



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500397-DR-25

Development	Demolition of bungalow and construction of four houses with all associated works.
Location	27 Redesdale Road, Mount Merrion, Blackrock, Co. Dublin, A94T9W6
Planning Authority	Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D25A/0617
Applicant(s)	Cajen Properties
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Mount Merrion Residents Association (MMRA)
Observer(s)	Tony Ferris Mark O'Kelly & Catherine McCann Louise Sabella Déaglán, Sadhbh, and Garbhán O' Dónaill

Date of Site Inspection

13th February 2026

Inspector

Aoife McCarthy

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	5
2.0 Proposed Development	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	6
3.1. Decision	6
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	6
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	8
3.4. Third Party Observations	8
4.0 Planning History.....	9
4.1. Subject Site.....	9
4.2. Environs of Site (Cited by Appellant)	9
5.0 Policy Context.....	11
5.7. Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028.....	12
5.8. Natural Heritage Designations	17
5.9. EIA Screening	17
5.10. Water Framework Directive Screening	17
6.0 The Appeal	18
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	18
6.2. Applicant Response	21
6.3. Planning Authority Response.....	23
6.4. Observations.....	24
6.5. Further Responses	25
7.0 Assessment.....	26
7.3. Residential Amenity	27

7.4. Visual Impact Assessment.....	30
7.5. Traffic and Transportation.....	33
7.6. Landscaping and Open Space.....	37
8.0 Recommendation.....	39
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	39
10.0 Conditions.....	40
Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination	46
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	
Form 2: EIA Preliminary Examination	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site has a stated area of 0.0785 hectares and is located at 27 Redesdale Road, Mount Merrion, Co. Dublin.
- 1.2. The site comprises a rectangular corner site, located at the junction of Redesdale Road and Trees Road Upper.
- 1.3. The site currently comprises 1 no. 4 bed bungalow, garage, and outbuildings accessed Trees Road Upper, with a pedestrian entrance from Redesdale Road.
- 1.4. The site is bound by the side boundary of a 2-storey property at No.134 Trees Road Upper to the east; the grounds of a bungalow, No. 25 Redesdale Road, to the south. This property forms part of pair of semi-detached bungalows with Bo. 23 Redesdale Road, to its south.
- 1.5. The site and wider area comprise a mix of single and two storey houses.
- 1.6. The subject site and environs are residential in character.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development consists of:
 - (i) demolition of the existing bungalow dwelling (115m² GFA) and associated outbuildings on site.
 - (ii) the construction of 4 no. two-storey with attic semi-detached, 3 bedroom dwellings (each 156.5m² GFA).
 - (iii) modifications to existing vehicular entrance along Trees Road Upper to provide 3 no. new vehicular entrances and the addition of a new vehicular entrance along Redesdale Road.
 - (iv) 4 no. on curtilage car parking spaces (1 no. space per dwelling) and private amenity space.
 - (v) repair and part replacement of existing damaged boundary wall and new timber fence over portion; and all associated works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. The Local Authority issued a Notification of a Decision to Grant Permission on the 17th of November 2025, subject to 14 No. Conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports (dated 24th September 2025)

- 3.2.2. The Report includes a summary of the 9 no. submissions received on file.

- 3.2.3. The main points raised are as follows:

- The PA is satisfied that the proposal is compatible with the A zoning objective which applies to the subject site.
- Whilst the structural defects of the existing building could be remedied, taking account of the current condition of the existing dwelling, BER F rating, retrofitting with greater life-cycle CO₂ emission, other related difficulties, in combination with significant increase in residential density, the planning authority welcomes more efficient use of the site; and in compliance with s.12.3.9 of the Development Plan.
- The site is located within one kilometre of the N 11 corridor; density at 51 units per hectare is acceptable.
- The proposed layout is broadly in line with the principles of s.12.3.7.7 (Policy Obj. PHP19) of the Development Plan.
- The dwellings would meet the standards of the Sustainable Communities Guidelines and as require under the Development Plan. However, the store would not meet min. standard of the 2007 Guidelines. It is recommended that FI is requested in this regard.
- Private amenity space would be in compliance with s. 5.3 and SPPR 2 within the Compact Settlement Guidelines 2024. The relatively less privacy of amenity space for House D is on balance, acceptable, in order to accommodate higher density.

- The proposed units would exceed required separation distances to adjoining properties as set out within the Sustainable Community Guidelines 2024.
- Given the orientation of the proposed dwellings, their relationship with surrounding properties and the relative size of those properties, no material impacts in terms of the sunlight and daylight enjoyed by those properties is anticipated. Similarly, the proposed units would receive adequate levels of sunlight and daylight both internally and also in the private amenity spaces.
- The proposed development would not result in significant adverse impacts to adjoining dwellings by way of overlooking and overbearing.
- The height of the dwellings including front and rear dormer windows would be in harmony with properties in the area.
- The scheme does not provide 15% public open space, as required in the Development Plan. The PA concurs with the recommendation of Parks & Landscape Services, to apply a Condition requiring a contribution in lieu.
- A 1.8m high timber fence which forms part of the western boundary should be removed; and this to be addressed as part of FI request.
- A Request for Further Information was issued on 29th September 2025, relating to 1) internal storage and omission of a 1.8m timber high fence on the western boundary; 2) Provision of revised drainage plans; separate SuDS measures for each house in accordance with Policy Objective E116 of the Development Plan, which requires that all surface water runoff generated by development is infiltrated or reused locally with no overflow to the public sewer. In the event that infiltration is not possible, the applicant to submit an Infiltration Test to this effect and to propose alternate SuDS measures; 3) Submission of a RWMP and a CEMP.
- The response received on the 24th October 2025 included 1) revised plans illustrating storage provision in compliance with the 2007 Housing Guidelines and the replacement of the timber fence with a low solid wall; b) a Drainage Report, prepared by MOCA Consulting Engineers, demonstrating separate SuDS measures for each dwelling; drainage would be infiltrated locally within each site using shallow infiltration baskets; c) a RWMP and CEMP.

- The PA considers that the Applicant has satisfied these Items.
- The PA recommend that permission should be granted.

3.2.4. Other Technical Reports

- **Parks and Landscape Services (5th September 2025):** No objection subject to condition.
- **Environmental Enforcement Department:** No objection subject to condition.
- **Drainage Planning:** No objection subject to condition.
- **Transportation Planning:** No objection subject to condition.
- **Environmental Health:** No objection subject to condition.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1. **Uisce Éireann:** No objection subject to Pre-connection agreement.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. A total of 9 no. third party submissions has been received by the authority. The submissions are from residents and a local residents' group. The grounds of the submissions are summarised as follows:

- Concerns regarding road safety due to the proximity of the proposed entrances to the corner, inevitable additional on-street parking in front of the shops,
- The proposal would result in an increase in car density at the commercial end of Trees Road, due to the single car parking space allocated per unit.
- No consultation between the Applicant and traffic planning authorities regarding access during and after construction.
- No reference to the existing traffic issues and the plans how to mitigate the traffic issues,
- Construction Management Plan is required.
- Sightline drawing does not acknowledge stationary traffic at the junction.

