



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501691-DS-26

Development	Permission for demolition of building and temporary permission for 72 car parking spaces and all associated site works.
Location	Block 2, Merrion House, 294 Merrion Road, Booterstown, Dublin 4
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council South
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB1937/26
Applicant(s)	Capital Scene Unlimited
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Capital Scene Unlimited
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	1 st October 2026
Inspector	Ciara McGuinness

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	4
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	5
3.4. Third Party Observations	6
4.0 Planning History	6
5.0 Policy Context	6
6.0 EIA Screening	7
7.0 The Appeal	8
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	8
7.2. Planning Authority Response	10
7.3. Observations	10
7.4. Further Responses	10
8.0 Assessment	10
9.0 AA Screening	12
10.0 Water Framework Directive	13
11.0 Recommendation	13
12.0 Reasons and Considerations	14
Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	15
Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination	18
Appendix 3: AA Screening Determination	21

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site is located on Merrion Road, Booterstown, Dublin. The site has a stated area of approximately 0.25 hectares. The Dublin–Wexford/DART railway line runs to the east of the site. A large office building, identified as Merrion House, is located immediately to the north, while a substantial surface car park adjoins the site to the south.
- 1.2. The site contains a part single-storey and part two-storey office building, which is no longer in use and is currently boarded up, along with associated surface car parking. This building has a gross external area of 1,208 sqm (857 sqm at ground-floor level and 351 sqm at first-floor level). The structure is in a poor state of repair. The site is directly accessible from Merrion Road. The site is surrounded by a tall, corrugated, metal security fence. Along the Merrion Road frontage, the site is also bounded by a low wall incorporating integrated seating and sections of hedging.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the demolition of the existing building on the subject site and the provision of surface car parking in its place. Temporary planning permission for a period of 5 years is sought. The proposed development will result in a total of 72 no. spaces, including 4 no. accessible parking spaces and 19 no. EV charging spaces.
- 2.2. As part of these works, the existing vehicular entrance along the western boundary will be permanently closed. A new vehicular entrance is proposed along the southern boundary, via the adjoining car park. This will result in the removal of 4 no. car parking spaces in the adjoining car park to the south (which is within the red line of this application).
- 2.3. The applicant has set out in their documentation that the development will provide additional staff parking for St. Vincent's University Hospital.
- 2.4. The planning application is accompanied by the following;
 - Construction Demolition Waste Management Plan
 - Demolition Justification Report

- Appropriate Assessment Screening Report

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission was refused for the following reason;

“The proposed provision of additional off-site car parking to serve medical/ other nearby uses at a highly accessible location within the city would give rise to increased commuting by private car. The development is therefore considered contrary to policies and objectives of the Dublin City Development Plan, 2022-2028 which seek to discourage commuter parking and promote a modal shift to sustainable transport means, including Policies SMT1 and SMT26 and Objective SMT01 of Chapter 8. The development would therefore set an undesirable precedent for similar sites and uses in the city and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.”

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planners Report (dated 15/06/2026) has had regard to the submitted Demolition Justification Report which has set out the building is in a poor condition and it is considered that the demolition of the existing building is reasonable. The subject site is zoned ‘Z10 – Inner Suburban and Inner City Sustainable Mixed-Uses’ and within this zoning ‘car park’ use is listed as open for consideration. The main issue with regards to the proposal is compliance with Development Plan policy on provision for an off-site car park for the staff of St. Vincent’s Private Hospital. It is noted that the Transport Division consider that the proposed development would set an undesirable precedent, which discourages the use of public transport to promote a model shift to sustainable transport means. The Transport Division have recommended refusal. Further details in Section 3.2.2 below.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Division – Further Information requested. The applicant is requested to submit a Surface Water Management Plan, a Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment,

and build over details proposed to protect the structural integrity of the existing culvert at the new vehicular access.

