



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-500250-DS-25

Development	Remodelling and extension to temple, with food hall, kitchen, changing room, short term guest accommodation and offices and all associated site works.
Location	Gurdwara Guru Nanak Darbar, 78 Serpentine Avenue, Dublin 4.
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council South.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB1649/25.
Applicant(s)	Gurdwara Guru Nanak Darbar CLG.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission.
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeals.
Appellant(s)	Clodagh Delany and; Paolo Maggioni and Barbara Kolodziejczyk.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	24 th February 2026.

Inspector

C. Daly.

1.0 Site Location and Description

The site, of area 0.08ha., consists of an existing two storey building in two main pitched roof sections behind a short single storey flat roof area at the front and is a temple of worship for the Sikh faith in Ireland. It sits between two no. two storey residences, no.s 76 and 80 Serpentine Avenue. The site is bounded by the rear gardens of three no. residences on Serpentine Road, no.s 3, 5 and 7. No. 7's rear garden also has a boundary with the site rear boundary and no. 1 Serpentine Park shares part of the side boundary with the site. The vehicular access to the site is from Serpentine Avenue with on-street parking noted beside the adjacent footpath with on-street parking located in the vicinity.

2.0 Proposed Development

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

- New entrance lobby and two storey front extension to temple.
- Extension to ground floor for food hall and reconfigured kitchen with ancillary changing facilities, toilets and lift.
- Extension to first floor for prayer hall and revisions to prayer hall.
- Central roof section to be remodelled and extended including removal of external asbestos and ductwork.
- New partial second floor community and two guest accommodation rooms to rear and new plant room.
- Total floor area will increase to 1,246.12sqm from 921.07sqm.
- A Gurdwara Sahib Dome and steeple in gold finish at roof level.
- Remodelled landscaped forecourt for pedestrian access and relocated flag post.
- One no. accessible car parking space and four no. bicycle parking spaces with new driveway and entrance.

- 2.2. At F.I. stage the guest bedrooms were relocated to the second floor with an enlarged lightwell and new bay window and the community room was relocated to the first floor.
- 2.3. At C.F.I. stage the bedrooms were relocated to the front of the building. The side extension was removed and high level windows on the left side of the structure were omitted and the plant room and storage areas were relocated to the rear.

3.0 **Planning Authority Decision**

3.1. **Decision**

Dublin City Council initially decided to request further information in relation to concerns in relation to the standard of the first floor bedrooms to the rear with a suggestion that they be moved to the second floor, details on proposed travel arrangements, revised TRICS comparator details and justification for the removal of the 4 no. on-site parking spaces and details for the management of surface water drainage.

Subsequently the P.A. decided to request clarification of further information in relation to inadequate residential amenity standards for the rear bedrooms with high level windows not considered appropriate.

Finally, the P.A. decided to grant permission subject to 9 no. conditions. Notable conditions include:

- Condition no. 3 requires the prior submission of details of external materials and finishes for agreement.
- Condition no. 4 requires a Construction Management Plan including a Construction Traffic Management Plan, a minimum of 13 no. long-term cycle parking spaces and a dedicated bin storage area.
- Condition no. 8 requires compliance with British Standard 5228 for noise control during construction and a noise limit condition during operations.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The initial Planner's Report noted the Z1 (Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods) zoning and that a place of worship is a permissible use. It noted that the property has been in use as a temple since 1986 and that this is the only Sikh temple in Ireland. The primary use times are stated to be Tuesdays and all day on Sundays. It noted the main festival in April/May and September/October 4 times a year. It noted that the previous cinema structure layout has not been subject to major alterations.

The assessment noted that the current structure is a departure from the existing pattern of development and that the proposed new frontage, with symmetrical design, would be an improvement on the current façade. Clarity was required on the height and position of the flagpole.

While noting the proposed two storey front extension would come forward of the existing façade by c.5.5m, it considered that there is not a strong building line at the location. The main concerns noted were the first floor bedrooms to the rear with poor levels of residential amenity noted. It recommended that the bedroom be moved to the second floor with more meaningful windows facing Serpentine Avenue and that louvres or other methods could be used to ensure privacy of adjoining properties. It recommended further information be requested in relation to this issue and the other matters referenced above in Section 3.1.