- The 4 no. entrances may result in the need for cyclist / pedestrians from footpaths.
- Removal of significant tree planting from the site.
- Metal finish at roof level and within the dormer is out of place.
- Unsympathetic design of the houses, with huge windows and use of brick through elevations.
- Potential negative impacts of the proposed development relating to overlooking and overbearance.
- The scale, height, massing, design are out of character within the established architectural context.
- House D is excessively close to the western wall of the property, no relevant measurement stated on the drawings.
- Misleading wording within the public notices and applicant's planning report.

3.4.2. There is no record within this hard file, or reference within the Planner's Report to third party submissions received by the PA, further to the receipt of the Response to Further Information from the Applicant.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Subject Site

4.1.1. There is no planning history relating to the subject site.

4.2. Environs of Site (Cited by Appellant)

4.2.1. **D23A/0600:** Scoil San Treasa, The Rise, Mount Merrion, Blackrock, Dublin. Permission granted by the local authority in March 2024 for the demolition and removal of existing temporary accommodation and the construction of a one/two-storey extension (total area 1,060m²) comprising 9 no. classrooms, 1 no. ASD unit and ancillary accommodation, a new school office, conversion of 1 no. existing classroom to special educational needs accommodation, solar voltaic panels to be mounted on the roof of the existing school and the proposed extension, 32 no.

additional bicycle stands and all associated landscaping, boundary treatments and site development works.

4.2.2. Condition 3 requires the following:

(a) Prior to commencement of development, the Applicant shall submit revised drawings and details which demonstrate the provision of an access gate accessible to cyclists adjacent to the existing bin storage area to the north-west of the site, which can provide access to the site from North Avenue and via the improved accessible entrance to Deerpark. An internal route shall be provided from the new entrance to the bicycle storage area. The required changes shall be agreed in writing with the Council prior to commencement of development. For the avoidance of doubt, these gates are not required to be kept open at all times and shall be in the full control of the applicant.

(b) Prior to commencement of development, proposals including revised drawings and details which show how the delivery of the Sea to Mountains Active School Travel Route can be facilitated along the area to the east of the subject site within the applicant's control (outlined in blue in the Site Location Map (Drawing No. P-001)), or alternate equivalent route as otherwise agreed, shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with the Council. Such agreed route area shall be reserved free of development other than the subject section of the Sea to Mountains route.

(c) All proposed measures outlined within Section 9 'Targets and Action Plan' of the submitted School Travel Plan shall be implemented by the Applicant.

(d) All proposed measures outlined within the submitted Outline Construction Management Plan, by EIRENG Consulting Engineers Revision date: 15/09/2023 shall be implemented by the Applicant.

(e) The Applicant shall prevent any mud, dirt, debris or building material being carried onto or placed on the public road or adjoining property(s) as a result of the site construction works and repair any damage to the public road arising from carrying out the works.

(f) All necessary measures shall be taken by the Applicant and Contractor to avoid conflict between construction activities and pedestrian/cyclist/vehicular movements on The Rise and the surrounding public roads during construction works.

Reason: In the interests of orderly development and the promotion of active travel measures in the area.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities, Best Practice Guidelines, 2007

5.1.1. These Guidelines set out national planning policy and guidance in relation to housing design.

5.1.2. Development standards for housing are set out in Table 5.1 of the document. It includes target gross floor area floor area (102m²); min. space requirements for main living room (13m²), aggregate living area (34m²), aggregate bedroom area (32m²), internal storage (5m²) for a 3 bed/5 person 3 storey dwellings.

5.2. Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities, Best Practice Guidelines, 2024

5.3. These Guidelines set out national planning policy and guidance in relation to the creation of settlements that are compact, attractive, liveable and well designed. These Guidelines replace the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2009.

5.4. Development standards for housing are set out in Chapter 5, including SPPR 1 Separation Distances, a separation distance of at least 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms¹⁶ at the rear or side of houses, duplex units and apartment units, above ground floor level shall be maintained. There shall be no specified minimum separation distance at ground level or to the front of houses, duplex units and apartment units in statutory development plans and planning applications shall be determined on a case-by-case basis to prevent undue loss of privacy.

5.4.1. SPPR 2 in relation to private open space (3-bed house - 40m²).

5.4.2. Section 5.3.4 of the Guidelines relates to quantum, form and location of car parking, sets out that,

“the approach should take account of proximity to urban centres and sustainable transport options, in order to promote more sustainable travel choices. Car parking ratios should be reduced at all urban locations, and should be minimised, substantially reduced or wholly eliminated at locations that have good access to urban services and to public transport.”

5.5. Climate and Low Carbon Development Act 2015 (as amended)

5.5.1. The Acts, to be read in conjunction with Climate Action Plan 2025 with reference to CAP2024, outline measures and actions by which the national climate objective of transitioning to a climate resilient, biodiversity rich, environmentally sustainable and climate neutral economy by 2050 is to be achieved. They include budgets appropriate across a range of sectors. Of relevance to residential development is the built environment sector. The Commission must be consistent with the Plan in its decision making.

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

5.6.1. The NBAP includes five strategic objectives aimed at addressing existing challenges and new and emerging issues associated with biodiversity loss.

5.6.2. Section 59B (1) of the Wildlife (Amendment) Act 2000 (as amended) requires the Commission, as a public body, to have regard to the objectives and targets of the NBAP in the performance of its functions, to the extent that they may affect or relate to the functions of the Commission. The impact of development on biodiversity, including species and habitats, can be assessed at a European, National and Local level and is taken into account in our decision-making having regard to the Habitats and Birds Directives, Environmental Impact Assessment Directive, Water Framework Directive and Marine Strategy Framework Directive, and other relevant legislation, strategy and policy where applicable.

5.7. Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028

5.7.1. The zoning objective for the subject site is “A”, “to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities.”

5.7.2. Residential use is Permitted in Principle as a land use under this zoning objective.

5.7.3. Chapter 3 addresses Climate Action.

5.7.4. Policy Objective CA5: Energy Performance in Buildings

Policy Objective CA5: Energy Performance in Buildings It is a Policy Objective to support high levels of energy conservation, energy efficiency and the use of

renewable energy sources in existing and new buildings, including retro fitting of energy efficiency measures in the existing building stock.

5.7.5. Policy Objective CA6: Retrofit and Reuse of Buildings

Policy Objective CA6: Retrofit and Reuse of Buildings It is a Policy Objective to require the retrofitting and reuse of existing buildings rather than their demolition and reconstruction where possible recognising the embodied energy in existing buildings and thereby reducing the overall embodied energy in construction as set out in the Urban Design Manual (Department of Environment Heritage and Local Government, 2009). (Consistent with RPO 7.40 and 7.41 of the RSES).

With 30% of construction related emissions locked into the completed building as 'embodied carbon' priority should be given to repairing and re-using existing buildings in preference to demolition and new-build. This policy objective is again in line with the targets of the DLR CCAP. For new build and repair or retrofit, the Planning Authority will support the use of materials that are sustainably sourced and the reuse and recycling of existing materials wherever possible. Where an existing building cannot be incorporated into a new layout and the development facilitates a significant increase in density, demolition may be considered to be acceptable to the Planning Authority (See also Section 12.3.9. Demolition and Replacement Dwellings).

5.7.6. Chapter 4: Neighbourhood – People, Homes and Place sets out policies and objectives on housing in Section 4.3: Homes.

