



Development	Construction of a 6-storey residential building with 38 apartment units and all associated site works.
Location	Site formerly known as Bruce House, Main Road, Tallaght, Dublin 24, D24 YF50
Planning Authority	South Dublin County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	SD25A/0053W
Applicant(s)	Irish Residential Properties REIT PLC
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission with Conditions
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Irish Residential Properties REIT PLC Tallaght Community Council
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	25 th May 2026
Inspector	Elaine Power

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision.....	4
4.0	Relevant Planning History	11
5.0	Policy Context.....	12
6.0	EIA Screening.....	18
7.0	The Appeal	19
8.0	Assessment	27
9.0	AA Screening.....	55
10.0	Water Framework Directive	56
11.0	Recommendation	57
12.0	Reasons and Considerations.....	57

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located in Tallaght Village, to the south of Main Road and to the north of the N81 (Tallaght By-Pass), c. 500m east of Tallaght Town Centre. To the south and west the site is generally bound by Priorsgate a 4-6 mixed use development and to the east by a single storey building occupied by Tallaght Youth Service. The surrounding area is urban in nature with a variety of uses including residential, commercial, retail, community and educational.
- 1.2. The site has a stated area of c. 0.34 ha. It forms part of the adjacent Priorsgate Development also within the ownership of the applicant. It comprises 2 no. separate parcels of land and a section of the public footpath on Main Road. The main development site is rectangular in shape with frontage onto Main Road and includes a linear stripe that runs in a north - south direction towards the N81 to the rear of the site. The rectangular portion of the site was formally known as Bruce House and is currently vacant and is surrounded by hoarding. The second parcel of land forms part of the existing basement level of the Priorsgate development.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the construction of a 6-storey residential building containing with 38 no. apartments. The development includes the provision of car and bicycle parking spaces in the existing basement level of the adjoining mixed-use Priorsgate scheme to the south and west. Vehicle and pedestrian access to the site is from Main Road.
- 2.2. The development also includes piped infrastructure and ducting, roof plant including lift overrun, changes in level, attenuation areas, site landscaping, communal open space including a children's play space and all associated site development and excavation works above and below ground
- 2.3. Key Development Statistics are outlined below:

	Proposed
Site Area	0.34 ha
No. of Units	38

Unit mix	4 no. 1-bed, 9 no. 2-bed (3 person) and 25 no. 2-bed (4 person)
Density	112 uph
Plot Ratio	1.11
Height	6 storeys
Dual / Triple Aspect	18 no. units (43%)
Other Uses	None
Public Open Space	None
Car Parking	24 no. basement level spaces
Bicycle Parking	88 no. spaces including 20 no. visitor spaces on Main Road.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission was granted subject to 29 no. conditions. The following conditions are considered relevant.

2. Amendments.

Prior to the commencement of development the applicant, owner or developer shall submit the following for the written agreement of the Planning Authority:

Revised plans that incorporate all of the following amendments:

- (a) (i) The building at 4th floor level shall be reduced in scale so that its gross floor area at that level is no more than 504 sqm (a reduction of 130 sqm).
- (ii) The building shall be set back from the northern elevation at 4th floor level. The set back shall at least match that of the top floor of the neighbouring building to the west (Block 1, Priorsgate, Main Road, Tallaght), and may need to be set back further to satisfy part (a)(i) of this condition.
- (iii) All proposed units at 4th floor level are omitted from the scheme. The 4th floor level shall accommodate 4 no. 3-bedroom units (a reduction of 3 units).
- (b) (i) The building at 5th floor level shall be reduced in scale so its gross floor area is no larger than 344 sqm (a reduction of 170 sqm).

(ii) The building shall be set back from the northern elevation at 5th floor level. The set back at 5th floor level shall at least match that of the 4th floor level, and may need to be set back further to satisfy part (b)(i) of this condition.

(iii) All proposed units at 5th floor level are omitted from the scheme. The 5th floor level shall accommodate 3 no. residential units; at least 2 no. of these units shall be 3-bed units (a reduction of 2 units).

(c) The applicant shall submit a revised Schedule of Accommodation to reflect on the changes required under parts (a) and (b).

(d) The permitted development shall contain 33 no. residential units.

REASON: To achieve LAP requirements for density (plot ratio) and unit mix for this area under the Tallaght Local Area Plan 2020 and in so doing deliver on the plan-led urban framework for Tallaght Village.

3. Amendments (Parking)

Prior to the commencement of development the applicant, owner or developer shall submit the following for the written agreement of the Planning Authority: Revised plans that incorporate all of the following amendments- (a) relocation of the Mobility Impaired Driver's Space. This space should be located in close proximity to the lift core and should provide a less constrained space which allows safe egress and reversing movements.

REASON: In the interest of transport and safety.

14. Green Space Factor – Supplementary Interventions (Public Realm)

The developer has not achieved the appropriate Green Space Factor for the site. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall liaise with the Public Realm department to determine what additional GI interventions can be provided. Following this and prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall obtain the written agreement of the Planning Authority (Public Realm) and thereafter implement these agreed GI interventions.

REASON: In the interests of green infrastructure and biodiversity.

27. Financial Contribution.

The developer shall pay to the Planning Authority a financial contribution of €432,724.50 (four hundred and thirty two thousand, seven hundred and twenty-four euro and fifty cents), in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development within 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 2026 - 2028, made under Section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended). The contributions under the Scheme shall be payable prior to commencement of development or as otherwise agreed in writing by the Council. Contributions due in respect of permission for retention will become payable immediately on issue of the final grant of permission. Contributions shall be payable at the index adjusted rate pertaining to the year in which implementation of the planning permission is commenced.

REASON: The provision of such facilities will facilitate the proposed development. It is considered reasonable that the payment of a contribution be required, in respect of public infrastructure and facilities 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.

NOTE RE: CONDITION: Uisce Éireann is the statutory body responsible for water services. Further details/clarification can be obtained from Uisce Éireann at at Tel. 01 6021000 or by emailing customerservice@water.ie.

28. Financial Contribution.

The developer shall pay to the Planning Authority a financial contribution of €255,000.00 (Two hundred and fifty-five thousand euro only), in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development within the area of the Planning Authority, that is provided, or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority, in accordance with Article 10(b) of the South Dublin County Council Development Contribution Scheme 2026 - 2028, made under Section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), and the Tallaght Town Centre Local Area Plan 2020. The contributions under the Scheme shall be payable prior to commencement of development or as otherwise agreed in writing by the Council. Contributions due in respect of permission for retention will become payable immediately on issue of the final grant of permission. Contributions shall be payable at the index adjusted rate pertaining to the year in which implementation of the planning permission is commenced. REASON: To secure an appropriate contribution towards the provision of public open space in Tallaght Town Centre under section 2.7.2 of the Tallaght Town Centre Local Area Plan 2020.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planners Report dated 6th May 2025 concluded that having regard to the provisions of the South Dublin County Council Development Plan 2022-2028, The Tallaght Town Centre Local Area Plan 2020, the responses of relevant consultees and the overall design and scale of the development and information provided by the applicant that further information should be sought. The 4 no. items of further information are summarised below.

1. Re-design

(a) Revised floor plans and elevations showing the following design revisions:

(i) The height of the building reduced from 6 to 5 storeys and the northern elevation of the fourth and fifth storeys (facing Main Road, Tallaght) set back from Main Road, Tallaght in line with the setbacks of the adjoining block to the immediate west or alternative approaches involving significant change to ameliorate the relationship between the scale of the proposals relative to the scale of the receiving environment.

(ii) Improved animation of eastern elevation and/or additional areas of brick cladding and reduced areas of mass render. Any revisions should avoid negatively impacting the future development potential of the immediately adjoining site to the east.

(iii) The floorplans revised to show 30% 3 bed units in line with the requirements of both the County Development Plan and the Local Area Plan. Alternatively, a robust justification shall be provided as to why such requirements should be set aside.

(iv) The ground floor of the northern elevation (facing Main Road, Tallaght) updated to improve the buildings sense of identity, to assist with wayfinding and to aid with the building's assimilation with the wider street. The ground floor should be finished in either stone - continuing the existing ground floor treatments to the west or shall include a more defined residential entrance point to the building

- (b) Amendments in response to item (a) above may have knock-ons including the reduction of the plot ratio and this would be welcome. More generally, further consideration is required in relation to compliance of the proposals with LAP plot ratio for the site of 1 and/or the 20% uplift in plot ratio allowed under the specific stated criteria set out in Section 2.6.1 of the Tallaght Local Area Plan.
- (c) The foregoing changes shall be supported by a revised architectural design statement, HQA assessment ensuring that all apartments meet all of the minimum standards set out in the Guidelines, including bedroom widths and storage sizes.

2. Response to Submissions

Submit a written response confirming how access arrangements to the proposed new block will be facilitated and how existing access arrangements to Block 3 residents will be protected.

3. Roads

(a) submit a detailed Construction & Traffic Management Plan that, notwithstanding all other requirements:

- (i) Has regard for the safety & privacy of the residents of Priorsgate
 - (ii) Ensures the levels of amenity and comfort that residents currently enjoy is not compromised
 - (iii) Ensures noise and dust levels are kept to an absolute minimum
- Ensures that current residential accesses and parking arrangements are not compromised as a result of the development works.

(b) Submit a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit that assesses all movements by pedestrian, cyclist or motorist within the basement area that arise from the subject application.

(c) Submit an accurate car parking layout that includes, and clearly shows, all items that currently occupy areas of the basement (as referred to in 3rd party submissions).

(d) Submit a report from a Fire Safety Consultant outlining how firefighting would be carried out in the case of a fire occurring to the rear of the development.

- (e) Submit a layout outlining where the bin staging area will be on collection days.
- (f) Submit a revised layout for the proposed vehicle layby at the front of the development with clear dimensions and details regarding cycle lane bollard removal that may be required.
- (g) Submit a Taking in Charge drawing.

4. Parks

The applicant is requested to submit the following:

- (a) SUDS Details of all proposed SUDs features on site.
- (b) Green Space Factor Revisit their GSF score card as there is no retained planting proposed on site.
- (c) Open Space In line with Section 2.7.2 of the Tallaght Local Area Plan, 2020 and Paragraph 10 of the South Dublin County Council Development Contribution Scheme, 2021-2025, the applicant shall provide a contribution in lieu of the public open space omitted from the scheme. The applicant shall contact the Public Realm Department to agree the details of this contribution.

The further information received was considered to be significant and revised public notices were requested.

The Planners Report dated 3rd February 2026 generally considered that the applicant had adequately addressed the concerns raised in the response to further information and that any outstanding issues could be addressed by way of condition. In this regard the report recommended that conditions be attached regarding the following:

- Reduce the height of the building.
- Ensure compliance with the unit mix set out in Objective RE2 of the Tallaght Local Area Plan, which requires a minimum of 30% of the proposed units be 3-bed.
- Reduce the plot ratio by reducing the number of apartments at the top two floors.
- A Housing Quality Assessment.

- A Construction Management Plan and details of the ramp, the layby and the re-positioning of 28 no. car parking spaces.
- Financial contribution in lieu of public open space.
- Details of SUDS and Green Space Factors.

3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports**

Roads Department: Report dated 16th April 2025 raised some concerns regarding the proposed development and recommended that further information be sought regarding (1) the submission of a Construction and Traffic Management Plan, (2) Stage 1 Road Safety Audit, (3) accurate car parking layout, (4) a Fire Safety report, (5) clarify bin storage area on collection day, (6) revised layout for layby and (7) taking in charge drawing.

The report dated 16th January 2026 generally considered the applicant had addressed the items of further information. However, it was recommended that if the Planning Authority were seeking Clarification of Further Information that the proposed vehicle lay-by be fully audited and a revised layout be submitted. The report also stated that if permission was being granted that 4 no. conditions should be attached requiring (1) the submission of a Construction and Traffic Management Plan, (2) a Road Safety Audit (ramp), (3) Road Safety Audit (lay-by) and (4) alternative proposal for car parking space no. 28, which is a mobility impaired driver space.

Environmental Health: Report dated 15th April 2025 considered that the proposed development was acceptable subject to standard conditions.

Public Realm: Report dated 7th January 2025 recommended that the following be submitted (1) details of SUDS features, (2) revise the Green Score Factor and (3) financial contribution in lieu of public open space. The date of the report appears to be a typo, and the year should be 2026.

