Inspector's Report
PL-501685-DS-26

Development	The construction of 3 No. padel courts with associated glass panelling enclosure with landscaping & all associated site works.
Location	Mount Pleasant Lawn Tennis Club, Mount Pleasant Square, Ranelagh Road Dublin 6
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council South
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB5896/25
Applicant(s)	Mount Pleasant Lawn Tennis Club
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Mount Pleasant Square Residents' Association
Observer(s)	The Irish Georgian Society (Donough Cahill)

Date of Site Inspection	19th August 2026
Inspector	Claire McVeigh

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description 5

2.0 Proposed Development 5

3.0 Planning Authority Decision 6

3.1. Decision 6

3.2. Planning Authority Reports 6

3.3. Prescribed Bodies 9

3.4. Third Party Observations 9

4.0 Planning History 12

5.0 Policy Context 13

6.0 EIA Screening 16

7.0 The Appeal 16

7.1. Grounds of Appeal 16

7.2. Applicant Response 19

7.3. Planning Authority Response 19

7.4. Observations 19

8.0 Assessment 20

8.2. Principle of the proposed development 21

8.3. Impact on the architectural heritage (Including visual impact/character) 21

8.4. Impact on residential amenity (Noise, lighting, traffic) 23

8.5. Biodiversity and removal of trees 29

8.6. Others 30

9.0 AA Screening 31

10.0 Water Framework Directive 31

11.0 Recommendation 32

12.0 Reasons and Considerations..... 32

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening 34

Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination..... 36

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The subject site (818sq. m) is located within Mount Pleasant Square and in the grounds of Mount Pleasant Lawn Tennis Club (Total site area 13230sq.m), Ranelagh Road, Dublin 8. There are 11 no. existing tennis courts within the square with two storey clubhouse, 2 no. badminton courts, 3 no. squash courts and gym. The square has principally a one-way system with on-street car parking spaces lining each of its three sides serving the residential dwellings (all protected structures) that frame the edge.

1.2. From my site visit I noted a public on-street bicycle parking bay is located on the southern approach to the Tennis Club. To the eastern end is a small public park area (Mount Pleasant Park). The Tennis Club and Park are screened along their boundaries with mature trees and hedgerows.

1.3. The subject site is accessed off the southern side of the curved square via a gated entrance. There are two surface car parking areas surrounding the Tennis Club building the larger of which is to the left of the entrance on entry. The site of the proposed padel court is currently a landscaped area with mature trees and some surface car parking between it and the clubhouse building. The ground level of the proposed site graduates and sits higher than that of the existing tennis courts (+14.90).

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. The proposed development comprises the construction of 3 no. padel courts[1] with associated glass panelling enclosure (3m in height) and a mesh over (1m in height). The courts are proposed to have 200W LED lights attached. Safety netting proposed to the south side of court 3 and to the east side of court 2 (7m in height) to prevent balls from leaving the site (green colour).

[1] 20m long x 10m wide enclosed above ground with a combination of glass and weld mesh rebound wall and fence panels Source: LTA Padel Court Data Sheet accessed at https://www.lta.org.uk/siteassets/play/padel/file/lta-padel-court-guidance.pdf)

2.2. The proposed works would require the removal of 8 no. trees and some other landscaping. 13 no. existing car parking spaces are proposed to be replaced with 3 no. disabled parking spaces and new landscaping and associated site work.

2.3. Further information was requested by the planning authority and in response to that request revised plans and particulars were submitted omitting 1 no. padel court to avoid removing any of the trees along the boundary. An acoustic screen is also proposed to the south and east sides of the proposed courts. The proposed screens are stated to be double-skin polyester textile cover with PVC UVA coating.

2.4. The proposed hours of use are from 07:00-23:00 Monday – Sunday.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. On the 10 June 2026 the planning authority recommended a grant of permission subject to 8 no. conditions.

3.1.2. Conditions

Condition of note are:

Condition no. 3: padel court 3 is omitted from the proposed development. The proposal results in the addition of 2 padel courts only.

Condition no. 4: Mobility Management Plan and a Mobility Manager/Travel Coordinator to be appointed.

Condition no. 5: Noise control construction stage and Noise control operational phase. Use of padel courts limited to 07:00 – 22:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00-22:00 Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays. No external loudspeakers shall be installed and no sound equipment located or operated in a manner that results in music or amplified sound being audible at any noise sensitive premises.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- Planner's initial report: Excludes EIA at preliminary examination and is of the view that a screening determination is not required. Screens out the need for Appropriate Assessment. Further information sought in respect to details for the lighting mast locations, an arborist report and associated justification to remove 8 no. trees to facilitate the proposed development and provide alternative screening proposals, a revised acoustics report to include details of noise mitigation measures, details of cycling provision to be provided and a mobility management plan detailing how members and visitors to the club would be encouraged to use sustainable modes of transport rather than travelling to site by private car.
- Second planner's report: Considers the revised drawings indicating 4 no. lighting masts serving each of the proposed 2 no. padel courts (Padel Court 3 omitted) at 6 metres above FFL to be acceptable. Notes that the third proposed padel court now omitted to reduce the extent of removal of existing trees along the boundary of the site. Accepts that the existing three trees to be removed are of poor condition, as stated by the applicant in response to the further information request. The further comments from the Environmental Health Officer in respect to the inclusion of the acoustic screens and consider that subject to condition the noise mitigation measures are acceptable. It is noted that a total of 22 no. bicycle parking spaces is proposed and that a member survey of transportation to and from the tennis club was submitted and, having regard to the comments from the Transportation Planning Division, considers the proposals acceptable subject to condition.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- *Transportation Planning Division Report*

  Recommends that further information is requested:

  1. Having regard to the loss of car parking spaces and the issues raised by the number of submissions on file, this division considers the provision of quality cycle parking to Development Plan Standards for the whole club is important to mitigate against increased vehicular traffic and overspill parking. The applicant is requested to submit cycle parking layout plans demonstrating

cycle parking in line with Development Plan Standards, in terms of both quantum and quality, for the whole club to serve both existing and proposed facilities. Appendix 5 of the 2022-2028 Dublin City Development Plan and the recommendations of the Cycle Design Manual (NTA, 2023) should be considered.