5.7.7. Policy Objective PHP19: Existing Housing Stock - Adaptation

In accordance with Policy Objective PHP19: Existing Housing Stock – Adaptation, infill development will be encouraged within the County. New infill development shall respect the height and massing of existing residential units. Infill development shall retain the physical character of the area including features such as boundary walls, pillars, gates/ gateways, trees, landscaping, and fencing or railings. This shall particularly apply to those areas that exemplify Victorian era to early-mid 20th century suburban 'Garden City' planned settings and estates that do not otherwise benefit from ACA status or similar. (Refer also to Section 12.3.7.5 corner/side garden

sites for development parameters, Policy Objectives HER20 and HER21 in Chapter 11).

It is a Policy Objective to:

- Conserve and improve existing housing stock through supporting improvements and adaption of homes consistent with NPO 34 of the NPF.
- Densify existing built-up areas in the County through small scale infill development having due regard to the amenities of existing established residential neighbourhoods.

5.7.8. **Policy Objective PHP20: Protection of Existing Residential Amenity.** It is a Policy Objective to ensure the residential amenity of existing homes in the Built Up Area is protected where they are adjacent to proposed higher density and greater height infill developments.

The Council will encourage the retention and deep retrofit of structurally sound, habitable dwellings in good condition as opposed to demolition and replacement and will also encourage the retention of existing houses that, while not Protected Structures or located within an ACA, do have their own merit and/or contribute beneficially to the area in terms of visual amenity, character or accommodation type - particularly those in areas consisting of exemplar 19th and 20th Century buildings and estates (see Chapter 3, Policy Objective CA6 and Chapter 12, Section 12.3.9).

5.7.9. Chapter 11 deals with Heritage and Conservation.

5.7.10. **Policy Objective HER21: Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Buildings, Estates and Features:** It is a Policy Objective to:

- i. Encourage the appropriate development of exemplar nineteenth and twentieth century buildings, and estates to ensure their character is not compromised.
- ii. Encourage the retention and reinstatement of features that contribute to the character of exemplar nineteenth and twentieth century buildings, and estates such as roofscapes, boundary treatments and other features considered worthy of retention.

- iii. Ensure the design of developments on lands located immediately adjacent to such groupings of buildings addresses the visual impact on any established setting.

5.7.11. Chapter 12 deals with Development Management.

5.7.12. Section 12.3.7.5 relates to Corner/Side Garden Sites and states the following:

Corner site development refers to sub-division of an existing house curtilage and/or an appropriately zoned brownfield site, to provide an additional dwelling(s) in existing built up areas. In these cases, the Planning Authority will have regard to the following parameters (Refer also to Section 12.3.7.7).

- Size, design, layout, relationship with existing dwelling and immediately adjacent properties.
- Impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents.
- Accommodation standards for occupiers.
- Development Plan standards for existing and proposed dwellings.
- Building lines followed, where appropriate.
- Car parking for existing and proposed dwellings provided on site.
- Side/gable and rear access/maintenance space.
- Adequate usable private open space for existing and proposed dwellings provided.
- Level of visual harmony, including external finishes and colours.
- Larger corner sites may allow more variation in design, but more compact detached proposals should more closely relate to adjacent dwellings. A modern design response may, however, be deemed more appropriate in certain areas where it may not be appropriate to match the existing design.
- Appropriate boundary treatments should be provided both around the site and between the existing and proposed dwellings. Existing boundary treatments should be retained/ reinstated where possible.

5.7.13. Section 12.3.7.7 sets out the following with respect to 'Infill':

In accordance with Policy Objective PHP19: Existing Housing Stock – Adaptation, infill development will be encouraged within the County. New infill development shall respect the height and massing of existing residential units. Infill development shall retain the physical character of the area including features such as boundary walls, pillars, gates/ gateways, trees, landscaping, and fencing or railings. This shall particularly apply to those areas that exemplify Victorian era to early-mid 20th century suburban ‘Garden City’ planned settings and estates that do not otherwise benefit from ACA status or similar. (Refer also to Section 12.3.7.5 corner/side garden sites for development parameters, Policy Objectives HER20 and HER21 in Chapter 11).

5.7.14. Section 12.3.9 Demolition and Replacement Dwellings states following:

The Planning Authority has a preference for and will promote the deep retro-fit of structurally sound, habitable dwellings in good condition as opposed to demolition and replacement unless a strong justification in respect of the latter has been put forward by the applicant. (See Policy Objective CA6: Retrofit and Reuse of Buildings and Policy Objective PHP19: Existing Housing Stock - Adaptation).

Demolition of an existing house in single occupancy and replacement with multiple new build units will not be considered on the grounds of replacement numbers only but will be weighed against other factors. Better alternatives to comprehensive demolition of, for example, a distinctive detached dwelling and its landscaped gardens, may be to construct structures around the established dwelling and seek to retain characteristic site elements.

The Planning Authority will assess single replacement dwellings within an urban area on a case by case basis and may only permit such developments where the existing dwelling is uninhabitable.

Applications for replacement dwellings shall also have regard to Policy Objectives HER20 and HER21 in Chapter 11. In this regard, the retention and reuse of an existing structure will be preferable to replacing a dwelling, and the planning authority will encourage the retention of exemplar nineteenth and twentieth century dwellings on sites in excess of 0.4 hectares.

5.8. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.8.1. The closest European site is the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024), located c.2.39km to the northeast of the subject site. 2.36km
- 5.8.2. The closest designated site is the Booterstown Marsh pNHA (Site Code: 000205), located c.2.39km to the northeast of the subject site.

5.9. EIA Screening

- 5.9.1. 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 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.

5.10. Water Framework Directive Screening

- 5.10.1. The subject site is located in a built-up area in the Greater Dublin Area, c. 1.37km west of the Brewery Stream (Site Code: IE_EA_09B130400), within the Brewery Stream 0_010 sub basin (Site Code: IE_EA_09B130400).
- 5.10.2. The site is located on top of the ground water body Kilcullen (IE-EA-G-003).
- 5.10.3. The proposed development comprises the demolition of a dwelling and replacement with 4 no. dwellings, within an established urban context.
- 5.10.4. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 5.10.5. 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.

5.10.6. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- the small scale and nature of the development.
- the distance from the nearest water bodies and the lack of hydrological connections.

5.10.7. 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.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. The grounds of appeal from the Appellant, the Mount Merrion Residents Association (MMRA). The Appellant notes that the issues raised in the Observation to the PA; are not necessarily repeated in this appeal; and it requested that these matters are addressed An Coimisiun as part of this appeal. I have reviewed this Observation in and summarised additional items, as set out below.

1. Traffic and Car Parking

- Traffic at Redesdale Road Trees Road Upper Junction is overloaded; with this route being used rat run to the N11.
- The local shops at the west end of Trees Road Upper also generate traffic and parking demand.
- Residents of properties on Redesdale Road and Trees Road Upper are often unable to enter or exit their properties due to current traffic volume.
- The geometry of the junction is substandard.
- Prospective residents would not be able to turn their cars within their properties and would have to either reverse in / drive out or drive in and reverse out.