Following F.I., the second Planner's Report noted that in relation to the relocation of the bedrooms and community room, the issue of poor residential amenity remains a concern and noted the failure to move the bedrooms to the front of the property and considered that this should be justified by way of C.F.I..

In relation to the updated Mobility Management Plan, the evolving plan was considered acceptable. In relation to the TRICS analysis, the updated comparator sites in urban environments were considered appropriate and coupled with the MMP were acceptable. The revised parking arrangement was considered acceptable. The drainage response was considered acceptable. It concluded by recommending C.F.I. in relation to the bedroom amenity issue.

Following C.F.I., the final Planner's Report noted the altered layout of the second floor with the bedrooms moved to the front of the building. It noted the opening provided for 20% of the room for natural light in addition to the ventilation and that these are to be used for short term ancillary accommodation. It noted the removal of the side extension and high level windows on the left side of the structure and the relocation of the plant room and storage areas to the rear and it considers the concerns to have been addressed. The layout justification based on fire safety and religious considerations was considered acceptable. It recommended that permission be granted subject to conditions.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Division: 1st report: F.I. required. 2nd report: No objection subject to conditions. 3rd report: No objection subject to conditions.
- Transportation Planning: 1st report: F.I. required. 2nd report: No objection subject to conditions. 3rd report: No objection subject to conditions.
- Environmental Health Officer: No objection in relation to proposals for asbestos removal subject to condition.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- Uisce Éireann: No response received.
- Irish Rail: No response received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

17 no. third part observations were received in relation to the development, and which can be summarised as follows:

- Excessive and overbearing front extension and façade.
- Existing facades merit retention.
- The flagpole is excessive and would negatively impact on other properties.
- Some structures do not have permission.

- The site will be over developed, and no daylight assessment has been provided.
- There may be encroachment on other properties.
- Light and noise pollution will result.
- Parking issues including illegal parking.
- The building should only be used for worship and not for other events.
- How will boundary walls be treated and how these will be supported.
- Absence of drop off and service parking spaces.
- Development description is misleading in relation to bedrooms.
- Construction noise and removal of asbestos concerns.
- There may be a bat roost in the rear building.
- The sensitive reincarnation of this much loved cultural space is welcomed and will promote inclusivity.
- The inclusion of the community room is appreciated.
- Fully respect the right of the Sikh community to practice their religion and traditions but it should be possible to do in a more sympathetic way.

4.0 **Planning History**

None.

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1. **Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 (the CDP)**

The site is zoned under Objective Z1 (Sustainable Residential Neighbourhood) zoning objective. This is “*to protect, provide and improve residential amenities*” and I note that a ‘place of public worship’ is a permissible use under this zoning

Section 15.4 Key Design Principles outlines key design principles that will be considered in the assessment of development proposals including healthy

placemaking, architectural design quality, sustainability and climate action, inclusivity and accessibility and safe and secure design.

Section 15.14.19 Places of Worship

Applications for places of worship will be considered on a case by case basis having regard to location of the site, proximity to other facilities and accessibility.

A traffic and transport assessment will be required as part of any planning application to demonstrate how the proposal will be accessed, the availability of public transport and a Travel Plan to manage any overflow traffic impacts, car parking and prioritise pedestrian and cycle movements – see Appendix 5.

Section 15.15.2.4 Retention and Re-use of Older Buildings of Significance which are not Protected

.... In assessing applications to demolish buildings/structures of significance that are not protected, the planning authority will actively seek the retention and re-use of buildings and other structures of architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, technical, social and/or local interest or those that make a positive contribution to the character and identity of streetscapes and the sustainable development of the city....

Section 15.18 Construction Management

All developments comprising 30 or more housing units and commercial developments (as well as institutional, educational, health and other public facilities) in excess of 1,000 sq. m. should be accompanied by a preliminary construction management plan. In the event of a grant of permission, and on appointment of a contractor, a final construction management plan will be required to be agreed with the Planning Authority...