2. The applicant is requested to submit a mobility management plan detailing how members and visitors to the club (existing and proposed) will be encouraged to use sustainable modes of transport rather than travelling to site by private car. The plan should include a survey of the members to provide baseline information of their travel patterns, and this should inform measures to promote active travel/public transport use in members.

Following receipt of further information the division notes no objection and recommends conditions in respect to the submission of a Mobility Management Plan (MMP) and appointment of a Mobility Manager/Travel Coordinator for the club, cycle parking to be designed in accordance with Table 6.1 'Layout dimensions for simple cycle stands section 6 of the Cycle Design Manual 2023 published by the National Transport Authority and that all costs incurred by Dublin City Council including any repairs to the public road and services necessary as a result of the development shall be at the expense of the developer.

- Engineering Department - Drainage Division

  No objection subject to conditions.

- Environmental Health Officer:

  Having regard to the impulsive nature of noise associated with padel and the close proximity of the proposed courts to nearby residential properties, this unit considers there to be potential for adverse noise impacts on nearby residents.

  The acoustic consultant's report submitted with the application does not adequately assess the impulsive characteristics of this noise source and fails to propose appropriate noise mitigation measures.

Accordingly, it is recommended that a revised acoustic consultant's report be submitted as additional information. The revised report should include the following:

- Details of the noise mitigation measures proposed to prevent adverse noise impacts and potential complaints. Such measures should include, but not limited to, the provision of acoustic screens, with full details of their height, location, and construction materials

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

An Taisce

The residential Mount Pleasant Square is one of the most attractive of Dublin's Georgian squares, with two crescent-shaped sides giving it a unique and special character, enhanced by the survival of historic iron railings and lamp standards, as well as views towards the great dome of Mary Immaculate church.

The current proposal to add three Padel courts to the square's garden, including high boundary fencing and floodlighting, together with associated increased noise and motor vehicle movement / parking demand, will significantly alter and detrimentally impact on the setting of the historic square and its residential amenity.

For these reasons the proposal would, furthermore, be damaging to the relationship between the houses and the square's garden. While there is an existing tennis club use in the square - with a small separate portion in public park use - this is largely screened and softened from the outside by mature planting.

On account of intensifying the tennis-related use of the square's garden, the proposal is in conflict with the subject Z2 land-use zoning for Mountpleasant Square to protect the amenities of the Residential Conservation Area. Recommend that the proposed development is refused permission.

3.4. Third Party Observations

Third party observations were received from Daragh Treacy, Emanuela Saccarola & James Joyce, James Boland, Isabelle Boucher, Jane Hall, Jane Linnane, Kadija Duiri and Marcus Mac Innes, Mary Hayes, Michael Boyle, Nicole and Nicholas

Sutton, Patricia Devine (Committee member of Mountpleasant Square Residents Association), Paul Burgess, Paul Gallagher, Pia Casal and Matthieu de La Chevardiere, Oliva Delaney & Aidan Doyle, R. Branigan, Siobhan Gardinar, Will Murphy and Catherine Cox, SJ. White, Cormac Flood, Damien Kelly (specific BS4142:2014+A1:2019 assessment presented), Emilia Wawrzyniak, Flore & Roger Dwan, Jane Gogan, Marc O Laoide, Giovanni Da Ros, Nessa Busteed, Orlaith McManus, Alan Healy, Alison and Hugh Hardiman, Bernadette McCloskey, Anna Hamill & Robert Boyle, Caroline Lund, Brian Palfrey, Conor Martin, Curt Adler and Grainne Gormely.

A number have expressed generally positive views on the tennis club and its amenity contribution to the area however they wish to highlight issues of concern with the subject application, I have grouped and summarised as below:

- Traffic, parking and access: Displacement and removal of parking on site would impact negativity on limited parking on street in the area combined with the significant rise in club usage.
- Noise impact and residential amenity. Noise levels in the early morning and evenings (6am – 11pm). Refers to independent Dalton Associates review of the submitted noise report included in the application documentation prepared by Amplitude Acoustics.
- Impact on historic setting and architectural heritage: Adverse visual impact on the adjoining designated residential conservation area (Z2) due to the heights and design of the safety netting, flood lighting and removal of mature trees at the visually important entrance to the square and would destroy the character of the square, its setting and residential amenity of the protected structures which surround the tennis club.
- Loss of mature trees and biodiversity: No tree survey or condition survey has been undertaken as part of the application.
- Light pollution and glare: Lighting impact, glare from the proposed low-level floodlights would have a very negative impact on the surrounding homes. Refers to lighting impact report prepared by Michael Boyle PhD (resident of the square) which forms part of the Mount Pleasant Square Residents Association observation.

- Overdevelopment of the site with an intensification of use and hours contrary to previously approved planning for floodlighting: The proposed extended hours of padel combined with the inherently intensive nature of padel would result in level of activity lighting and disturbance that differ from the tennis use. Refers to previous applications for floodlighting.
- Disappointment at the lack of meaningful engagement from the tennis club, residents informed after the club members had voted to proceed with the submitted scheme.
- The proposed application would render the application to relocate the entrance to the club to a less dangerous location closer to Ranelagh Road impossible.

Submissions in support of the proposed development include Eoin Corrigan resident of Mountpleasant Square, Conor Fingleton and Orla Fitzgerald resident of Mountpleasant square.