- The proposal to permit additional 3 no. accesses to Trees Road Upper and 1 no. to Redesdale Road so close to an already overloaded junction should not be permitted.
- Two or three no. smaller dwellings with adequate turning space within the curtilage of the overall site would have allowed the applicant to retain the use of the single entrance off Trees Road Upper.
- The site is not close to the N11 QBC not to the Luas in Stillorgan or Ballally. Whilst the Development Plan mandates 1 no. space per dwelling; it is likely that they would generate 2 no. cars each, due to unit size.
- The Commission must agree that the local authority has not acknowledged any of these issues and must take ownership of this matter.
- There is no mention of Traffic Management for construction and operational phases. Reference is made to Condition 3 (a)-(f) for a permission to replace portacabins at Scoil San Treasa (D23A/0600 refers).

2. Site Coverage

- The proposed development breaches the established building line along Redesdale Road; with unit D extending 8.7m to the west of this established building line.
- The proposal also breaches the building line to Trees Road Upper.

3. Amenity

- The proposed development would distract from the amenities of the area; with excessive congestion; affecting lines of sight for motorists; unsympathetic building design and material finish (use of red brick).
- A reduction in dwelling numbers with a sympathetic design would provide a fairer approach.

4. Management Plans

- The CMP and RWMP do not confirm who is empowered to approve various actions and monitoring.

- There is no agency or mechanism for enforcement relating to the Public Liaison Plan, as conditioned by the PA.

5. Observation

- The existing site is a blight on the local area.
- External brick together with dormer structures at roof level, do not respect existing local architectural style.
- The bulk, height, massing, excessive site coverage together with unsympathetic finishes would ensure that proposed development would stand out as being completely unsuitable within the local area.
- A well-designed development sensitive to local amenity of Mount Merrion, that reflects local construction and environmental standards without exacerbating traffic issues at the T junction would be welcomed by residents.
- Overlooking of neighbouring properties, especially No. 25 Redesdale Road and No.134 Trees Road Upper.
- Western gable of Unit D would be much closer to the public road than the established building line.
- The existing site has significant tree planting; the application proposes to remove all trees without any replacement; with no reports from specialist tree surgeons.
- The proposal would make an existing traffic problem much worse.
- The proposed development would require modifications to the existing footpaths including the lowering of levels and dropped kerbs, to 4 no. entrances on the inside of the T junction; resulting in pedestrians and cyclists may be forced off the footpaths at this already congested junction.
- The shops located on the opposite side of the site require adequate parking and turning capacity for trucks from suppliers and for customers; and must not be subject to further disruption from traffic and parking impacts arising.
- Misleading wording in the planning notices and the applicant's planning report.

6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1. A response to the third party appeal on behalf of the Applicant, has responded as follows:

1. Traffic, Safety, Vehicular Access and Parking Provision

- Traffic Safety, access design and junction proximity were fully assessed at by the local authority which raised no objection to the development subject to standard condition.
- The proposed development is fully compliant with the standards of the development plan and national policy guidelines, stated to reduce reliance on private cars and promote sustainable transport.
- The appeal does not identify any failure to comply with applicable road safety standards or Development Plan policy.
- Speculative assumptions regarding future car ownership cannot reasonably override adopted policy standards.
- The planning process assesses the impact of the proposed development rather than resolving pre-existing traffic conditions, and that notwithstanding this, the roads authority has confirmed that the development would not give rise to unacceptable traffic or safety impacts.
- Concerns that the proposal will worsen an already overloaded junction; were specifically considered by the Planning Authority and the development was permitted subject to conditions, precisely to ensure safe operation at the frontage and to protect pedestrians and road safety during construction.
- MMRA's position amounts to a disagreement with the Roads Authority's professional assessment rather than demonstrating a conflict with Development Plan policy or a technical non-compliance would warrant refusal, rather the Roads Authority assessed the access arrangements and imposed conditions to regulate works and safeguards the public realm.
- With respect to the parking provision, the appellant fundamentally misunderstands both the purpose and application of the Development Plan

parking standards which are expressly framed within the context of promoting sustainable transport and modal shift.

- Section 12.4.5 of the car parking standards state that the principal objective is to ensure that in assessing development proposals, appropriate consideration is given to the accommodation of vehicles on site within the context of Smarter Travel, the Government policy aimed at promoting modal shift to more sustainable forms of transport.
- The Plan further confirms that parking standards are intentionally calibrated to reflect evolving travel patterns and investment in public transport walking and cycle infrastructure.
- The provision of 1 no. on curtilage parking space per dwelling fully accords with the adopted standards of the development plan and reflects the council's stated objective of balancing residential parking provision with the promotion of sustainable transport modes.
- The suggestion of the Appellant, that additional parking should be provided on an assumed future car ownership is explicitly contrary to the policy approach of the plan which does not require nor encourage parking provision to be inflated or on a precautionary or speculative basis.
- The site is served by public transport services and is in an established serviced suburban area which is consistent with the development plan's broader aim of accommodating additional housing at appropriate infill locations, supported by sustainable movement options.

2. Scale of development site coverage and building line

- The siting, footprint and relationship of the proposed dwellings to established building lines were expressly considered by the planning authority which concluded that the development would not significantly detract from the character of the area and is acceptable in principle.
- With respect to the alleged projection of the building line of Unit D beyond the established building line at Redesdale Road; Planning authority had examined the relationship of the proposed dwellings to the surrounding built

form and was satisfied that the building line and the overall head were acceptable in the context of the site and its corner location.

3. Design height massing and visual impact

- The description of the dwelling accords with accepted planning terminology.
- The Planning Authority assessed the height, massing, design and materials in detail and concluded that the proposal is compatible with the established residential character of the area.
- Residential amenity impacts were assessed by the Planning Authority which concluded that the approved layout incorporates appropriate separation distances, boundary treatments and design measures to protect residential amenities.

4. Trees and landscaping

- The parks and landscape section reviewed the proposal and raised no objection on the appeal does not identify any protected trees or conflict with any development plan policies play link tree protection.

5. Reliance on alleged precedents

- The planning authority has assessed the proposed development on its own merits and any other hints to other developments or contextual only and not determinative of the decision determinate.

6. Planning terminology

- The use of the term “two storey with attic” within the public notices is consistent established planning practise and terminology.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- 6.3.1. A response was received from the planning authority on 11th December 2025. The grounds of appeal do not raise any matters which, in the opinion of the authority, would justify a change in attitude to the proposed development.

6.4. Observations

6.4.1. A total of 4 no. observations has been received in relation to this appeal, as detailed below.

1. Tony Ferris

6.4.2. This owner-occupier of a local business; objects on the following grounds:

- The proposed development is excessive in scale.
- Located at a busy junction with no exit onto Redesdale Road at present.
- Redesdale Road is used by pedestrian and cycle entrance to Deer Park, heavily used for matches, by walkers and is the site of Mount Merrion Tennis Club and Football Club.
- The retail units adjacent to the site including cafes with heavy footfall, would be impacted greatly during the construction phase.

2. Déaglán Ó Dónaill, Sadhbh Ní Dhónaill, Garbhán Ó Dónaill

6.4.3. Adjoining neighbours to the proposed development to the east object to the proposed development, and have included a copy of the appeal as submitted by MMRA; along with a separate document, summarised as follows:

- Road safety concerns due to the proximity of the new proposed entrances to the junction of Trees Road Upper and Redesdale Road.
- The proposal would result in additional on-street car parking at an established parking hotspot.
- As adjoining neighbours, we believe that the scale (4 no. large houses of 158 m² GFA over 3 storeys) is too great for the site and would block sunshine completely from our back garden in summer evenings.

