



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501073-DF-26

Development	Change of use to recreational/sport facility with all associated site works
Location	Unit 1A, Rosemount Business Park, Rosemount Park Road, Dublin 11
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	FW26A/0006E
Applicant(s)	Green Urban Logistics Rosemount Limited
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Green Urban Logistics Rosemount Limited
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	3 rd of September 2026
Inspector	Darragh Ryan

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site is located within Rosemount Business Park, Dublin 11, an established commercial and industrial employment area. The site comprises a vacant two-storey office building of approximately 1,652 sq.m gross floor area, which was previously ancillary to the adjoining warehouse/logistics facility at Unit 1B, operated by Wincanton European (Ireland) Limited in connection with servicing Dunnes Stores. The current office accommodation (subject of the development proposal) is no longer required for the warehouse operation and has remained vacant. The site benefits from an established access and 99 on-site car parking spaces, with the adjoining warehouse operation having separate operational parking and loading areas.
- 1.2. The site is surrounded by established commercial and industrial premises and is accessed via the internal Rosemount Business Park road network. The IRFU High Performance Centre, located to the south-west and accessed via Snugborough Road. The site has connectivity to the wider transport network, with access principally via the existing internal estate roads and local distributor routes. The site is also served by a number of Dublin Bus services providing connections to Blanchardstown, Finglas and surrounding residential areas, while the location is accessible by walking and cycling from nearby employment areas.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development provides for the reuse of the existing vacant office building as a gym/recreational facility, primarily intended to serve employees within Rosemount Business Park and the wider employment area.
- The change of use of existing two – storey office building (GFA 1652 sq.m) to a recreational/sports facility, including gym use (Class 11);
 - Allocating 99 no. car parking spaces within the existing car park, including 3 no accessible spaces, to serve the sports facility;
 - Provision of secure bicycle stores providing a total of 66 no cycle parking spaces;

- Minor alterations to the building elevations, including the installation of 2 no. tenant signs; and all associated and ancillary site development works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. The planning authority issued a Decision to refuse permission

The subject site is zoned 'GE General Employment with the objective to 'provide opportunities for general enterprise and employment'. The supporting vision for the 'GE General Employment zoning objective seeks to 'facilitate opportunities for compatible industry and general employment uses including appropriate sustainable employment and enterprise uses, logistics and warehousing activity in a good quality physical environment. General Employment areas should be highly accessible, well designed, permeable and legible' within the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029.

The recreational/sports facility, by virtue of its size, opening hours, its low-employment intensive nature and its incompatibility with existing land uses within the Rosemount Business Park, cumulatively results in the unsustainable and uneconomical use of the subject site and prejudices the broader vision of the 'GE' General Employment lands. In this regard, the development materially contravenes the 'GE' General Employment zoning objective of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029, conflicts with Policy EEP2 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 and will set an inappropriate precedent for other similar forms of development. The development is therefore contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. There is a single Planning Report on file. The issues raised in the planning report generally reflect the primary reason for refusal.

The principle of development was not accepted owing to site zoning GE zoned lands - The recreational/sports facility, by virtue of its size, opening hours, its low-

employment intensive nature and its incompatibility with existing land uses within the Rosemount Business Park, cumulatively results in the unsustainable and uneconomical use of the subject site and prejudices the broader vision of the 'GE' General Employment lands. In this regard, the development materially contravenes the 'GE' General Employment zoning objective of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029, conflicts with Policy EEP2 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029.

Concerns noted from the Transportation and Planning Section in relation to a number of transport and parking matters. The resolution of these matters would not overcome the primary zoning issue underpinning the refusal. A refusal of permission is recommended for refusal.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Transportation Planning Section

- The applicable Parking standard for gym use within Zone 2 is 1 space per 20sqm equating to a maximum provision of 83 no spaces for the proposed development. The 99 spaces exceed this standard and needs to addressed
- The minimum cycle parking requirements for the employment use GYM is 1 per 30 m2 visitor and this equates to 55 cycle parking spaces for a GFA 1,652 sq.m. Long term parking is provided at 1 per 2 staff. The proposed 66 spaces would be acceptable.
- 8 No. motorcycle parking spaces should be provided.
- The applicant should provide a schedule for parking for the existing warehousing and logistics developments detailing the parking requirements in accordance with the Fingal County Development Plan 2023–2029 parking standards based on the GFA. Where parking is significantly less than the maximum allowable the parking level should be justified.

