

DEPUTY PLANNING OFFICER

APPLICATION NO. PROPOSAL	WEB1250/26 (i) demolition of commercial buildings at Nos. 1-7 Templeogue Road (Eircode No. D6WW611) and unnamed commercial building fronting Templeogue Road (Eircode No. D6WX688); (ii) demolition of the party boundary wall and non-original single-storey rear returns to the residential buildings at Nos. 16-18 Terenure Road West and provision of new party/ boundary walls to the rear of these properties; (iii) construction of a part-four part-five storey mixed-use block with frontage to Terenure Road West and Templeogue Road comprising 36 no. apartments (13 no. one-bedroom & 23 no. two-bedroom units) and 165sq.m of commercial floor space; (iv) construction of a three storey residential block within the centre of the site comprising 9 no. apartments (2 no. one-bedroom & 7 no. two-bedroom units); (v) provision of an ESB substation accessible via Terenure Road West and provision of service/loading bay and new footpath on Terenure Road West; (vi) provision of surface level carparking areas (20 no. car spaces, 3 no. motorcycle spaces & 1 no. service bay) accessible via Templeogue Road; (vii) all ancillary works necessary to facilitate the development including boundary treatments, landscaping, SuDS drainage works, construction of pedestrian infrastructure, provision of bin/bicycle storage. All residential apartments will be served by private amenity space in the form of a balcony/terrace and will have shared access to an area of communal amenity space at surface level between the proposed blocks.
LOCATION	Nos. 16-18 Terenure Road West, Nos. 1-13 Templeogue Road, Nos. 1-7 Templeogue Road (Eircode No. D6WW611), and unnamed commercial building fronting Templeogue Road (Eircode No. D6WX688), Dublin 6W
APPLICANT	Reverie Developments Limited, Reverie Developments Limited
DATE LODGED	24-Jun-2026
ZONING	
APPLICATION TYPE	Permission

16/07/2026**1.0 Site Inspection**

04/03/2026 and 11/03/2026, site notices in place.

2.0 Description of Site and Surroundings

The site is situated at the forked junction leading from Terenure Place to Terenure Road West and Templeogue Road, at the western edge of the which is a Z4-zoned urban village of Terenure. The site has frontage to Templeogue Road to the southeast and Terenure Road West to the northeast, while also extending behind an existing two-storey block of shops on Terenure Road West, and also includes a pair of existing semi-detached houses beyond this at Nos. 16 and 18 Terenure Road West, which have gardens extending back to the rear boundary of existing two-storey houses on Olney Crescent. To the west, No. 18 is bounded by the side of an existing apartment block at Loughmorne House, which is predominantly three to four-storey in height, with a surface car park to the rear. To the southwest, the site is bounded by No. 15 Templeogue Road which is a single storey house on a narrow site, with what appears to be a partly completed front extension. Beyond No.15 is a terrace of two-storey part red brick houses with front and rear gardens. The site faces a two-storey block of retail/commercial units of modern construction, set back from Terenure Place facing the junction, and a terrace of two-storey houses on Templeogue Road, just northeast of Terenure Library. On the northern side of the junction is an existing two-storey terrace of retail/commercial units which extends to the public footpath at Terenure Place.

The bulk of the site is occupied by an existing car showroom and yard. The car showroom is located in a two-storey building, with single storey extension to the front, which faces the corner. The two-storey element of the building is curved in shape, with aerial views showing that the curve aligns with the curved site boundary of the development on the northern side of Terenure Place. A second showroom building of modern construction, extends along the boundary wall with No. 15 Templeogue Road and along the side boundary of No. 16 Terenure Road West. The boundary with No. 15 comprises a stone wall. The front boundary on Templeogue Road consists of a low plinth wall, with a vehicular entrance opening. There is also a short area of boundary comprising a chain-link fence fronting Terenure Road West between the main two-storey building on the site and the adjoining retail block.

The site has a stated area of 0.32 hectares (3,200m²). The existing buildings on the site have a stated area of 789m². The site includes an area of the public road on Terenure Road West, which is in the ownership of Dublin City Council. A letter of consent has been included in this regard.

3.0 Proposed Development

The proposed development comprises the following:

- Demolition of commercial buildings at Nos. 1-7 Templeogue Road and unnamed commercial building fronting Templeogue Road;**
- Demolition of party boundary wall and non-original single-storey rear returns to the residential buildings at Nos. 16-18 Terenure Road West and provision of new party/boundary walls to the rear of these properties;**
- Construction of a part four and part five-storey mixed-use block with frontage to Terenure Road West and Templeogue Road comprising 36 apartments (13 no. one-bedroom & 23 no. two-bedroom units) and 165m² of commercial floor space;**
- Construction of a three storey residential block within the centre of the site comprising 9 apartments (2 no. one-bedroom & 7 no. two-bedroom units). All of the proposed apartments will be served by private amenity space in the form of a balcony/terrace and will have shared access to an area of communal amenity space at surface level between the proposed blocks.**
- Provision of an ESB substation accessible via Terenure Road West and a service/loading bay and new footpath on Terenure Road West, with surface carparking areas (20 car spaces, 3 motorcycle spaces & one service bay) accessible via Templeogue Road;**

- Ancillary works including boundary treatments, landscaping, SuDS drainage works, pedestrian infrastructure, bin/bicycle storage.