3. Louise Sabella

6.4.4. This observer resides at the adjacent property to the south of the subject site, and is summarised as follows:

- The scale of the development appears greater than what the site can accommodate.

- Provision of 1 no. car parking space per dwelling may lead to increased parking in surrounding areas.
- The proposed three-storey houses do not align with the architectural style of the neighbourhood and would alter visual consistency of the area.
- Access during and after construction would cause traffic disruption at Trees Road/Redesdale Road junction, taking account of closures of Thornhill and Glenabbey Roads, which have made Redesdale and Trees Road main routes between Lower Kilmacud Road and the N11.

4. Catherine McCann and Mark O'Kelly

6.4.5. These observers reside in close to the subject site to the east, and the observation is summarised as follows:

- The proposal would result in a congested pressurised junction, give rise to safety concerns and depreciate the quality of life who frequent the local amenities (to the north of the subject site).
- The proposed development would undermine pedestrian safety, exacerbate congested roads meeting at this junction with increased parking and traffic to the detriment of the local residents, businesses and communities.
- The number of units is excessive for this small site.
- The proposed units would completely blocksight lines of approaching traffic.
- The height and design of units including large windows are out of character with the established architectural character of the area.
- Insufficient car parking space per dwelling may lead to increased parking in surrounding areas.

6.5. Further Responses

6.5.1. None received.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having examined the application details and other documentation on file, including the report of the local authority, having inspected the site and having regard to the relevant national and local planning policy guidance, I consider the substantive issues in this appeal area as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Residential Amenity
- Visual Impact Assessment
- Traffic and Transportation
- Landscaping and Trees

7.2. Principle of Development

- 7.2.1. The proposed development relates to the demolition of 1 no. single storey dwelling and provision of 4 no. detached dwellings to be served with 3 no. accesses from Trees Road Lower and 1 from Redesdale Road.
- 7.2.2. Residential development is a permissible use under the A land use zoning objective which applies to the site.
- 7.2.3. The site is a regularly shaped parcel of land, at the junction of two roads in an established residential area.
- 7.2.4. The proposed units comply with the target gross floor area for a 3B/5P 3 storey dwelling as identified under the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities (2007) and the private amenity standards and minimum separation distances as set out in the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities (2024). The proposed development complies with private open space standards as set out in the Development Plan.
- 7.2.5. Having regard to the above, I consider that the proposed development is acceptable in principle, subject to assessment with respect to the grounds of appeal as raised by the appellants. These are addressed below.

7.3. Residential Amenity

Overlooking

- 7.3.1. The Residents Association objects on the grounds that the proposed development would result in overlooking of the neighbouring properties, in particular the adjoining properties to the east and south.
- 7.3.2. As set out above, the proposed development includes the provision of 4 no. dwellings; 2 no. pairs of 2 storey semi-detached dwellings fronting Trees Road Upper, reflecting the pattern of housing currently fronting Trees Road Upper, including the neighbouring property to the immediate east.
- 7.3.3. I note that proposed Houses A, B and C the same layout at ground floor level; fronting Trees Road Upper to the north, with access to Unit D from the western side of the development. The units comprise the same layout at upper floors.
- 7.3.4. The eastern elevations of both semi-detached blocks include a single window at first floor level, with obscured glazing, extending from ground floor level below.
- 7.3.5. The units include a single bedroom only to the rear, set back a distance of 8m from the southern site boundaries with adjoining bathrooms set back an additional distance of c.2.7m. Windows at dormer level serving bathrooms are set back a distance of c.12m from the southern boundary.
- 7.3.6. The rear gardens would have a depth of 8m and average width of 6.9m.
- 7.3.7. The closest house to the adjoining property, House A, would have a setback distance of 0.8m to the party boundary to the east.

Property to the East

- 7.3.8. The adjoining property to the east comprises a 2 storey detached dwelling with a garden and driveway to the front (north) and garden to the rear.
- 7.3.9. The dwelling is set back a distance of c.0.4m from the western party boundary wall.
- 7.3.10. There are 2 no. windows to habitable rooms on the rear (southern) elevation at first floor level with no windows in the western gable elevation, with a separation distance of 14.07m from first floor level windows to the rear boundary of this property.
- 7.3.11. The scheme sits to the west of the adjoining property to the east; with a single narrow window to a void, on the eastern, gable elevation at first floor level.

- 7.3.12. Potential overlooking of the rear garden of this property, would also arise from the eastern most pair of dwellings; with narrow windows to a single bedroom per dwelling at first floor level; and all other southern facing windows serving bathrooms.
- 7.3.13. Having regard to lack of windows from habitable rooms on the eastern elevation; narrow windows to single bedrooms per dwelling on the southern elevation, the proposed development would not result in significant adverse impacts with respect to overlooking of the adjoining property to the east; including it's rear garden.
- 7.3.14. I also consider that this property would also not result in significant adverse impacts with respect to overlooking of the proposed dwellings including the private open space to the rear, having regard to lack of windows on the western elevation; and separation distances from it's southern and western site boundaries.

Dwellings to the South

- 7.3.15. The property to the south comprises a single storey bungalow with private garden and car parking to the front and garden to the rear. The rear garden extends to the south of the appeal site and the rear garden of the adjoining property to the east.
- 7.3.16. As set above, the proposed units would front Trees Road Upper to the north. Access to Unit D is at the western side of the development from Redesdale Road.
- 7.3.17. From a review of the plans, overlooking impacts would arise from windows at first and attic level on the southern boundary with a narrow window to a single bedroom per dwelling and all others to bathrooms. Single windows on the eastern gable are to a void only.
- 7.3.18. As above, having regard to the presence of narrow windows to a single bedroom only at first floor level set back a distance of 8m from the southern boundary; set back distance by c.2.7m at first floor level and 12m at dormer level and all serving bathrooms; the proposed development would not result in adverse impacts to overlooking of the property to the south.
- 7.3.19. The proposed development would not in my view, give rise to significant adverse impacts with respect to overlooking of properties to the east and south; and would therefore be acceptable with respect to overlooking.
- 7.3.20. The first-floor windows from bedrooms at first floor level do not directly (or otherwise) front rear windows of adjoining properties.

- 7.3.21. The units include bedrooms at first and dormer level; these would overlook proposed front gardens to the north; extending across Trees Road Upper to the north; and would not result in adverse impacts with respect to overlooking of the commercial units, café's, located a distance of c.32m from the proposed development.
- 7.3.22. The Development Plan does not include standards relating to the minimum distance between windows at ground floor level to the front of houses. SPPR 1 of the Sustainable Communities Guidelines 2024 recommends that applications should be determined on a case by case basis, in order to prevent undue loss of privacy.
- 7.3.23. The Development Plan supersedes these Guidelines in this regard.
- 7.3.24. Having regard to the above, I do not consider that the proposed development would result in significant adverse impacts with respect to overlooking of the subject proposal and adjoining properties, to the south or east for example.
- 7.3.25. Whilst not brought up within the grounds of appeal, I note that Objective PHP19 and Section 12.3.7.7 of the Development Plan, outline that new infill development shall respect the height and massing of existing residential units, retaining the physical character of the area, including boundary walls, trees and landscaping. The policy refers to Section 12.3.7.5 Corner / Garden Sites for development parameters.
- 7.3.26. Development parameters under s.12.3.7.5 include design, scale and layout, potential impacts on the amenities of the neighbouring residents, accommodation standards, provision of adequate private open space and car parking the level of visual harmony, including external finishes and colours.
- 7.3.27. As demonstrated above, the proposed development would not result in significant impacts with respect to overlooking, overbearing impacts. The application was accompanied by a Shadow Study, and I consider by reason of the orientation, location and height that the proposed development would not give rise to significant adverse impacts with respect to overshadowing and loss of daylight to properties adjoining the subject site; as well as to the private rear gardens to these units.
- 7.3.28. The proposed units would exceed the minimum requirement of 60m² for private open space as set out in the Development Plan. I note that this quantum exceeds the private open space requirements for a 3 bedroom house, as set out in SPPR 2 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines 2024.