Transport Planning Division – Recommended refusal. The following points are noted from their report;

- The letter of support from St Vincent's Private Hospital does not address that the temporary nature of the application and therefore does not provide a long-term solution to any commuting issues faced by the hospital.
- The application similarly has not provided details on the level of existing car parking within the hospital and if this is in line with maximum permitted car parking outlined under Table 2 of Appendix 5 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028.
- No Transport and Traffic Assessment or Mobility Management Strategy has been provided. As such, this division cannot determine if the quantum of car parking is justified. This division notes there is an existing public car park to the south, and no information has been submitted regarding the capacity of the existing car park.
- The proposed provision of temporary additional off-site car parking to serve a medical use, alongside other nearby uses, is of concern, given the highly accessible location of the site by both public transport and active travel means.
- The submission does not include details on the Bus Connects Belfield/Blackrock to City Centre Core Bus Corridor Scheme (ACP ref 313509). Part of the granted scheme by the Commission includes permanent and temporary compulsory purchase order of the western section of the site off Merrion Road.

Environmental Health Officer – Recommends the attachment of conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

One third-party submission has been received in relation to the application. The submission considers the development should be refused based on the environmental sensitivity of the site given its location to the South Dublin SAC, North Dublin SAC, Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC, South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, North Bull Island SPA, Baldoyle Bay SPA, Malahide Estuary SPA, and Dalkey Island SPA. They note that Dublin City Council refused permission for an Interpretative centre and that DLR County Council refused permission for an associated car park in proximity to the site.

4.0 Planning History

Reg. Ref. 2552/99 - Planning permission granted for new advertising to be located to the front and rear.

Reg. Ref. 1860/99 - Planning permission granted for new traffic control barriers to be erected at both vehicular entrances.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

The subject site is zoned 'Z10 – Inner Suburban and Inner City Sustainable Mixed-Uses' with an objective "to consolidate and facilitate the development of inner city and inner suburban sites for mixed-uses".

'Car Park' use is open for consideration under this zoning objective.

The following policy objectives of the Plan are considered relevant;

SMT1 Modal Shift and Compact Growth To continue to promote modal shift from private car use towards increased use of more sustainable forms of transport such as active mobility and public transport, and to work with the National Transport Authority (NTA), Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII) and other transport agencies in progressing an integrated set of transport objectives to achieve compact growth.

SMT26 Commuter, Shopping, Business and Leisure Parking To discourage commuter parking and to ensure adequate but not excessive parking provision for short-term shopping, business and leisure uses.

SMT01 Transition to More Sustainable Travel Modes To achieve and monitor a transition to more sustainable travel modes including walking, cycling and public transport over the lifetime of the development plan, in line with the city mode share targets of 26% walking/cycling/micro mobility; 57% public transport (bus/rail/Luas); and 17% private (car/van/HGV/motorcycle).

Car Parking Standards

The subject site is located in Parking Zone 2 which occurs alongside key public transport corridors. Under the car parking standards set out in Table 2 of Appendix 5, the Dublin City Council Development Plan, a maximum of 1 space per 100sqm GFA is permissible for hospital uses.

5.4 Natural Heritage Designations

South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA – c.40m to the east of the site

South Dublin Bay SAC - c.40m to the east of the site

South Dublin Bay pNHA - c.40m to the east of the 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

The appeal is a first party appeal against the decision to refuse permission. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows;

- The subject application to demolish the building was made in direct response to the listing of the site on the Derelict Sites Register and represents an attempt by the applicant to remediate the issues arising.
- The existing building has been independently assessed as unsafe, non-compliant and unsuitable for use. The proposed demolition works will remove a vacant and visually detrimental structure.
- The proposed development provides a temporary, carefully considered interim use of a brownfield site. The five-year duration ensures the proposal remains fully reversible and does not prejudice the long-term redevelopment potential of the lands.
- Dublin City Council have accepted that the demolition of the existing structure is reasonable.
- The proposal will provide a substantial improvement to the appearance of the site through the removal of a deteriorated structure, upgraded boundary treatments/landscaping and improved site management.
- The proposal is consistent with the Z10 zoning under which a car park is 'open for consideration'.
- The proposal responds to a clearly demonstrated operational requirement associated with the nearby St. Vincents Private Hospital, as supported by correspondence from the healthcare operator.
- The proposal has been designed to incorporate sustainable transport measures, including EV charging infrastructure.
- While public transport in the area is acknowledged, the proposal recognises the operational realities of a major healthcare facility, where shift based

working patterns mean that private vehicle use remains necessary for many staff members.

