



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501500-DF-26

Development	Retention of mezzanine and office, infill, trailer and car park together with retention of boundary treatment
Location	Food Central, St. Margaret's, Co Dublin (Townland Killeek)
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	F26A/0217E
Applicant(s)	DXL Logistics Limited
Type of Application	Retention
Planning Authority Decision	Split Decision
Type of Appeal	First Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	DXL Logistics 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 existing warehouse/logistics site is located at Food Central, St Margarets, Co Dublin. The site is within an established warehouse/industrial park where there are a number of other facilities.
- 1.2. The site located in the townland of Killeek is adjacent (north) of Dublin Airport and is accessed off the R108.
- 1.3. The subject site is stated at 3.31ha.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The application is for retention development for the following:
 1. Retention of internal mezzanine floor and associated office accommodation, including 2 no roller doors.
 2. The partial infilling of an existing covered storage bay, including mezzanine floor and roller door.
 3. Trailer and Carparking spaces which are required to be removed under Condition No 5 of Planning Ref F20A/0549, together with the retention of northern boundary

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

- 3.1. **The planning authority recommended a split decision in relation to the proposed retention development.**

Permission was granted subject to conditions for the retention of internal mezzanine floor and associated office accommodation, including 2 no roller doors & The partial infilling of an existing covered storage bay, including mezzanine floor and roller door.

A refusal of permission was recommended for the retention of car parking area as follows:

The development seeking retention fails to accord with the car-parking standards for warehouse/distribution uses as set out under Table 14.19 of the Fingal County

Development Plan 2023 – 2029 and as such is 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 addressed can be summarised as follows

- Table 14.19 Car Parking Standards of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 advises 1 Car Park space per 100m² for Warehouse/ distribution uses in Zone 2. Based on a total floor space of 10,883.35 sqm, the maximum permitted parking area would remain as 112 spaces which accords with previous permissions. The proposal fails to comply with development plan standards in relation to car parking.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Water Services Department – no objection
- Parks and Green Infrastructure - The applicant shall implement all landscaping proposals and requirements previously approved under Reg. Ref. F20A/0549 (Condition No. 4) and the subsequent compliance submission (Feb 2022). The agreed landscape masterplan shall be implemented in full no later than the first planting season following the grant of permission. Any plant failures shall be replaced until such time as the planting scheme has become established.

- Transportation Planning Section –

The Infrastructure and Transport Department does not consider the justification for retention of the additional staff parking within the red line boundary which exceeds the Development Plan Management standards sufficient as it is partly based on the GFA of the permitted development (warehouse 5) to the south which did not have any parking requirement and the separation of uses within the overall development. Parking should not exceed the maximums set out in the Development Plan.

The Infrastructure and Transport Department has no objection to the proposed retention of an internal mezzanine floor and associated office

accommodation, including 2 no. roller doors and the partial infilling of an existing covered storage bay, including a mezzanine floor and roller door and the trailer parking along the northern boundary.

The Infrastructure and Transport Department recommends that retention of additional car parking spaces be refused, as car parking shall not exceed the previously permitted quanta.

- Air & Noise Unit – no objection to the proposal

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Dublin Airport Authority – no comment to make

3.4. Third Party Observations

- None

4.0 Planning History

F20A/0549; The development Will consist Of:

- (a) Part demolition of the existing vehicle maintenance unit.
- (b) Construction of a new separate vehicle maintenance unit.
- (c) Construction of a new warehouse extension to the rear of the existing warehouse With 5 no docking bays and a roller shutter door to the Side.
- (d) Retention ff a car park.
- e) Retention of the temporary parking area for trucks including all associated iite works and treatments.

GRANT PERMISSION & GRANT RETENTION, Condition 5 states:

Prior to commencement the applicant/developer shall submit and receive written agreement of the planning authority for a revised proposal for car and truck parking demonstrating the following:

a) A reduction in the total number of car parking spaces to a maximum of 112 spaces by removal of spaces from the northern end of the parking for which retention permission is sought and replacement with landscaping as set out in condition number 4.

b) A reduction in the number of truck/trailer parking spaces in the Heavy Vehicle Park for which retention is sought to the North of the site by omission of the northern row of spaces in its entirety and substitution with planting as required in condition no 4 of this permission.

c) In the interest of clarity the number of HGV parking spaces permitted on the overall site is 34, comprising 16 on the southern part of the overall site and 18 in the northern part of the overall site.