Site Statistics

Site Area	0.32 ha (gross), 0.31ha (net)
Number of Units	45
Total internal floor area	4,552m ²
Gross Density	140 dph
Net Density	145 dph
Maximum Height	5 storeys
Plot Ratio	1.42
Site Coverage	35.5% (stated)
Car Parking	20 spaces
Cycle Parking	99 spaces (breakdown provided)
Motorcycle Parking	3 spaces
Communal Open Space	348m ²
Public Open Space	none
Retail/Commercial Space	165m ²
Childcare Facility	none

Unit Mix	Number	%
One bed	15	33.3
Two-bed (four-person)	30	66.6
Total	45	100.0
Dual aspect (stated)	23	51.0

4.0 Zoning

- Z4 - 'to provide for and improve mixed services facilities'.
- Z1 – 'to protect, provide and improve residential amenities' (Nos. 16 and 18 Terenure Road West).
- There are no protected structures on the site.

5.0 Pre-Application Consultations

The application form states that no meetings were held.

However, two pre-application meetings were held, on 25 November 2024 and 11 June 2025.

6.0 Relevant and Recent Planning History

Subject Site

The site has an extensive planning history, with a number of applications relating to the existing car showroom use on the site, of which the more relevant are included below:

0238/97:	Permission granted for single storey extension to side of car showroom, associated signage and internal alterations at Rathdown Motors, 1-5 Templeogue Road.
3341/99:	Permission granted for extended forecourt area and demolition of dwelling at Nos. 1-7 Templeogue Road.
2815/02:	Permission granted for new single storey car showroom and car valeting bay and associated site works and demolition of existing single storey car valeting bay.
1533/03:	Permission refused for new two-storey car showroom and car valeting bay (floor area 401m ²) with associated site works and demolition of existing single storey car valeting bay at Rathdown Motors Ltd, 1 - 7 Templeogue Road. The decision to refuse permission was upheld by An Bord Pleanála on appeal.
2640/04:	Permission refused for retention of demolition of single storey shed and boundary wall to front of house for provision of two car parking spaces at 18 Terenure Road West.
3067/04:	Permission refused for retention of the change of use from existing dwelling to commercial offices at 18 Terenure Road West, due to residential zoning.
3892/08:	Permission granted for change of use from previously approved motor sales showroom (315m ²) approved under Reg. Ref. 2815/02, to a shop (site area 0.2098 ha) at Rathdown Motors, 1-7 Templeogue Road.

- SHDPAC0074/18:** Pre-application consultation re. a Strategic Housing Development with 102 BTR apartment units.
- SHDPAC0075/18:** Pre-application consultation re. a Strategic Housing Development with BTR apartments.
- PAC0274/18:** Pre-application consultation re. retail and residential development, with option of 3-5 storey block with residential at ground floor, up to 53 units in total, or a shared living scheme with student accommodation and retail in a three-to four-storey development.
- 4702/18:** Permission refused for development at 1-13 Templeogue Road and 2-6 Terenure Road West, comprising demolition of existing commercial buildings on site (c.538m²) currently used as a car dealership and the construction of a 'Build to Rent' residential apartment development, intended for use as a long-term rental housing scheme comprising of a six-storey building with a maximum height of 21m to accommodate 55 apartments consisting of 40 one-bedroomed and 15 two-bedroomed units with associated balconies, c.384m² of commercial development at ground floor level consisting of three commercial units and a café, c.98.8m² of residential shared amenity; underground parking facilities providing 37 parking spaces and two motorcycle spaces, ESB substation/service room at ground floor level, bicycle lock-up parking facilities providing 64 spaces, secure bin storage facility, a c.850.82m² internal courtyard and all ancillary works a site of 0.23 ha with primary vehicular access to be provided via Templeogue Road and pedestrian access via Terenure Road West. The decision to refuse permission was upheld by An Bord Pleanála on appeal.

Surrounding Area

- 0217/02: Permission granted to complete previously approved bungalow at No. 15 Templeogue Road (Reg. Ref. 1984/84).
- 1984/84: Permission granted for demolition of cottage at No. 15 Templeogue Road and erection of bungalow on site (extension of duration granted).

7.0 Relevant Enforcement History

E0120/00: Enforcement file re. garage extension, floodlights and carwash, tarmacadam to whole area. File closed.

8.0 Consultations

Internal Consultees:

- Drainage Division: Report received; no objection subject to conditions.
- Transportation Planning Division: Report received. Recommend Further Information.
- City Archaeologist: Report received; recommend seeking further information.

Prescribed Bodies

- Uisce Éireann: Submission received; conditions recommended.
- National Transport Authority (NTA): Submission received; recommend condition to be attached re. liaison with NTA.

9.0 Submissions/Observations /Representations

Forty-one (41) submissions were received. The main points relate to the following:

Scale/Density/Height

- Proposal represents overdevelopment of the site, which would significantly harm the established character of Terenure Village
- Scale, density and height are inappropriate to the size and context of the site and inconsistent with the prevailing low to medium rise character of Terenure village.
- Scale and height are inconsiderate and are highly inappropriate in the context of Terenure village which is characterised by predominantly two-storey dwellings and small scale buildings.

