97
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX /OR LEAVE BLANK	
<p>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?</p> <p>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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) 	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.</p>
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.</p> <p>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3</p>	

<p>1. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)</u> OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?</p>	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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)	<p>Class 10(b) of Part 2 (dwelling units) Proposed development of 2 no. residential units is substantially below the 500 dwelling unit threshold in Class 10(b)</p>
<p>2. 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)?</p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</p>
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: _____

Date: 20 October 2025

Appendix B: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ACP-323399-25
Proposed Development Summary	The proposed development comprises the construction of a 2 bed 3 person self-contained apartment with own hall door access at first floor level above existing single storey hair salon with pedestrian and cycle access from the public footpath at 84 Highfield Road. This proposal also includes for new external brick finish to the existing four plastered ground floor elevations and redesign of salon front elevation (door and window surrounds).
Development Address	84 Highfield Road, Dublin 6 D06 RF97
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
<p>Characteristics of proposed development</p> <p>(In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).</p>	<p>Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed.</p> <p>The development of 2 no. apartments has a modest footprint, comes forward as a standalone project, requires no demolition works, does not require the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.</p>
<p>Location of development</p> <p>(The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).</p>	<p>Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed</p> <p>The development is situated in an established urban area on serviced lands in Dublin city and is not in close proximity to designated sites and landscapes of identified significance in the Dublin City Development Plan.</p>

<p>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</p> <p>(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).</p>	<p>Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects.</p> <p>Having regard to the modest nature of the proposed development, its urban location removed from sensitive habitats/features, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.</p>
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.

Inspector: _____ **Date:** 20 October 2025

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

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