Eoin Corrigan:

- Notes that the site is already in active sporting use and provides a range of recreational facilities that are used responsibly by members and the wider community, including engagement with the local primary school.
- The proposed padel use would be a complementary addition to the existing sporting facilities and would broaden access to recreational activity within the local community.
- Recommends appropriate conditions to be applied to safeguard residential amenity of the area in terms of noise and traffic.

Conor Fingleton and Orla Fitzgerald:

- Recommend reducing the number of courts from 3 to 2 and repositioning these on the site perpendicular to the existing tennis courts would provide a greater separation distance and would be at a lower level which would help to ameliorate noise impacts.
- Planting of mature trees to dampen the sound.

- Condition requiring all external lights off (including spotlights within the car park) between 12 midnight and 7am.
- Location of 3 disabled parking spaces does not leave sufficient space between parking space and building.
- No increase in covered bicycle parking.
- A portion of the increased revenue from the padel courts should be spent on ensuring that the boundary of the tennis club is improved. The railings are in need of repair and painting in several places.

4.0 Planning History

ABP-304593-19: Planning Register Reference 3766/18: Permission GRANTED (Planning permission not enacted, expired 30th October 2024) for relocation of existing vehicle and pedestrian entrance of the club from its current position to a new position closer to the south eastern corner of Mount Pleasant Square; The rearrangement of car parking bays within the club grounds and the construction of an extension of 265 sq.m containing two additional squash courts and an accessible toilet, all built attached to the western gable of the existing club house building and all associated ancillary work.

Planning register reference 3216/18: Permission granted (September 2018) for the replacement of existing twenty-two x ten-meter-high floodlighting poles and fittings for eleven courts, with sixteen poles x fifteen meters high, each with luminaries, to light eleven courts, including landscaping and all site works. (This application should be seen as a substitute for the planning permission approved for forty-two x eight meters high poles with luminaries by Dublin City Council Reg. Ref. 2291/17))

Planning register reference 2291/17: Permission granted (November 2017) for replacement of existing floodlighting poles and fittings for eleven courts with forty-two poles x eight metres high, each with luminaries, to light eleven courts, including landscaping and all site works. (The poles and floodlights will replace twenty-two x ten metres high poles with luminaries).

Planning register reference 2543/07: Permission granted (October 2007) for erection of a swipe card activated barrier entry system inside the gates.

ABP: PL29S.128563 Planning register refence 3395/01: Permission granted (August 2002) Balcony and related alterations. Condition no. 1. The proposed balcony shall not be used between the hours of 2230 and 0800. Reason: In order to protect the residential amenity of adjoining property.

ABP: PL29S.108044 Planning register reference 0761/98: Permission granted (December 1998) for three 5.5m tall lighting standards.

Planning register reference 0348/98: Permission granted to erect 6 no. columns with floodlighting.

Planning register reference 1861/93: Permission granted (May 1994) for a badminton Court, Squash Court, extension to bar, additional car parking and alterations and additions to existing club premises.

Planning history provided by appellant as a precedent in the surrounding area

ACP-322820-25 Planning register reference WEB1685/25: Planning permission was refused by the Commission for the following reason:

> Having regard to the location of the site and the proposed removal of all existing car parking, with no supporting mobility strategy or provision of additional cycle parking, it is considered that the development proposed to be retained would give rise to unacceptable levels of overspill and haphazard parking on adjacent residential roads, which would seriously injure the amenities of the area and endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and obstruction of pedestrians and other road users. The development proposed to be retained would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

The subject site is zoned Z9 ‘Amenity/Open space Lands/Green Network (Map H of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028.

14.7.9 Land-Use Zoning Objective Z9: To preserve, provide and improve recreational amenity, open space and ecosystem services.

Z9 lands are multi-functional and central to healthy place-making, providing for amenity open space together with a range of ecosystem services. They include all amenity, open space and park lands, which can be divided into three broad categories of green infrastructure as follows: public open space; private open space; and sports facilities.

14.3.1 Permissible and Non-permissible uses …There will be a presumption against uses not listed under the permissible or open for consideration categories in zones Z1, Z2, Z6, Z8, Z9, Z11, Z12 and Z15.

Generally, the only new development allowed in these areas, other than the amenity/recreational uses, are those associated with the open space use. These uses will be considered on the basis that they would not be detrimental to Z9 zoned lands.

Sport facility and recreational use are open for consideration in Z9 zoning.

The houses fronting onto the Square are designated as Z2 Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas). In which it is the objective to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.

15.5.2.2 Conservation Area

Policy BHA9 Conservation Areas ..development within or affecting a conservation area must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting, wherever possible…

Policy BHA2 Development of protected structures subsection (g) Ensure historic landscapes, gardens and trees (in good condition) associated with protected structures are protected from inappropriate development.

Policy GI40 Tree Planting – General: To require appropriate and long-term tree and native hedgerow planting in the planning of new development, urban spaces, streets, roads and infrastructure projects. New development should seek to provide for additional tree planting using a diversity of species including native species as appropriate to the location of the development in the interests of natural heritage, amenity, environmental quality and climate resilience.

GI41 Protect Existing Trees as Part of New Development: To protect existing trees as part of new development, particularly those that are of visual, biodiversity or amenity quality and significance. There will be a presumption in favour of retaining and safeguarding trees that make a valuable contribution to the environment.

15.6.8 Landscape Plans and Design Reports …. A tree survey must be submitted where there are trees within a proposed planning application site, or on land adjacent to an application site that could influence or be affected by the development. Information will be required on which trees are to be retained and on the means of protecting these trees during construction works. Where development is proposed, it is essential that existing trees are considered from the very earliest stages of design and prior to an application for planning permission being submitted. Root systems, stems and canopies, with allowance for future movement and growth, need to be taken into account in all projects.