- The proposed off-site parking facility will accommodate staff parking that would otherwise compete for limited parking capacity within the hospital campus. As a result, additional on-campus parking spaces can be made available for patients attending the hospital.
- The objectives cited in the refusal reason are city-wide policy objectives designed to shape long-term transport behaviour and land-use patterns. They are not absolute prohibitions on all forms of car parking, particularly where a clear, justified, and context-specific need is demonstrated.
- The development does not introduce a new trip-generating use, nor does it intensify employment or activity on the site. Instead, it provides for the relocation and better management of existing parking demand associated with St. Vincent's Private Hospital.
- The applicant would have no objection to a condition requiring that the temporary parking facility be used solely by staff associated with St. Vincent's Private Hospital (or any successor healthcare operator) and operated in accordance with a Parking Management Plan agreed with the Planning Authority.
- The proposal does not compromise or constrain the long-term redevelopment potential of the site and can be readily removed when a comprehensive redevelopment proposal comes forward.
- With regard to BusConnects CPO provisions, the temporary and reversible nature of the development ensures that the proposal does not prejudice future transport infrastructure delivery.
- Notwithstanding the above, should the Commission not be minded to grant permission for the temporary car parking element of the proposal, it is requested that permission is granted for the demolition of the existing building as a standalone and independent element of the development.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

A response from Dublin City Council requests that the Commission uphold the decision to refuse permission. It is also requested that if granted, a Section 48 development contribution condition be applied.

7.3. Observations

None.

7.4. Further Responses

None.

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the 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:

- Car Parking Provision
- Other Issues

8.2. Car Parking Provision

- 8.2.1. The applicant has set out in their documentation that the proposed car parking spaces are to be used as off-site car parking for the staff of St Vincent's Hospital. I note that the application is accompanied by a letter from St Vincents Healthcare Group that states that the hospital is operating with a material deficit in staff car parking, with demand exceeding supply.
- 8.2.2. The subject site is zoned 'Z10 – Inner Suburban and Inner City Sustainable Mixed-Uses'. Under this zoning 'car park' use is as open for consideration. Notwithstanding that the use is open for consideration, I note that it is Government policy to promote a modal shift towards more sustainable modes of transport, and this is reflected in Objective SMT1 'Modal Shift and Compact Growth' and SMT01 'Transition to More

Sustainable Travel Modes' of the Development Plan, which seeks to promote modal shift from private car use towards increased use of more sustainable forms of transport such as active mobility and public transport.

- 8.2.3. I note the location of the site and the accessibility of public transport and active travel measures. The DART/Dublin to Rosslare line adjoins the eastern boundary of the site, with the nearest station (Booterstown) just a short walk away. A number of existing bus routes serve Merrion Road including Route 4, 7, 7A, 27X, and S2. The Busconnects Bellfield/Blackrock to City Centre Core Bus Corridor will also pass along Merrion Road. Active travel measures are also in place along the Merrion Road with pedestrian paths and dedicated cycle lanes available for use.
- 8.2.4. Having regard to the abundance of sustainable transport options surrounding the site and available to the staff of St Vincents Hospital, I am not satisfied that a parking proposal offers the most efficient or sustainable land use at this zoned location. I note the letter of support submitted with the application, and I also acknowledge the applicants claim that shift work may not lend itself to public transport use. However, the permission is sought for a temporary period and will not offer a long-term solution to parking shortage. In this regard, I consider that the proposed development has the potential to negatively shape long-term transport behaviour through the promotion of the private car for commuting in an area that is well served by public transport and active travel measures.
- 8.2.5. Furthermore, I have no information before me in relation to existing quantum of parking serving St Vincents or with regards to the operation/capacity of the adjoining car park to the south. Therefore, I am not able to assess the proposed development against the parking standards set out in the Development Plan. The subject site is located in Parking Zone 2 which occurs alongside key public transport corridors. Under the car parking standards set out in Table 2 of Appendix 5, the Dublin City Council Development Plan, a maximum of 1 space per 100sqm GFA is permissible for hospital uses.
- 8.2.6. In conclusion, I consider that the proposed development would give rise to increased commuting by private car at a highly accessible location within the city. Therefore, the development is considered contrary to policies and objectives of the Development Plan which seek to discourage commuter parking and promote a

modal shift to sustainable transport means, including Policies SMT1 and SMT26 and Objective SMT01 of Chapter 8. Furthermore, it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would comply with the required parking standards set out in Table 2 of appendix 5 of the Development Plan. I therefore recommend that permission is refused.