Water Services

No objection subject to conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- None

3.4. Third Party Observations

- None

4.0 Planning History

- Reg. Ref.: F96A/0198 — Parent Permission for a warehousing unit and office floorspace Fingal County Council (FCC) issued a final grant of planning permission, subject to 14 no. conditions, on the 2nd of July 1996 for the following development: "Phased development incorporating 14.5 metres high bay warehousing (18, 625 sq. metres); 10.5 metres high distribution facility including welfare facilities (2,979 sq. metres); ancillary 2 storey office administration (1,728 sq. metres); transport depot (545 sq. metres) for servicing vehicles; Vehicle and trailer parking; marshalling yard; associated car parking; site development works and access road on 5.269 hectare site'
- Reg. Ref.: F98A/0149 — For modifications to the development permission under Reg. Ref.: F96A/0198
FCC issued a final grant of planning permission, subject to 8 no. conditions, on the 3rd of June 1998, for the following development:
"For modifications to the existing planning permission (Ref: F96A/0198) for the warehousing distribution facility as follows.
 - a) Single storey service compound (156 sq. m.)
 - b) Single storey security hut at entrance (16.5 sq.m.),
 - c) Single storey extension to transpon depot (77 sq. m),
 - d) Automated truck wash on 200 sq, m. concrete slab with single storey 20 sq. m. pump house and 4.5m, diameter; 3m high water tank.
 - e) Extension to canteen (60 sq. m.)"

- 4.1.1. ACP Ref.: PL06F.120304 (FCC Reg. Ref.: FOOA/0160) - 3 storey office extension and associated development An Coimisiún Pleanála issued an Order to grant planning permission following a third party appeal against the Planning Authority's notification of decision to grant, subject to 6 no. conditions, on the 9th February 2002 for the following development:

"Additions to existing Planning Permission [Ref. F96A/01981 for the Warehousing Distribution Facility of Irish Express Cargo. The additions are 3-storey plus plant, Office Extension 1,214 sq.m Ground Floor Addition to the existing Canteen [59.5 sq.m.]. First floor Addition to the Computer Area [55.5 sq.m] and car parking to meet the provisions of the Development Plan. "

Condition No. 2 of the Commission's Order to grant states the following:

"The proposed development shall remain ancillary to that of the main warehousing and distribution facility on site and shall not be sold or leased separately from that main use. Any change(s) in the use or purpose of the development shall be subject of a further application for planning permission.

Reason: In the interest of orderly development and the proper planning and development of the area. "

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Fingal County Development Plan 2023 - 2029

5.1.1. Land Use Zoning

The site is currently zoned GE, 'General Employment', opportunities for general enterprise and employment. ' The GE Zoning Vision states the following:

"Facilitate opportunities for compatible industry and general employment uses including appropriate sustainable employment and enterprise uses, logistics and warehousing activity in a good quality physical environment. General Employment areas should be highly accessible, well designed, permeable and legible. "

The proposed development comprises a change of use of an building to a recreational/sports facility, including gym use, which is defined under appendix 7 in

the Development Plan as:

"Recreational / Sports Facility - A building or part thereof or land which is available for use by the public on payment of a charge or free of charge for the propose of recreation may include facilities to support indoor or outdoor physical activities in the form of structured games or active pursuits for the purpose of recreation or amusement. '

Recreational/sports facility or gym use is neither 'Permitted in Principle' nor 'Not Permitted' within GE-zoned lands. Accordingly, the proposal falls to be assessed on its individual planning merits, having regard to its contribution towards the achievement of the GE Zoning Objective and Vision, and its compliance with the policies and objectives of the Development Plan. The Development Plan explicitly states that.

"Uses which are neither 'Permitted in Principle' nor 'Not Permitted' will be assessed in terms of their contribution towards the achievement of the Zoning Objective and Vision and their compliance and consistency with the policies and objectives of the Development Plan.

5.1.2. Reuse and Retrofitting Existing Buildings

Policy CAP8 — Retrofitting and Reuse of Existing Buildings states "Support the retrofitting and reuse of existing buildings rather than their demolition and reconstruction where possible. "

5.1.3. Objective DMS0256 — Retrofitting and Re-Use of Existing Buildings requires the Council to "Support the retrofitting and reuse of existing buildings rather than their demolition and reconstruction where possible."