The following criteria shall be taken into account by Dublin City Council in assessing planning applications on sites where there are significant individual trees or groups/ lines of trees, in order to inform decisions either to protect and integrate trees into the scheme, or to permit their removal:

▪ Habitat/ecological value of the trees and their condition.

▪ Uniqueness/rarity of species.

▪ Contribution to any historical setting/ conservation area.

▪ Significance of the trees in framing or defining views.

▪ Visual and amenity contribution to streetscape.

15.6.11 Financial Securities

SI35 Ambient Noise Quality

SI42 Light Pollution

Appendix 5: Table 1

5.2 Guidelines

Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011)

- Section 13.7.2 Development Within the Attendant Grounds

5.3 Natural Heritage Designations

The proposed Natural Heritage Area: Grand Canal [Site Code: 002104] is located 0.28 km north of the subject site.

Special Protection Areas: South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA {Site Code 004024] proposed Natural heritage Areas; South Dublin Bay [000210} and Special Area of Conservation: South Dublin Bay SAC [Site Code: 000210] are located 3.42km to the east of the subject site.

6.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

A third-party appeal has been made from Mount Pleasant Square Residents Association, prepared by Hughes Planning and Development Consultants. In respect to the application, they are of the view that the revised proposals, following receipt of further information, have significantly altered the proposal in terms of its visual impact (the inclusion of two full height acoustic screens) and that with the reduction in padel courts there are still 5 no. trees required to be removed and an arborist report was not provided by the applicant as requested by the planning authority.

It is stated that the revisions at further information stage were significant and should have been readvertised.

In summary the key grounds of appeal are:

- Impact on Residential Amenity (Noise, Traffic and Parking, Light Pollution)

The proposed development would have detrimental impact on the residential amenity of immediate neighbours, as a result of noise and light pollution and traffic impacts.

Noise: Padel is significantly louder and more disturbing sport than tennis, with more frequent and sharper sounds. Scientific acoustic studies, such as those by UL firm Aderson Acoustics show that padel produces a sharper, more percussive sound that the duller stung impact of tennis. Padel creates greater subjective annoyance and neighbourhood complaints for the following reasons:

- Impulsive noise
- Strike frequency
- Human and social density
- Psychological perception

Stated that experts and environmental health officers frequently advise setting padel courts a minimum of 100 to 160 metres from residential housing. Note that the proposed development is less than 24m from the nearest dwelling (no. 54 Mount Pleasant Square). The proposed padel courts are within 160m of every single dwelling on Mount Pleasant Square (Figure 18.0).

The padel courts would significantly negatively impact on the tranquillity and enjoyment of the public part at the northeastern corner of the square.

Noise assessment prepared by Damian Kelly (DK) (Appendix C of the appeal) notes that the original noise assessment by Amplitude Acoustics (AA) underestimated the impact by failing to apply sufficient penalties from highly impulsive nature of padel. Based on an updated 3D noise model the report concludes that the development would cause adverse to significant noise impacts at several nearby residential locations, namely R01, R02 and R03 in Table 6-1 of the Noise Assessment (prepared by DK), even with currently proposed screening. Recommend significant additional mitigation such as full enclosure of the courts or relocation further from sensitive receptors.

Light: The 8-no. floodlights are proposed which would be on during the houses of 7.00am to 10.00pm which would result in significant light

disturbances for particular residential dwellings located as close as 25m from the proposed padel courts. Critical review of the submitted floodlighting report attached in Appendix D which argues that the applicant's report is flawed as it doesn't account for a single 500m2 luminous object that transforms the nature of light spill, sky glow and glare rather it models the eight discreet light sources. Incorrect environmental zone classification used, and the report lacks a post-curfew assessment despite the courts being permitted to operate until 22:00 a period when tighter lighting limits apply.

Traffic: Serious concerns that the reduction in car parking spaces (11no.) in conjunction with the intensification of use would result in inevitable overspill of car parking on Mount Pleasant Square, which already has significant on-street parking congestion. The existing houses with no curtilage parking spaces rely soley on the on-street parking.

- Impact on Conservation Area and Protected Structures: Mountpleasant Square built between 1807 and 1838 is the only Georgian Square in Dublin still in fully residential use. All the dwellings are protected structures (RPS Nos. 5545-5599) and zoned Z2 Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Area). Reference An Taisce's submission. The development would result in excessive effects by being visually obtrusive, incongruous and out of character with the integrity of the context and setting of surrounding protected structures.
- Visual Impact: The proposed development would be visually incongruous with intrusive elements including the 7m high chain link fencing and 10m screening on the east and south elevations, floodlighting and the removal of a significant number of mature trees at the visually sensitive entrance to the square. No visual impact assessment verified views or drawings to show the visual impact.
- Removal of Trees and Environmental Impacts: The removal of mature trees (5 no.) and vegetation would harm local ecology and disrupt bat flights. No arborist report submitted. The trees to be retained would potentially be harmed by the development in terms of inadequate root protection. These

trees (Figure 29.0) are essential in safeguarding the boundary of the development in terms of noise and visual impact.

- The proposed development fails to provide adequate drainage and attenuation measures, concerns about the increase in impervious surface which may result in unmanaged surface water run-off.

I note the example of a refusal of permission in respect to Darty Health Club, at Palmerston Gardens (ACP-322820-25).

7.2. Applicant Response

- None

7.3. Planning Authority Response

- None

7.4. Observations

An observation has been received from the Irish Georgian Society. They provide a description of the square as follows:

Mount Pleasant Square was developed in the first decades of the 19th century and comprises fifty-six terraced houses which lie along the three sides of a central open space that was originally laid out as a landscaped garden and today is largely occupied by the Mount Pleasant Lawn Tennis Club.