Table 15-1: Thresholds for Planning Applications.

Appendix 3 – Height Strategy

Table 2 Indicative Plot Ratio and Site Coverage

Indicative Site Coverage of 45% to 60% for a residential area.

Indicative Plot Ratio of 1.0 to 2.5 for a residential area.

Appendix 5 – Transport and Mobility – Technical Requirements

Table 1: Bicycle Parking Standards for Various Land Uses requires 1 short stay/visitor space per 20 seats for a place of worship.

Table 2: Maximum Car Parking Standards for Various Land Uses requires 1 space per 25 seats for a place of worship. It states that,

These car parking standards shall be generally regarded as the maximum parking provision and parking provision in excess of these maximum standards shall only be permitted in exceptional circumstances e.g. boundary areas, or where necessary for the sustainable development of a regeneration area (see Chapter 13). A relaxation of maximum car parking standards will be considered in Zone 1 and Zone 2 for any site located within a highly accessible location. Applicants must set out a clear case satisfactorily demonstrating a reduction of parking need for the development based on the following criteria:

- *Locational suitability and advantages of the site.*
- *Proximity to High Frequency Public Transport services (10 minutes' walk).*
- *Walking and cycling accessibility/permeability and any improvement to same.*
- *The range of services and sources of employment available within walking distance of the development.*
- *Availability of shared mobility.*
- *Impact on the amenities of surrounding properties or areas including overspill parking.*
- *Impact on traffic safety including obstruction of other road users.*
- *Robustness of Mobility Management Plan to support the development.*

Appendix 16 – Sunlight and Daylight

Section 5.2 refers to impact on surrounding properties where a Sun on Ground analysis is required in relation to outdoor amenity space.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

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

- c.680m south-west of South Dublin Bay SAC and PNHA (site code 000210).

- c.680m south-west of South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (site code 004024).
- c.1.4km south-east of Grand Canal PNHA (site code 002104).
- c.2km south-east of Royal Canal PNHA (site code 002103).
- c.2.5km south-west of North Dublin Bay PNHA (site code 000206).
- c.4.2km south-west of North Dublin Bay SAC and PNHA (site code 000206).
- c.4.2km south-west of North Bull Island SPA (site code 004006).
- c.5km south-west of North-west Irish Sea SPA (site code 004236).
- c.7.5km north-west of Dalkey Coastal Zone and Killiney Hill PNHA (site code 001206).
- c.8.6km north-east of Dodder Valley PNHA (site code 000991).
- c.8.7km west of Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (site code 003000).

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of the two. no. third party appeals by Clodagh Delany and by Paola Maggioni and Barbara Kolodziejczk can be summarised as follows:

In relation to No. 76 Serpentine Avenue and surrounding area

- Failure of the P.A. to take into consideration third party objections.
- Per Table 15-1 of the development plan, the application is required to include a Community and Social Audit, a Construction Management Plan, a Construction and Demolition Waste Management Plan, an Operational Waste Management Plan and a Noise Assessment and given that likely significant effects could not be tested such that it fails procedural and evidential standards.
- The front forward extension creates an enclosing wall-like presence which would be overbearing on the forecourt and principal ground floor room of the adjacent no. 76 Serpentine Avenue.

- The development is contrary to the key design principles (Section 15.4) where it fails to respect prevailing building lines, rooflines and the scale and pattern of the street and fails to make a positive contribution to the townscape.
- There was a failure to submit a complete Daylight and Sunlight assessment to quantify overshadowing and sky component losses to the adjoining dwelling with a noted failure to address the early-morning period for the adjacent front room (see Appendix 1 visual representation submitted by C Delany).
- The ancillary accommodation should be omitted by condition given the loss of privacy and overlooking of the adjacent no. 76 that would result. The metal screening will not be adequate to mitigate this impact (See Photo submitted by C Delany). The Inspector on the case is requested to visit no. 76 to assess the impact.
- In relation to asbestos a bespoke condition is required per the EHO recommendation and this was not provided for in the grant of permission.
- The building façade, little altered from the original art deco style, merits retention given its historic, social and cultural interest (see photo submitted by C Delany of original cinema frontage).
- The religious function does not necessitate a monumental frontage which would be out of character for Serpentine Avenue's modest residential grain and contemporary Gurdwara architecture can be modest and contextual (see photo submitted by C Delany of Gurdwara in Northampton, England). The applicant's religious rights would not be diminished by adopting a more sympathetic design to the façade.
- It was inappropriate of the P.A. to justify the façade design by reference to the ad-hoc façade structures added without permission.
- Site coverage would be increased from 61% to 75% and the site lacks the capacity to accept the proposed front extension which would be excessive and constitute overdevelopment, and the remaining front curtilage would have multiple functions as the sole external landscaped space.