Housing Department: Report dated 1st April 2025 notes that the applicant has engaged with the Housing Department and recommended that a standard Part V condition be attached to any grant of permission.

Waste Management Section: Email dated 11th April 2025 recommends a standard Resource and Waste Management Plan condition be attached to any grant of permission.

Public Lighting: Email dated 5th June 2025 states that the lighting equipment is not suitable for taking in charge and no taking in charge drawing was provided.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

Department of Defence: The submissions dated the 12th January 2026, and the 2nd April 2026 state that given the proximity to Casement Aerodrome, operation of cranes should be coordinated with Air Corps Air Traffic Services, no later than 30 days before use.

Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII): Submission dated 9th April 2025 states that the Authority will rely on the planning authority to abide by official policy in relation to development on/affecting national roads.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

The information available indicates that five submissions were received to the initial planning application and two additional submissions were received following re-advertising of significant additional further information. The concerns raised related to unit mix and lack of 3-bed units, excessive plot ratio, height and negative visual impact, public open space provision, mix of ground floor uses, negative impact on existing residential amenities during the construction phase due to the location of hoarding and staff welfare facilities, access to the car park lacks security measures, anti-social behaviour, conflict between accessible car parking and bin storage, location of playground would negatively impact existing residents.

4.0 **Relevant Planning History**

Appeal Site

ABP-302617-18, Reg. Ref. SD18A/0239: Permission was granted in 2019 for the construction of a 5-storey mixed use building comprising 31 no. apartments and a retail unit.

Adjacent site – Priorsgate

PL06S.206768, Reg. Ref. SD03A/0633: Permission was granted in 2004 for a mixed use development in 3 no. blocks comprising 210 apartments and retail use. This is the existing Priorsgate Development located to the west of the appeal site and within the ownership of the applicant.

Reg. Ref. SD18A/0240: Permission was granted in 2018 for a change of use from creche to residential use at Block 1 Priorsgate.

Surrounding Area

ABP-312504-22, Reg. Ref. SD21A/0139: Permission was refused in 2023 for the demolition of existing structure and the construction of 40 apartments in 2 no. blocks ranging in height from 3-6 storeys. The reason for refusal considered that the proposed development by reason of its scale and mass would negatively impact on the Tallaght Architectural Conservation Area and the architectural heritage of the wider area. This site is located at the junction of Main Road and Greenhills Road, c. 100m north west of the appeal site.

PL-500367-SD-25, Reg. Ref SD24A/0893W: Permission was granted in 2025 for the demolition of the former Ulster Bank building and the construction of a mixed use development comprising residential and retail use in 2 no. blocks ranging in height from 3-5 storeys. This site fronts onto Main Road and is located c. 160m west of the appeal site.

This decision is currently on appeal.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. *Tallaght Town Centre Development Plan 2020 (as extended)*

On the 14th April 2025 the Tallaght Town Centre LAP was extended for a further period, up to the expiry of the current South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028. The LAP sets out a Strategic Framework for the development of Tallaght. As per the Development Plan the site is zoned Village Centre (VC) with the associated land use objective to protect, improve and provide for the future development of Village Centres.

The lands within the LAP are subdivided into Neighbourhoods. The appeal site is located within 'The Village'. The LAP seeks to consolidate existing retail, town centre and mixed use residential neighbourhood within a high quality place of intimate scale respecting the historic character of the place.

Section 2.6.1 sets out a Plot Ratio range of 0.75 -1 for The Village Neighbourhood and states flexibility in relation to the gross floor area of up to 20% of the plot ratio ranges may generally be applicable where there is a strong design rationale for an increase in density / height and the development would result in significant public gain including public open space, creation of streets and links, major upgrades to streets, community / cultural amenities or other public domain works.

Section 2.6.2 states that in general terms the height strategy provides for the following:

- Building height and scale is greatest in the Centre, in close proximity to Luas stops and along arterial and primary route frontages (up to 6–7 storeys residential, +1 recessed and up to 5–6 storeys non-residential, +1 recessed).
- Building height and scale on secondary routes/frontages is lesser but still within an urban scale, (4–6 storeys residential, 3–5 storeys non-residential).
- Building Height (3-4 storeys) is lower along tertiary routes, within the network of secondary streets).

The height standards set out above may be exceeded in the Centre neighbourhood where they reflect the height of existing buildings, particularly in the core of the town centre proximate to the Luas Terminus and The Square Shopping Centre, subject to Section 2.6

A Key Objective for the Village is VL1: to consolidate mixed use residential uses.

5.2. South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028

The subject site is on lands zoned VC with the associated land use objective *to protect, improve and provide for the future development of Town Centres*. Residential uses are permitted in principle.

Chapter 2 sets out the Core Strategy and Settlement Strategy. Section 2.5.6 states that based on the population targets and housing need set out within National and Regional planning policy, South Dublin County Council must accommodate an

additional 45,002 persons to achieve the target of 323,769 persons by 2028. This increase requires an additional 15,576 housing units by 2028. These figures are based on an average household size of 2.73 persons per unit. Figure 9 identifies a total housing capacity of 42,570 no. units on 990 ha of already zoned land.

- Policy CS3: Monitoring Population and Housing Growth.
- Policy CS6: Settlement Strategy.
- Policy CS7: Consolidation Areas within the Dublin City and Suburbs are considered relevant.

Chapter 5 addresses Quality Design and Healthy Placemaking includes policies and objectives relating to urban design, densities, building heights, mix of dwelling types and open space. Of particular relevance are:

- Policy QDP1: Successful and Sustainable Neighbourhoods.
- Policy QDP2: Overarching: Successful and Sustainable Neighbourhoods.
- Policy QDP3: Neighbourhood Context.
- Policy QDP4: Healthy Placemaking.
- Policy QDP5: Connected Neighbourhoods.
- Policy QDP7: High Quality Design: Development General: Promote and facilitate development which incorporates exemplary standards of high-quality, sustainable and inclusive urban design, urban form and architecture.
- Policy QDP8: High Quality Design: Building Height and Density Guide (BHDG).
- Policy QDP9: High Quality Design: Building Height and Density.
- Policy QDP10: Mix of Dwelling Types.
- Policy QDP11: Materials, Colours and Textures.

Chapter 6 addresses Housing and sets out the county's housing strategy. Of particular relevance are:

- Policy H7: Residential Design and Layout.
- Policy H8: Public Open Space.
- Policy H9: Private and Semi-Private Open Space.
- Policy H10: Internal Residential Accommodation.
- Policy H11: Privacy and Security.

Chapter 7 addresses Sustainable Movement. Of particular relevance are:

- Policy SM1: Overarching – Transport and Movement.
- Policy SM2: Walking and Cycling.
- Policy SM3: Public Transport – General.
- Policy SM7: Car Parking and EV Charging.

Chapter 8 addresses Community Infrastructure and Open Space. Of particular relevance are:

- Policy COS2: Social / Community Infrastructure.
- Policy COS7: Childcare Facilities.

Chapter 9: addresses Economic Development and Employment with the aim of creating a strong and resilient economic base providing expanded opportunities for employment and facilitating a good quality of life within vibrant and attractive places to live, work, visit and invest. Of particular relevance are:

- Policy EDE8: Retail.

Chapter 10 addresses Energy. Of particular relevance are:

- Policy E1: Responding to European, National and Regional Policy and Legislation.
- Policy E3: Energy Performance in Existing and New Buildings.
- Policy E4: Electric Vehicles.
- Policy E7: Solar Energy.
- Policy E11: Green Infrastructure.

Chapter 11 addresses Infrastructure and Environmental Services. Of particular relevance are:

- Policy IE2: Water Supply and Wastewater.
- Policy IE3: Surface Water and Groundwater.
- Policy IE7: Waste Management.

Chapter 12: Implementation and Monitoring sets out the Land Use Zoning Objectives and development standards.

Appendix 10: Building Height and Density Guide 2022, Appendix 11: Housing Strategy and HNDA and Appendix 12: Our Neighbourhoods are also considered relevant.

5.3. ***Eastern and Midland Regional Assembly – Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES) 2019 - 2031***

The RSES is underpinned by key principles that reflect the three pillars of sustainability: Social, Environmental and Economic, and expressed in a manner which best reflects the challenges and opportunities of the Region. It is a key principle of the strategy to promote people's quality of life through the creation of healthy and attractive places to live, work, visit and study in.

The site is located with the 'Dublin Metropolitan Area'. The Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan (MASP), which is part of the RSES, seeks to focus on a number of large strategic sites, based on key corridors that will deliver significant development in an integrated and sustainable fashion. The followings RPOs are of particular relevance:

RPO 5.4: Future development of strategic residential development areas within the Dublin Metropolitan Area shall provide for higher densities and qualitative standards set out in the 'Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas'. 'Sustainable Urban Housing; Design Standards for New Apartment' Guidelines, and Draft 'Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines for Planning Authorities'.

RPO 5.5: Future residential development in the Dublin Metropolitan Area shall follow a clear sequential approach, with a primary focus on the consolidation of Dublin and suburbs, supported by the development of Key Metropolitan Towns in a sequential manner as set out in the Dublin Area Strategic Plan (MASP) and in line with the overall settlement strategy for the RSES.

5.4. ***National Planning Framework First Revision (2025)***

The National Planning Framework is a high-level strategic plan for shaping the future growth and development of the county to 2040. It is a framework to guide public and private investment, to create and promote opportunities for our people, and to protect and enhance our environment - from our villages to our cities, and everything around and in between.

It states that the major policy emphasis on renewing and developing existing settlements established under the NPF 2018 will be continued, rather than allowing the continual expansion and sprawl of cities and towns out into the countryside, at the

expense of town centres and smaller villages. It includes revised figures of 50,000 units per annum in the years to 2040. The NPF was revised to allow planning for an additional 950,000 people in Ireland between 2022 and 2040.

Relevant Policy Objectives include:

- National Policy Objective 7: Deliver at least 40% of all new homes nationally, within the built-up footprint of existing settlements and ensure compact and sequential patterns of growth.
- National Policy Objective 8: Deliver at least half (50%) of all new homes that are targeted in the five Cities and suburbs of Dublin, Cork, Limerick, Galway and Waterford, within their existing built-up footprints and ensure compact and sequential patterns of growth.
- National Policy Objective 9: Deliver at least 30% of all new homes that are targeted in settlements other than the five Cities and their suburbs, within their existing built-up footprints and ensure compact and sequential patterns of growth.
- National Policy Objective 12: Ensure the creation of attractive, liveable, well designed, high quality urban places that are home to diverse and integrated communities that enjoy a high quality of life and well-being.
- National Policy Objective 14: Regenerate and rejuvenate cities, towns and villages of all types and scale as environmental assets that can accommodate changing roles and functions, increased residential population and employment activity, enhanced levels of amenity and design and placemaking quality, in order to sustainably influence and support their surrounding area to ensure progress toward national achievement of the UN Sustainable Development Goals.
- National Policy Objective 20: In meeting urban development requirements, there be a presumption in favour of development that can encourage more people and generate more jobs and activity within existing cities, towns and villages, subject to development meeting appropriate planning standards and achieving targeted growth.
- National Policy Objective 22: In urban areas, planning and related standards, including, in particular, height and car parking will be based on performance criteria that seek to achieve well-designed high-quality outcomes in order to achieve targeted growth. These standards will be subject to a range of tolerance that enables alternative solutions to be proposed to achieve stated outcomes,

provided public safety is not compromised and the environment is suitably protected.

5.5. **Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines**

Having considered the nature of the proposal, the receiving environment, the documentation on file, including the submissions from the planning authority, I am of the opinion that the directly relevant Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines are as follows.

- Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2025) (the 'Apartment Guidelines').
- Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024).
- The Planning System and Flood Risk Management (including the associated Technical Appendices) (2009).
- Appropriate Assessment of Plans and Projects in Ireland – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2009).
- Childcare Facilities – Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2001 and Circular PL3/2016 – Childcare facilities operating under the Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE) Scheme.
- Urban Development and Building Height, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2018) (the 'Building Height Guidelines').

Other

- Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS December 2013) (as updated) (Including Interim Advice note Covid-19 May 2020).

5.6. **Natural Heritage Designations**

There are no designated sites within or immediately adjacent to the appeal site. I refer the Commission to Appendix 3: Appropriate Assessment Screening (Stage 1) of this report.