5.1.4. Objective EE06 — Regeneration Of Obsolete/Underutilised Buildings and Lands states that the Council will "Promote the regeneration of obsolete and/or underutilised buildings and lands that could yield economic benefits, with appropriate uses and subject to the proper planning and development Of the area. "

5.4 Natural Heritage Designations

South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA – 11km west of site

6.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development does not come within the definition of a ‘project’ for the purposes of EIA, that is, it does not comprise construction works, demolition or intervention in the natural surroundings. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. This is a first party appeal against the decision of Fingal County Council to refuse permission. The Grounds of Appeal can be summarised as follows:

The refusal of permission is grounded in a qualitative judgement regarding the appropriateness of use within the GE lands rather than a clear policy prohibition. The General Employment zoning does not Permit or Prohibit the proposed development.

- The appellant submits that the proposed use does not materially contravene the ‘GE’ General Employment zoning, noting that gym/recreational use is not identified as a ‘Not Permitted’ use. It is argued that the proposal should be assessed having regard to its compatibility with the function and vision of the employment lands.
- The appellant considers the gym to be a complementary employment-supportive use, with particular reference to Objective EEO21 of the Fingal Development Plan, which encourages Local Support Facilities serving employees within major employment areas.
- It is submitted that the proposal would provide approximately 15–20 jobs and support the wider employment base by providing an amenity for employees within Rosemount Business Park and the surrounding employment areas.
- The appellant highlights that the existing 1,652 sq.m building has been vacant for approximately 14 years and was originally ancillary office accommodation

associated with Unit 1B. It is argued that the building is surplus to the operational requirements of the adjoining warehouse/logistics use and has no realistic prospect of returning to its former use.

- The appeal submits that the proposal represents the sustainable reuse of an underutilised building and serviced employment lands, having regard to Development Plan policies supporting the reuse and regeneration of existing buildings.
- The appellant states that the proposal would not displace or interfere with the established warehouse/logistics operation in Unit 1B, which comprises approximately 18,625 sq.m, and would remain the dominant use of the site.
- In response to concerns regarding existing gyms in the wider area, the appellant identifies an employment catchment of approximately 15,949 workers within 1.5 km and submits that the proposed facility would provide a conveniently located gym primarily serving this employment population rather than functioning as a destination leisure facility.
- The appellant considers the proposed opening hours and operational model appropriate to the shift-based nature of employment in the surrounding logistics and industrial area.
- Regarding transportation, the appellant submits that the matters raised by the Planning Authority can be satisfactorily addressed. The revised proposal provides 82 car parking spaces, 66 cycle spaces, 8 motorcycle spaces and 8 EV charging spaces, together with revised pedestrian and cycle arrangements.
- The appellant also submits that a significant proportion of gym trips would be linked trips by existing employees within the Business Park and that the differing peak periods of the gym and warehouse uses would minimise potential operational conflict.
- Without prejudice, the appellant requests that, should the Commission have concerns regarding the long-term suitability of the use, consideration could be given to a five-year temporary permission, allowing the use to be reviewed while bringing the vacant building back into productive use.

- The appellant ultimately submits that the proposed development is an appropriate and sustainable reuse of the vacant building, is consistent with the objectives of the Fingal Development Plan 2023–2029, would provide a complementary facility to the established employment area, and would not undermine the primary employment function of the site. Planning permission is accordingly requested.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

- The planning authority issued a response to the appeal on the 23rd of April 2026. The Planning Authority remains of the opinion the development results in an unsustainable and uneconomical use of the subject site that prejudices the broader vision of the “GE” General Employment Lands.

7.3. Observations

- None

7.4. Further Responses

- None

8.0 Assessment

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

- Principle of Development/Development Plan Policy
- Traffic and Transport
- Material Contravention