- There would be a significant intensification of multi-use on the site given the size and extent of facilities proposed with a noted failure to apply all necessary development standards.
- Assurances are required in relation to impacts on boundaries including party walls and trees and should permission be granted a condition is required to require a full structural survey and report including mitigation measures.
- In relation to the historic rubble stone party wall between no.s 76 and 78, Section 15.15 of the Development Plan requires safeguarding of historic fabric and appropriate method statement with none submitted in this case.
- The development requires an Operational Management Plan to govern drop-off/collection, stewarding, delivery and refuse collection arrangements per Appendix 5 of the Development Plan.
- The forward extension will negatively impact on residential amenities and should be assessed de novo.
- Any external lighting scheme should be appropriate to the established residential area with no light spillage onto adjacent property.
- Issues with the Council's website during the observation period mean that it is likely that member of the public were prevented from making observations contrary to the planning regulations.
- C Delany's submission specifically requests, without prejudice, 15 no. conditions should permission be granted. These relate to omission of the front extension and skyline elements, a revised daylight and sunlight assessment with changes to the development to be required where material adversely effects are identified, the submission of a community and social audit, the submission of a structural survey report including mitigation measures, a survey and abatement plan for the asbestos removal including waste tracking and air monitoring, the submission of a noise impact assessment for construction and operation, the submission of an odour management plan, the submission of a maintenance contract for the degreasing and charcoal vent, the submission of a Construction and Demolition Waste Management Plan, the submission of an Operational

Management Plan, the submission of a Structural Method Statement addressing works in relation to party walls and historic rubble fabric, the height and dimensions of the flagpole shall be agreed to prevent visual dominance and noise impacts, the ancillary bedrooms be omitted, opaque glazing be required for the bedroom windows and an appropriate external lighting scheme with no light spillage.

In relation to No. 65 Serpentine Avenue and surrounding area

- In the context of illegal traffic parking, particularly Tuesday evenings and Sundays, the observations of the Transportation Department bear no relation to the conditions on the ground.
- Reduction of parking on the site will exacerbate the existing parking and traffic issues.
- Clarity is required as to when the new dining facilities will also cater for third party events.
- The community room will be available to local residents exacerbating transport and parking concerns.
- The facade is not necessary for a Sikh temple and will be overbearing, dominant, incongruous and is incompatible with the surrounding houses.
- Breaking the building line will add to the negative visual impact.
- There is no reason why a more discrete and smaller flagpole could not be relocated elsewhere, e.g. the flat roof at the front.
- There has been an absence of community consultation.
- The front extension and associated domes should be refused permission and a design that reinstates the established building line with a contextual recessed façade is required.
- 4 no. conditions are sought should permission be granted. These relate to a reduction in the scale of the front of the building and omission of the dome and two storey extension and a more sympathetic façade.
- The building line should be pushed back to respect the established building line.

- Off-street parking spaces be increased to 6-7.
- Relocation of the flagpole and reduction of a more modest height set further back within the site.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

Dublin City Council's response can be summarised as follows:

- The amendments submitted at FI and CFI stage addressed the concerns of the P.A..
- The development supports the continued use at this location.
- The condition in relation to asbestos recommended by the Environmental Health Officer was omitted in error and it is recommended it be included should permission be granted.