6.0 **EIA Screening**

6.1. I refer the Commission to Appendix 1 and 2 of this report.

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

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of the First Party Appeal

The first party appeal includes details 5 no. appendices.

- Appendix A: Notification of Decision to Grant Permission
- Appendix B: Demographic and Market Analysis Report
- Appendix C: The Green Space Factor Tool Worksheet and Landscape Masterplan
- Appendix D: Architectural Design Statement including Housing Quality Assessment
- Appendix E: Taking Charge Drawing

The grounds of the appeal are summarised below:

Principle of Development

- The proposed scheme complies with national and regional planning policies regarding the achievement of compact urban growth and the sustainable regeneration of brownfield sites in highly accessible urban areas.
- The scheme would result in the provision of much needed housing in Tallaght.

Condition 2

It is requested that Condition 2 be omitted.

Unit Mix

- The amendments outlined in Condition 2 would result in an unnecessary redesign of the scheme. It reduces the number of units from 38 to 33, a loss of

5 units. The loss of the units would fundamentally compromise the viability of the scheme intended to deliver much needed housing.

- The condition is not in accordance with the Apartment Guidelines 2025, which are specifically aimed at facilitating the delivery of housing units. SPPR 1 of the Apartment Guidelines 2025 can be applied. No restrictions on the proposed developments unit mix is warranted.
- The original application included a unit mix analysis in accordance with Objective H1 12.
- In response to the request for additional information the applicant conducted an in-depth survey of the surrounding area.
- The applicants report notes that SDCC HNDA is based on Census data from 2016 and notes that the population growth and demographic change have accelerated significantly in the last 10 years. It is considered that the predictions and needs outlined in the HDNA are outdated and not reflective of Tallaght's current population or housing demands.
- Having regard to the updated housing market and demographic analysis provided by the applicant it is considered that the proposed development would not create an undesirable precedent and that the housing mix is appropriate to the specific socio-economic and demographic profile of the study area.
- The submission clearly demonstrates compliance with the criteria set out in H1 Objective 12 which allows for flexibility in the unit mix.

Plot Ratio

- A plot ratio of 1.0 – 1.2 is low for an urban area in close proximity to public transport.
- The LAP allows for a 20% uplift in plot ratio standards where there is a strong design rational or significant public gain, which results in a permissible plot ratio of 1.2.
- The LAP does not specify what constitutes a strong design rational.
- The proposed development has a strong design rational solely based on the receiving environment and Priorsgate development and should be considered

in accordance with a strong design rationale to qualify for the 20% flexibility regarding plot ratio.

- The applicant has engaged with the residents of Priorsgate and they expressed concerns regarding the provision of public open space and increased permeability within the site due to potential anti-social behaviour, which is an existing and on-going issue.
- The proposed development would redevelop a vacant brownfield site in Tallaght village which would have a positive impact on the streetscape and would constitute a significant community gain and deliver meaningful benefits to the area. Therefore, the scheme qualifies for the 20% flexibility regarding plot ratio.
- The Architectural Design Statement includes a breakdown of the design rationale.
- The site is not identified within the LAP height strategy. The site is identified as an existing building with no specific height strategy.

Destiny

- The Planning Authority considered the density of 112 uph to be acceptable.
- The applicant is seeking to optimise the sites potential to deliver much needed housing units.
- It is not feasible to adhere to conservative plot ratio standards without significantly limiting the number of units that can be provided.
- Section 2.72 of the LAP allow for a financial contribution in lieu of public open space, acknowledging that not all sites, particularly small infill urban sites can provide new public open space. Given the sites characteristics and the and the Councils acceptance of a financial contribution in lieu of public open space a consistent approach should be applied when considering the sites plot ratio.

Condition 14

- The proposed scheme retains planting and has a Green Score Factor of 0.53 which exceeds the minimum requirement. It is requested that Condition 14 be omitted.

Other Issues

- A Housing Quality Assessment was submitted by way of further information.
- A Taking in Charge drawing was submitted by way of further information.

Development Contributions

- Concerns are raised regarding the method for calculating the development contribution.

7.2. Grounds of the Third Party Appeal

The detailed third party appeal from Gerard Stockil on behalf of Tallaght Community Council against the Planning Authority's decision to grant permission includes a summary of the proposed development, a description of the site location and surrounding area, relevant planning policy and relevant planning history.

Below is intended as a summary of the main planning grounds of the appeal. I have read and considered all documentation submitted with the appeal.

Principle of Development

- The ground floor level should include uses that would result in an active street frontage in the village. The solely residential use in a village centre is not in accordance with the zoning objective, the provisions of the LAP or national policy.
- The appeal site is not of strategic or national importance and is not supported by local, regional or national policy.

Design Approach

- Redesigning the scheme by way of condition is too significant and the scheme should be re-advertised.
- The height, scale and mass of the proposed development are excessive, and the scheme results in overdevelopment of the site.
- The scheme fails to respect and is injurious to the existing pattern of development, built form, scale, character, heritage and residential and visual amenities of the area.

- The development is not in accordance with national policy set out in the NPF, the Building Height Guidelines, the Compact Settlement Guidelines the Urban Design Manual.
- The site is located in excess of 1km from the Luas Red Line.
- The height of the proposed building needs to provide a transition between the 5-storey Priorsgate development and the single storey building to the east. The 6th floor level should be omitted.
- The plot ratio exceeds the limit set out in the LAP. The 20% uplift which the LAP allows is noted. However, no adequate justification has been provided by the applicant. There is no significant public gain provided as part of the proposed development.
- Condition 2 of the Planning Authority's decision which reduces the plot ratio, by reducing the floor area at the upper levels, is welcomed.
- The density is excessive and not in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan.
- The proposed scheme would negatively impact on the residential amenity of adjoining properties and undeveloped sites, in terms of overbearing impact, overlooking and overshadowing.
- The site is not located within the Tallaght Architectural Conservation Area, however, the intimate scale and character of The Village, as set out in the LAP is not retained by the proposed development.
- The proposal is contrary to the Landscape Character Assessment of the Development Plan. Tallaght Village is an historic urban land category. The proposed development is not appropriate to a village context.
- In accordance with H1 Objective 12 of the Development Plan a minimum of 30% of the units should have 3 bedrooms. SDCC Housing Need and Demand Assessment identifies a need for 3-bed units. The applicants justification is not considered acceptable.
- The Planning Authority's condition to provide 3-bed units is not sufficient as it result in 21.3% of the units being 3-bed, which is below the required 30%. The

4th and 5th floor levels should provide 3-bed units, and the 6th floor should be omitted.

- The Commission have repeatedly supported the 30% requirement for 3-bed units in Tallaght. In this regard ABP-313591-22 and ABP-313606-21
- Concerns regarding the lack of open space and landscaping within the scheme.
- The proposed scheme would set an undesirable precedent.
- Concerns regarding the lack of a detailed Construction Management Plan.

Other Issues

- The applicant did not engage with the appellant prior to submitting the application.
- The proposed development would devalue property in the area.

7.3. Applicant Response to the Third Party Appeal

To avoid repetition only new issues addressed by the applicant are summarised below.

Plot Ratio and Height

- The Planning Authority did not state in its assessment that a 6-storey building at this location would represent unsustainable or overdevelopment of the site.
- In the absence of a specific height strategy the proposed building height has been informed by the established context. The scheme is intended to complete the existing Priorsgate scheme and has been designed to integrate cohesively with its built context.
- The application was supported by detailed assessments demonstrating compliance with standards relating to daylight and sunlight, overlooking and residential amenity. Subsequent amendments to the façade and materials further enhance alignment with the character of the area.
- The low rise nature of the site to the east is acknowledged, however, this is likely to evolve over time. The scale and form of the development are appropriate, reflecting the existing and anticipated future character of the surrounding area.

- The residents of the Priorsgate development did not raise any concerns regarding the height of the scheme.

Mix of Uses

- Residential uses are permissible under the sites Village Centre (VC) zoning objective. The Planning Authority raised no concerns regarding the residential use.
- The site represents an infill development within which commercial units already exist on the overall site. In the applicants experience, commercial units within the Priorsgate development remained vacant for a period exceeding 10 years. Permission was granted for a change of use of the creche unit to residential (Reg. Ref. SD18A/0240).
- Residential uses are appropriate at this site and will complement the streetscape.

Unit Mix

- A clear and robust justification for a departure from the 30% 3-bed unit mix requirement set out in H1 Objective 12 of the Development Plan has been provided. Therefore, Objective RE 2 of the LAP is not applicable in this instance.
- SPPR 1 of the Apartment Guidelines can be applied.

Green Space Factor

- Following review, the Landscape Architects identified that an area had been underestimated. A revised Green Space Factor Tool is submitted as Appendix A of the response. The revised Green Space Factor score is appropriate for the subject site.

Precedent

- The proposed development does not materially contravene the Development Plan or the LAP. Where the scheme deviates slightly it does so in accordance with the permitted flexibility set out in the relevant policies and objectives.
- The Planning Authority granted permission and did not consider that the scheme would set a poor precedent or conflict with sustainable development.

Property Values

- The proposed development will not give rise to any adverse impacts on adjoining residential amenities or property values.
- The applicant owns 108 no. apartments within the Priorsgate Development and would not carry out a development that would adversely affect the value of its assets.
- The applicant's experience is that underutilised or vacant sites can have a negative impact on the value and overall perception of adjoining properties.

Construction Waste Management Plan

- It is standard practice for a CWMP to be submitted by way of condition. Condition 20 of the grant of permission requires a Construction and Demolition Waste Management Plan to be submitted.

Other Issues

- Discrepancies and errors within the appellants report are noted.
- Clarify that the site is not located within the Tallaght ACA.
- The applicant carried out public consultation on the 11th June 2025 with the residents of Priorsgate and the appellant (Tallaght Community Council) was invited and did not attend. An online meeting was held with the appellant on the 13th June 2025. A walkthrough was conducted with the residents of Priorsgate on the 10th July 2025.
- The applicant has actively communicated with the appellants to arrange suitable dates and times for meetings. This demonstrates a clear intention on the applicants behalf to inform and engage with the public.

7.4. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority confirmed its decision and states that the issues raised in the appeal were covered in the Chief Executives Order.

7.5. Observations

None

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Having examined the appeal details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the report of the local authority and inspected the site, and having regard to 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
- Quantum of Development
- Design Approach
- Height
- Residential Amenity
- Unit Mix
- Open Space
- Car Parking
- Financial Contribution

8.2. In the interest of clarity my assessment relates to the scheme as submitted by way of further information.

8.3. *Principle of Development*

8.3.1. Tallaght is the County Town of South Dublin County Council. The surrounding area comprises urban land uses, including commercial, retail, residential, health, educational and community uses. The site is located on Main Road in the village centre, c. 500m southeast of Technological University Dublin (TUD) Tallaght, c. 1km east of the Square Shopping Centre and c. 1.4km west of Tallaght Hospital. The surrounding area is well served by public transport. There is a bus stop located adjacent to the site on Main Road and an additional stop on the Greenhills Road, c. 180m northwest of the site.

8.3.2. The site previously contained a 2-storey building known as Bruce House. However, all structures have been demolished. The site is currently vacant and surrounded by hoarding. It is proposed to construct a 6-storey building containing 38 no. apartments. The proposed block would form part of the existing 4-6 storey Priorsgate mixed use

development located to the south and west of the appeal site. The existing Priorsgate development is also within the ownership of the applicant.