8.2. Principle of Development

- 8.2.1. The Planning Authority considered that the proposed development would materially contravene the “GE” zoning objective applying to the site, on the basis that the proposed gym use would constitute a low-employment-intensive use which would prejudice the achievement of the objective to maximise employment on lands zoned “GE”. The proposed development comprises the change of use of the existing vacant Unit 1A, with a gross floor area of approximately 1,652 sq.m., to a recreational/sports facility including a gym.
- 8.2.2. I note that the “GE” zoning objective does not expressly identify a gym or recreational use as either a use that is permitted in principle or a use that is not permitted. Accordingly, I consider that the proposed use falls to be assessed on its merits having regard to the zoning objective, the relevant policies and objectives of the Fingal Development Plan 2023–2029, and the circumstances of the subject site.
- 8.2.3. Policy EEP2 seeks to maximise the potential of lands zoned “GE”, where appropriate, for employment-generating uses. This policy should be considered in conjunction with Objective EEO21, which seeks to “Encourage the provision of Local Support Facilities to serve the needs of the employees within major employment areas.” I consider that Objective EEO21 is particularly relevant to the subject proposal, as it provides for complementary facilities which support the functioning of established employment areas and the needs of their workforce. The proposed development would provide such a facility within Rosemount Business Park. The appellant has identified a substantial employment population within the surrounding area and states that approximately 15,949 workers are located within a 1.5 km catchment of the site. The proposed gym would therefore have a strong employment-related catchment and would provide a facility accessible to employees within the Business Park and surrounding employment lands. I consider that this is consistent with the purpose of Objective EEO21 and supports the view that the proposed use can appropriately function as a local support facility within an established employment area.
- 8.2.4. I also consider the specific circumstances of the subject building to be material to the assessment. Unit 1A has remained vacant for approximately 14 years and was historically used as ancillary office accommodation associated with Unit 1B. Unit 1B,

which has a gross floor area of approximately 18,625 sq.m., continues to operate as an established warehousing and logistics facility. I note the appellant's submission that the administrative and support functions formerly accommodated within Unit 1A are now provided within the existing warehouse operation and that the building is consequently surplus to the current operational requirements of Unit 1B. In this context, the proposed development would not result in the displacement of an existing industrial, logistics or warehousing use. Rather, it would facilitate the reuse of a long-term vacant building within an established employment area. The proposed use would also generate direct employment, stated to be approximately 15–20 staff, while providing a service to the wider employment population.

8.2.5. I consider that the reuse of existing buildings is supported by the wider policy framework of the Development Plan concerning the reuse and regeneration of existing buildings. Policy CAP8 supports the retrofitting and reuse of existing buildings rather than their demolition and reconstruction where possible. This is reinforced by Objective DMSO256, which promotes the reuse of existing building stock, and Objective EEO6, which supports the regeneration of obsolete and/or underutilised buildings and lands where appropriate uses can yield economic benefits. I acknowledge that a gym use is likely to have a lower employment density than some traditional employment uses that could potentially occupy "GE" lands. However, I do not consider that the assessment of the principle of development should be based solely on employment density. The zoning objective does not expressly prohibit the proposed use, and the Development Plan specifically recognises the role of local support facilities within major employment areas. In the circumstances of this site, the proposal would reuse a long-term vacant building, retain the established employment function of the wider site through the continued operation of Unit 1B, provide direct employment and deliver a facility serving the substantial workforce within the surrounding employment area.

8.2.6. I further note the appellant's reference to previous permissions within Fingal for gym/recreational uses on employment-zoned lands, including Reg. Ref. FW19A/0154 and Reg. Ref. FW19A/0216. While each proposal must be considered on its individual merits, these permissions demonstrate that such uses have previously been considered capable of being accommodated within employment areas where they function as complementary or local support facilities. Having

regard to the above, and particularly to the long-term vacancy of Unit 1A, its former ancillary office function, the continued and substantially greater employment use of Unit 1B, the employment catchment served by the proposal, and the policy support for local support facilities and the reuse of underutilised buildings, I do not consider that the proposed change of use would undermine the primary employment function of the “GE” zoned lands or materially contravene the zoning objective.

- 8.2.7. I therefore consider the proposed principle of development to be acceptable and consistent with the “GE” zoning objective, Policy EEP2 and Objective EEO21 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023–2029.

8.3. Parking and Transportation

- 8.3.1. I note the concerns raised in the Fingal County Council Planning Report and by the Transportation Section in relation to the level of car parking proposed and the provision and arrangement of cycle parking. The Transportation Section considered that the proposed development was oversubscribed in terms of car parking and that the quantum of parking should be re-examined. Concerns were also raised regarding the cycle parking arrangements. The applicable car parking standard for a gym use within Zone 2 is 1 space per 20 sq.m. Based on the proposed gross floor area of approximately 1,652 sq.m, this equates to a maximum requirement/provision of approximately 83 no. car parking spaces. I note that the original proposal provided for 99 no. spaces and therefore exceeded the applicable Development Plan standard. However, the proposal does not require the construction of any new car parking spaces, with the development utilising the existing parking infrastructure associated with the site.
- 8.3.2. A revised site layout has subsequently been submitted which reduces the overall provision to 82 no. car parking spaces. This is below the maximum standard of 83 spaces and therefore brings the proposed parking provision into accordance with the Fingal Development Plan 2023–2029. The revised arrangement also provides for 8 no. electric vehicle charging spaces, representing more than 10% of the total parking provision, together with ducting infrastructure to facilitate the future provision of charging infrastructure to the remaining spaces. I consider this to be consistent with Section 14.17.10 of the Development Plan. The Transport Statement prepared by DBFL Consulting Engineers also sets out a parking management strategy for the