- 7.3.29. The proposed unit also exceeds the standards for the provision of a 5 person (3 bed 3 storey house) as set out in the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities; Quality House for Sustainable Communities' (DOEHLG, 2007).
- 7.3.30. As addressed below, the proposed development seeks to include 1 no. car parking space per dwelling.
- 7.3.31. Matters relating to visual harmony and choice of materials is also addressed below.
- 7.3.32. The proposed development has had, in my opinion, regard to potential impacts with neighbouring properties, and would not result injurious impacts with respect to overlooking, overbearing and overshadowing or loss of access to daylight. The proposed development would accord with national and local car parking standards applicable to this case, as addressed below.
- 7.3.33. Overall, I consider that the development meets the development parameters relating to a Corner/ Garden Site (Section 12.3.7.5 refers). The proposal therefore is considered to accord with the provision of an infill development as referenced within Section 12.3.7.7 of the Development Plan; and is considered to concur with Policy Objective PHP19, which seeks to, inter alia, densify existing built-up areas in the County through small scale infill development having due regard to the amenities of existing established residential neighbourhoods.

7.4. Visual Impact Assessment

- 7.4.1. The Appellant objects on the grounds that the proposed development would detract from the amenities of the area, that the scale, and excessive site coverage together with unsympathetic finishes would deliver development entirely unsympathetic to the local area, including through the use of red brick does not respect the existing local architectural style.
- 7.4.2. The proposed development includes the removal of existing trees from the site; principally located along the northern, western and southern boundaries; and the development of a 4 no. 3 storey semi-detached homes across the site. The development is set back by a depth of 1.1m from the western boundary.

- 7.4.3. From a review of the file, the subject site, a corner site is located at the junction of two public roads: Trees Road Upper and Redesdale Road. In this context, I consider the site to constitute a visually dominant site.
- 7.4.4. Road levels increase from Kilmacud Road Lower to this junction, with limited level change at this part of Trees Road Upper. Building heights in this area include a mix of single and two storey properties.

Assessment

- 7.4.5. From review of the site and environs, including when viewed from Redesdale Road, the site would be identifiable, primarily as a result of the trees within this site.
- 7.4.6. At a closer context, views into the site are mostly screened by the established planting on all boundaries. It is also characterised by the low boundary wall which surrounds the site to Redesdale Road and Trees Road Upper.
- 7.4.7. From a review of the subject drawings, when viewed at a distance on Trees Road Upper, the units would integrate with the dwellings fronting Trees Road Upper towards Redesdale Road. When viewed from closer to the site along Trees Road Upper; the view would comprise 4 no. houses, set behind the boundary wall.
- 7.4.8.** From Redesdale Road, the view would illustrate the western and southern sides of the scheme, set behind the boundary wall. As discussed above, the scale and form of development would integrate with the established character of the area; and would be acceptable with respect to potential overbearing impacts arising.
- 7.4.9.** When viewed from further south on Redesdale, Road, the development would be visible, however, would not dominate the vista to the same degree arising from the trees on site.
- 7.4.10. Having regard to the above, the proposed development would constitute a significant change to the visual context of this site.
- 7.4.11. Notwithstanding, the proposed development comprises a 2 storey + attic level residential development set behind the existing boundary wall; with units fronting Trees Road Upper to the north; and Redesdale Road to the west. The development reflects the established pattern of development within the immediate environs of the site in terms of heights, setbacks, elevational treatments and materials.

7.4.12. The proposed development would integrate with the wider visual context of this site; would result in a significant positive change to the visual context of the subject site and would be acceptable with respect to visual impact.

Design

7.4.13. From a review of the plans the proposed development includes the use of rendered concrete, brick finish on the western elevation at first floor level; and metal style cladding to the dormer windows, the works also include the reuse of the low boundary wall.

7.4.14. The site is located within an established suburban area; with a relatively limited mix of styles; predominantly comprising a mix of detached and semi detached single and two storey developments on large sites. The two storey housing fronting to Trees Road and the wider area; is in my view, compatible with a mix of design styles in principle; including contemporary design.

7.4.15. I consider that this selection would provide a visually amenable mix of materials, which would integrate with the pattern of development in the wider area.

7.4.16. Overall, whilst the proposed development brings houses across the site to within 1.1m; existing trees would be removed; the proposal relates the replacement of the single storey bungalow fronting Redesdale Road; and providing development which reflects the established pattern of development to Trees Road Upper.

7.4.17. The Appellant objects on the grounds that the proposed development would breach the established building line along Redesdale Road; with House D extending 8.7m to the west of this established building line. The proposal also breaches the building line to Trees Road Upper.

7.4.18. In addition, the appellant considers that the proposed development would distract from the amenities of the area; comprising an unsympathetic building design including the use of red brick.

7.4.19. The proposed dwellings comprise pitched roofs on an east-to-west alignment with a ridge height of +80.56m; marginally above that of No. 134 to the east. Dormer windows to the front of the properties are wider than those to the rear; and in my opinion, are visually balanced within the wider roof scape.

- 7.4.20.** The parapet levels at first floor level also reflect generally that of No. 134 to the east. I consider that the parapet windows are appropriate in size; and that the ridge height would integrate the established pattern of development in the vicinity of this site.
- 7.4.21. The front building would align with that of No.134 to the east; whilst the rear building line extends beyond the rear boundary of the adjacent property by c.3.3m at ground floor, and c.2.7m at first floor level. The first floor level with flat roof is set back from the boundary by c.2.8m. I consider that these measures would prevent overbearing impact on the dwelling to the east.
- 7.4.22. Development parameters under s.12.3.7.5 of the Development Plan include reference to the level of visual harmony, including external finishes and colours.
- 7.4.23. As discussed above, the proposed development generally reflects the established pattern of development, with respect to building heights, set back from site boundaries, retention of a low boundary wall around to Redesdale and Trees Road Upper. The elevational treatments are contemporary in design and include the use of brick, rendered concrete, slate tiles at roof level.
- 7.4.24. I consider that the proposed development is in accordance with development would not result in significant adverse impacts with established to the visual context and visual amenities of the site and environs, and would accord with parameters for Corner /Garden sites (section 12.3.7.5); as referenced under s.12.3.7.7 and Policy Objective PHP19 of the Development Plan relating to infill development.