8.3. Other Issues

Demolition Proposal Only

- 8.3.1. The applicant has requested that in the event the Commission is not minded to grant permission for the temporary car parking element of the proposal, that permission is granted for the demolition of the existing building as a standalone and independent element of the development. I have reviewed the Demolition Justification Report, and I note that Dublin City Council have accepted that the demolition of the existing structure is reasonable. Likewise, I am also of the opinion that the demolition of the structure would be reasonable given its deteriorating condition and injury to the visual amenity of the area.
- 8.3.2. While I noted that the demolition is reasonable, I am not satisfied that the demolition of the structure with no plan for future proposals would be an appropriate approach for the development of the lands. I consider that such a proposal would be an inefficient use of zoned lands at a highly accessible location in Dublin City. Furthermore, I am not satisfied that the demolition only proposal and resultant brownfield site would offer any significant visual improvement at this site, noting the sites' prominent location. I therefore do not recommend that permission is granted for the demolition of the existing building only.

9.0 AA Screening

Refer to Appendix 3 below for AA Screening Determination. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on South Dublin Bay SAC (000210) and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024) in view of

the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- The relative scale of the development within a brownfield site and lack of impact mechanisms that could significantly affect a European Site
- The location of the development in a serviced urban area, distance from European Sites and urban nature of intervening habitats, absence of ecological pathways to any European Site.
- No significant ex-situ impacts on wintering birds

10.0 Water Framework Directive

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.

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.

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.

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

11.0 Recommendation

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

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

The proposed provision of additional off-site car parking to serve medical/ other nearby uses at a highly accessible location within the city would give rise to increased commuting by private car. The development is therefore considered contrary to policies and objectives of the Dublin City Development Plan, 2022-2028 which seek to discourage commuter parking and promote a modal shift to sustainable transport means, including Policies SMT1 and SMT26 and Objective SMT01 of Chapter 8. Furthermore, it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would comply with the required parking standards set out in Table 2 of appendix 5 of the Development Plan. The development would therefore set an undesirable precedent for similar sites and uses in the city and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

Ciara McGuinness
Planning Inspector

7th October 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	501691
Proposed Development Summary	Permission for demolition of building and temporary permission for 72 car parking spaces and all associated site works.
Development Address	Block 2, Merrion House, 294 Merrion Road, Booterstown, Dublin 4
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	State the Class here

<p>be requested. Discuss with ADP.</p>	
<p>☒ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3</p>	
<p>3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?</p>	
<p>☐ 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.</p>	
<p>☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p>☒ 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)</p>	<p>State the Class and state the relevant threshold Class 10(b)(ii) Construction of a car-park providing more than 400 spaces, other than a car-park provided as part of, and incidental to the primary purpose of, a development. (iv) Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere.</p>

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

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	501691
Proposed Development Summary	Permission for demolition of building and temporary permission for 72 car parking spaces and all associated site works
Development Address	Block 2, Merrion House, 294 Merrion Road, Booterstown, Dublin 4
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).	Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed. The development has a modest footprint, comes forward as a standalone project, does not require the use of substantial natural resources, nor does it 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	Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed The site is located in a urban area and is zoned 'Inner Suburban and Inner City Sustainable Mixed-Uses'. The subject site is not located within or adjoining any environmentally sensitive sites or protected sites of ecological importance. The site is not located within an

<p>of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).</p>	<p>area of historic, cultural or archaeological significance. Given the nature of the development and the site/surroundings, it would not have the potential to significantly affect other significant environmental sensitivities in the area.</p>
<p>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</p> <p>(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).</p>	<p>Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects.</p> <p>Having regard to the modest nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitats/features, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.</p>
<p>Conclusion</p>	
<p>Likelihood of Significant Effects</p>	<p>Conclusion in respect of EIA</p>
<p>There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p>	<p>✓</p>