site, including the allocation of parking spaces between the proposed gym use and the existing warehouse/logistics operation within Unit 1B. The revised arrangement allows for the appropriate segregation of parking associated with the respective uses and addresses the concern regarding potential over-provision of parking for the gym use.

8.3.3. In considering the potential traffic and parking implications, I consider the nature of the proposed use and its relationship with the existing employment use of the site to be relevant. The proposed gym would have a relatively dispersed trip profile, with demand occurring during early morning, lunchtime and evening periods rather than being concentrated exclusively within the conventional daytime working period. This pattern is complementary to the established warehouse/logistics operation within Unit 1B, which primarily operates during standard daytime hours. I therefore consider that the respective uses would not give rise to significant operational conflict in terms of parking demand. I further note that a proportion of trips associated with the proposed gym would be linked trips generated by employees already working within Rosemount Business Park and the surrounding employment area. Such trips could occur before or after work or during lunchtime periods and would not necessarily represent additional trips generated independently on the wider road network. The potential for linked trips is therefore relevant in assessing the overall traffic and transport implications of the proposal.

8.3.4. The proposed development is also located within an established employment area with a significant workforce within convenient walking and cycling distance. In this regard, I note the provision of 66 no. cycle parking spaces. The revised cycle parking arrangement relocates the secure and covered cycle parking and provides for the doors to open away from areas of vehicular circulation, thereby improving safety and usability. A dedicated pedestrian route from the parking area to the building entrance is also incorporated into the revised layout, addressing the concerns raised regarding pedestrian movement through the site. Furthermore, the revised proposals include a pedestrian and cycle connection which would improve permeability within the site and facilitate pedestrian and cycle access between the proposed development, the wider Business Park and the surrounding area. I consider that this represents a positive aspect of the proposal in terms of accessibility and the promotion of active travel.

- 8.3.5. The provision of 66 no. cycle parking spaces is retained and is stated to comply with the relevant Development Plan standards. The nature of the proposed use, together with the provision of showers, lockers and secure covered cycle parking, also provides an appropriate level of supporting infrastructure for employees and users travelling by bicycle. The proposed development therefore has the potential to encourage walking and cycling, particularly given the substantial employment population within the immediate catchment. I also note the provision of 8 no. motorcycle parking spaces, in accordance with Section 14.17.9 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023–2029. More generally, the Transport Statement identifies a number of measures intended to support sustainable travel and modal shift, including secure and high-quality cycle parking, EV charging infrastructure, dedicated pedestrian access routes and on-site shower and locker facilities. The Flyefit Supporting Statement also indicates the operator’s intention to promote sustainable travel among staff and members, including walking, cycling and public transport.
- 8.3.6. Having regard to the above, I consider that the transportation and parking concerns raised by the Planning Authority have been substantively addressed through the revised site layout and supporting Transport Statement. In particular, the car parking provision has been reduced from 99 no. spaces to 82 no. spaces, thereby complying with the applicable maximum standard of 83 no. spaces for the proposed use. The revised cycle parking and pedestrian arrangements also address the identified concerns and provide for improved accessibility and permeability within the site. I acknowledge that the proposed use will generate additional trips to and from the site. However, I consider that the nature of these trips, including the dispersed pattern of demand throughout the day and the potential for linked trips associated with the existing employment population, is such that the proposal would not give rise to a significant increase in peak-period traffic or place undue pressure on the existing road network. The proposal also makes use of existing parking and transport infrastructure and incorporates measures to encourage sustainable modes of travel.
- 8.3.7. Accordingly, I do not consider that the car parking or cycle parking arrangements constitute substantive planning concerns in this instance. Having regard to the revised parking provision, the existing site infrastructure, the proposed parking management arrangements, the cycle and pedestrian facilities and the measures

proposed to support sustainable travel, I consider that the development can be accommodated without giving rise to an unacceptable impact on traffic, parking, pedestrian or cyclist safety.