7.5. Traffic and Transportation

Traffic

- 7.5.1. The Appellant contends that traffic at Redesdale Road Trees Road Upper Junction is overloaded; with this route being used rat run to the N11. The local shops at the west end of Trees Road Upper also generate traffic and parking demand.
- 7.5.2. Residents of properties on Redesdale Road and Trees Road Upper are often unable to enter or exit their properties due to current traffic volume. The geometry of the junction is substandard. Prospective residents would be unable to turn their cars within their properties and would have to either reverse in drive out or drive in and reverse out.

7.5.3. The proposal to permit additional 3 no. accesses to Trees Road Upper and 1 no. to Redesdale Road so close to an already overloaded junction should not be permitted. Two or three no. smaller dwellings with adequate turning space within the curtilage of the overall site would have allowed the applicants to retain the use of the single entrance off Trees Road Upper.

Vehicular Access

7.5.4. From a review of the file and site inspection, the proposed development comprises the provision of 4 no. dwellings; 2 no. pairs of 2 storey plus attic level houses.

7.5.5. It is proposed that Unit A on the eastern side of the site, would egress to Trees Road Upper to the north, utilising the location of the existing vehicular access to this site. Two no. additional vehicular access points are also proposed to serve Houses B and C, egressing to Trees Road Upper.

7.5.6. Unit D on the western side of the site, would be served by a new access/egress point, to Redesdale Road; located at the southern end of the subject site; parallel to the existing egress to Redesdale Road serving the unit to the south of the site. All accesses would be 3.5m in width.

7.5.7. The application is accompanied by a Roads & Services Report and Sight Line drawings. The site would egress to Redesdale Road and Trees Road Upper, both with a designated speed limit of 30km /hr. sight line drawings have been prepared on the basis of the site's location within a 50km /hr zone, with a constraint on overtaking as set out in DMURS. sight line triangles for the new access points to Trees Road Upper are 45m to the kerb to the right; and to the centre of the road at a traffic island to the left. That to Redesdale Road for House D, would be 45m in both directions. sight lines from the existing egress point, serving House A would be as per the new access points serving houses B and C.

7.5.8. The sight line drawings confirm that adequate sight lines are achievable from additional egress points from the subject site.

7.5.9. I note that the Transport Section has raised no objection to the development including sight lines. I therefore consider sight lines from the proposed development to be acceptable.

7.5.10. Whilst the concerns of the Appellant with respect to the provision of a series of accesses in close proximity to the junction are noted; each access has been designed and accord with design standards relating to, sight lines and visibility. The Roads Authority has no objection to the proposed development.

7.5.11. I therefore consider that the layout of the scheme providing 4 no accesses as proposed in this instance to be acceptable.

Car Parking

7.5.12. The Appellant sets out that the site is not close to the N11 QBC, or to the Luas in Stillorgan or Ballally. Whilst the Development Plan mandates 1 no. space per dwelling; it is likely that they would generate 2 no. cars each, due to unit size.

7.5.13. Car Parking standards, as set out in Table 12.5 of the Development Plan require the provision of 2 no. car parking spaces within Zone 3; the relevant zone for the subject site. This is not a maximum standard.

7.5.14. Section 12.4.5.2 of the Development Plan sets out that in certain circumstances, deviation from the standards will be applied, with reference to small infill residential schemes (up to 0.25 hectares) in Zones 1 and 2 and in neighbourhood or district centres in Zone 3 may be able to fulfil these criteria. As such, a deviation from the standard does not apply to this case.

7.5.15. The Compact Settlement Guidelines 2024 set out that in all urban areas, car parking provision should be minimised, substantially reduced or wholly eliminated in areas that have good access to urban services and public transport services.

7.5.16. From a review of the site, I note that the subject site is defined as at a peripheral location, noting that the location of the site does not meet accessibility criteria as set out in Table 3.8 of the Guidelines. The maximum rate of car parking where such provision is justified to the satisfaction of the planning authority, shall be 2 no. spaces per dwelling. For peripheral locations, as applies to the subject site, the Guidelines recommend the maximum provision of 2 no. car parking spaces.

7.5.17. As such, whilst the Development Plan sets out a requirement of 2 no. spaces per dwelling at this location, the Compact Settlement Guidelines 2024 require a maximum of 2 no. spaces per dwelling; noting that objectives of the Development

Plan take precedence over the standards as set out in the Compact Settlement Guidelines 2024.

- 7.5.18. Notwithstanding, the site is located at a distance of 350m from Dublin Bus route No. 11 operating along Lower Kilmacud Road and c. 450m to a stop on North Avenue serving Route No.47. The site is also located a distance of 1.1km (14 minute walk time) to the closest bus stop on the N11, served by routes Dublin Bus routes 7B, 7D, 47, 116,118, E1 and E2; and the Aircoach 700 to Dublin Airport. The Stillorgan Luas Stop is located 2km to the south of the subject site.
- 7.5.19. The site is c.32m to the south of the services located to the north of Trees Road Upper. The site is well served by urban services within Stillorgan Village, with cafes, shops and other services along Kilmacud Lower, leading to the village centre. Dundrum Town Centre is located c.2.9 km to the west of the site. Access to Deer Park comprising open space and walking trails, tennis courts, football and GAA pitches is within the vicinity of the site.
- 7.5.20.** Having regard to the above, I consider that the provision of 1 no. car parking for each 4 no.3 bed dwellings at this urban location, in close proximity to local services and public transport services to be justified, in accordance with the Compact Settlement Guidelines 2024.
- 7.5.21. The Transportation section has no objection to the proposed development, subject to condition.

Junction Capacity

- 7.5.22. From a site inspection, a traffic island is located in the centre of Trees Road Upper; and there is a raised speed table at this junction.
- 7.5.23. It may be the case that these components result in the concern that, delivery vans mount the footpath in order to turn this corner, as raised by the appellant.
- 7.5.24. From my assessment there are no restrictions with visibility along both public roads, noting the straight alignment of Trees Road Upper in particular. As detailed above, adequate sight lines are achievable at all egress points.
- 7.5.25. I note that the Transportation Department has no objection to the proposed development, subject to condition; and that these include undertaking footpath and kerb dishing and strengthening works. These works would assist in the delivery

of the public footpath around the perimeter of the subject site, and I consider this condition reasonable.

7.5.26. I note that road works to address this junction; is a matter for the Roads Authority to address.

7.5.27. Whilst the concerns with respect to traffic volume at this junction are noted, the delivery of the subject infill site; is supported at national and local level; taking account of the proximity of the site to public transport and wider services, as discussed above.

7.5.28. I am therefore satisfied that, subject to condition, the proposed development would not give rise to significant adverse impacts with respect to traffic safety.

Traffic Management

7.5.29. There is no mention of Traffic Management for construction and operational phases of the proposed development. Reference is made to Condition 3 (a)-(f) for a permission to replace portacabins at Soil San Treasa (D23A/0600).

7.5.30. Each application must be assessed on it's own merits; notwithstanding in this case, the Roads Authority had recommended the inclusion of a condition, which requires that the applicant and contractor take all necessary measures to avoid conflict between construction activities and pedestrian/ vehicle movements on the surrounding road network. I consider this reasonable; and recommend it's inclusion in the event the Commission decide to grant permission for the proposed development.

7.6. Landscaping and Open Space

7.6.1. The Appellant notes that the existing site has significant tree planting; and objects on the grounds that the application has not been accompanied by arborist reports relating to tree removal.