Reason: in the interest of achievement of reduction Of negative visual impact and towards achievement of sustainable transportation objectives

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Fingal County Development Plan 2023 - 2029

- 5.1.1. The subject site is zoned “FP – Food Park” under the Fingal Development Plan 2023–2029.

The zoning objective is: “Provide for and facilitate the development of a Food Industry Park.”

The Development Plan further describes the vision for the FP zoning as facilitating a state-of-the-art Food Park incorporating activities including the growing, preparation, processing, ripening, packaging, storing, distribution and logistics of food, drink, flowers and related products. The Plan states that the Park is intended to operate at a national and international scale and to optimise its strategic value to the regional economy.

5.1.2. Car Parking

The relevant car parking provisions are contained in Chapter 14 – Development Management Standards, Section 14.17.7 – Car Parking.

The Development Plan provides for two car parking zones, with Zone 1 relating to areas with higher levels of public transport accessibility and Zone 2 applying to other areas of the County. The applicable standards are set out in Table 14.19.

The Plan states that:

“Max” refers to maximum number of spaces allowed. “Norm” refers to the number of spaces that will generally be permitted unless specific changes are considered necessary to ensure the proper planning and sustainable development of a proposed development.

It further provides that, where a development type is not specifically identified in the parking table, the Council is to determine the parking requirement having regard to traffic and movement generation associated with the development and the other objectives of the Plan.

The Plan also allows for reduced parking provision where good public transport links are available or planned and/or where a Mobility Management Plan demonstrates a high level of modal shift towards sustainable modes.

5.1.3. Objective DMSO121 – Car Parking at Places of Work and Education

Objective DMSO121 seeks to limit car parking at places of work and education in order to minimise car-borne commuting. It requires parking at new developments to accord with Table 14.19 and the associated criteria for car parking provision in the Development Plan.

5.1.4. Road Safety – Objective DMSO120

Objective DMSO120 – Road Safety Measures seeks to promote road safety measures and avoid the creation of traffic hazards. The Development Plan states that the safety of all road users, including pedestrians, cyclists and motorists, is to be a primary consideration in the design and/or improvement of roads and in the assessment of planning applications. ([Fingal County Council][5])

5.1.5. Accessible Car Parking – Section 14.17.8

Section 14.17.8 – Accessible Car Parking provides that a minimum of 5% of car parking spaces in non-residential developments should be set aside for disabled parking. The Plan also allows for a higher proportion where the nature of a particular development is likely to generate a greater demand. Spaces should be located as close as reasonably possible to building entrances and appropriately allocated and signposted.

5.1.6. Motorcycle Parking – Section 14.17.9

Section 14.17.9 – Motorcycle Parking provides that motorcycle parking should be provided to meet the requirements of a development, with spaces generally provided at a rate of one motorcycle parking bay per 10 car parking spaces for non-residential and apartment developments.

5.1.7. Electric Vehicle Parking – Section 14.17.10

Section 14.17.10 – Electric Vehicle Parking sets out minimum standards for EV charging points and infrastructure and seeks to encourage the use of electric vehicles. The Development Plan also provides for parking spaces to be capable of accommodating future charging infrastructure. ([Fingal County Council][6])

5.1.8. Bicycle Parking

Section 14.17 sets out the Development Plan's bicycle parking standards, with Table 14.17 setting out minimum long-stay and short-stay bicycle parking requirements for different land-use categories.

5.2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

Malahide Estuary SPA 004025– 5.4km east of the site

Baldoyle Bay SPA 004016 - 9.95km east of the 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. Grounds of Appeal

The first party appeal relates to the refusal of retention permission for existing car parking spaces at the northern portion of the Food Central logistics campus, together with the retention of the northern boundary treatment. The appellant notes that retention permission was granted for other elements of the development and that the appeal relates solely to the refusal of the additional car parking spaces.