- 8.3.3. Concerns are raised by the third party that the ground floor level should include uses that would result in an active street frontage in the village and considers that the solely residential use in a village centre is not in accordance with the zoning objective, the provisions of the LAP or national policy.
- 8.3.4. The ground floor level has a c. 19m wide frontage onto Main Road. The main pedestrian access to the apartments is proposed directly from Main Road. An additional pedestrian route is also provided along the sites eastern boundary, with a gated access from Main Road. The layout also provides for an apartment and an ESB substation fronting onto Main Road. The apartment unit is set back 1.5m, with a balcony / terrace provided between the apartment and the public footpath.
- 8.3.5. The appeal site is zoned Village Centre (VC) in the Development Plan with the associated land use objective *to protect, improve and provide for the future development of Town Centres*. Residential uses are permitted in principle under this zoning objective.
- 8.3.6. The lands within the Tallaght Town Centre Local Area Plan (LAP) are subdivided into Neighbourhoods. The appeal site is located within 'The Village' Neighbourhood. The LAP seeks to consolidate existing retail, town centre and mixed use residential neighbourhood within a high quality place of intimate scale respecting the historic character of the place. The proposed development forms part of the larger Priorsgate development, which incorporates commercial uses at ground floor level and active frontage onto both Main Road and the Greenhills Road. Tallaght Village is mixed use and includes residential uses at ground floor level. I am satisfied that the proposed use, which is permissible under the zoning objective, would consolidate the existing urban environment and is, therefore, in accordance with the provisions of the LAP.
- 8.3.7. The NPF support compact growth with an emphasis on renewal of existing settlement rather than continued sprawl. National Policy Objectives 7, 8, 9, 12, 14 and 20 all support residential development in existing urban areas. RPO 5.5 of the RSES states that future residential development in the Dublin Metropolitan Area shall follow a clear sequential approach, with a primary focus on the consolidation of Dublin and suburbs. A key priority of the Compact Settlement Guidelines is to deliver brownfield and infill

development at scale at suitable strategic and sustainable development locations within the existing built up footprint of the city and suburbs area or metropolitan towns. I am satisfied that national and regional policy do not restrict solely residential developments in urban areas.

8.3.8. The concerns of the third party regarding the vitality and viability of Tallaght village are noted. However, in response to the appeal the applicant states that the commercial units within Priorsgate remained vacant for a period exceeding 10 years. It is noted that permission was granted in 2018 (Reg. Ref. SD18A/0240) for a change of use of the creche unit to residential. Having regard to the existing uses along Main Road and the sites relatively limited (19m) frontage onto Main Road, it is my opinion that there are sufficient non-residential uses within the village centre to ensure an active streetscape and passive surveillance.

8.3.9. The concerns of the third party is noted. However, having regard to the existing mix of uses within Priorsgate and within Tallaght Village and to the sites zoning objective and the provisions of the LAP, national and regional policies I am satisfied that the residential use is acceptable in principle. It is also noted that no concerns were raised regarding the mix of uses by the Planning Authority.

8.4. ***Quantum of Development***

Density

8.4.1. The third party raised concerns that the density is excessive and not in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan. It is also considered that the proposed development results in overdevelopment of the site.

8.4.2. Based on the site area of 0.34 ha, the proposed scheme has a density of 112 dpa. The Development Plan and the Tallaght Town Centre LAP do not set out prescriptive out density standards. However, Section 5.2.7 of the Development Plan notes that the Building Height and Density Guide (BHDG) Appendix 10 of the Development Plan forms the primary policy basis and toolkit to employ the delivery of increased building height and density within the County in a proactive but considered manner. The guide contains a detailed set of performance-based criteria for the assessment of developments of greater density and increased height. An assessment of the scheme against these performance-based criteria is set out below in Section 8.6 of this report.

As assessed in detail below, I am satisfied that the density of the scheme is in accordance with the criteria set out in the BHDG.

8.4.3. The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) identify types of locations that may be suitable for different density ranges. Table 3.1 of the Guidelines sets out the areas and density ranges for Dublin as well as Cork City and its suburbs and divides the city into City - Centre, City-Urban Neighbourhoods and City – Suburbs / Urban Expansion. In my opinion the site is located within the City - Urban Neighbourhoods. The Guidelines note that these neighbourhoods are highly accessible urban locations with good access to employment, education and institutional uses and public transport. It is a policy and objective of the Guidelines that residential densities in the range 50 dph to 250 dph (net) shall generally be applied in urban neighbourhoods of Dublin and Cork. Therefore, the proposed density of 112 dph is in accordance with the provisions of the Guidelines.

8.4.4. As set out below in Section 8.6, having regard to the surrounding urban context and the high level of accessibility to public transport and a wide range of services and amenities within Tallaght Village and Tallaght Town Centre, located c. 500m west of the appeal site, I am satisfied that the proposed density is reasonable at this location. It is also noted that the Planning Authority raised no concerns regarding the density.

Plot Ratio

8.4.5. Plot ratio is an expression of the amount of floor space in relation to the site area. It is a useful tool to ensure that high density schemes are appropriately developed to a high standard by controlling the bulk and mass of buildings.

8.4.6. The proposed scheme has a plot ratio of 1.1. The Development Plan does not set out plot ratio standards. However, Section 2.6.1 of the LAP sets out a plot ratio range of 0.75 – 1.0 for The Village Neighbourhood, which the appeal site is located within. The LAP allows for a 20% increase in the plot ratio ranges where there is a strong design rationale for an increase in density / height and where the development would result in significant public gain. Therefore, subject to certain criteria a plot ratio of 1 – 1.2 is acceptable.

- 8.4.7. The third party raised concerns that the plot ratio exceeds the limit set out in the LAP and considers that no adequate justification has been provided by the applicant that would allow for the 20% uplift permitted in the LAP subject to certain criteria.
- 8.4.8. The Planning Authority's initial report noted that the plot ratio was in excess of the LAP standard. Item 1(b) of the request for further information requested further consideration of the plot ratio and noted that the request to amend the height of the scheme could result in a reduction of the plot ratio. In response to the request for further information the Planning Authority considered that the applicant did not adequately justify the plot ratio with regard to the criteria set out in the LAP. Condition 2 of the grant of permission omitted the 5th floor level and set back the 4th floor level. The Planning Authority notes that this would also reduce the plot ratio.
- 8.4.9. The applicant also notes that the 1.1 plot ratio exceeds the standard set out in the LAP. However, it is considered that the proposed development qualifies for the 20% uplift in plot ratio as it has a strong design rationale solely based on the receiving environment and Priorsgate development and would redevelop a vacant brownfield site in Tallaght village which would have a positive impact on the streetscape and would constitute a significant community gain and deliver meaningful benefits to the area.
- 8.4.10. As the proposed development has a similar form, scale and height to the existing Priorsgate development and having regard to the urban location and vacant nature of the site I agree with the applicant that there is a strong design rationale for increased density and height. However, the LAP states that there must be a strong design rationale and result in a significant public gain including public open space, creation of streets and links, major upgrades to streets, community / cultural amenities or other public domain works. The proposed development does not include a significant public gain as specified in Section 2.6.1 of the LAP. Therefore, it is my view that the scheme is not eligible for an additional 20% increase in plot ratio.
- 8.4.11. It is acknowledged that the proposed plot ratio does not comply with the provisions of Section 2.6.1 of the LAP. However, as the floor area or volume of a building can be distributed in different ways plot ratio should be considered in combination with other development control measures, as site coverage, building height, quantum of open space and built form. As noted above the proposed density is in accordance with the

provisions of the Compact Settlement Guidelines. As outlined below the 6 storey height is in accordance with the criteria set out in South Dublin County's BHDG, the LAP and the Building Height Guidelines. I also consider the built form, scale and massing of the proposed building to be similar to the existing Priorsgate development and mixed use and apartment developments within Tallaght Village. Overall, I have no objection to the proposed plot ratio and consider it appropriate at this urban location.

Conclusion

8.4.12. While the concerns of the third party are noted, it is my opinion that the proposed development should be viewed in the context of the surrounding area which has experienced a transition to a more urban / denser area, with a mix of uses, including apartment blocks of varying heights and significantly increased densities and plot ratios. It is my view that the proposed development would be appropriate and reinforce the changing profile towards a mixed-use urban centre.

8.4.13. In conclusion, I am satisfied that the proposed density and plot ratio are in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan and the LAP and are consistent with recent grants of permission in the wider area. It is also my view that they are appropriate at this location and would support the consolidation of the urban environment, which is welcomed.

8.5. Design Approach

Design and Layout

8.5.1. The proposed development comprises the construction of a 6-storey residential block and would form part of the existing Priorsgate Development. Priorsgate was constructed in c. 2007 and comprises 3 no. blocks ranging in height from 4-6 storeys. The existing blocks provide an urban frontage onto Main Road, Greenhills Road and the N81 (Tallaght By-Pass). The existing development is primarily residential with commercial units fronting onto Main Road and Greenhills Road. Internally the blocks front onto a central courtyard of communal open space. The proposed residential block would complete the Priorsgate development.

- 8.5.2. It is noted that permission was granted on the appeal site (ABP-302617-18, Reg. Ref. SD18A/0239) in 2019 for the construction of a 5 storey mixed use building comprising 31 no. apartments and a retail unit. This development was not constructed.
- 8.5.3. The proposed development is rectangular in shape with a c. 19m frontage onto Main Road. The sites northern (front) elevation is level with the public footpath and follows the established building line within the Priorsgate development. The southern, eastern and western elevations have a staggered building line. There are projecting balconies on the southern and western elevations with no balconies on the eastern elevation. The scheme also incorporates a variation in balcony type which adds visual interest to the scheme and is welcomed.
- 8.5.4. The 38 no. apartments include 8 no. unit types ranging in size from 56.8sqm (1-bed) to 110sqm (2-bed 4 person). A Housing Quality Assessment is provided in Section 5.8 of the applicants Architectural Design Statement and the information provided within the drawings indicates that each of the apartments reaches or exceeds the minimum standards for room sizes as set out in SPPR 2 of Apartment Guidelines (2025).
- 8.5.5. Section 3.3 of the Apartment Guidelines (2025) recommends that 25% of all apartments in a proposed scheme shall exceed the minimum floor area standard. It is noted that >50% of units in the scheme exceed the minimum floor area standard by at least 10%.
- 8.5.6. SPPR3 of the Apartment Guidelines, 2025 requires that a minimum of 25% of apartments should be dual aspect. The layout provides for 18 no. dual aspect units, which equates to a 43% of units, which is significantly in excess of the minimum standard. It is noted that there are no single aspect north facing units.
- 8.5.7. The site area include a portion of the public footpath, and it is proposed to provide a lay-by on the public road, outside of the proposed development. I have no objection to the provision of a lay-by at this location, and it is noted that no concerns were raised by the Planning Authority in this regard.
- 8.5.8. The third party raised concerns that the scale and mass of the proposed development are excessive and also considered that the proposed scheme fails to respect, and is injurious to, the existing pattern of development, built form, scale, character, heritage

and visual amenities of the area. In the interest of clarity, the issue of height is addressed separately below in Section 8.6.

- 8.5.9. The appeal site is located outside of the Tallaght Architectural Conservation Area (ACA) and is not subject to any special designation and does not contain and is not adjacent to any protected structure. In my opinion the form and scale of the blocks are similar to Priorsgate and the existing apartment and mixed use developments within Tallaght Village. It is acknowledged that the proposed development would be visible from Main Road. However, in my view the proposed development would integrate with the existing Priorsgate development and the surrounding streetscape and would not detract from the visual amenities of Tallaght Village.

Materials

- 8.5.10. The drawings submitted by way of further information indicate that the front (northern) elevation of the proposed development would be finished in a yellow brick and the setback 6th floor level would be finished in a metal cladding to match the existing Priorsgate development. The southern elevation would comprise white render. The eastern is predominate finished in yellow brick with a central element of white render and western elevations would include a mix of yellow brick and white render. Given the prominent location of the appeal site within the village centre the use of a high quality brick is welcomed.
- 8.5.11. Render is not a durable material and having carried out a site visit on the 25th May 2026 it was noted that existing elements of white render within the Priorsgate development have not result in a high quality finish. While it is noted that the white render finish would generally oppose the existing development, within Priorsgate, it is my opinion that given the on-going maintenance that would be required for a building of this height and given the proximity of the block to existing residential uses and the existing area of communal open space, that the use of a poor quality material could negatively impact on the visual amenity of existing Priorsgate development and the wider area. Therefore, if permission is being contemplated is my view that it is appropriate in this instance to attach a condition that the building be finished in high quality and durable materials. It is also my view that a variation in brick / cladding

colour should be provided to retained the vertical emphasis of the development currently proposed by the use of brick and render.

- 8.5.12. The updated Architectural Design Statement states that either a contrasting buff brick with white mortar or stone cladding is proposed at ground floor level to define a plinth, similar to the neighbouring development. I agree with the applicant that given the residential nature of the scheme that a brick finish would be more appropriate. I am satisfied that this can be addressed by way of condition.

Conclusion

- 8.5.13. In conclusion, while the concerns of the third party are noted having regard to the urban location, the brownfield nature of the site and as this development would complete the existing Priorsgate development, it is my view that the proposed development successfully integrates into the streetscape and would support the consolidation of the urban environment and represents a reasonable response to its context.