7.6.2. The appeal site does not contain any protected trees or conflict with Development Plan objectives relating to tree protection.

7.6.3. From a review of the plans, it is proposed to remove a total of 13 no. trees from the subject site as illustrated on the Drawing No. 2.

- 7.6.4. At Further Information stage, the planning authority sought the removal of a 1.8-2m high timber fence at the northwestern and western site boundaries.
- 7.6.5. In response this fence was replaced by a retained section of the boundary wall (Plan 2 of the RFI response refers).
- 7.6.6. Landscape works to the site otherwise include the provision of hedges primarily on the southern boundary; which would enhance the privacy and screening from the adjoining property to the south.
- 7.6.7. The scheme initially included a boundary fence at 1.8-2m high timber at the junction of the site to Redesdale Road and Trees Road Upper and for a section along the western boundary to Redesdale Road, both. Its omission and use of the existing boundary wall would enhance the visual amenities of these visible locations and would support the integration of the proposal with the established character of the area.
- 7.6.8. Parks & Landscape Services section has no objection to the proposals, as there are no street trees around the site; and that the proposal is acceptable in principle, subject to a financial contribution in lieu of public open space.
- 7.6.9. Section 12.8.3 of the Development Plan requires the provision of a minimum of 15% of the site as public open space for residential development in existing urban areas. On sites of less than 0.25 ha, the local authority may consider levying a contribution in lieu of public open space. The subject development proposal does not include the provision of public open space.
- 7.6.10. The financial contribution in lieu of 15% of the site in Public Open Space is set at a rate €7,500,000 per hectare pro rata, as detailed within the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown Development Contribution Scheme 2023-2028.
- 7.6.11. The subject site has a total area of 0.0785 hectares; 15% of which would relate to an area of 0.011775 hectares.
- 7.6.12. The contribution therefore amounts to a total of €88,312.00 (€7,500,000 pro rata x 0.011775 hectares) as required under s.12.8.3 of the Development Plan. This figure is as also calculated by the Parks and Landscape Services Section.
- 7.6.13. This condition has not been included within the Notification to Grant Permission; despite the Planner's Report confirming support for the inclusion of such a levy, as

recommended by the Parks & Landscape Services section. It is possible that this condition was omitted in error.

7.6.14. This is also not referenced within the third party appeal, the response by the local authority or the applicant to this appeal.

7.6.15. Having regard to the above, I therefore recommend the inclusion of a condition requiring a Contribution in lieu of the provision of public open space, as required under s.12.8.3 of the Development Plan, and referenced in the Development Contribution Scheme.

8.0 Recommendation

8.1. I recommend that Permission is granted, subject to conditions, for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the site's location on urban land, the residential zoning objective under the Dún Laoghaire -Rathdown County Development Plan 2022- 2028 which applies to this site, the scale, mass and form of the subject proposal, to the pattern of development in the area, Policy Objective PHP19 and development standard 12.3.7.7 of the Development Plan relating to Infill Development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions as set out below, the proposed development would constitute an acceptable form of development, would not adversely impact on the visual or residential amenities of the area.

The proposed development would therefore be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application on 6th August 2025, as amended by Further Information received on 24th October 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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2	<p>The glazing of the side windows to the proposed 4 houses within the west and east elevation at first floor level and attic level shall be manufactured opaque or frosted glass and shall be permanently maintained. The application of film to the surface of clear glass is not acceptable.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of residential amenities</p>
3	<p>Each proposed house shall be used as a single dwelling unit and shall not be sub-divided in any manner or used as two or more habitable units.</p> <p>Reason: To prevent unauthorised development.</p>
4	<p>a) The footpath and verge in front of the proposed and widened vehicular entrances shall be dished and strengthened at the Applicant's own expense including any moving / adjustment of any water cocks /chamber covers. With regard to the dishing and strengthening of the footpath and verge in front of the proposed and widened vehicular entrances, and reinstatement of the existing entrance dishing, the Applicant shall contact the Road Maintenance & Control Section to ascertain the required specifications for such works and any required permits.</p>

	<p>b) A minimum of one third of the front garden area shall be maintained in grass or landscaped in the interest of urban greening and SUDS in accordance with Section 12.4.8.3 Driveways/Hardstanding Areas of the county development plan 2022-2028.</p> <p>c) All necessary measures shall be taken by the Applicant and Contractor to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • prevent any mud, dirt, debris or building material being carried onto or placed on the public road or adjoining properties as a result of the site construction works, • repair any damage to the public road arising from carrying out the works, • avoid conflict between construction activities and pedestrian/vehicular movements on the surrounding public roads during construction works.' <p>Reason:: In the interest of public safety and of proper planning and sustainable development of the area.</p>
5	<p>The applicant shall enter into a Connection Agreement(s) with Uisce Éireann to provide for a service connection(s) to the public water supply and/or wastewater collection network and adhere to the standards and conditions set out in that agreement. All development shall be carried out in compliance with Uisce Éireann's Standard Details and Codes of Practice. Uisce Éireann does not permit Build Over of its assets. Where the applicant proposes to build over or divert existing water or wastewater services the applicant shall have received written Confirmation of Feasibility (COF) of Diversion(s) from Uisce Éireann prior to any works commencing.</p> <p>Reason: To provide adequate water and wastewater facilities</p>
6	<p>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.</p>

	<p>Reason: In the interest of public health.</p>
7	<p>Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company, or other security to secure the provision and satisfactory completion of roads, footpaths, watermains, drains, open space and other services required in connection with the development, coupled with an agreement empowering the local authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory completion of any part of the development. The form and amount of the security shall be as agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of agreement, shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála for determination.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the satisfactory completion of the development</p>
8	<p>The developer shall lodge to Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council the total sum of €88,312.00 (€7,500,000 x 0.011775 Ha) as a contribution in lieu of not providing the 15% public open space requirement.</p> <p>Reason: It is considered reasonable that the payment of a contribution be required in respect of the provision of the Community & Parks facilities & Recreational amenities benefiting development in the area of the Planning Authority and that is provided, or that is intended will be provided, by or on behalf of the Local Authority.</p>
9	<p>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</p>

matter shall be referred to An Comisiun 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.

Aoife McCarthy
Planning Inspector

23rd February 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Coimisiún Pleanála Case Reference	500397-25		
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of a house and construction of 4 no. houses and all ancillary works.		
Development Address	27 Redesdale Road, Mount Merrion, Blackrock, Co. Dublin		
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			
No	X		
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			
Yes	X	Class 10(b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units – Sub Threshold.	Proceed to Q.4

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?

No	X	Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	500397-25
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of a house and construction of 4 no. houses and all ancillary works.
Development Address	27 Redesdale Road, Mount Merrion, Blackrock, Co. Dublin
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>The application relates to the construction of 4 no. dwelling and all associated works.</p> <p>The size is not exceptional in this context.</p> <p>The development would not be exceptional in this context.</p> <p>The development would not result in the production of significant waste, pollution and nuisance.</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>The site is located within a suburban area, an urban environment.</p> <p>The subject site is not located within or adjacent to any Natura 2000 sites.</p> <p>The development would not have the potential to significantly impact any European sites or areas.</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>There is no potential for significant effects on the environment.</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.
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

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

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)