- Height is out of keeping with the area where most buildings are two or three-storey, and will result in overshadowing and detract from the character of the area, contrary to development plan policy SC8
- Proposed development is excessively high and dense, is too blocky and bulky and lacks architectural or cultural merit.
- A development of this bulk and massing on the edge of an established residential terrace represents a stark and overbearing departure from the prevailing streetscape.
- Proposal would visually dominate neighbouring homes and fundamentally alter the established character of this part of Terenure village.
- Terenure village is defined by modest building scales, human-friendly streetscapes and heritage architecture, all of which would be compromised by the proposed development.
- Massing, height and bulk will result in an overbearing impact on adjoining homes and on the public realm, contrary to development plan policy which requires infill and higher density development to respect the existing character and avoid an overly dominant impact on established residential areas.
- Combined height, site coverage and intensity of use will result in overdevelopment of this relatively constrained site, and will set an undesirable precedent for further intensification which will undermine the established scale of the village.
- Proposed density is in excess of the density set out in the development plan for suburban areas within established village cores, where protection of local character is a key objective, as set out in Policy SC25 and Objective QH22.
- An excessive number of apartments is proposed -excessive density will overwhelm existing infrastructure and services in the area.
- Pressure on local amenities and services will result in a reduced quality of life for residents.
- Recent permissions for apartments/houses could add 1800-plus residents to the area; however, it lacks the educational, medical and transport facilities to cater for these numbers and cannot sustain all of these developments together with the impact of Bus Connects.
- Reason for previous refusal of permission on the site in relation to scale, height, bulk and massing, visually intrusive and overbearing impact and failure to provide an adequate design response to the site would still apply.
- It appears to be planning policy for every available site in Terenure to be covered in apartments, with the number of developments becoming excessive. Some sites should be retained for other purposes.
- Proposals for enhanced height should demonstrate a sensitive transition in scale.
- Both Circle House and Loughmorne are in keeping with surrounding heights, and are stepped back from the public footpath.

Visual Impact/Heritage

- Terenure is a charming intact Victorian village which should be preserved and not subjected to a domineering, overbearing mass of buildings.
- Scale and visibility of proposed development on the most prominent site in the village.
- Bulky, block-like appearance is not in keeping with the surrounding areas and is overdevelopment of a small site.
- The village is currently characterised by predominantly two to three-storey buildings with a fine urban grain - proposal does not respond appropriately to this.
- Proposal will dominate the streetscape and materially alter the neighbourhood character.
- Proposal is not high quality design and fails to respect the existing context, scale and local character.
- Proposed development is ugly and bulky and is not in keeping with adjoining and nearby structures.
- Proposal is aesthetically unsuitable for a landmark village location.
- A scaled down, more aesthetically pleasing development would be more in keeping with this location.
- Reducing the block fronting Templeogue Road to three storeys would help to improve its visual impact.
- Scale, density and design will erode the distinctive identity of Terenure and its human scaled village centre.
- Proposal will erode the character, visual identity and human scale of Terenure and turn it into a generic, high-intensity urban node.

- Demolition of buildings will fundamentally alter the character of Terenure village and fails to respect its historical context and unique charm.
- Proposal does not provide an adequate transition in scale to Loughmorne House, will be out of keeping with the character of the area and will result in overlooking and overshadowing.
- Proposal provides for demolition of a historic building which was built in 1801 and replacement with a drab symmetrical building, contrary to conservation requirements.
- Proposal is incompatible with the low rise, aesthetically pleasing and historically and culturally relevant village of Terenure, and does not seek to preserve, restore or protect the remaining historical, cultural and aesthetic elements of the site (i.e. the Round House, which dates from 1801, the eighteenth century boundary walls of the old Olney Estate and the two existing houses at Nos. 16 & 18 Terenure Road West).
- Although Terenure is not currently an ACA, if permitted the proposal will set a negative precedent within the wider area, with a lack of sensitivity to its urban context and historic setting and no thought given to preserving the last remnant of the former Roundtown village comprising a circle of houses constructed in the early nineteenth century, which was deemed worthy of including in the Terenure Walking Trail published in 2002 by Dublin City Council.
- The house on the site dating from 1801, which was part of the circle of houses which gave the area the name of Roundtown, should not be demolished. This issue is not addressed in any of the submitted documentation.
- Note incorporation of original stone arches and building structure from the old tram depot into the recent Aldi development – a similar approach should be taken in the case of the house on this site.
- Proposal would dominate the village core and disrupt established rooflines and streetscape rhythm.
- Four-storey red brick building with additional setback storey in black is out of character with the streetscape and is not an acceptable finish in this strategically visible location.
- Refer to case of Rotunda Hospital extension where permission was refused due to visual impact.
- Refer to previous reasons for refusal relating to scale, height, bulk and massing, visually intrusive and overbearing impact and failure to provide an adequate design response to the corner.
- Design, articulation of facades and treatment of balconies will appear visually intrusive and insensitive to the established architectural character of the village.
- Repetitive balcony elements, materials and proportions do not read as a coherent extension of the existing streetscape, but introduce a discordant and bulky frontage.
- A high quality and context-sensitive design is required for prominent corners and village centre sites, with attention to scale, proportion and materials. Proposal does not achieve this, with balcony design exacerbating the perceived bulk and contributing to an overly dominant and visually obtrusive building.
- Proposal is an intrusion which is totally unsuitable and damaging to the historic urban village of Terenure.
- Proposal would diminish the historic streetscape which is a defining feature of Terenure village.
- The existing built heritage should be integrated into the proposed development, as has been done in other developments in the city.
- The site is a prominent corner site which is probably one of the most visible in Terenure, and can be seen from the approach along Terenure Road East in the context of existing heritage buildings at the crossroads. Perspective appears to have been used in the CGIs to reduce the scale of the proposal when viewed in the context of these buildings.
- The CGIs do not show the upward slope towards the site and portray it as being similar in height to the existing three-storey landmark building at the main crossroads.
- A CGI from Hannaville Park should be required.
- Contrast in scale, massing and design between the proposed development, the adjoining stone wall fronting Nos. 15 and 17 and the single storey cottages, two-storey houses and library on the opposite side of Templeogue Road.
- The boundary wall, which is a 3m high stone and brick wall which is the original boundary wall of the old Olney Estate, is a proposed protected structure with aesthetic, cultural and historical significance. This was previously damaged by construction of the car showroom on the site and construction of a shed, and is now proposed to be partly demolished.