I therefore consider that the issues relating to parking and transportation do not warrant a refusal of permission in this instance.

8.4. Material Contravention

The Planning Authority's reason for refusal states that the proposed development would materially contravene the "GE" General Employment zoning objective on the basis that the proposed gym use is considered to be a low-employment-intensive use which would prejudice the achievement of the objective to maximise employment on "GE" lands. As set out under Section 8.2 of this report, I consider that the proposed gym use is acceptable in principle having regard to the "GE" zoning objective, Policy EEP2 and Objective EEO21 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023–2029. I have also had regard to the long-term vacancy of Unit 1A, the continued employment use of the adjoining Unit 1B and the policy support for the reuse of underutilised buildings under Policy CAP8, Objective DMSO256 and Objective EEO6.

In considering whether the proposal would constitute a material contravention, I note that a relevant consideration of materiality is whether the proposed development would prejudice the principle objective of the zoning. In this instance, I do not consider that it would. The proposal relates to an existing vacant building and would not displace the established warehousing and logistics use of Unit 1B, which remains the dominant employment use on the site. Furthermore, the proposed gym would provide direct employment and function as a local support facility serving the substantial employment population within the surrounding employment area, consistent with Objective EEO21.

I therefore consider that the proposed development would not undermine or prejudice the principal objective of the "GE" zoning, notwithstanding that the proposed use may be less employment-intensive than some other uses that could be accommodated on employment lands. The relevant issue is not solely the comparative employment density of the use, but whether the development would materially frustrate the purpose and objective of the zoning.

Having regard to the foregoing, and to the assessment under Section 8.2 of this report, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not constitute a material contravention of the “GE” zoning objective or the Fingal Development Plan 2023–2029. Accordingly, I do not consider that the provisions relating to material contravention are engaged in this instance.

9.0 AA Screening

9.1. I have considered the proposed change of use of an existing office building into a gym building in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located in an existing Industrial/Warehouse state which is a heavily modified brownfield site well-serviced urban settlement. The nearest European Site South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA is 11.3km east of the site

The proposed development comprises no development works outside of minor works to existing car park. The site is already extensively modified.

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

- The limited scale and nature of works
- The location of the site within an established, serviced urban environment
- Lack of connections to nearest European sites

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

10.0 Water Framework Directive

I have assessed the proposed development, on an established General Employment Industrial Estate 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. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning application or appeal.

I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that planning permission be granted for the following reasons and considerations:

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the long-term vacancy of the existing office building within an established employment area, the proposed use would provide for the sustainable reuse of the existing building and would function as a local support facility serving the employees of Rosemount Business Park and the surrounding employment area, in accordance with Objective EEO21 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023–2029. The proposed use would not displace or adversely affect the established warehousing and logistics use of Unit 1B, which remains the dominant employment use on the site, and would provide for additional direct employment. It is therefore considered that the proposed change of use would not prejudice the employment function of the site and would be acceptable having regard to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as received by Coimisiún Pleanála on the 30th day of March 2026, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. Prior to commencement of development, the applicant shall submit proposals for the written agreement of the Planning authority for the following with respect of traffic management:
 - Provision of 82 no. car parking spaces,
 - a revised cycle parking layout and dedicated pedestrian route from the parking area to the building,
 - provision of 8 no. motorcycle parking spaces and provision of EV charging infrastructure

All works shall be carried out to the requirements of Fingal County Council Development Plan 2023-2029 standards, as per the revised proposal.

Reason: In the interest of orderly and sustainable development

3. The use of the premises shall be restricted to the gymnasium use as described in the public notices and application documentation, being a use falling within Class 11 of Part 4 of Schedule 2 to the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. No other use within Class 11, or any other use, shall be commenced without a prior grant of planning permission.

Reason: In the interest of clarity and to ensure that the development remains consistent with the use assessed in this decision and with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

4. Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the Planning Authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health and surface water management.

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.”

Darragh Ryan
Planning Inspector

14th of September 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	501073- DF-26
Proposed Development Summary	Change of use from office to gymnasium
Development Address	Unit 1B Rosemount Business Park Rosemount Park Road, Dublin 11
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?	☐ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	☒ 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)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.	State the Class here

EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
☐ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
☒ No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3) [Delete if not relevant]
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3) [Delete if not relevant]

Inspector: _____ Date: _____