8.6. Height

- 8.6.1. The proposed building is predominately 6 storey's in height and incorporates a set back at 5th floor level at the sites northern elevation with Main Road and the western elevation with the existing Priorsgate development. Condition 2 of the grant of permission omitted the 5th floor level and set back the 4th floor level. As noted above, permission was granted on the appeal site in 2019 for a 5-storey development (ABP-302617-18, Reg. Ref. SD18A/0239).
- 8.6.2. The third party raised concerns that the proposed building height is excessive and would negatively impact on the visual amenity of Tallaght Village.
- 8.6.3. The Planning Authority raised concerns regarding the height of the scheme and Condition 2 of the grant of permission omitted the 5th floor level and set back the 4th floor level at the sites northern elevation with Main Road. The first party appeal requests that condition no. 2 be omitted from the grant of permission. The third party considered that redesigning the scheme by way of condition is too significant and the scheme should be re-advertised. I agree with the third party that the proposed amendments by way of condition 2 result in a significant redesign of the scheme.

Should the Commission wish to attach a similar condition the scheme may need to be re-advertised.

- 8.6.4. Section 2.6.2 of the Tallaght Town Centre LAP sets out the height strategy and notes that in general terms building height and scale is greatest in The Centre Neighbourhood, in close proximity to Luas stops and along arterial and primary route frontages (up to 6–7 storeys residential). Building height and scale on secondary routes / frontages is lesser but still within an urban scale, (4–6 storeys residential) and Building Height (3-4 storeys) is lower along tertiary routes, within the network of secondary streets. The appeal site is identified in Figure 2.8 of the LAP as an existing building and a recommended height for the site is not provided. However, sites to the east of the appeal side are identified as suitable for 4-6 storeys residential. Therefore, it is my view that the LAP considers this area of Tallaght Village as a secondary route and suitable for height of up to 4-6 storeys.
- 8.6.5. The Development Plan does not set out prescriptive height parameters. Policy QDP8 of the Development Plan aims to adhere to the requirement of the Building Height Guidelines through the implementation of the Assessment Toolkit set out in Appendix 10: Building Height and Density Guide (BHDG). Policy QDP9 of the Development Plan aims to apply a context driven approach to building heights as supported by the BHDG. It is noted that the criteria set out in the BHDG is similar to that outlined in the Building Height Guidelines and the Urban Design Manual.
- 8.6.6. The Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines support compact development through higher density developments in appropriate locations, to avoid the trend towards predominantly low-density commuter-driven developments. Section 3.2 of the guidelines sets out criteria for assessing the scale of the development with regard to the city, street and site level including, proximity to high frequency public transport; integration / enhancement of the character and public realm of the area; response to overall natural and built environment; architectural response; urban design; improved legibility; mix of uses and building typologies. Additional specific assessment may also be required for issues including daylight and sunlight; microclimate; communication.
- 8.6.7. In my opinion the proposed heights are in accordance with the provision of the LAP and similar to those previously approved in the surrounding area. However, having

regard to the concerns raised by the third-party regarding height and density, and Condition 2 of the grant of permission which requires the height to be reduced, it is my opinion that it is appropriate to assess the scheme in accordance with the planning authority's Building Height and Density Guide. This is set out in the table below.

Table 2: Building Height and Density Guide

Theme	Yes / No	Comment
<p>CONTEXT</p> <p>Is the site well served by public transport with high capacity, frequent service and good links to other modes of public transport by which it links to the wider city and region?</p> <p>Has the proposal adopted an approach to urban intensification proportionate to its setting?</p> <p>Is the increased height proposed required for density?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>I am satisfied that the appeal site is well served by high frequency and high capacity public transport. There is a bus stop located adjacent to the site on Main Road and an additional stop on the Greenhills Road, c. 180m northwest of the site which provides connectivity to the city centre. The LUAS Red line Tallaght Stop is located c. 1km (15 minute walk) west of the appeal site.</p> <p>The proposed design and layout of the scheme is similar to the adjacent Priorsgate development and existing residential and mixed use schemes within Tallaght Village along Main Road and Greenhills Road. I am satisfied that the design approach is proportionate to its setting.</p> <p>The proposed scheme is predominately 6 storeys with a set back at 5th floor level. The density of 112 units per ha is mainly achieved by the unit mix and the building height within the scheme.</p>
<p>SETTING</p> <p>How does the proposal respond positively to its surroundings?</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>The subject site is an underutilised brownfield site in the urban area of Tallaght Village Centre. The proposed development is a high quality scheme which would complete the Priorsgate mixed use development. The</p>

<p>Are there specific issues of character, topography or visual impact to which the proposal should respond?</p> <p>How does the proposal make a positive contribution to its context?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>-</p>	<p>design, layout, height and materiality are similar to previously permitted and constructed scheme. Due to the vacant nature of the site the proposed scheme would improve the streetscape on Main Road. However, as noted below in Section X I have concerns regarding how the proposed scheme relates to the existing blocks in Priorsgate. Please refer to Section 8.7 Residential Amenity of this report.</p> <p>The proposed development is bound by Main Road and would be visually prominent within the village centre. The design of the block appropriately the existing Priorsgate Development and the central area of communal open space.</p> <p>The form, massing and height of the blocks are similar to the 3 no. blocks within Priorsgate. The proposed development would complete the central area of communal open space within Priorsgate and would have a significant positive impact on the consolidation of the urban environment and the visual amenities of Main Road.</p>
<p>CONNECTIONS</p> <p>Do proposals incorporate new streets to facilitate new links at the local level or improve existing streets and links to local amenities?</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The proposed scheme does not include any additional pedestrian cycle links. It would complete an existing mixed use scheme. The site is bound by Main Road to the north and the N81 to the south. Due to the lack of pedestrian infrastructure to the rear of the site, it is undesirable to provide a public pedestrian link to the N81.</p> <p>Residents of the Priorsgate development raised concerns during the initial application to the Planning Authority regarding public access to the proposed</p>

<p>How does the proposed layout respond to existing streetscape and patterns of development and how are increased heights located in relation to these patterns?</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>development due to on-going security and anti-social behaviour concerns.</p> <p>The proposed development is located in Tallaght Village Centre, and the proposed heights are in accordance with the provisions of the Tallaght Town Centre LAP (4-6 storeys).</p> <p>The existing buildings in the vicinity of the appeal site range in height up to 6 storeys. The proposed scheme does not provide for a stepped approach to height. However, given the existing 4-6 storey building located to the south and west of the appeal site it is my opinion that this is appropriate.</p> <p>There is an existing single storey building to the east of the appeal site. However, this site is identified in the LAP as being suitable for heights of 4-6 storeys. The proposed scheme has been designed to ensure it does not impede the future development of this site.</p> <p>In my opinion the 6-storey building, with set back at 5th floor level provide appropriate urban frontage onto Main Road.</p>
<p>INCLUSIVITY</p> <p>Does the proposal provide equitable, people-friendly streets, spaces and uses?</p> <p>Are routes appropriately scaled</p>	<p>No</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>This is a residential development and does not incorporate public open space. However, it is proposed to provide public bicycle parking on the public footpath as part of the scheme.</p> <p>The proposed development would provide for passive surveillance of the public road.</p> <p>The proposed scheme does not include any new links or routes.</p>

<p>and properly located within the urban environment to encourage maximum use by as many people as possible?</p>		
<p>VARIETY</p> <p>Does the form of development at higher densities proposed complement or compete with existing built form and local variations of height?</p> <p>Does the increased height proposed facilitate and encourage a wider mix of uses in the development?</p>	<p>-</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>The proposed development is located within Tallaght Village Centre, which has a variety of building forms and heights. It is my opinion that the form of the proposed development is similar to existing and proposed development within the surrounding urban environment and that it would complement the existing streetscape.</p> <p>The proposed height is in accordance with the Height Strategy set out in the LAP.</p> <p>The proposed development would increase the number of residential units (38 no.) available in the area.</p>
<p>EFFICIENCY</p> <p>Is the proposed increase in height enabling the optimal use of the land at a sustainable density?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The proposed site is located within a village centre on a vacant site, which is zoned and serviced. The residential density is in accordance with the standards outlined in the Compact Settlement Guidelines.</p>
<p>DISTINCTIVENESS</p> <p>How does the development preserve, complement or enhance the character of the area and contribute in a positive manner to the visual setting or built heritage of the area?</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>The subject site is an underutilised brownfield site in Tallaght Village Centre. The vacant nature of the site results in a gap in the streetscape. It is my opinion that the development of this site would have a positive impact on the visual amenity of this urban streetscape and the urban character of the wider area.</p>
<p>LAYOUT</p> <p>Is the overall layout making use</p>		<p>The proposed scheme comprises a single block, which</p>

of forms of development appropriate to higher densities?	Yes	would complete the existing Priorsgate development. In my opinion the scale and form of this block is appropriate for this urban site and responds positively to the characteristics of the site and the surrounding area.
PUBLIC REALM How safe, secure and enjoyable are the public areas adjacent to higher buildings, and how has the human scale been taken into account?	-	The proposed scheme does not include any public space. The proposed development would provide passive overlooking of Main Road.
ADAPTABILITY Are the buildings and layouts designed to accommodate future change?	Yes	The internal layout of the majority of residential units would allow for interior alterations or future amalgamation of units.
PRIVACY AND AMENITY Has the proposal addressed recognised potential impacts of increased height and densities?	No	Inadequate separation distances are provided between the proposed scheme and Blocks 1 and 3 in the existing Priorsgate development to the south and west of the proposed development. It is my view that permission should be refused on this basis. Please refer to Section 8.7 Residential Amenity of this report.
PARKING Has parking been considered from a people-first perspective?	Yeso	All car parking is provided within the existing basement level of the Priorsgate Development. I am satisfied that the location of car parking has been adequately considered and is appropriate at this urban location.
DETAILED DESIGN Have external material finishes and assembly been well	Yes	The external material would predominately comprise a high-quality yellow brick, with elements of metal cladding at 5 th floor set back level, glazing, steel

Overlooking

- 8.7.2. The appeal site is bound to the south and east by the existing Priorsgate development. The applicant states that the proposed development would not give rise to any adverse impacts on adjoining residential amenities or property values and note that they own 108 no. apartments within the Priorsgate Development and would not carry out a development that would adversely affect the value of its assets.
- 8.7.3. The rear (southern) elevation of the proposed development is located c. 12m from the northern elevation of Block 3 Priorsgate and the western elevation of the proposed development is located between 7m and 17m from Block 1 Priorsgate. The drawings submitted do not clearly show the floor plans and locations of windows for the existing apartments in Priorsgate. However, having regard to the available information and having carried out a site visit, it is my view that the proposed development would result in directly opposing windows / balconies between the proposed building and the existing units.
- 8.7.4. H11 Objective 4 of the Development Plan seeks to ensure that opposing balconies and windows at above ground floor level have an adequate separation distance, design or positioning to safeguard privacy without compromising internal residential amenity. SPPR 1 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines requires a separation distance of at least 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses, duplex units and apartment units, above ground floor level. It further notes that separation distances below 16 metres may be considered acceptable in circumstances where there are no opposing windows serving habitable rooms and where suitable privacy measures have been designed into the scheme to prevent undue overlooking of habitable rooms and private amenity spaces. The separation distances within the proposed scheme do not comply with the standards set in SPPR1. Having regard to the limited separation distance between directly opposing windows I have serious concerns that the proposed scheme would result in undue overlooking which would negatively impact on the existing residential amenities of the occupiers of Priorsgate and of future residents of the proposed development and would not be in accordance with SPPR 1 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines or 11 Objective 4 of the Development Plan. It is my recommendation that permission be refused on this basis.

8.7.5. To the east the site is bound by an existing single storey Tallaght Youth Service building. The proposed development is set back c. 3m from the site's eastern boundary and c. 6m from the existing single storey building. The proposed development includes windows serving habitable rooms on the eastern elevation. Having regard to the existing use on the adjacent site I am satisfied that the proposed development would not unduly overlook the existing use. However, I have concerns that the limited separation distance to the site boundary and the location of windows serving habitable rooms on the eastern elevation that the proposed development could potentially negatively impact on the future development potential of the adjacent site. It is noted that the windows serving habitable rooms on the eastern elevation of the proposed development are dual aspect units. Therefore, if permission is being considered it is my opinion that a condition should be attached requiring windows on the eastern elevation serving habitable rooms in units 202, 207, 302, 307, 402, 407 and 501 to be permanently fitted with obscure glazing.