In The Georgian Squares of Dublin (p.123, DCC, 2007), Susan Roundtree notes that Mount Pleasant Square "*has justifiably been described as one of the most beautiful early 19th century squares in Dublin*" and observes that its "*special architectural quality…relates to its overall composition rather than the quality of individual houses*".

in summary the key observations are:

- Mount Pleasant Square should be considered in its totality with its houses, streetscape and central park together contributing to its heritage interest.

- The zoning objective for the square recognises its architectural significance and sensitivity to development through the designation of the houses under Z2 Residential Neighbourhood (Conservation Areas).
- Each of the houses are included in the record of Protected Structures. Policy BHA2 of the Dublin City Development Plan states that any development proposals will conserve and enhance protected structures and their curtilage and shall have regard to the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011) which also sets out considerations to assess developments within the attendant grounds of protected structures (ref. 13.7.2).
- Concur with the views of the Mount Pleasant Square Residents Association in that the proposed development contravenes the development plan as it does not represent a sensitive development within an established and protected conservation area and will negatively impact the protected structures around the subject site.
- The protection of the heritage value of Mount Pleasant Square should be prioritised and planning permission refused for this development.

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 report/s of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of the proposed development
- Impact on the architectural heritage (Visual impact/character)
- Impact on residential amenity (Noise, lighting, traffic)
- Biodiversity and removal of trees

8.2. Principle of the proposed development

8.2.1. The proposed development comprises the construction of 3 no. Padel courts as part of an extension of facilities at the existing Mount Pleasant Square Tennis Club. The proposed number of padel courts was reduced to two following a request for further information from the planning authority, as detailed in section 2.0 above. The proposed development of the courts would require the removal of 13 no. car parking spaces and the provision of 3 no. accessible parking spaces. I consider the proposed development to be an additional sports facility to an existing sports facility and is 'open for consideration' as such under the Z9 zoning designation. The Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 (the development plan) defines an open for consideration use as one which may be permitted where the planning authority is satisfied that the proposed development would be compatible with the overall policies and objectives for the zone, would not have undesirable effects on the permitted uses, and would otherwise be consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. Therefore, in the following sections of my assessment, I shall address these factors and the effects on the permitted and existing uses within the immediate area.

8.3. Impact on the architectural heritage (Including visual impact/character)

8.3.1. The Irish Georgian Society in their observation to the third-party appeal, summarised in section 7.4 above, highlight the special architectural quality of Mount Pleasant Square quoting from the publication *The Georgian Squares of Dublin* in which it is written that Mount Pleasant Square "*has justifiability been described as one of the most beautiful early 19th century squares in Dublin*". The submission from An Taisce, at application stage with the planning authority, highlights that the residential Mount Pleasant Square is one of the most attractive of Dublin's Georgian squares, with two crescent-shaped sides giving it a unique and special character, enhanced by the survival of historic iron railings and lamp standards, as well as views towards the great dome of Mary Immaculate church. The Irish Georgian Society stress in their observation that Mount Pleasant Square should be considered its totality with its houses, streetscape and central park together as contributing to its heritage interest. I would agree with this approach and will apply same to my consideration of

the impact of the development on the heritage interest of Mount Pleasant Square in its totality.

8.3.2. The proposed development, as revised following further information request by the planning authority, has reorientated two of the proposed padel courts and omitted 1 padel court in order to retain trees along the site boundary. In the revised design there are 5 no. existing trees to be removed, not 3 as referred to in error in the applicant's submitted FI cover letter. The applicant did not submit an arborist report as requested in Item 2 of the planning authority's request for further information rather in the cover note the architect on behalf of the applicant makes the statement that the "*3 no. existing trees to be removed are of poor condition and do not add to the landscape within the site*". From my site inspection I would not concur with this statement, of the 5 no. trees proposed to be removed there are at least two larger specimens that create an attractive landscaped focal area close to the entrance of the clubhouse building and contribute to the green buffer of the structures within the tennis club. In the absence of an arborist report it has also not been demonstrated whether there would be impacts to other trees within the vicinity of the proposed courts given the extent of tree canopy overlap with the proposed courts. I am of the opinion that given the heritage importance of the Georgian Square and its contribution to the street that the submitted response to the further information request is not sufficient justification for the removal of these trees.

8.3.3. As a result of the updated acoustic report (D250907RP1 R1 dated May 2026), submitted in response to the planning authority's FI request Item 3, two acoustic screens to the south and east - illustrated as having a curved profile and canopy roof structure, extending 3.5m above the padel court to an eaves height of 6.5m and up to approximately 10m at ridge level - are proposed as mitigation measures. It is stated that the screen would be a double skin polyester textile cover (light in colour) with PVC UVA coating (sheet 200 for dimensions). The appellants consider that the acoustic screens, making the development a total height of 10m, significantly alter the proposal from what was originally submitted, without the acoustic screens, and would result in further adverse visual impact.

8.3.4. From my site visit I noted the lower level of the existing tennis courts within the club to the ground level of the proposed padel courts, as illustrated at +16.66 over 1.5m higher. Considering the subject site within its wider context and its role as a central

landscape element to the unified design, setting and character of the protected structures of Mount Pleasant Square that surround it, I am of the opinion that it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that the proposed development, including how the proposed canopy would present as a large luminous form at night (please refer to section 8.4 lighting), would not result in an adverse effect on the special interest and the architectural heritage of the place by reason of visual obtrusiveness, or that it would be adequately screened by the trees proposed to be retained. I would concur with the views expressed by both the Irish Georgian Society and An Taisce that the protection of heritage value of Mount Pleasant Square should be prioritised when set against the provision of additional sporting facilities at Mount Pleasant Lawn Tennis Club. I consider a refusal of permission is warranted on this basis.