- Proposal to build various elements in the eighteenth century boundary wall is illegal.
- The rear gardens of Nos. 16 and 18 Terenure Road West should be turned into allotments or a walled garden rather than car parking, which would be detrimental to biodiversity and would not allow for sustainable drainage on the site.
- Proposed development has no architectural or aesthetic merit.
- Terenure should be protected as one of the last intact Victorian or Edwardian villages in Dublin, which is increasingly visited by tourists.

Proposed Units/Amenity

- Lack of usable private outdoor space.
- The garden/play area between the blocks would be permanently in shadow.
- Lack of a set down area close to the entrance may result in falls or security risks to residents.

Housing Mix/Tenure

- Proposal is not in keeping with policies for sustainable housing and will not result in better homes, neighbourhoods or urban living.
- Proposal will not assist with downsizing for older residents or provide the necessary amenities for them to do so.
- Proposal seems to be aimed at 25-35 year olds with no account taken of people with mobility issues.
- The area needs 'rightsizing' accommodation with age-friendly, universal design features which support genuine intergenerational communities.
- The site would be ideal for older persons, who could access services in the village without requiring cars.
- A three-storey development for older persons, or assisted living, would be ideal on this site.
- The development should include three-bedroomed units.
- The site should be occupied by low rise back-to-back or terraced houses as part of a co-operative of owner occupied housing, with Part V units given to elderly people.
- Part V units should be fully integrated and tenure blind to ensure long term maintenance and community stability.

Impact on Residential Amenity

- As with the previous application, the drawings do not clearly show the impact on No. 15 Templeogue Road which is a bungalow in an organic garden adjoining the site. Only the landscaping plan refers to No. 15.
- The contextual drawings do not show No. 15 as residential.
- The applicant's planning report refers to the impact on No. 17, but refers to No. 15 only as a future development site.
- Proposal would deprive No. 15 of morning sunlight and create a wind tunnel between Nos. 13 and 17.
- Overbearing and overlooking impact due to the proximity of the proposed four- to five-storey and three-to four-storey structures to the boundary wall with No. 15 and a grey metal structure, twice the height of the boundary wall, the function of which is not clear.
- Balconies in southwest elevation would overlook the entire site of No. 15 in addition to the adjoining terrace and houses on Olney Crescent, resulting in loss of privacy and amenity.
- Health, safety and fire hazards due to proximity of balconies to the boundary and overpopulation of the site.
- A detailed construction environmental management plan should be submitted for agreement prior to commencement. This should include strict dust suppression measures for demolition works and a ban on HGVs queueing on Terenure Road West or Templeogue Road.
- Cumulative impact on immediate neighbours of construction activity, pressure on local infrastructure, pressure on on-street parking, noise and general disturbance.
- Proposal would result in overlooking and in overbearing impacts, in particular when viewed from Olney Crescent, Templeogue Road, Terenure Road West and Hannaville Park. This impact would increase relative to the previous application which was refused.
- Impact on No. 15 Templeogue Road, in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy, is more severe than the impact of the previous application.

- The applicants refer to the development potential of No. 15 Templeogue Road; however, this is not in their ownership.
- Loss of privacy and amenity to residents on Olney Crescent and Templeogue Road.
- Overlooking of adjoining rear gardens and rear facing windows
- Due to balcony position, floor level and proximity to site boundaries, the proposed balconies and terraces will have direct views into rear rooms and gardens.
- Proposal will result in overlooking and in a domineering effect.
- Loss of residential amenity by reason of overlooking, visual intrusion, light and noise pollution.
- Extent of loss of daylight - only 23 of 61 locations assessed meet the recommendation for VSC and the remainder cannot be classed as minor or negligible.
- Reduction in winter probable sunlight hours by 80% or more – four times the allowable reduction cannot be classed as minor.
- Dwellings assessed for loss of sunlight and daylight will also be impacted by overlooking.
- Nos. 18 and 20 Olney Crescent are stated as being beyond the zone of influence for sunlight and daylight impacts but this is not the case.
- Impact on rear extension to No. 18 Olney Crescent, which was specifically designed to maximise natural light.
- Overlooking and loss of privacy to No. 18 Olney Crescent from proposed windows and balconies.
- Overlooking by construction workers during construction phase.
- Overbearing impact on No. 18 Olney Crescent.