Overbearing Impact

8.7.6. The limited separation distance are noted. However, given the urban location and the design and layout of the proposed development I am satisfied that the proposed development would not have an overbearing impact on existing residents.

Overshadowing

8.7.7. QDP7 Objective 7 of the SDCDP aims to *ensure that all proposals for development contribute positively to providing a coherent enclosure of streets and public spaces, taking into consideration the proportions and activities of buildings on both sides of a street or surrounding a public space, providing for good standards of daylight and sunlight, and micro climatic conditions and having regard to the guidance and principles set out in the South Dublin County's Building Height and Density Guide and the Design Manual for Urban Streets and Roads (DMURS) (2019)*. Therefore, in accordance with QDP7 Objective 7 daylight and sunlight are one of a number of considerations when assessing a scheme.

External Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing

8.7.8. A Daylight Performance Assessment was submitted with the application, which follows the guidelines set out in the BRE (2022). The report includes an assessment of Vertical

Sky Component (VSC). In general, VSC is a measure of the amount of sky visible from a given point (usually the centre of a windows) within a structure. The 2022 BRE guidelines state that if the VSC, with the new development in place, is both less than 27% and less than 0.8 times its former value occupants of the existing building would notice the reduction in the amount of skylight. An assessment of the impact on no. 4 Old Blessington Road, no. 1 – 8 Main Road, Blocks 1 and 3 Priorsgate and Priorsgate Centre, the single storey education and training centre to the east of the appeal site. The assessment indicates that the impact on no. 4 Old Blessington Road, no. 1 – 8 Main Road and Priorsgate Centre are within the BRE guidelines.

8.7.9. Priorsgate Block 1: The analysis indicates that with the proposed development in place windows on the eastern elevation (windows 58 -68 and windows 71-73) of the existing building would notice a reduction in the amount of skylight. The applicant's report considers that either reasonable skylight access is retained or the impact falls within tolerable bounds. Overall, the applicant considers the impact to be negligible. The data provided in the applicants assessment (pages 15 and 16) indicated that in the worst case scenario the VSC (for window 64) would reduce from 35.8 to 20.6. In my view this is not a negligible impact. It is acknowledged that in the comparison is being made between an existing vacant brownfield site and the proposed 6-storey development and that inevitably there will be some impact. However, it is my opinion that the significant loss of light for 13 no. existing windows on the eastern elevation of Block 1 Priorsgate could be reduced if a greater separation distance was provided between the existing and proposed developments. Having regard to the information provided it is my opinion that the proposed development would have a significant negative impact on access to daylight for existing windows on the eastern elevation of Block 1 Priorsgate.

8.7.10. Priorsgate Block 3: The analysis indicates that with the proposed development in place windows on the northern elevation (windows 102-111) of the existing building would notice a reduction in the amount of skylight. The applicant considers that the impact falls within tolerable bounds. Overall, the applicant considers the impact to be negligible. The data provided in the applicant's assessment (page 17) indicates that in the worst case scenario the VSC (for window 109) would reduce from 34.2 to 17.3. In my view this is not a negligible impact. Again, it is my opinion that the significant loss of light for the existing residential units on the northern elevation of Block 3 Priorsgate

could be reduced if a greater separation distance was provided between the existing and proposed developments. Having regard to the information provided it is my opinion that the proposed development would have a significant negative impact on access to daylight for 10 no., existing windows on the northern elevation of Priorsgate Block 3.

- 8.7.11. The applicant's report also carried out an assessment of the impact of the development on access to sunlight (Annual / Winter Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH / WPSH)) for living rooms in adjacent properties with a window facing within 90° of due south, which is in accordance with the BRE Guidance. If a room can receive more than 25% of Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) including at least 5% in winter, then a room should receive adequate sunlight. The analysis provided by the applicant (pages 20 – 24) indicates that the proposed development would largely have a negligible impact on APSH and WPSH for existing living room with a window facing within 90° of due south. However, the APSH for window 77 in Block 1 Priorsgate would reduce from 25% to 22%, which is below the standard. The minor impact on APSH for 1 no. window is acknowledged. However, when balanced against the need for housing on zoned and serviced lands in the urban area I consider this minor adverse effect to be acceptable.
- 8.7.12. The BRE guide states that good site layout planning for daylight and sunlight should not limit itself to providing good natural lighting inside buildings. Sunlight in the spaces between buildings has an important impact on the overall appearance and ambience of a development. It is recommended that at least half of the amenity areas should receive at least 2 hours of sunlight on 21st March. It is noted that the proposed development would have a negligible impact on access to daylight and sunlight for existing amenity spaces.

Internal Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing

- 8.7.13. The 2022 BRE Guidelines provides target spatial daylight autonomy (SDA) values to be applied. The illuminance methodology was adopted for the assessment. The target values are 200 Lux for kitchens, 150 Lux for living rooms and 100 Lux for bedroom. These are the median illuminances, to be exceeded over at least 50% of the assessment points in the room for at least half of the daylight hours. The BRE notes

that where rooms serve more than one function the higher target value should be applied.

- 8.7.14. The information provided in Table 2 of the applicant assessment indicates that 18 of the 38 kitchen / living / dining (K/L/D) rooms reach or exceed the recommended 200 Lux target and 60 of the 72 bedrooms reach or exceed the recommended 100 Lux target over at least 50% of the assessment points in the room for at least half of the daylight hours. This equates to 47% of the K/L/D rooms in the scheme and 83% of the bedrooms achieving the recommended target. Overall, 71% of rooms achieve the recommended target. It is acknowledged that in urban schemes there are challenges in achieving the recommended standards in all instances, and to do so could unduly compromise the design / streetscape and that it is not mandatory for an applicant to achieve full compliance. However, I have concerns regarding the 53% of non-compliance with the recommended standard for K/L/D rooms within the scheme and consider that the proposed development would result in a significant portion of poorly lit K/L/D which would negatively impact on the residential amenity of future occupants.

Conclusion

- 8.7.15. Having regard to the information provided within the applicant's documentation I have concerns regarding a significant negative impact on access to daylight for 13 no. existing windows on the eastern elevation of Block 1 Priorsgate, 10 no. existing windows on the northern elevation of Block 3 Priorsgate and the significant portion (53%) of poorly lit K/L/D rooms within the proposed scheme. Therefore, it is my opinion that the proposed scheme would negatively impact on the residential amenity of future occupants and existing residents of Priorsgate Development.

8.8. Unit Mix

- 8.8.1. H1 Objective 12 of the Development Plan requires that a minimum of 30% of all units in new residential developments be 3-bedroom. Objective RE 2 of the LAP also requires a that a minimum of 30% of all new residential units be 3-bedroom. The proposed development does not include any 3-bed units. Condition 2 of the grant of permission amended the scheme to provide a maximum of 33 no. residential units with at least 6 no. being 3-bed units. This equates to c. 18% of the apartments.

- 8.8.2. The third party raised concerns that the proposed scheme does not comply with H1 Objective 12 and notes that the Planning Authority's condition does not result in the required 30% 3-bed units.
- 8.8.3. In response to the request for additional information the applicant conducted a Demographic and Market Analysis Report. This is attached as Appendix B of the first party appeal. The applicant notes that the SDCC HNDA is based on Census data from 2016 and states that the population growth and demographic change have accelerated significantly in the last 10 years and considers that the predictions and needs outlined in the HDNA are outdated and not reflective of Tallaght's current population or housing demands. The applicant also notes that SPPR 1 of the Apartment Guidelines (2025) does not impose any restrictions on unit mix.
- 8.8.4. While H1 Objective 12 of the Development Plan requires that 30% of units be 3-bed it also states that in some circumstances a lesser provision can be provided including *inter alia* where the proposed housing mix meets the specific demand required in an area, having regard to the prevailing housing type within a 10-minute walk of the site and to the socio-economic, population and housing data set out in the Housing Strategy and Interim HNDA. This flexibility requires consideration of both the prevailing housing type in the area and the socio-economic, population and housing data set out in the Housing Strategy and Interim HNDA.
- 8.8.5. Figure 1.2 of the applicants Demographic and Market Analysis Report identifies the study area as a 10 minute walking distance from the appeal site. There are 2,856 residential units in the study area, 2% are 5+ beds, 11% are 4-bed, 45% 3-beds, 19% 2-beds and 10% 1-beds and 12% not stated. Therefore, at least 58% of units in the study area have 3+ bedrooms. Having regard to the prevailing housing type within a 10-minute walk of the site I am satisfied that the proposed unit mix of 4 no. 1-bed, 9 no. 2 bed (3 person) and 25 no. 2-bed (4 person) would meet a specific demand required in an area.
- 8.8.6. The SDCC Housing Strategy and Interim HNDA is set out in Appendix 11 of the Development Plan. Section 6.8.2 of Appendix 11 notes that there is a need to facilitate more 3-bed units in the Tallaght area due to the housing needs arising from the large Pre-Family groups. The applicants report notes that the data in the Development Plan

and LAP are based on the census 2016, which indicated that 75% of households are at the pre-family stage of life. However, for the applicants study area this was 31% in 2016 and has declined to 29% in 2022.

- 8.8.7. The applicants report also indicates that within the study area 73% of all households comprise 3 or less persons. The study area also has a higher proportion of 1 and 2 person households (53%) when compared to the SDCC administrative area (44%). The information provided also indicates that due to the median net household income in Tallaght Central Local Electoral Area (LEA) a 3-bed unit would likely be unaffordable for the vast majority of people living in this LEA. Having regard to the information provided in the applicants report I am satisfied that the proposed unit mix would meet the specific demand required in the area having regard to socio-economic, population and housing data.
- 8.8.8. While it would contravene Objective RE2 of the LAP I am satisfied that having regard to the information provided by the applicant, which is evidence based and robust that this contravention would be acceptable.
- 8.8.9. Notwithstanding this, H1 Objective 12 of the Development Plan states that a lesser provision of 30% of 3-bed units must be based on the socio-economic, population and housing data set out in the Housing Strategy and Interim HNDA. As the data is based on the applicants analysis and not the information provided in the HNDA, it is my opinion that the proposed unit mix is a material contravention of H1 Objective 12 of the Development Plan.
- 8.8.10. Section 37(2)(b) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended) states that where a planning authority has decided to refuse permission on the grounds that a proposed development materially contravenes the development plan, the Board may only grant permission in accordance with *paragraph (a)* where it considers that: -
- (i) the proposed development is of strategic or national importance,
 - (ii) there are conflicting objectives in the development plan, or the objectives are not clearly stated, insofar as the proposed development is concerned, or
 - (iii) permission for the proposed development should be granted having regard to the regional spatial and economic strategy for the area, guidelines under

section 28, policy directives under section 29, the statutory obligations of any local authority in the area, and any relevant policy of the Government, the Minister or any Minister of the Government, or

- (iv) permission for the proposed development should be granted having regard to the pattern of development, and permissions granted, in the area since the making of the development plan.

8.8.11. It is noted that the Planning Authority did not refuse permission on the basis of the unit mix. However, condition 2 of the grant of permission does alter the unit mix in favour of more (6 no.) 3-bed units.

8.8.12. The proposed development is not of strategic or national importance. There are no conflicting objectives, and all objectives are quite clear in the development plan relating to the requirement for 30% of all new residential units to be 3 bed and the pattern of development and permissions granted in the area since the making of the development plan do not suggest a predisposition to the proposed unit mix. Therefore, having regard to the characteristics of the proposed development Section 37 (2) (b) (iii) is considered relevant in this instance.

8.8.13. SPPR1 of the Apartment Guidelines (2025) states:

(a) with the exception of social housing developments, social/affordable housing provided for under Part V the Act or schemes to provide housing for older persons where a specific mix of unit sizes may be required, such as in accordance with a Housing Need and Demand Assessment (HNDA), there shall be no restrictions within statutory plans in relation to the mix of unit sizes or types to be provided within apartment developments. There shall be no minimum or maximum requirements for apartments with a certain number of bedrooms.

b) Where any such restriction or requirement is set out within a statutory plan, this Specific Planning Policy Requirement shall apply to any single apartment scheme and there shall be no restriction in relation to the mix of unit sizes or types and there shall be no minimum requirements for apartments with a certain number of bedrooms within the development, except in the circumstances set out above.