8.4. **Impact on residential amenity (Noise, lighting, traffic)**

Noise impacts

8.4.1. The appellant has submitted a report (Appendix C) prepared by Damian Kelly (referred to herein as DK report), sitting committee member of the Institute of acoustics (Irish Branch) co-author of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Office of Environment of Enforcement (OEE) Guidance note for Noise: Licence Applications, Surveys and Assessments in Relation to Scheduled Activities (NG4), as a review of the revised Amplitude Acoustics report and an assessment of the proposed development having regard to BS 4142:2014+A1:2019. It is put forward that the guidance note (NG4) referred to in the AA report is not a suitable source in relation to noise criteria given that the type of development is not an “agency scheduled activity” and, therefore, it is not directly applicable. It is advised that guidance from the Dutch Tennis Association (KNLTB), referenced also in the AA report literature review, in respect to new padel court facilities, should be taken into consideration in the assessment and in order to comply with a limit of 50dBA as adopted by the AA report that the two courts should not be built within 100m of a noise sensitive location without significant noise reduction measures at a minimum. Notwithstanding their commentary in relation to the applicability, I do note that the DK report uses BS 4142 in their own assessment and application of penalties (section 5.0).

8.4.2. As outlined above in section 7.1 the noise from padel courts is stated to be different to that of tennis and the appellant sets out in Table 1 of Appendix C the sound source data assumed which the overall 92 dB LWA shows good agreement with the stated 91 dB LWA stated in the KNLTB guidance. The assessment as part of the appellant's submission has taken into account the proposed screening to the eastern and southern side of the courts plus the roof so as not to represent an over prediction of the expected padel court noise emissions. I highlight to the Commission what appears to be a typographical error on page 11 of the DK report referencing Table 9 and heat pumps. I note that the review of assessment levels presented in Table 6-1 indicates that there would be an adverse to significant impact at receptors R1, R2 and R3 (within range of NSL1 and NSL3) with a low potential impact to the remaining identified receptors (R4-R11 inclusive).

8.4.3. I highlight that the sound power level per court in both acoustic reports (AA report and DK report) is stated in agreement to be 92 dB(A). The difference between both reports is principally the application of an impulsivity penalty in which the applicant has applied +5dB to the predicted noise levels, whereas the appellant's submission (DK report) is that a penalty of 9 dB, the maximum penalty according to BS 4142, is attached. The DK report explains that the racket strikes are expected to be clearly perceptible (my underline) at the closest noise sensitive locations and will be materially different in characteristic to traditional tennis ball strikes and that a 9 dB is appropriate as a worst-case scenario.

8.4.4. On review of the submitted '*Table 6: Available Penalties According to BS 4142*' within the DK report in terms of the impulsivity penalty I note that the comments section indicates that where the sound is clearly perceptible that a 6dB penalty can be used. In this instance it would appear that there is a discrepancy in the application of a 9 dB impulsivity penalty when the qualified justification, i.e. clearly perceptible, for same aligns with the lesser 6 dB impulsivity penalty.

8.4.5. The applicants in the revised acoustic report (AA report) advise that the acoustic modelling of the proposed canopy has been undertaken using SoundPLAN incorporating the geometric screening effect provided by the enclosed elevations of the structure. It is stated that in order to ensure a robust and conservative assessment the modelling approach has considered only the screening effect of the south and east elevations and not the canopy roof. It is further outlined that based on

typical performance of lightweight canopy structures this approach is considered to result in an overestimation of noise levels in the order of at least 5 dB(A). It is set out that this margin effectively off sets uncertainness associated with the modelling process and input assumptions ensuring the predicted results represent a robust worst-case scenario. In the assessment provided by the appellant (DK report) I highlight to the Commission that the screening to the southern and eastern side of the courts and the roof has been taken into account in their model for prediction of expected padel court noise emissions.

8.4.6. A direct comparison between the two submitted acoustic reports is not possible given the variances in application of the impulsivity penalty and the different approach to assessment of the proposed mitigation screening/canopy structure. Nevertheless, I am of the view that given the site-specific evidence presented by the applicant and the overestimation of noise levels, by excluding the roof canopy cover from assessment, that the applicant has adequately demonstrated that the predicted noise levels with mitigation are indicative of a low impact and that the specific sound source is not expected to give rise to adverse effects (as illustrated in Figure 5 AA report). I note that the planner's report states that the further information response has been reviewed by the Environmental Health Officer and they now have no further objections to the proposal subject to condition (no written report available on file). I do not consider that a refusal would be warranted in terms of the predicated noise levels for the proposed two no. padel courts. Notwithstanding, the applied acoustic canopy results in concerns with respect to visual obtrusiveness and increased lighting impacts these issues are addressed respectfully in section 8.3 and 8.4.7 of my report.

Lighting impacts

8.4.7. Within the submitted Report on Proposed Floodlighting Installation prepared by Kevin Cleary & Associates it is explained that each court measuring 20mx10m would be lit by four 6 metre masts each carrying on 230-watt light emitting diode (LED) twin module floodlighting lantern. It is advised that given the relatively small size of the court a modest mounting of 6 metres and fitting of the floodlights at zero degrees tilt to the horizontal contributes to restricting glare and minimising light spill on adjacent properties. It is set out that at the front corner of houses nos. 53 & 54 the maximum horizontal spill light at ground level is predicted to be no more than 0.2 lux, which is

less than the effect of bright moonlight and that horizontal spill at other receptors is much less than this figure approaching zero in all cases. The report confirms that the vertical illuminance spill light on building facades is more significant with a spill light value of 0.6 lux to the front facades (close to the corner at ground level) of 49 to 53 Mount Pleasant Square South and is 0.6 for the front facades of numbers 54 and 55 Mount Pleasant Square South all below the 10-lux limit. It is advised that the vertical spill light calculations show that the maximum spill light values all occur at or close to the ground level and the values diminish significantly at higher elevations. As such they state that the spill light at sensitive areas such as windows are considerably less than these maximums. The report highlights that the existing significant screening by mature trees around the proposed padel courts would ameliorate light spill.