- It is submitted that the parking area is already constructed, operational and integrated within the established Food Central logistics campus and that the appeal does not seek permission for new parking infrastructure. It is stated that the parking has operated for a number of years without giving rise to traffic safety, congestion, visual, environmental or operational concerns and forms part of the infrastructure supporting the established warehousing, distribution and logistics activities on the site.
- No demonstrable planning harm has been identified arising from the retention of the spaces, including in respect of traffic generation, road safety, congestion, residential or visual amenity, environmental quality, surface water, biodiversity or the operation of adjoining lands. It is argued that the Transportation Section's concerns relate primarily to the parking quantum exceeding that previously permitted rather than to any identified adverse transportation or environmental impact.
- The removal of the existing spaces would provide little or no transportation benefit, as it would not reduce vehicle trips, staffing levels, logistics activity or the underlying demand for parking. Instead, it is argued that the removal of the spaces would simply result in parking being relocated elsewhere within the Food Central campus.
- The appeal also raises sustainability and circular economy considerations. The appellant submits that removal of the existing parking would require the demolition of functioning hardstanding and associated infrastructure, removal and disposal of materials, importation of replacement materials and construction of alternative parking elsewhere within the campus. It is argued

that this would result in unnecessary construction activity, waste generation and embodied carbon emissions without providing a corresponding transportation or planning benefit.

- The “FP – Food Park” zoning objective applying to the lands, sets out to “Provide for and facilitate the development of a Food Industry Park”. It is submitted that Food Central is intended to operate as a coordinated Food Industry Park incorporating food processing, storage, distribution and logistics activities, and that the existing parking forms part of the operational infrastructure supporting these uses.

The retention of the existing parking is therefore consistent with the operational requirements and wider objectives of Food Central and represents a more efficient use of existing infrastructure. It is further submitted that requiring the removal and reconstruction of equivalent parking elsewhere within the Food Park would not improve transportation outcomes or advance the sustainable use of resources. The refusal is disproportionate having regard to the established and operational nature of the parking area and the absence of identified planning harm. The appellant requests that the decision of Fingal County Council be set aside insofar as it relates to the refusal of the parking spaces and that retention permission be granted.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

- None

7.3. Observations

- None

7.4. Further Responses

- None

8.0 Assessment

- 8.1. This is a first-party appeal against the split decision of Fingal County Council in respect of an application for retention permission for the following:

- retention of an internal mezzanine floor and associated office accommodation, including two roller doors;
- partial infilling of an existing covered storage bay, including a mezzanine floor and roller door;
- retention of trailer and car parking spaces which were required to be removed under Condition No. 5 of Planning Ref. F20A/0549; and
- retention of the northern boundary.

8.1.1. The planning authority granted retention permission for the above elements, with the exception of the existing car parking spaces located along the northern boundary of the site, for which permission was refused. The first-party appeal therefore relates solely to the refusal of retention permission for this car parking area. Accordingly, my assessment is confined to the specific matters raised in the appeal in respect of the retention of these car parking spaces.

8.1.2. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the grounds of appeal and observation submissions, the reports of the planning authority, and having inspected the site, I consider that the substantive issues arising in this appeal are as follows:

- Context / Site History;
- Car Parking

8.2. Context/Site History

8.2.1. Under Planning Ref. F20A/0549, Fingal County Council granted permission for a number of works to the existing site, including the part demolition of the existing vehicle maintenance unit, the construction of a new separate vehicle maintenance unit, and the construction of a warehouse extension to the rear of the existing warehouse incorporating five docking bays and a roller shutter door. The permission also provided for the retention of a truck parking area and car parking area.

8.2.2. Condition No. 5 of Planning Ref. F20A/0549 required the reduction of car parking provision on the site to 112 spaces, in accordance with the applicable car parking standards. This was to be achieved through the removal of car parking spaces at the northern end of the site, together with the provision of replacement landscaping in

accordance with Condition No. 4 of the permission. I note that the applicant proceeded with the development permitted under F20A/0549; however, the car parking spaces identified for removal under Condition No. 5 were not removed and the existing parking arrangement along the northern boundary has remained in place.

- 8.2.3. The current application seeks, inter alia, retention permission for these existing car parking spaces. The planning authority granted retention permission for the other elements of the application but refused permission for the retention of the car parking area along the northern boundary. The stated basis for refusal relates to the level of car parking provision and its compliance with the car parking standards contained in the Fingal Development Plan 2023–2029. The first-party appeal is therefore concerned solely with whether the existing car parking spaces along the northern boundary, which were previously required to be removed pursuant to Condition No. 5 of F20A/0549, should now be permitted to remain.