8.8.14. Having regard to the provisions of SPPR 1 of the Apartment Guidelines (2025) which supersedes the provisions of the development plan, it is my opinion that the proposed material contravention of H1 Objective 12 of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028 is justified by reference to section 37(2)(b)(iii) of the act.

8.9. ***Open Space***

8.9.1. The third party raised concerns regarding the lack of open space and landscaping within the scheme.

8.9.2. Table 12.21 of the Development Plan sets out minimum standards for private and communal open space for apartment developments. These standards are reflective of the standards set out in the Apartment Guidelines (2025) of, 5sqm per 1-bed, 6sqm per 2-bed (3 person) and 7sqm per 2- bed (4 person). The information provided within the applicants Architectural Design Statement and within the drawings indicates that private open space provision for each of the apartments reaches or exceeds these minimum standards.

8.9.3. The unit mix results in a requirement for 249sqm of communal open space. The proposed scheme incorporates 435sqm of communal open space which equates to 12% of the sites area. The proposed area of communal open space connects to the existing central courtyard of Priorsgate. The proposed layout results in a larger central courtyard for the overall development and a walkway to the west of the proposed development. The area of open spaces incorporates a seating, planting and a play area (99sqm) to the south of the proposed building and to the east of the existing central courtyard area. The play space is overlooked by the proposed and existing residential units.

8.9.4. The applicant's Daylight performance assessment indicates that 90% of the area of communal open space would receive at least 2 hours of sunlight on 21st March. This significantly exceeds the BRE target which recommends at least half (50%) of the amenity areas should receive at least 2 hours of sunlight on 21st March.

8.9.5. The landscape masterplan drawing submitted by way of further information indicates that there would be areas of hard and soft landscaping within the area of communal open space. The planting would comprise native and ornamental species and include pollinator friendly plants. I have no objection to the proposed landscaping proposals.

- 8.9.6. COS5 Objective 5 of the Development Plan requires the provision of public open space in accordance with Table 8.2 of the Development Plan. Table 8.2 sets out a minimum standard of 10% of the site area be provided as public open space for new residential developments on lands in other zones, including mixed use. The information submitted with the application states that due to the constraints of the infill site and the layout of the adjoining Priorsgate development it is not possible to provide public open space within the site and the applicant proposed to pay a financial contribution in lieu of public open space. It is also noted that concerns were raised by residents of the adjoining Priorsgate development to the Planning Authority regarding public access to the site due to on-going anti-social behaviour and security concerns. Having regard to the characteristics of the site I agree with the applicant that it is not feasible to provide high quality public open space within the scheme.
- 8.9.7. COS5 Objective 5 of the Development Plan states that a financial contribution may be accepted in lieu of public open space. Section 2.7.2 of the LAP also states that in the event that the site is too small or of inappropriate shape or layout to provide useful public open space then a financial contribution shall be required. Condition no. 28 of the grant of permission required the payment of €255,000.00 as a contribution towards the provision of public open space in Tallaght Town Centre. It is noted that the applicant raised no objection to the proposed contribution. If permission is being granted it is recommended that a similar condition be attached.

Green Space Factor

- 8.9.8. Section 4.2.3 of the Development Plan states that the quantity and quality of green infrastructure provided by new development will be improved by the implementation of a Green Space Factor (GSF). The GSF is a score-based requirement that establishes minimum standards for landscaping and GI provision in new developments. GI5 Objective 4 of the development plan requires all qualifying development to implement the Green Space Factor (GSF). The Planning Authority considered that the proposed scheme did not achieve the appropriate Green Space Factor. Condition 14 of the grant of permission requires that the developer liaise with the Public Realm department to determine what additional GI interventions can be provided.

8.9.9. The applicant submitted a revised Green Space Factor Tool in response to the request for further information and it is again submitted as Appendix to both the appeal and the response to the third party appeal. It is noted that in response to the request for further information existing trees on site are to be retained, which increased the proposed developments GSF. The information provided indicates that the scheme has a GSF of 0.53 which exceeds the minimum requirement of 0.5. Therefore, I am satisfied that condition 14 is unwarranted in this instance.

Conclusion

8.9.10. The third party concerns regarding a lack of open space and landscaping within the scheme are noted. I have no objection to the quantity or quality of the proposed area of communal open space which equates to c. 12% of the site area. I am satisfied that it would provide a high level of amenity for future occupants for the scheme.

8.10. ***Car Parking***

8.10.1. Section 12.7.2 of the Development Plan sets out maximum car parking standards. Given the sites village centre location and proximity to public transport it is my view that the site is located in Zone 2, which apply a more restrictive approach to car parking. A maximum of 0.75 no. spaces is permitted per residential unit in Zone 2.

8.10.2. It is proposed to assign 24 no. existing car parking spaces at the basement level of the Priorsgate development to the proposed development. This equates to 0.63 no. spaces per unit. The car parking spaces include 5 no. EV charging spaces and 2 no. accessible spaces. The accessible spaces are provided in lieu of 4 no. standard spaces and are located adjacent to core 1 in the basement. I have no objection to the proposed quantum of car parking and consider it appropriate at this urban location in close proximity to public transport and services and amenities within Tallaght Village.

8.10.3. The information provided indicates that the existing car parking spaces are currently vacant and were previously assigned to a commercial use which was permitted under the original Priorsgate development in 2004 (PL06S.206768, Reg. Ref. SD03A/0633). Having regard to the underutilised nature of these existing car parking space and as the Priorsgate development is also within the ownership of the applicant I have no objection to these spaces being assigned to the proposed development.

8.10.4. Financial Contribution

8.10.5. Condition no. 27 requires a financial contribution of €432,724.50 (four hundred and thirty two thousand, seven hundred and twenty-four euro and fifty cents), in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development within 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 2026 - 2028, made under Section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).

8.10.6. The applicant raised concerns regarding the method used by the Planning Authority for calculating the contribution.

8.10.7. The Planning Authority's method for calculating the development contribution is set out on page 47 of the final Planners Report dated 3rd February 2026. The proposed scheme has a floor area of 2,792sqm. When calculating the contribution, the Planning Authority reduced the floor area by 300sqm, as required by Condition 2 of the grant of permission. The floor area was then multiplied by the rate of €126.45 per square meter of residential development, as set out in the SDCC Development Contribution Scheme 2026 -2028. This equated to a financial contribution of €315,113.40. However, Condition 27 requires a payment of €432,724.50. It would appear that this is an error in the wording of the condition.

8.10.8. As noted above, it is my opinion that Condition 2 is unwarranted. Therefore, the floor area of the scheme is 2,792sqm. In my opinion the financial contribution equates to €353,048.40.

8.11. Other Issues

Property Values

8.11.1. Concerns are raised by the third parties that the proposed development would have a negative impact on property values. No evidence has been submitted in this regard. The appeal site is located within the established urban area of Tallaght Village. The proposed scheme has a similar design approach to the adjacent Priorsgate Development. Having regard to the urban location and the established pattern of development I am satisfied that the proposed development would not have a significant adverse impact on property values.

Public Consultation

- 8.11.2. Concerns were raised by the third party regarding a lack of public participation. It is noted that while meaningful consultation may be to the benefit of both parties, there is no statutory requirement to undertake such engagement.
- 8.11.3. In response to the appeal the applicant stated that they carried out public consultation on the 11th June 2025 with the residents of Priorsgate and the appellant (Tallaght Community Council) was invited and did not attend. An online meeting was held with the appellant on the 13th June 2025. A walkthrough was conducted with the residents of Priorsgate on the 10th July 2025. The details of the public consultation are noted.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1.1. I refer the Commission to Appendix 2 of this report.
- 9.1.2. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on South Dublin Bay SAC (000210), South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024), North Dublin Bay SAC (000206) or North Bull Island SPA (004006) or the North West Irish Sea SPA (004236) in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.
- 9.1.3. This determination is based on:
- The urban location.
 - The nature and extent of the proposed development.
 - The absence of any surface water feature in the vicinity of the appeal site and the distance from nearest water body.
 - The distance to the nearest European Site and
 - Lack of a direct hydrological or ecological pathway to a European Site.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. I refer the Commission to Appendix 3 of this report.
- 10.2. The appeal site is located in the urban area of Tallaght Town Centre. The nearest watercourse is Dodder_040 (IE_EA_09D010620) located c. 100m south of the appeal site on the opposite side of the Tallaght By-Pass (N81). This waterbody has a Moderate Status and is At Risk. The groundwater body underlying the site is Dublin (IE_EA_G_008). The groundwater has a Good Status and is Not at Risk.
- 10.3. No water deterioration concerns were raised.
- 10.4. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and / or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.
- 10.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows
- The urban location.
 - The nature and extent of the development
 - The absence of any surface water feature in the vicinity of the appeal site and the distance from nearest water body.
 - The location of the appeal site outside an area at risk of flooding.
- 10.6. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment

11.0 Recommendation

It is recommended that permission be refused for the following reason.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. It is considered that the proposed development by virtue of the limited separation distances between the proposed development and Blocks 1 and 3 of the existing Priorsgate development would result in undue overlooking which would negatively impact on existing and future residential amenity and would contribute to reduced access to daylight for the existing residents of Block 1 and Block 3 Priorsgate and poor quality daylight for a significant portion of the proposed open plan kitchen / living / dining rooms within the proposed scheme. The proposed development would result in a substandard form of development and would be contrary to the provision of Specific Planning Policy Requirement 1 (SPPR 1) of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines, 2024 which requires a minimum separation distance of 16 meters and 11 Objective 4 of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022 - 2028 to ensure adequate separation distances to safeguard privacy. and would be 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.

Elaine Power
Senior Planning Inspector

28th May 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500879-SD-26
Proposed Development Summary	The construction of a 6-storey residential building with 38 no. apartments and all associated works.
Development Address	Site formerly known as Bruce house, Main Road, Tallaght, Dublin 24.
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	

<p>3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	<p>Part 2, Schedule 5, Class 10 Infrastructure Projects – (b)</p> <p>(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units.</p> <p>(iv) Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere.</p> <p>The number of housing units proposed in this instance is 38 which is significantly below the 500-unit threshold.</p> <p>The site area is c. 0.34 ha gross is also significantly below the 10ha threshold for urban development in other parts of a built-up area that's not a business district.</p> <p>15: Any project listed in this Part which does not exceed a quantity, area or other limit specified in this Part in respect of the relevant class of development, but which would be likely to have significant effects on the environment, having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7</p>

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-500879-SD-26
Proposed Development Summary	The construction of a 6-storey residential building with 38 no. apartments and all associated works.
Development Address	Site formerly known as Bruce house, Main Road, Tallaght, Dublin 24.
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 proposed development comprises the construction of a 6 storey residential block to form part of the existing 4-6 storey mixed use Priorsgate development</p> <p>The nature and scale of the development is similar to the character of the surrounding area and the established pattern of development.</p> <p>The proposed development would use the public water and drainage services of Uisce Eireann and South Dublin County Council.</p> <p>Having regard to the relatively limited nature and scale of the proposed development I am satisfied that it would not give rise to significant use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution, nuisance, or a risk of accidents.</p> <p>The site is not at risk of flooding.</p> <p>There are no Seveso / COMAH sites in the vicinity of this location.</p>
Location of development	The proposed development is a vacant, brownfield site in Tallaght Village Centre.