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

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

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

Appendix 3: AA Screening Determination

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects	
Case Reference Number: 501691	
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics	
Brief description of project	<p>Permission for demolition of building and temporary permission for 72 car parking spaces and all associated site works.</p> <p>Refer to Section 2 of my report above for further details on the proposed development.</p>
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	<p>The proposed development site is a brownfield site on zoned land within Dublin City. The Proposed Development involves demolition of the existing building situated to the landward side of the coastal Dublin to Rosslare railway line, along Merrion Road in Dublin 4.</p> <p>There will be no change to the curtilage of the overall landholding and no changes to surface water runoff or treatment.</p> <p>There are no watercourses on site and the nearest water body is Dublin Bay c.40m from the development site to the east. There are no other ecological features of note on site or in the vicinity of the site that would connect it directly to European Sites in the wider area. It is considered the site does not provide significant supporting habitat for any bird species protected under the legislation.</p>
Screening report	Yes – prepared by Moore Group – Environmental Services

Natura Impact Statement	No			
Relevant submissions	N/A			
Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model				
The nearest European sites to the Proposed Development are the South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024), approximately 40m to the northeast.				
European Site (code)	Qualifying interests ¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections ²	Consider further in screening ³ Y/N
South Dublin Bay SAC (000210)	Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140] Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210] Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310] Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]	0.04km	Possible Indirect	Yes
South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024)	Light-bellied Brent Goose (Branta bernicla hrota) [A046] Oystercatcher (Haematopus ostralegus) [A130] Ringed Plover (Charadrius hiaticula) [A137] Grey Plover (Pluvialis squatarola) [A141]	0.04km	Possible Indirect	Yes

	Knot (<i>Calidris canutus</i>) [A143] Sanderling (<i>Calidris alba</i>) [A144] Dunlin (<i>Calidris alpina</i>) [A149] Bar-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa lapponica</i>) [A157] Redshank (<i>Tringa totanus</i>) [A162] Black-headed Gull (<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>) [A179] Roseate Tern (<i>Sterna dougallii</i>) [A192] Common Tern (<i>Sterna hirundo</i>) [A193] Arctic Tern (<i>Sterna paradisaea</i>) [A194] Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]			
--	---	--	--	--

Due to the enclosed nature of the development site (fully serviced) and the presence of a significant buffer area (trainline) between the brownfield site and Dublin Bay, I consider that the proposed development would not be expected to generate impacts that could affect anything but the immediate area of the development site, thus having a very limited potential zone of influence on any ecological receptors.

Step 3. Describe the likely effects of the project (if any, alone or in combination) on European Sites

AA Screening matrix

Site name Qualifying interests	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*		
	Impacts	Effects	

Site 1: South Dublin Bay SAC (000210) QI list	Indirect localized, temporary, low magnitude impacts from noise, dust and construction related emissions to surface water during demolition/construction	The contained nature of the site (serviced, defined site boundaries, no direct ecological connections or pathways) and distance from receiving features connected to the SAC make it highly unlikely that the proposed development could generate impacts of a magnitude that could affect habitat quality within the SAC for the QIs listed. Conservation objectives would not be undermined.
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? No	
	Impacts	Effects
Site 2: South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024) QI list	Indirect: localized, temporary, low magnitude impacts from noise, dust and construction related emissions to surface water during demolition/construction	The contained nature of the site (serviced, defined site boundaries, no direct ecological connections or pathways) and distance from receiving features connected to the SPA make it highly unlikely that the proposed development could generate impacts of a magnitude that could affect habitat quality within the SPA for the SCI listed. No significant disturbance to any SCI wintering birds (ex-situ) that may occasionally use the amenity grassland area near to the proposed development site.

		Conservation objectives would not be undermined
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone) : No	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? No	
Step 4: Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site		
<p>I conclude that the proposed development (alone) would not result in likely significant effects on South Dublin Bay SAC (000210) and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024). The proposed development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on any European site(s). No further assessment is required for the project.</p> <p>No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.</p>		
Screening Determination		
Finding of no likely significant effects		
<p>In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on South Dublin Bay SAC (000210) and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024) in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.</p>		
<p>This determination is based on:</p>		

- The relative scale of the development within a brownfield site and lack of impact mechanisms that could significantly affect a European Site
- The location of the development in a serviced urban area, distance from European Sites and urban nature of intervening habitats, absence of ecological pathways to any European Site.
- No significant ex-situ impacts on wintering birds