8.4.8. The appellants have submitted a critical review of the Report on Proposed Floodlighting Installation submitted by the applicant in which they state is fundamentally flawed as it fails to account for the proposed large barrel-vault fabric acoustic canopy added to the plans to enclose the courts and floodlights. It is put forward that the applicant's report models eight discreet lights sources radiating into the open sky rather than a single (500 m2) luminous object that would transform the nature of light spill, sky-glow and glare. Furthermore, it is argued that the incorrect Environmental Zone of E3[2] was selected whereas the value of E2 'low district brightness' would apply to residential areas in or adjacent to conservation areas.

8.4.9. Having regard to Table 2: Environmental Zones of the ILP's Guidance Notes for Reduction of Obtrusive Light I highlight to the Commission that E3 is a suburban category of medium district brightness whereas E2 is a rural category of low district brightness which can also, as per the commentary in the table, relate to relatively dark outer suburban locations. Notwithstanding the question of which environmental zone is appropriate in terms of illumination on surrounding premises, I note that the proposed predicted light spill horizontal and vertical levels are less than both E3 and E2 maximum values. On this basis I would consider that the floodlighting masts as separate elements would not result in a significant adverse impact on the adjoining properties.

[2] Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light, Institution of Lighting Professionals (ILP)

8.4.10. I do, however, agree with the appellants in that the lighting assessment has not taken into account the effect of the proposed canopy on the lighting proposals. The submitted report prepared by Dr. Michael Boyle (Appendix D of the appeal submission) advises that "*Enclosing the luminaires within a translucent PVC skin changes the fundamental nature of the light source: eight discrete point fittings become the internal illumination of a luminous enclosure of approximately 500 m_2*". It is further set out that the point source spill calculations do not represent the effect of the development as proposed with acoustic screen and canopy. The consequences of the transformation of the nature of the light source are described in summary below:

- The illuminated skin glows across approximately 500 m2 becoming an extended source in its own right, casting light at the window heights and oblique viewpoints.
- A light-coloured skin reflects 60-80% of light internally and as such the luminous flux emitted outward through the skin exceeds any single pass estimate based on luminaire output alone.
- At night the canopy presents as a large luminous form within a Georgian conservation area.

8.4.11. In conclusion on this issue, I am of the opinion that the submitted lighting report has not sufficiently addressed the proposed acoustic screen/canopy within its analysis and as such has not adequately demonstrated that the proposed lighting would not have an adverse impact on the surrounding residential properties. On this basis I recommend that planning permission is refused.

8.4.12. Separately, I am of the view that the visual impact of the proposed canopy at night is a material consideration in terms of its impact on the visual and heritage quality of Mount Pleasant Square which has not been addressed in the application or appeal documents. Please refer to section 8.3 of my report.

Traffic impacts

8.4.13. Within the planning and appeal documentation there is a lack of clarity with respect to the proposed reduction in car parking spaces both in the written particulars and

the submitted plans. For the purposes of my assessment, I shall set out the details as presented in the tables below:

Table: 8.1: Existing car parking and proposed car parking

Existing car parking	78 no.
Proposed car parking	68 no. (Including 3 no. accessible parking spaces)
Proposed car parking reduction referenced as per FI cover note	Reduction of 9 no. spaces = 69 no.

Table 8.2: Existing and proposed bicycle parking

Existing bicycle parking	10 spaces
Proposed bicycle parking (as originally proposed)	26 spaces (in total)
Revised bicycle parking at further information stage	22 new spaces Detailed as: 7 Sheffield stands (14 no. spaces) 4 Sheffield stands (8 no. spaces)

8.4.14. The Transport Division of the Planning Authority raised concerns regarding the loss of car parking spaces and the issues raised in the third-party submissions in termsof overspill parking demand, as noted above, and requested that cycle parking layout plans be submitted to demonstrate cycle parking in line with the development plan standards (Table 1 of Appendix 5) for the whole club to serve both existing and proposed facilities. I highlight to the Commission bicycle parking is divided into two categories in the Dublin City Development Plan, namely long term (secure and well-lit area) and short term which are designed to be in a highly visible area for ease of access for visiting public.

8.4.15. In respect to the bicycle parking proposals, I see no differentiation in the design of the proposed Sheffield stands, other than those identified in the text of the FI cover letter for cargo bicycle parking, and no details have been provided in respect to numbers of staff or inclusion of total number of bicycle spaces for all of the courts within the club to allow for an evaluation against the development plan standards.

8.4.16. In addition, the applicant did not submit as requested, by the planning authority, a Mobility Management Plan (MMP) to detail how members and visitors to the club would be encouraged to use sustainable modes of transport rather than travelling to the site by private car. I do note that whilst a MMP was not submitted a member survey was which illustrates that almost half (47%) travel to the club by car as their primary mode, the remaining (53%) travel by public transport or active travel methods.

8.4.17. On the basis of the limited information provided I am of the opinion that the applicant has not demonstrated that sufficient quality bicycle parking spaces have been provided to accommodate the intensification of the sporting facility at this location. I recommend a refusal on this basis.

8.5. Biodiversity and removal of trees

8.5.1. As noted in section 5.0 above it is policy to protect existing trees as part of new development (Policy GI41) particularly those that are of visual, biodiversity or amenity quality and significance. The development plan makes clear that there is a presumption in favour of retaining and safeguarding trees that made a valuable contribution. From my site visit, as already noted in my assessment, I am of the view that the existing trees proposed to be removed are of a visual and amenity quality and that sufficient justification has not been provided for their removal to facilitate the development. The planning authority requested an arborist report to be prepared and submitted as further information and the applicant did not comply with this request.