8.3. Car Parking

The single reason for refusal cited by the Planning Authority is that the proposed parking area for retention does not accord with Table 14.19, Car Parking Standards, of the Fingal Development Plan 2023–2029 and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. I note that Table 14.19 provides a maximum standard of 1 car parking space per 100 sq.m. for warehouse/distribution uses in Zone 2. Based on the total floor area of approximately 10,883 sq.m. for warehouse Units 1, 2 and 3, this equates to a maximum provision of 112 car parking spaces. The overall existing parking provision of 272 car parking spaces is substantially in excess of this figure.

- 8.3.1. I acknowledge the appellant's submission that the existing parking arrangement has operated for a significant period without identified issues in terms of traffic safety or congestion and that the parking is considered necessary to support the operation of the established warehouse/logistics use. I also note the appellant's contention that the removal of the spaces would result in parking demand being displaced elsewhere within the Food Park and could require the removal of existing hardstanding and the construction of alternative parking infrastructure within an existing site in the applicants control outside of the site boundary.

- 8.3.2. I consider that the absence of an identified existing traffic or road safety problem does not, in itself, provide sufficient justification for the retention of parking provision which exceeds the maximum standard set out in Table 14.19 of the Development Plan. Objective DMSO119 seeks to limit the number of car parking spaces at places of work and education so as to minimise car-borne commuting, with parking provision at new developments to accord with Table 14.19 and the associated criteria for car parking provision. In addition, Policy CMP25, Car Parking Management, seeks to implement a balanced approach to the provision of car parking, using parking as a demand management measure to promote a transition towards more sustainable forms of transportation while meeting the needs of businesses and communities. I consider that this policy is particularly relevant to the appeal, having regard to the substantial level of existing parking provision and the established reliance on the private car associated with the site.
- 8.3.3. I acknowledge that the subject site forms part of an established logistics and employment area and that its location adjacent to Dublin Airport and its operational characteristics result in a degree of car dependency. I consider that the distinction should also be made between the existing use of the parking spaces and the demonstrated need for their permanent retention. The fact that the spaces are currently available and utilised does not, in itself, establish that an equivalent level of parking is required on a permanent basis. No detailed parking demand assessment or staff travel survey has been submitted to demonstrate the extent to which the existing parking demand could be reduced through more efficient allocation of spaces, car-sharing, alternative parking arrangements or a shift towards other modes of travel. In the absence of such information, I am not satisfied that the permanent retention of the additional spaces has been adequately justified.
- 8.3.4. The Fingal County Development requires consideration of opportunities to reduce reliance on private car travel. Policy CMP1 seeks to support the decarbonisation of motorised transport and facilitate modal shift towards walking, cycling and public transport, while Objective CMO1 seeks to encourage modal shift towards more sustainable modes of transport and patterns of commuting in order to reduce reliance on the private car. Objective CMO2 similarly seeks to develop mode share targets and facilitate a transition to more sustainable modes.

- 8.3.5. I consider Policy CMP5, Mobility Management and Travel Planning is significant with respect to the appeal. This policy seeks to promote best practice mobility management and travel planning through proactive mobility strategies for developments, with a focus on prioritising sustainable modes of travel, including walking, cycling and public transport. Section 14.17.3 of the Development Plan further identifies Mobility Management Plans and Workplace Travel Plans as an effective means of reducing private car use to and from developments, while Objective DMSO111 provides for the preparation and submission of a Mobility Management Plan for developments likely to generate a significant demand for travel, including existing developments that are expanding or intensifying their use.
- 8.3.6. In this regard, I consider there is a notable absence of a comprehensive assessment of alternatives to the retention of the existing level of car parking. While the appellant has demonstrated the operational importance of the existing parking to the current logistics operation, I do not consider that the appeal documentation adequately examines how the existing parking demand could be reduced or managed through mobility management measures, alternative modes of travel, parking management or reconfiguration of the existing site. I note the limited provision identified for bicycle parking and electric bicycle charging, the absence of a comprehensive mobility management strategy, and the limited information provided regarding facilities and incentives to encourage staff to travel by bicycle or other sustainable modes. I also note the opportunity presented by the existing hardstanding to accommodate appropriate active travel infrastructure, accessible parking, motorcycle parking, EV charging infrastructure and associated staff facilities, rather than relying solely on the retention of the existing car parking arrangement.
- 8.3.7. I have considered the appellant's reference to the availability of parking within the wider Food Park and the potential to accommodate parking demand associated with the subject development elsewhere within the overall Food Park lands. However, I do not consider that this provides a reasonable basis for the retention of the disputed spaces in the context of the current appeal. The application before me relates to the retention of the car parking spaces located within the red-line boundary of the appeal site. The wider Food Park comprises lands outside the application site and which are not the subject of the current retention application. Accordingly, I do not consider that it would be appropriate, in determining this appeal, to rely upon an arrangement