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:

- Principle of Development
- Visual Amenity
- Residential Amenity
- Transportation and Parking
- Other Matters

7.2. Principle of Development

7.2.1. I note the site zoning under the Z1 (Sustainable Residential Neighbourhood) zoning objective. This is "*to protect, provide and improve residential amenities*" and I note that a 'place of public worship' is a permissible use under this zoning. Accordingly, I consider the principle of the proposed extensions and internal changes to the

existing place of worship, including provision of a food hall, kitchen and ancillary accommodation and other complimentary uses, to accord with the zoning objective for the site.

7.3. Visual Amenity

- 7.3.1. I note that the appellants have raised concerns in relation to failure to retain the existing façade which is stated to merit retention and in relation to whether the proposed façade is necessary. Noting the existing façade and historic use of the building, previously as a cinema, and noting that the building is not on the record of protected structures, having reviewed the submitted drawings and visited the property and street, I do not consider that the current façade or the previous façade is of any special architectural or historic significance that would merit retention and I note that significant demolition is not proposed.
- 7.3.2. I note that effective large scale retention of the existing older building is proposed consistent with Section 15.15.2.4 (Retention and Re-use of Older Buildings of Significance which are not protected) of the CDP. I note this particularly in the context of the proposal to facilitate, modernise and expand the current use as a place of worship. I also do not consider it reasonable that the applicant is required to justify whether or not such a façade is required for religious or other purposes.
- 7.3.3. I note that the appellants have raised concerns in relation to the proposed front extensions and alterations including that the front extension and façade would be excessive and out of keeping with the street. I note that the front façade would increase to two storey height with hipped roof and gold painted dome like structure with steeple on top of the central flat roof area. I agree with the P.A. that the proposed façade would have a uniform and coherent design. While noting that the front extension and redesign would be of significant scale relative to the existing, I consider that it would integrate with the existing building on the site given its proportions, scale and symmetry.
- 7.3.4. I note that the front two storey extension would bring forward the existing building line. This would have the effect that the building line would step forward towards the adjacent building line at the corner where the houses are further forward of the temple building. In my view this would present a coherent stepping forward of the building line that would aid with enclosing the street and creating a strong urban

presence. I do not consider that this would be excessive for a suburban street of this nature with mainly two storey dwellings in the vicinity.

7.3.5. I note this in the context of the adjacent no.s 76 and 78 Serpentine Avenue which I consider have strong urban presence and which building line is not parallel to the street. There are also three storey apartment buildings opposite the site which adds variety to the area. I note that while the proposed front extension would not be in keeping with the street, given the proximity to the corner and noting the differing house and building types along the street, I do not consider that this difference would be so excessive as to outweigh the placemaking and inclusivity considerations noted in the Key Design Principles Section (15.4) of the CDP. I consider the scale would reflect the role of the use as a place of worship and community facility.

7.3.6. I also note that making this building somewhat more prominent in the streetscape would provide visual interest and aid in way-finding due to the strong and differing design presence on the street that would result. I consider these to be significant urban design benefits and accordingly, in my opinion, the proposed front extension and new façade would not impact significantly on the street and would be acceptable in terms of visual impact on the street.

7.3.7. In relation to other design changes proposed for the building such as the front facing windows for the second floor bedrooms, I do not consider that there would be significant impacts on the site or surrounding streets. I note the third party appellant concerns in relation to the new higher flag pole to be located close to the street. Given the proposed height, to a height of 25.53m, over double the height of the parapet of the front extension, together with its prominent position close to the front boundary, should permission be granted, I recommend that its maximum height be limited to the height of the steeple above the dome structure (16.74m) and that it be required to be located within 3m of the new front entrance or on top of the central flat roof adjacent to the dome structure. This is to avoid it appearing excessively visually dominant noting the residential context and noting the other building design changes.

7.4. Residential Amenity

7.4.1. I note that the appellants have raised concerns in relation to the impact of the front two storey extension and dome structure on the adjacent no. 76 Serpentine Avenue given that the front façade would be just over 6m further forward than the adjacent

house to the south-west at no. 76. I note this would present a two-storey façade of significant depth along the front side boundaries of the site.