Traffic Issues

- The site is at the confluence of two major traffic arteries and a short distance from a junction with a third. Existing tailbacks will be exacerbated by the proposed 45-unit development with 75 bedrooms.
- Proposal will exacerbate traffic, parking and infrastructure problems in the area and would overload an already saturated road network.
- Proposal will increase vehicular and pedestrian traffic at this busy junction and create a safety hazard.
- Proposal will increase risks to pedestrians, cyclists and school children,
- Proposal would be contrary to development plan SM7 and other objectives which seek to reduce car use and promote sustainable transportation objectives.
- Proposal will result in further chaos to an already chaotic junction which is one of the busiest in the country.
- Additional congestion at western end of site from residential traffic, servicing and delivery vehicles, refuse collection etc.
- Location of proposed vehicular entrance so close to a busy junction and bus stops will exacerbate existing traffic problems and risks for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Proposed gated entrance on Templeogue Road will result in a traffic impediment with vehicles entering and exiting the site being required to cross the bus corridor.
- Proposal does not incorporate an increased setback to Templeogue Road to increase the width of the footpath, as recommended by the planning authority at the time of the previous application on the site.
- Impact of traffic exiting right from the site on proposed bus gate bar and remaining road area on Templeogue Road.
- Unclear whether a left turn ban would be enforced and whether it would be effective.
- Given BusConnects measures to reduce outbound traffic on Templeogue Road, it makes no sense to add additional traffic from this development, causing congestion on Terenure Place. It would make more sense to have left turns only in and out of the site.
- The traffic counts given in the traffic report are not consistent with the traffic volumes forecast for Bus Connects, with the morning peak being double that suggested.
- The traffic report is incorrect in stating that the A4 bus will pass the site.
- Excessive number of car parking spaces provided – given the location in an urban village close on a bus corridor, there should be no parking.
- Proposed service area on Terenure Road West is incompatible with recent school safety measures.
- Vehicles exiting the site onto Templeogue Road will not have a clear view of any pedestrians, which may include school children, coming from the village side and crossing the road.

- Proposal does not refer to Bus Connects which will divert normal traffic away from Templeogue Road. Additional pressure on the junction will result in Fergus Road and Rathdown becoming rat runs.
- Proposed service/loading bay on Terenure Road West is not feasible as the footpath is not wide enough. Proposed bay would seriously impact on safety for road users, including pedestrians and cyclists. The existing commercial units are stepped back from the footpath, which is not adequately shown on the drawings.
- Service vehicles seeking to access the bay from the KCR direction would have a significant impact on traffic, pedestrians and cyclists.
- Only 20 car parking spaces proposed for 45 apartments, which is insufficient to cater for the demand generated by the development.
- Failure to provide one car parking space per unit as required.
- Insufficient parking for the number of units will result in overspill parking (both legal and illegal), safety hazards and inconvenience for residents. Most of the surrounding residential streets are narrow and only allow parking on one side.
- Overspill parking will obstruct traffic circulation, reduce availability of on-street parking, potentially impede emergency and service vehicle access and result in unsafe informal parking near the junction.
- There is already a lack of visitor parking in the area.
- Hannaville Park is already used as a rat run despite three 'no entry' signs.
- Illegal parking on Hannaville Park by visitors to nearby commercial units.
- A car club scheme and residents' travel plan should be required.
- While the development plan promotes sustainable transport, it also requires developments not to cause unacceptable impacts by way of overspill parking.
- Unreasonable to assume that future residents will not own cars, given the limited public transport in the village.
- The additional traffic would worsen congestion, increase turning conflicts and create a serious safety risk for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians.
- Proposal would materially intensify traffic movements at a constrained junction and increase conflict between vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians, thus creating a significant risk to road safety.
- Proposal is contrary to traffic management and road safety objectives in the development plan, i.e. that new developments do not adversely impact on the safe and efficient operation of the road network.
- Note existing difficulty accessing driveways along Templeogue Road with the road often being gridlocked. There is unlikely to be a yellow box junction for a private residential development, as with the existing car showroom, so it is likely that cars will often be left blocking the footpath while trying to exit the site.
- Impact of further pressure on the loading/set down area on Terenure Road West, with obstruction of traffic and risks to pedestrians and cyclists.
- Extension in loading bay will result in traffic hazard.
- Note proximity to two schools and increased risk of accidents and congestion from additional traffic.
- Unclear whether the proposed archway can accommodate emergency vehicles.
- Additional retail units are not needed on the site and would add to the chaos.

Other/General

- Proposal does not comply with the current development plan or take cognisance of the three reasons for refusal in the case of the previous application on the site.
- Applicants do not appear to have considered the previous reasons for refusal by An Bord Pleanála - current proposal therefore appears to be legally frivolous or vexatious.
- Refer to previous objections and observations and to the inspector's report on the previous application.
- While the need for more housing in the area is recognised, the proposal is excessive and ignores issues such as the visual impact of the proposal, excessive traffic congestion in the village and the impact of BusConnects.
- A smaller development would be welcome on the site but the scale of the proposed development is inappropriate and would result in overdevelopment, which would be visually obtrusive and out of character with the location.
- Demolition of kitchen extensions to Nos. 16 and 18 would render these houses uninhabitable.

- Proposed retail units built flush with the footpath are unsustainable, would compete with existing retailers who are struggling to survive and result in traffic which would exacerbate vehicular chaos at this location.
- Proposal does not meet performance criteria set out in the current city development plan, including a failure to provide a transition in scale, contrary to the height criteria set out in Appendix 3, negatively impacting on the character of Terenure Road West which is a conservation area, contrary to Policy BHA9, inadequate car parking
- Loss of a local amenity to the area
- Demolition – the greenest building is the one which already exists
- Proposal will add nothing to the local community.
- Impact on local infrastructure, school places, health facilities etc.
- Existing primary schools are oversubscribed.
- Failure to widen footpath – increased footfall will result in a hazard to pedestrians.
- No planning or conservation gain, unlike in other recent large scale developments (Lidl and Aldi).
- There are 7,000 housing units proposed in the South Dublin County area west of Templeogue to cater for housing demand.
- Reference to Hannaville Road – should be Hannaville Park.
- Site notices are incorrectly dated (stating January 30th).
- Proximity of vehicular entrance archway to boundary could result in a fire hazard.
- Pressure on water and drainage in the area.
- Safety risk from collecting and emptying of large bins.
- Need for pest control during and after construction.