whereby the level of parking on the appeal site is effectively offset by parking provision elsewhere within the wider Food Park. The Coimisiun has no application before it to regulate, restrict or otherwise secure the provision of car parking on lands outside the appeal site. Any reliance on a reduction or restriction of parking elsewhere would therefore be difficult to establish as a direct planning requirement arising from the current application and would not provide the necessary certainty that the overall level of parking provision across the wider landholding would be managed in accordance with the Development Plan.

- 8.3.8. I therefore do not consider that the potential to offset the disputed parking spaces against parking provision elsewhere within the wider Food Park provides sufficient justification for their permanent retention. The assessment should instead focus on whether the level of parking within the appeal site is justified having regard to the applicable Development Plan standards, the operational requirements of the use and the potential for parking demand to be managed through alternative measures.
- 8.3.9. I also do not consider that the potential requirement to remove existing hardstanding, in itself, provides sufficient justification for departing from the Development Plan standards. (This will be examined more closely under Section 8.4) While I acknowledge the appellant's concerns regarding construction activity, waste and embodied carbon, the Development Plan places a clear emphasis on parking management and reducing reliance on the private car. I consider that the existing hardstanding represents an opportunity to improve the overall mobility arrangements serving the site, including the provision of sustainable transport infrastructure. I do not consider its removal is absolutely necessary in this instance owing for opportunities to provide mobility management measures on site.
- 8.3.10. While I recognise that a logistics and warehousing operation will have a greater reliance on road-based transport than many other forms of development, this should not preclude the implementation of measures to reduce staff car dependency. The Development Plan expressly seeks to achieve a transition towards more sustainable transport modes through mobility management, active travel provision, parking management and other measures. Having regard to the above, I consider that the proposed retention of the additional parking spaces cannot be justified solely on the basis of existing operational requirements or the absence of demonstrated traffic congestion or road safety problems. The proposal would retain a level of parking

materially in excess of the maximum standard identified in Table 14.19, without a sufficiently robust assessment of alternative means of accommodating or reducing parking demand. I therefore consider that the proposed retention, as currently presented, would be contrary to the car parking provisions of the Fingal Development Plan 2023–2029, including Table 14.19, Objective DMSO119 and the wider objectives of Policy CMP5, Policy CMP25, Policy CMP1, Objective CMO1 and Objective CMO2, which seek to manage parking demand and reduce reliance on the private car. I therefore recommend that permission be refused in this regard.

8.4. Other Matters

8.4.1. Waste & Embodied Carbon

I have considered the appellant's contention that the removal of the existing car parking spaces and associated hardstanding would result in a substantial release of carbon and would give rise to additional environmental impacts associated with demolition, removal and disposal of existing materials. I acknowledge that the reuse of existing hardstanding can, in certain circumstances, have advantages in terms of avoiding the consumption of additional resources and the embodied carbon associated with new construction. However, I do not consider that the potential carbon implications identified by the appellant, in themselves, provide sufficient justification for the permanent retention of car parking which does not accord with the applicable parking standards and which was previously required to be removed under Condition No. 5 of Planning Ref. F20A/0549.

8.4.2. In reaching this conclusion, I have had regard to my obligations to consider climate action in the assessment of the appeal, including the requirements arising under the Climate Action and Low Carbon Act and the relevant provisions of the Fingal Development Plan 2023–2029. Climate action is an overarching consideration within the Development Plan, with policies addressing both climate mitigation and adaptation and the need to reduce carbon emissions, minimise resource consumption and promote more sustainable forms of development.

8.4.3. I have had regard to Policy CAP10 – Climate Mitigation Actions in the Built Environment, which seeks to promote low-carbon development and requires consideration to be given to minimising the generation of site and construction waste, maximising reuse and recycling, and the use of construction materials with

low embodied energy and CO₂ emissions. I have also had regard to the wider climate action objectives of the Development Plan, including those relating to sustainable transport, resource management, biodiversity, green infrastructure and the provision of landscaping.