- 7.4.2. A photomontage has also been submitted and the appellants assert that it would result in an overbearing impact on no.76 in close proximity. I agree with this opinion given the significant depth and scale of the proposed front extension up to the front side boundary with the adjacent no. 76. In my view, this would constitute an excessive overbearing impact to the front side of the residence at no. 76. I also note this would be in addition to the impact of the existing two storey building along the northern rear side of that property which side walls are proposed to be raised in height primarily for the new prayer hall. In this context, the new expanded building would excessively visually dominate the adjacent residence to the south in my opinion.
- 7.4.3. I also note that in relation to the adjacent rear garden of no. 80 Serpentine Avenue, a two storey dwelling to the north, that there would be a new two storey wall of significant depth up to the rear garden side boundary with the subject site. In my opinion, this scale of development, above the eaves height of no. 80 in such close proximity to the adjacent rear garden would result in an undue overbearing impact on the adjacent private open space. I also note that this structure in close proximity would be to the south of no. 80 with potential for significant overshadowing impact. I also note that the appellant at no. 76 has raised concerns in relation to overshadowing, particularly in the early morning hours.
- 7.4.4. I note the submitted shadow diagrams, particularly the shadow analysis on the Autumn equinox at 14.00 which suggests a significant increase in the overshadowing of the rear garden of no. 80 Serpentine Avenue and no.s 1 and 3 Serpentine Road to the north-east as a result of the proposed development. I also note it suggests a significant increase in shadowing at 16.00 in this regard. In relation to the shadowing of no. 76, due to its position to the south-west of the front extension, I do not consider that any significant shadowing that would result would be significant for that property.
- 7.4.5. I note no detailed analysis of the overshadowing impacts on the rear gardens of no.s 1 and 3 Serpentine Road or on the rear garden of no. 80 Serpentine Avenue was undertaken in accordance with the BRE standard (for example a Sun on Ground

evaluation) required in Appendix 16 of the CDP such that I cannot rule out that significant overshadowing of this private amenity space would not occur. This would also fail to ensure a key principle of healthy placemaking is achieved per Section 15.4.1 of the CDP. Accordingly in relation to this issue and the overbearing impacts to the sides of the front extension, I recommend that permission be refused.

7.4.6. In relation to loss of privacy raised by the appellant by reason of the front facing windows for the second floor level ancillary bedrooms, I note the CDP standard of 22m between opposing first floor (and above) windows. In this case, I note the applicable windows would not be directly opposing the windows or open space of the adjacent no. 76 Serpentine Park. I also note that the diagonal distances to the windows at first floor level would be over 21m as shown on the proposed second floor plan submitted. Accordingly, I have no significant concerns in this regard.

7.4.7. I note that the appellants have raised the issue of a significant intensification of use. Transportation related matters will be assessed separately below. In relation to impacts that may arise such as increased noise, I note that standard operational conditions can be applied to ensure no undue impacts on residential amenities arise. Should permission be granted, I also recommend a condition to ensure any no odours are emitted to adjacent properties from the kitchen and that lighting does not result in light spill onto adjacent properties. This would be an improvement on the current situation in my opinion given the existing kitchen facilities are no subject to such control. Otherwise, I do not consider that an excessive intensification of use of the site/building would arise in the suburban context.

7.5. Transportation and Parking

7.5.1. I note that the appellants have raised issues in relation to transportation and parking and have highlighted that illegal parking and congestion often result on the days of services. I note that matters in relation to illegal parking are matters for parking enforcement which in the city area is robust as it includes clamping. I consider on-street parking to be appropriately regulated for this location.

7.5.2. I note that a Mobility Management Plan was submitted following F.I. prepared by ORS Consulting engineers and that the TRICS comparator sites were updated to more relevant sites to the satisfaction of the Transportation section of the Council. In relation to potential excessive intensification of use, noting the travel survey results

where private car use was found to be 12% of visitors, I have no significant concerns in this regard. The MMP seeks to promote sustainable travel methods and it notes the available travel options in this regard. It includes a recommendation for the appointment of a MMP Co-ordinator so that the plan can adapt over time and an annual stakeholder survey is included.