<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>This site is not located on, in or adjacent to any ecologically sensitive site and does not have the potential to impact any such sites.</p> <p>There are no protected landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance within or immediately adjacent to the site.</p> <p>Having regard to the location of the site and the nature and scale of the development I am satisfied that there is no potential to significantly affect environmental sensitives in the area, including sites 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 and urban 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.</p>
<p>Conclusion</p>	
<p>Likelihood of Significant Effects</p>	<p>Conclusion in respect of EIA</p>
<p>There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p>	<p>EIA is not required.</p>

<p>There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p>	
<p>There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p>	

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

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

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

Appendix 3: Appropriate Assessment Screening (Stage 1)

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects
<i>Brief description of project</i>
<p>A description of the project is summarised in Section 2 of my report. In summary, the proposed development comprises the construction of 38 no. apartments in a 6-storey block and all associated site works.</p>
<i>Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms</i>
<p>The appeal site is located on a brownfield site in Tallaght Village Centre. It has a stated area of c. 0.34ha and includes parts of the public footpath on Main Road. The appeal site was formerly known as Bruce House and contained a 2-storey building. However, all structures have been demolished, and the site currently comprises hardstanding. The site boundaries comprise a low wall, vegetation / trees and hoarding. There are no drainage ditches or surface water bodies within or immediately adjacent to the site. The nearest water course is the Jobstown Stream (Dodder_040) located c. 100m south of the appeal site, which flows to the River Dodder c. 1.2km southeast of the appeal site.</p> <p>Surface water from the site would enter the public network under the Greenhills Road to the west of the Priorsgate Development. The applicant Engineering Report states that the surface water sewer runs under the N81 and discharges to the River Poddle. The River Poddle is located c. 500m north of the appeal site. It is my view that this is an error and the surface water sewer runs under the N81 and discharges to the River Dodder, c. 100m south of the appeal site, as shown in Figure 04 of the report. Ultimately, the surface water run off discharges to the Liffey Estuary and Dublin Bay.</p> <p>Foul water from the site would enter the public network and be treated at Ringsend WWTP, which ultimately discharges to Dublin Bay.</p> <p>There is also potential for surface water discharge to ground, which would drain to the downgradient receiving surface waterbody (Jobstown Stream) and ultimately to Dublin Bay.</p>
<i>Screening Report / Natura Impact Statement</i>
<p>An Appropriate Assessment Screening Report was prepared by Openfield Ecological Services was submitted in support of the application.</p>

Relevant Submissions

No concerns raised by the third party, the prescribed bodies or the Planning Authority with regard to AA.

Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model

The proposed development is not located within or adjacent to any designated site. Therefore, the proposed development would not result in any direct effects such as habitat loss on any European Site.

The applicant AA Screening report identified 6 no. European sites. Five sites are located within Dublin Bay and, therefore, being within a potential zone of influence downstream of the proposed development. These are detailed in Table 1 below.

The applicant also identified Poulaphouca Reservoir SPA as being with a potential zone of influence. Given the 27km separation distance and nature and scale of the proposed development I am satisfied that this site can be excluded from further assessment.

Site synopsis and conservation objectives can be found on the NPWS website (www.npws.ie).

I am satisfied that there is no ecological pathway to any other designated sites.

Table 1: European Sites within the Zone of Influence.

European Site (code)	Summary of Qualifying Interests	Distance from proposed development	Ecological connections (source, pathway, receptor)	Consider further in screening Y/N
South Dublin Bay SAC (000210)	Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide. Annual vegetation of drift lines. Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand.	10.6km	Yes. Indirect hydrological connect via the public surface water network and the public foul water network.	Yes

	Embryonic shifting dunes.			
North Dublin Bay SAC (000206)	<p>Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide.</p> <p>Annual vegetation of drift lines.</p> <p>Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand.</p> <p>Atlantic salt meadows.</p> <p>Mediterranean salt meadows.</p> <p>Embryonic shifting dunes.</p> <p>Shifting dunes along the shoreline with white dunes.</p> <p>Fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation.</p> <p>Humid dune slack.</p> <p>Petalwort.</p>	14.7km	Yes. Indirect hydrological connect via the public surface water network and the public foul water network.	Yes
South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024)	<p>Light-bellied Brent Goose.</p> <p>Oystercatcher.</p> <p>Ringed Plover.</p> <p>Grey Plover.</p> <p>Knot.</p> <p>Sanderling.</p> <p>Dunlin.</p>	10.6km	Yes. Indirect hydrological connect via the public surface water network and the public foul water network.	Yes

	<p>Bar-tailed Godwit. Redshank. Black-headed Gull. Roseate Tern. Common. Tern Arctic Tern. Wetlands & Waterbirds.</p>			
<p>North Bull Island SPA (004006)</p>	<p>Light-bellied Brent Goose Shelduck Teal Pintail Shoveler Oystercatcher Golden Plover Grey Plover Knot Sanderling Dunlin Black-tailed Godwit Bar-tailed Godwit Curlew Redshank Turnstone Black- headed Gull Wetlands</p>	15.2km	<p>Yes. Indirect hydrological connect via the public surface water network and the public foul water network.</p>	Yes
<p>North West Irish Sea SPA (004236)</p>	<p>Red-throated Diver Great Northern Diver Fulmar Manx Shearwater Cormorant Shag</p>	15.2km	<p>Yes. Indirect hydrological connect via the public surface water network and the public foul water network.</p>	Yes

	Common Scoter Black-headed Gull Common Gull Lesser Black-backed Gull Herring Gull Great Black-backed Gull Kittiwake Roseate Tern Common Tern Arctic Tern Guillemot Razorbill Puffin Little Gull Little Tern			
--	---	--	--	--

Likely effects of the project, alone or in combination on European Sites

The development is not located within a designated site and, therefore, does not result in any direct effects on the site. However, due to the indirect hydrological connection to the designated sites within the inner section of Dublin Bay via groundwater infiltration, the public surface water drainage network and the foul network potential impacts generated by the construction and operational phases of the development requires consideration.

Sources of impact and likely significant effects are detailed in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Screening Matrix

Site Name / QI's are listed in Table 1 above.	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site	
	Impact	Effects
South Dublin Bay SAC (000210)	<u>Direct:</u> No direct impacts	Due to the distant and interrupted hydrological connection, the nature and scale of the development and the

<p>South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024)</p>	<p><u>Indirect:</u> Potential release of silt and sediment during site works and potential release of</p>	<p>distance and volume of water separating the application site from Natura 2000 sites in Dublin Bay (dilution factor) no effects are likely.</p>
<p>North Dublin Bay SAC (000206)</p>	<p>construction related compounds including hydrocarbons to surface water and ground water.</p>	<p>The foul discharge from the site is negligible in the context of the overall licenced discharge at Ringsend WWTP, and thus its impact on the overall discharge would be negligible.</p>
<p>North Bull Island SPA (004006)</p>	<p>Indirect impacts on water quality from an accidental spill or leak of a contaminant to surface water network or to groundwater during the operational phase.</p>	<p>There is no direct hydrogeological pathways from groundwater to any designated site. Due to the distance and intervening watercourses between the Proposed Development and the nearest European sites within Dublin Bay no effects are likely.</p>
<p>North West Irish Sea SPA (004236)</p>	<p>Indirect impacts on water quality from Ringsend WWTP.</p> <p>Due to the significant separation distances, there is no pathway for indirect loss or disturbance of habitats within any Natura 2000 sites or other semi-natural habitats that may act as ecological corridors for important species associated with their qualifying interests; there is no potential for ex-situ impacts associated with</p>	

	any SPA qualifying interest species.	
Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development alone? No		
Likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? No		
<p>Comments:</p> <p><u>Habitat Loss</u></p> <p>Having regard to the current characteristics of the appeal site and as the intervening land is occupied by urban development and combined with the separation there is no pathway for loss or disturbance of habitats in any Natura 2000 site, or other semi-natural habitats that may act as ecological corridors or stepping stones for important species associated with the qualifying interests of Natura 2000 sites. No significant effects are likely to arise to Natura 2000 sites from this source.</p> <p><u>Habitat Disturbance/Ex situ impacts</u></p> <p>The appeal site comprises hardstanding and is located in a well-established urban area. It is not identified as an ex-situ site for any protected species. There is no pathway for indirect loss or disturbance of habitats within any Natura 2000 site or other semi-natural habitats that may act as ecological corridors for important species associated with their qualifying interests.</p> <p><u>Hydrological Impacts – surface water during construction</u></p> <p>During the construction phase there will be earth works, however, the likelihood of sediment, or other construction pollutants entering the River Dodder is low due to the separation distance to the nearest watercourse and the fact that the lands are already largely composed of hard surfaces, and so significant quantities of soil will not be disturbed. No significant effects are likely to arise to Natura 2000 sites from this source.</p> <p><u>Hydrological Impacts – surface water during operation</u></p> <p>During the operational phase attenuated surface water would flow by gravity to the existing surface water drain which runs under the Greenhills Road to the west of the overall Priorsgate Development. During both the construction and operational phases standard pollution control measures would be put in place. Pollution control measures standard practices for urban sites and would be required for a development on any urban site in order to protect local receiving</p>		

waters, irrespective of any potential hydrological connection to Natura 2000 sites. In the event that the pollution control and surface water treatment measures were not implemented or failed, I remain satisfied that the potential for likely significant effects on the qualifying interests of Natura 2000 sites in Dublin Bay can be excluded given the distant and interrupted hydrological connection, the nature and scale of the development and the distance and volume of water separating the application site from Natura 2000 sites in Dublin Bay (dilution factor).

Hydrological Impacts - wastewater

There is an indirect pathway between the development site and Natura 2000 sites in Dublin Bay. The foul discharge from the proposed development would drain, via the public network, to the Ringsend WWTP for treatment and ultimately discharge to Dublin Bay. There is potential for an interrupted and distant hydrological connection between the site and sites in Dublin Bay due to the wastewater pathway. The Uisce Eireann Wastewater treatment capacity register indicates that there is capacity at Ringsend WWTP (green status). I am satisfied that there is capacity within the Ringsend WWTP to accommodate the proposed development. In addition, the foul discharge from the site is negligible in the context of the overall licenced discharge at Ringsend WWTP, and thus its impact on the overall discharge would be negligible.

Based on a consideration of the likely impacts arising from the proposed works and a review of their significance in terms of the conservation interests and objectives of the Natura 2000 Sites screened, no significant impacts have been identified on the Natura 2000 sites as a result of the proposed development.

Cumulative Impact:

While there are other permissions and projects in the vicinity of the appeal site, I am satisfied that the cumulative residual impacts are not likely to be significant.

Conclusion

I conclude that the proposed development (alone) would not result in likely significant effects on South Dublin Bay SAC (000210), South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024), North Dublin Bay SAC (000206) or North Bull Island SPA (004006) or the North West Irish Sea SPA (004236). The proposed development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on any European sites. No further assessment is required for the project.

No measures intended to avoid or reduce harmful effects on European sites were taken into account in reaching this conclusion.

Appendix 4: WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING

Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality

An Bord Pleanála ref. no.	PL-500879-SD-26	Townland, address	Site formerly known as Bruce House, Main Road, Tallaght, Dublin 24.
Description of project		The proposed development comprises the construction of 38 no. apartments in a 6-storey block and all associated site works.	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,		Site is a vacant brownfield site in the urban area. It is cleared of all structures. There are no water features within or adjoining the site.	
Proposed surface water details		The proposed scheme would incorporate SUDS measures, which allow for infiltration to ground via permeable paving, green and blue roof (38% of the site), tree pits and rain gardens at ground floor level and a hydro brake system to regulate outflow. Surface water would be attenuated on site and discharged to the public network, at a maximum of 2 litres per second.	
Proposed water supply source & available capacity		It is proposed to connect to the public network. There is no submission on file from Uisce Eireann. It is noted that under the previous application (ABP-302617-18, Reg. Ref. SD18A/0239) on the site the submission from Uisce Eireann, which is publicly available on the Planning Authority's website, raised no objection to the proposed development subject to conditions.	

Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues	<p>It is proposed to connect to the public network. There is no submission on file from Uisce Eireann. It is noted that under the previous application (ABP-302617-18, Reg. Ref. SD18A/0239) on the site the submission from Uisce Eireann, which is publicly available on the Planning Authority's website, raised no objection to the proposed development subject to conditions.</p> <p>The Uisce Eireann Wastewater treatment capacity register indicates that there is capacity at Ringsend WWTP (green status).</p>
Others?	N/A

Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection							
Identified water body	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk	Identified pressures on that water body.	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater)	Mitigation Measures Proposed	Is mitigation sufficient, will there be any residual impacts?
River Waterbody	Dodder_040 (IE_EA_09D010620)	Moderate Status	At risk	Urban Run-off	Surface Water run-off.	Standard construction practices. SuDS measures include them incorporation of grit and petrol/oil interceptors.	No residual risk. I am satisfied that the preventative measures will reduce any possible effects to a non-significant level.
Groundwater Waterbody	Dublin (IE_EA_G_008)	Good Status	Under Review	Under Review	Infiltration to groundwater.		

Coastal Waterbody	Dublin Bay (IE_EA_090_0000)	Good Status	Not At Risk	N/A	The foul network is treated at Ringsend WWTP which ultimately discharges to Dublin Bay.	No mitigation measures proposed	No residual risk.
-------------------	-----------------------------	-------------	-------------	-----	---	---------------------------------	-------------------