Support for Proposal

- Proposal will make a significant positive contribution to Terenure village. The site has deteriorated from having a mix of residential and small businesses in the 1960s to what is largely a tarmacadam car lot. The proposal will make good use of the site and restore a sense of urban living to this corner of the historic urban village of Terenure.
- Proposal is in keeping with policies for sustainable housing, compact growth and the 15-minute city, being within walking distance of all requirements for daily living and a considerable number of bus routes.
- Proposal appears proportionate, appropriate to its location and capable of integrating successfully with the surrounding neighbourhood.
- Proposal represents an appropriate response to its urban context.
- Proposal will help to support local businesses and economic activity.
- Proposal will help to create a socially inclusive neighbourhood, with a mix of housing and household types and tenures and a more balanced demographic profile.
- Proposal will broaden housing choice and providing opportunities for older residents to downsize, freeing up houses for young families.
- Proposal is an appropriate and sustainable form of urban development which will closely align with strategic objectives in relation to housing delivery, compact growth, sustainable neighbourhoods and transport-led developments.
- Proposal will make a meaningful contribution to housing supply, providing 36 (45) apartments in a central and well-served location.
- Proposal is consistent with development plan objectives of supporting increased residential development on underutilised and brownfield sites and promoting consolidation and intensification in appropriate suburban locations.
- Proposal is consistent with the planning authority's objectives to accommodate growth through sustainable, compact urban development.
- The site is in an established urban area with good access to both public transport and local services, allowing for sustainable travel patterns.
- The concerns regarding height, traffic parking and local character should be considered in the context of national and local policy to support intensification in accessible locations.
- Proposal will not have a noticeable impact on traffic, while contributing to the community in a way that through traffic does not.
- It is likely that future residents will rely less on private cars given the site's strong connectivity to public transport.

These submissions have been considered in the overall assessment of the proposed development.

10.0 Relevant Policies, Objectives and Standards Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028

Zoning: Z4 – ‘to provide for and improve mixed services facilities’.

Section 14.7.4 – Key Urban Villages and Urban Villages

Z1 – ‘to protect, provide and improve residential amenities’

Section 14.7.1 – Sustainable Urban Neighbourhoods

Section 14.6 - Transitional Zones

Policy BHA6 – Buildings on Historic Maps

Policy BHA11 – Rehabilitation and Reuse of Existing Older Buildings

Policy BHA24 – Reuse and Refurbishment of Historic Buildings

Appendix 3 – Density and Height

Table 2 – Indicative Plot Ratio and Site Coverage

Section 15.9 – Apartment Standards

Section 15.5.2 – Infill Development

Section 15.9.1 – Unit Mix

Section 15.9.2 - Unit Size/Layout

Section 15.9.3 – Dual Aspect

Section 15.9.4 – Floor- to Ceiling Height

Section 15.9.5 – Lift/Stair Cores and Entrance Lobbies

Section 15.9.6 – Internal Storage

Section 15.9.7 – Private amenity space

Section 15.9.8 –Communal amenity space

Section 15.9.11 – Secure design

Section 15.9.13 – Refuse storage

Section 15.9.14 – Lifecycle reports

Section 15.9.14- Operational management and maintenance

Section 15.9.16.1 – Daylight and sunlight

Section 15.9.16 – Separation distances

Section 15.9.18 – Overlooking and overbearance

Section 15.8.6 - Public Open Space

Appendix 5 – Transport & Mobility: Technical Requirements

- Section 3.0 – Cycle Parking Standards
- Section 4.0 – Car Parking Standards.

Section 15.17.5 – Shopfronts and Signage

10.1 Relevant Government Guidelines

Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities, Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, (2024)

Planning Design Standards for Apartments, Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, (2025)

Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines for Planning Authorities, Department of Housing, Planning and Local Government, (2018)

11.0 Initial Planning Assessment

The following was noted on initial assessment:

Having reviewed the documentation submitted, including the submissions/observations received in relation to the proposed development, and inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional and national policies and guidance, it is considered that the main issues for assessment relate to:

- *Principle of Proposed Development / Compliance with Zoning*

- Compliance with Policy
- Compliance with Standards
- Compliance with Height Criteria
- Conservation and Built Heritage
- Impact on Visual And Residential Amenity
- Access, Movement and Parking

11.1 Principle of Proposed Development

The proposal is for redevelopment of the site, to include demolition of the existing buildings and construction of a part four and part five storey mixed-use block with frontage to Terenure Road West and Templeogue Road comprising 36 apartments (13 one-bedroomed & 23 two-bedroomed) and 165m² of commercial floor space and a three-storey residential block in the centre of the site comprising 9 apartments (2 one-bedroomed & 7 two-bedroomed).

The proposal also includes demolition of the party boundary wall and non-original single-storey rear returns to two existing houses at Nos. 16-18 Terenure Road West and provision of new party/boundary walls to the rear of these properties. The proposal includes balconies or terraces to all apartments and communal amenity space at surface level between the proposed blocks, provision of an ESB substation accessible via Terenure Road West, a service/loading bay and new footpath on Terenure Road West, surface level car parking (20 car spaces, 3 motorcycle spaces and one service bay) accessible via Templeogue Road and ancillary works including boundary treatments, landscaping, SuDS drainage works, pedestrian infrastructure and refuse and bicycle storage

Compliance with Zoning

Under the current Dublin City Development Plan (2022-28) the bulk of the site has zoning objective Z4– ‘to provide for and improve mixed services facilities’. Section 14.7.4 of the plan notes that such areas, comprising key urban villages and urban villages (formerly district centres) function to serve the needs of the surrounding catchment, providing a range of retail, commercial, cultural, social and community functions that are easily accessible by foot, bicycle or public transport, in line with the concept of the 15-minute city. Key urban villages form the top tier of centre outside the city centre, while urban villages are typically smaller in scale with a more localised role. The site is not situated in a key urban village.