8.5.2. As noted already the applicant refers to the removal of 3 no. trees in the revised proposals in error, in agreement with the appellant I note that there are 5 no. trees to be removed, which is an acknowledged reduction from the originally proposed removal of 8 no. trees. Section 15.6.8 of the development plan a tree survey must be submitted where there are trees within a proposed planning application site, or on

land adjacent to an application site that could influence or be affected by the development. The tree survey also requires information on which trees are to be retained and on the means of protecting these trees during construction works. In this subject appeal I am of the view that by reason of the lack of information submitted in terms of the trees proposed to be removed and those to be retained including root systems, stems and canopies, with allowance for future movement and growth that the proposed development would not comply with the provisions of the development plan and as such would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

8.5.3. Separately I note the appellants concerns that the removal of trees would affect the flight of bats. As this issue is integral to the proposed removal of trees, I do not consider that further information is required in this instance in respect to a bat assessment given the significant reasons for refusal set out above.

8.6. **Others**

8.6.1. The appellant has concerns that the adequate drainage and attenuation measures are not provided in the application. I highlight to the Commission that surface water management proposals are contained in section 2 of the submitted Civil Engineering Infrastructure and Flood Risk Assessment Report prepared by Barrett Mahony. The submitted report sets out that the padel courts themselves are proposed to be constructed with a porous surface over a minimum 250mm thick layer of clean graded stone to provide a reservoir for storage of rainwater in high intensity events before percolation to the ground. Interconnected perforated pipes are proposed to be laid within the hardcore to allow future provision of a canvas type roof over the courts. Footpaths and terraces are proposed to be constructed using permeable paving. I am of the opinion that sufficient information has been provided in respect to drainage and attenuation measures and a refusal of permission is not warranted on this ground.

9.0 AA Screening

9.1. I have considered the proposed padel courts in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

9.2. The subject site is located approximately 3.42km west of Special Protection Areas: South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA [Site Code: 004024] and Special Area of Conservation: South Dublin Bay SAC [Site Code: 000210].

9.3. The proposed development comprises the construction of 3 no. padel courts, amended following further information response to the planning authority to 2 no. padel courts. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal with respect to the designated Natura 2000 sites.

9.4. 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:

• Nature of works e.g. small scale and nature of the development

• Location-distance from nearest European site and lack of connections

• Taking into account screening report/determination by the planning authority.

9.5. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

9.6. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken with regard to the objectives set out in Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive.

10.2. Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, it is concluded that the proposal will not result in any risk of deterioration in the status of any water body, including surface waters (rivers and lakes), groundwater, transitional

waters, or coastal waters. This applies to both qualitative and quantitative status, and in respect of temporary and permanent effects.

10.3. In addition, the proposed development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the protection, maintenance, and improvement of water body status, as required under the Directive.

10.4. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that permission is refused for the following reasons and considerations.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the special architectural quality of the subject site within its wider context and its role as a central landscape element to the unified design, setting and character of the adjoining designated Z2 conservation area and the protected structures of Mount Pleasant Square that surround it, it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that the proposed development, including the proposed acoustic canopy, would not result in an adverse effect on the special interest and the architectural heritage of the place by reason of visual obtrusiveness, or that it would be adequately screened by the trees proposed to be retained contrary to policy BHA9 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The submitted lighting report has not sufficiently addressed the proposed acoustic screen/canopy within its analysis and, as such, has not adequately demonstrated that the proposed lighting would not have an adverse impact on the surrounding residential properties contrary to policy SI42 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. It has not been sufficiently demonstrated that appropriately designed quality bicycle parking spaces are provided, in accordance with Table 1: Bicycle Parking Standards for Various Land Uses Appendix 5 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, to accommodate the proposed intensification of the sporting facility at this location and to mitigate against increased vehicular traffic and overspill parking as a result of the proposed removal off on-site parking spaces. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

4. Given the lack of information submitted in terms of the trees proposed to be removed and in respect to those to be retained (including root systems, stems and canopies, with allowance for future movement and growth) the proposed development would not comply with Policy GI41 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 which seeks to protect existing trees as part of new development. As such, the proposed development 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.

Claire McVeigh
Planning Inspector

15 October 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501685-26
Proposed Development Summary	The construction of 3 No. padel courts with associated glass panelling enclosure with landscaping & all associated site works.
Development Address	Mount Pleasant Lawn Tennis Club, Ranelagh Road, Dublin 6.
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.** **EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.**	**State the Class here**
☒ 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)**	Schedule 5, Part 2, 10 (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.

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:** _____

Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-501685-26
Proposed Development Summary	The construction of 3 No. padel courts with associated glass panelling enclosure with landscaping & all associated site works.
Development Address	Mount Pleasant Lawn Tennis Club, Ranelagh Road, Dublin 6.
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (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).	Proposed sports facility use is open for consideration within the Z9 zoning designation. The development has a modest footprint, comes forward as a standalone project, does not require demolition works, does not require the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.
Location of development (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	The development is situated in an existing sports facility 'Mount Pleasant Lawn Tennis Club'. The subject site is surrounded by residential dwellings (all protected structures within a designated Z2 Residential Neighbourhood (Conservation Area). The development is removed from sensitive natural habitats, designated sites and landscapes

populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	of identified significance in the City Development Plan.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	Having regard to the following: - modest nature of the proposed development, - lack of significant sensitive habitats/features - likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects - absence of in combination effects there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	**Conclusion in respect of EIA**
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	**EIA is not required.**

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)