- 7.5.3. I note the revised site layout plan shows provision for three no. car parking spaces which includes one accessible/EV space. This is one less space than the total quantum of parking spaces under the existing situation. I note the MMP conclusions include that 83% of attendees do not require parking facilities and that 88% use alternative modes of transport the car. I note the submitted Parking Provision Justification as part of the Transportation Letter prepared by ORS Consulting Engineers at F.I. stage. This notes the current on-street car parking availability of 20 to 25 spaces within 100m of the site and that 15 vehicles regularly attend during weekly operations.
- 7.5.4. It is proposed to actively manage the three spaces on the site given the limited turning options within the site. I note the MMP submitted at F.I. stage whereby the total number of attendees is noted to be 260. Based on the maximum car parking standard of 1 space per 25 seats in Table 2, Appendix 5, of the CDP this would give a maximum requirement for 10 on-site parking spaces.
- 7.5.5. The MMP nes that bus at 45% is the dominant modal choice based on its travel survey with 12% coming by private car. I note the location within Parking Zone 2 where car parking provision is to be minimised, I consider the three spaces proposed to be justified by reference to the CDP criteria under Table 2 and particularly given the off-peak attendance patterns and the accessible location within walking distance of high quality public transport, for example Lansdowne Road DART station is a c.700m walk away and the site within walking distance of city bus services. Contrary to the appellants, in this case I do not consider that a separate Operational Management Plan is required in relation to standard movements to and from the site.
- 7.5.6. Based on this, and the conditions recommended by the transportation section including a requirement for a Construction Traffic Management Plan, 13 no. long term sheltered cycle parking spaces and a dedicated bin storage area, I have no objection to the development. Should permission be granted I recommend that these

conditions be applied to ensure a reasonable balance between car use and sustainable transportation methods is sought.

7.6. Other Matters

- 7.6.1. I note the appellants have raised that the requirements of Table 15-1 for the submission of several documents with the application, such as a Community and Social Audit, have not been complied with by the applicant. In relation to the documents raised, I note that these are generally required for developments of 1,000sqm or more. As this is an extension proposal for an additional c.325sqm of floorspace, I do not consider there to be a mandatory requirement to provide such documents.
- 7.6.2. I note that the issues raised in this regard in relation to construction and demolition waste management, operational waste management plan and noise assessment are matters that can be dealt with by standard conditions for a development of this scale and type. Should permission be granted I recommend such conditions be applied. I do however agree with the appellant that a report in accordance with BRE guidance is required given the type of shadowing effects associated with the proposed development and I assessed this matter above in Section 7.4.
- 7.6.3. I note issues have been raised in relation to an excessive plot ratio for the site. I note the proposed plot ratio would be c.1.4 which is in line with the indicative plot ratio between 1.0 and 2.5 in the CDP. I have calculated the proposed site coverage to be c.75%. This would be above the indicative site coverage for a residential area noted to be 45% to 60% per Table 2 of Appendix 3 of the CDP. While I note this is an indicative standard and not mandatory, given my above concerns in relation to impacts on adjacent residential amenities, I consider that the increase in site coverage is reflected in the identified impacts on adjoining residential properties..
- 7.6.4. Outside of any potential legal issues in relation to the boundaries which are not planning matters, I have assessed separately shadowing issues associated with the two storey forward extension. Having reviewed the drawings, in my opinion there are no significant issues, other than those already assessed earlier in this report, that would unduly impact on adjacent residential amenities from the extensions which are proposed within the site boundaries. In relation to the old stone party wall referred to by the appellant, I note no works are proposed to these walls. I note these walls are

not within the curtilage of a protected structure or conservation area such that I have no significant built heritage concerns or concerns in relation to significant impacts on adjacent amenities from the proposed works in the vicinity of the site boundaries.