Proposals for development within key urban villages and urban villages areas should be in accordance with the principles set out below in addition to complying with the land-use zoning:

- Mixed Use
- Density
- Transport
- Commercial/Retail
- Community and Social Services
- Employment
- Built Environment.

Proposals should ensure the creation of high-quality, mixed-use urban districts with a high quality public realm, distinct spatial identity and coherent urban structure of interconnected streets and child-friendly, accessible public spaces and urban parks. Development should also have regard to the existing urban form, scale and character and be consistent with the built heritage of the area.

The site is part of the urban village of Terenure, which occupies an extensive area around the forked junction and the adjacent crossroads and extends north along Terenure Road North. The Z4-zoned area has a range of retail and commercial units, including supermarkets and smaller retail units, pubs, restaurants, health centre and library, while there are schools and churches on Z15-zoned lands adjoining or adjacent to the village. The site is at the southwestern edge of the village and is bounded to the north and west by residential development.

The proposal provides for a retail/commercial unit (floor area 165m²) and 45 apartments in place of the existing car showroom and yard on the site. Both residential and retail use are permissible in principle within the Z4 zoning, with the preference being for more active non-residential uses at street level and residential above.

In the case of the larger block fronting Templeogue Road and Terenure Road West, the proposed retail/commercial unit occupies part of the ground floor level, including two bays in the curve facing the corner, two bays along Templeogue Road and a single bay on Terenure Road West, with own-door residential units and the vehicular entrance occupying the remaining frontage to Templeogue Road and a plant room and ESB substation at the remaining frontage to Terenure Road West. The rear block is fully residential.

The site also includes two existing semi-detached houses at Nos. 16 and 18 Terenure Road West, which are zoned Z1 – ‘to protect, provide and improve residential amenities’. The proposal includes demolition of the rear returns of the houses, retention of an area of private open space to the rear of each house and incorporation of the remaining rear garden areas into the proposed surface car parking area.

Section 14.6 of the development plan refers to transitional zones. It is important to avoid abrupt transitions in scale and use between zones. In contiguous transitional zoned areas it is necessary to avoid developments that would be detrimental to the amenities of the more environmentally sensitive zones. In zones abutting either residential areas or residential development in predominately mixed-use zones, particular attention must be paid to the use, scale, density and design of development proposals, and to landscaping and screening proposals, in order to protect adjacent residential amenities.

The site is bounded to the west and southwest by residential zoned lands on Terenure Road West and Templeogue Road. The site includes two two-storey houses, with Z1 zoning, on Terenure Road West and is bounded by an apartment block, which is also zoned Z1, further west. To the southwest the site is bounded by an existing single storey house on Templeogue Road, beyond which are two-storey terraced houses. The site faces Z4-zoned areas to the east and south. The Z4-zoned areas on the opposite side of Templeogue Road include a recently constructed two-storey mixed use development on part of the original circle around the junction, a terrace of three two-storey redbrick houses (at Nos. 4-8), and an existing two-storey house gabbling onto the main road at No. 10, adjoining Terenure Library. The site also faces Z1 and Z2 zoned areas on Terenure Road West.

While there is a preference for active uses such as retail at street level in Z4-zoned areas, with residential at upper floor levels, the site is considered to be in a transitional location, on the edge of the urban village and bounded on its western and northern sides by residential uses. It is considered that the proposal allows for an appropriate transition in use between the site and the adjoining residential areas, while retaining a commercial use on the corner. The proposal can therefore be considered in principle within the zoning, subject to compliance with the standards and policies set out in the development plan, and to having no undue adverse impact on the residential and visual amenities of the area. The transition in scale and height will be considered below.

Demolition of Buildings

It is proposed to demolish all existing buildings on the site, including the existing two-storey building, which is set back from the corner at first floor level to reflect the circular building line around the junction, with a glazed front extension at ground floor level, and the more recently constructed showroom in the western part of the site, adjacent to the boundary with No. 15 Templeogue Road.

The applicant's design statement notes that the site contains the last fragment of a circle of nineteenth century cottages that have their origins in the development of a village at Terenure and the inspiration for the name Roundtown, which was used for the village during the nineteenth century. Although much altered, the corner building on the site is the remains of an urban composition that formed a full circle of cottages built around a junction of roads leading to the city. There is no objection in principle to the proposed demolition of the modern car showroom building. The demolition of the corner building will be assessed below in the context of the impact on the built heritage of the area.