- 8.4.4. I consider that these objectives must be considered in the round. The climate implications of retaining an extensive area of hardstanding for car parking cannot be considered solely by reference to the potential carbon associated with its removal. The retention of the carparking spaces would prolong a level of private car parking in excess of the Development Plan standards and would not support the Plan's broader objectives in relation to managing car dependency, promoting sustainable transport and transitioning towards lower-carbon patterns of movement. I therefore do not consider that the appellant's reference to embodied carbon associated with the removal of the parking area outweighs the planning policy considerations supporting its removal.
- 8.4.5. I also note that the removal of the disputed parking spaces is not proposed in isolation from any environmental enhancement. Condition No. 2 of the planning authority decision to grant retention application for other elements requires the implementation of a landscape strategy as approved under F20A/0549. This will require the area concerned to be subject to replacement landscaping following the removal of the parking spaces. While the implementation of this requirement would involve the removal of existing hardstanding, it would also provide an opportunity to introduce soft landscaping and contribute to the enhancement of the site's visual and environmental qualities. Over the longer term, such landscaping has the potential to provide environmental benefits through the introduction of vegetation, enhancement of biodiversity and green infrastructure, and an increase in the permeability and ecological value of an area which is currently substantially occupied by hardstanding.
- 8.4.6. I therefore consider that the environmental implications of the removal of the parking spaces need to be considered over the longer term and not solely in terms of the immediate carbon or resource implications associated with removing the existing hardstanding. The implementation of the landscaping requirement associated with the original permission would provide an opportunity for environmental enhancement

and would be more consistent with the Development Plan's objectives relating to climate adaptation, biodiversity, green infrastructure and sustainable development.

8.4.7. Having regard to the above, while I acknowledge the appellant's concerns regarding embodied carbon and the potential environmental implications of removing the existing hardstanding, I am not satisfied that these considerations outweigh the requirement to manage car parking in accordance with the Fingal Development Plan 2023–2029 or the planning history of the site. I consider that the removal of the disputed parking spaces, together with the implementation of the required landscaping, represents a more appropriate long-term planning outcome having regard to the overall climate, environmental and sustainable transport objectives of the Development Plan.

9.0 AA Screening

I have considered the proposed retention of existing car parking spaces 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 Sites are Malahide Estuary SPA 004025– 5.4km east of the site and Baldoyle Bay SPA 004016 - 9.95km east of the site.

The development for retention comprises no development works. 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

- 10.1. I have assessed the proposed development, on an established Food Park 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.
- 10.2. 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. In the interests of clarity I recommend a split decision as follows:

Grant retention permission for the i) Retention of an internal mezzanine floor and associated office accommodation, including 2 no roller doors; ii) The partial infilling of an existing covered storage bay including a mezzanine floor and roller door and ii) Trailer parking spaces based on the reasons and considerations marked (1) under and subject to the conditions set out below.

REFUSE permission for the retention of car parking on northern boundary based on the reasons and considerations marked (2) set out below.

Reasons and Considerations (1)

The part of the proposed development which seeks retention of internal works, partial infilling of storage bay and roller doors are considered to be minor with no significant visual impact to the surrounding area. This element of the proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Conditions

1. The development shall be retained in its entirety in accordance with the plans, particulars and specifications lodged with the application, save as may be required by the other conditions attached hereto.

Reason: To ensure that the development shall be in accordance with the permission and that effective control be maintained

2. Prior to commencement the applicant/developer shall submit and receive written agreement of the planning authority for a revised proposal for car and truck parking demonstrating the following:

A reduction in the total number of car parking spaces to a maximum of 112 spaces by removal of spaces from the northern end of the parking for which retention permission is sought and replacement with landscaping.

Reason: in the interest of achievement of reduction of negative visual impact and towards achievement of sustainable transportation objectives

3. The applicant shall implement all landscaping proposal and requirements previously approved under Condition 5 of Plan. Ref. F20A/0549 and the subsequent compliance submission. The agreed landscape masterplan shall be implemented infill no later than the first planting season following the grant

of permission. Any plant failures shall be replaced until such time as the planting scheme has become established.

Reason: In the interests of landscaping and amenity

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	501500-DF-26
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of mezzanine and office, infill, trailer and car park together with retention of boundary treatment
Development Address	Food Central, St. Margaret's, Co Dublin (Townland Killeek)
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	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
☐ 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)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold

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 ☐	
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____