- 7.6.5. In relation to surface water drainage matters, I note that the P.A. initially had concerns in relation to a lack of information on this. Following a detailed response from ORS Consulting Engineers, the Drainage Division had no issues. The F.I. response noted that the updated drainage proposals were finalised following a meeting with the Council's drainage section. It also noted that a green roof would be used for the low pitched roof to the front and that permeable paving areas would be included within the front boundary. Noting the proposed SUDS measures which were to the satisfaction of the P.A., I consider that standard conditions can be applied if permission is granted.
- 7.6.6. In relation to the requirement for asbestos removal, should permission be granted I recommend the inclusion of the condition recommended by the Environmental Health Officer to ensure best practice measures are employed.
- 7.6.7. I note the issues raised in relation to the Council's website being unavailable for a period during the period for observations. While this may or may not have been the case, I note it did not prevent the appellants or 17 no. third party observations from being made. I am satisfied that I have considered the relevant significant planning issues, particularly by reference to impacts on adjoining properties, the surrounding area and by reference to CDP policy. I therefore do not consider that the appellant has raised any significant planning issue in this regard.

8.0 EIA Screening

- 8.1. 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 the potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

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 c.680m south-west of South Dublin Bay SAC (site code 000210) and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (site code 004024), the nearest European sites.
- 9.2. The proposed development comprises remodeling and extension to temple, with food hall, kitchen, changing room, short term guest accommodation and offices and all associated site works. 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.
- 9.4. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The relatively small-scale nature of the development.
 - The distance from the nearest European site and lack of ecological connections thereto, and intervening urban land uses.
 - Taking into account the screening determination by the P.A..
- 9.5. 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.
- 9.6. 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 c.345m south-east of the Dodder_050 (IE_EA_09D010900) river waterbody (status “moderate”), is c.680m south-west of the Dublin Bay (IE_EA_090_0000) coastal waterbody (status “good”) and is above the Dublin (IE_EA_G_008) ground waterbody (status “good”). The proposed development comprises remodeling and extension to a temple, with food hall,

kitchen, changing room, short term guest accommodation and offices and all associated site works.

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 seeks to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and ground water bodies 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 relatively small-scale nature of the development and that wastewater disposal would be to the Ringsend WWTP which has available capacity.
- The distance from the nearest surface water bodies.

10.4. I conclude on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would 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 jeopardize any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that permission be refused.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the significant depth and height of the front extension element in close proximity to the adjacent dwellings to the north and south, this would result in significant visually overbearing impacts on numbers 76 and 80 Serpentine Avenue and would excessively negatively impact on the residential amenity of these residences. Having regard to the potential for a significant overshadowing impact to result on the rear gardens of numbers 1 and 3 Serpentine Road and the rear garden of number 80 Serpentine Avenue,

the proposed development would be contrary to Section 5.2 of Appendix 16 (Sunlight and Daylight) of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028. The proposed development would fail to ensure that appropriate access to outdoor sunlight is maintained consistent with healthy placemaking principles which would be contrary to Section 15.4.1 of the Development Plan. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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 me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

Ciarán Daly

Planning Inspector

27th February 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

An Coimisiún Pleanála Case Reference	PL-500250-DS-25		
Proposed Development Summary	Remodelling and extension to temple, with food hall, kitchen, changing room, short term guest accommodation and offices and all associated site works.		
Development Address	Gurdwara Guru Nanak Darbar, 78 Serpentine Avenue, Dublin 4.		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	X
		No	
2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?			
Yes			EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	X		Proceed to Q.3
3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?			
		Threshold	Comment (if relevant)
			Conclusion
No			No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required
Yes	X	Part 2, Class 10(b)(iv). Threshold: Urban development of an area greater than 10 hectares outside a business	Proceed to Q.4

		district or other parts of a built-up area.		
--	--	---	--	--

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Preliminary Examination required
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 2

Form 2 – EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-500250-DS-25
Proposed Development Summary	Remodelling and extension to temple, with food hall, kitchen, changing room, short term guest accommodation and offices and all associated site works.
Development Address	Gurdwara Guru Nanak Darbar, 78 Serpentine Avenue, Dublin 4.
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>Extensions totalling c.325sqm in an urban area.</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 site is within the built-up serviced urban area of south Dublin in the inner suburbs of the city. There are no sensitive natural environmental receptors in close proximity to the site. Not located in proximity to areas of historic, cultural or archaeological significance.</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>Modest scale of the development would give rise to no significant environment effects on the site or in the vicinity.</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:** _____

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

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)