Site History

It is noted that there is a previous refusal of permission on the site, by the planning authority and by An Coimisiún Pleanála on appeal, for demolition of existing commercial buildings on the site and construction of a Build to Rent apartment development comprising a six-storey building (maximum height 21m) with 55 apartments, ground floor commercial space comprising three commercial units and a café, shared residential amenity spaces, 37 underground car parking spaces and ancillary facilities (see site history above). The reasons for refusal, which will need to be considered in the current application, were as follows:

- 1. Having regard to the unique characteristics of the prominent corner site, it is considered that the proposed development, by reason of its design, overall height, bulk, scale and mass, would fail to respond to the site context, would not contribute to a sense of place making, would be monolithic and would visually dominate and seriously injure the character of the streetscape. The proposed development would represent a visually discordant feature that would be detrimental to the character of this area. The proposed development would, therefore, contravene the provisions of the Development Plan and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*
- 2. Having regard to the design, scale, bulk, mass and overall height of the development in the context of its surroundings, it is considered that the proposed scheme would be overbearing when viewed from adjacent residential properties and would seriously injure the residential amenities of these properties through undue overbearing visual impact and failure to provide a transition in scale with existing development. As such, the proposed development would seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

11.2 Compliance with Policy

Density

The proposal provides for 45 residential units on a 0.32-hectare site, resulting in a density of 140 dwelling units per hectare (dph). The net site area is stated as being 0.31 hectares and the net density is therefore 145 dwellings per hectare. It is noted that this area would appear to include the two existing houses on the site at Nos. 16 and 18 Terenure Road West, which are within the site boundary but are not part of the proposed development.

Appendix 3 of the development plan sets out policies in relation to height and density. Section 1.0 of Appendix 3 notes that it is adopted planning policy at both national and regional level to promote compact growth and provide for increased density and height on underutilised lands within core urban areas in order to promote consolidation, prevent further sprawl and address climate change. It is recognised that increasing height and density can also bring challenges in terms of design and sustainability.

Section 2.0 of Appendix 3 states that the development plan aims to ensure consistency with the objectives of the National Planning Framework (NPF) and the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES) and accompanying Metropolitan Area Spatial Plan (MASP), in relation to urban consolidation and delivery of new homes and employment opportunities within existing settlements, including on brownfield lands, and with the Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines for Planning Authorities (December 2018) and the specific planning policy requirements (SPPRs) contained within these.

Section 3.2 of Appendix 3 states that appropriate densities are essential to ensure the efficient and effective use of land. It is important to make the best use of the city's limited land supply in order to meet the need for new homes, jobs and infrastructure required by the city's growing population. Table 1 sets out the density ranges which will be supported in different areas of the city. The net density range is 60-120 dph in outer suburban areas and 60-150 in key urban villages. Where proposed heights and densities significantly exceed than the prevailing context, the performance criteria set out in Table 3 apply.

While the subject site is not in a key urban village, it is in an urban village which includes many of the characteristics of key urban villages, including a range of shops, schools, sport and leisure facilities and other amenities, while also fronting a Bus Connects corridor.

The site is also considered to be situated in a city-urban neighbourhood as defined in the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines (2024) (referred to as

the Compact Settlement Guidelines). This category includes both compact medium density residential neighbourhoods around the city centre, which have evolved over time to include a greater range of land uses, and lands around existing or planned high-capacity public transport nodes or interchanges within the city and suburban area (stated as including locations within 500m walking distance of an existing or planned Bus Connects CBC stop). These are considered to be highly accessible urban locations with good access to employment, education and institutional uses and public transport. The Guidelines set out a net density range of 50 to 250 dwellings per hectare in such neighbourhoods in Dublin.

The proposed density is in keeping with the density range set out above. The proposal therefore complies with the policies set out in the development plan and in national guidance relating to the need for increased densities in urban locations adjacent to public transport. This is subject to a number of safeguards, including the need to comply with standards and the need to avoid any undue impact on the residential or visual amenities of the area and the need to comply with the height criteria set out in Appendix 3.

The applicant's covering submission considers that the site is representative of a city - urban neighbourhood as defined in the Compact Settlement Guidelines. It is stated that, having regard to the overarching focus on sustainable residential development and the creation of compact settlements which is the mandate of the Guidelines, the proposal has been appropriately designed on the basis of the following:

- Responds appropriately to its locational context in terms of scale, massing and architectural treatment, and provides an appropriate form of residential development that will represent a direct precedent for similar development within suburban Dublin.
- The location close to existing public transport routes will ensure good connectivity.
- Provides a range of housing types to accommodate for a mix of the population demographic. The variety of open space areas within the development will facilitate significant levels of interaction within the development.
- By reason of its location on an underutilised site, its density and layout will promote the efficient use of land and of energy, including in relation to transport, and thereby minimise greenhouse gas emissions.
- Provides for a high-quality development of purpose-built residential apartments.

Height

Section 3.1 of the development plan sets out the key factors that determine height, including key criteria which must be demonstrated in all proposals for increased scale and height. The general principle is to support increased height and higher density schemes in the city centre, SDRAs, key urban villages, areas close to high frequency public transport and some other areas (as identified) considered as suitable for increased intensity of development. The Guidelines note that general building heights of at least three to four storeys, coupled with appropriate density, in locations outside what is defined as city centre, including suburban areas, must be supported in principle at development plan level.

All schemes must have regard to the local prevailing context, particularly in lower-scaled areas of the city where broader consideration must be given to potential impacts such as overshadowing and overlooking, as well as the visual, functional, environmental and cumulative impacts of increased building height.

Key criteria which must be demonstrated in all proposals for increased scale and height include:

- Potential contribution to the development of new homes, economic growth and regeneration in line with the compact urban growth principles set out in the NPF and Project Ireland 2040.
- Proximity to high quality public transport connectivity, including key public transport interchanges or nodes.
- Proximity to a range of employment, services and facilities.
- Provision of adequate social and community infrastructure.
- Availability of good walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure.
- Appropriate mix of uses, housing typologies and tenures.
- Provision of high quality public open space and public amenities.
- The resilience of the location from a public access and egress perspective in the event of a major weather or emergency or other incidents.

- That the ecological and environmental sensitivities of the receiving environments have been adequately assessed and addressed.
- Appropriate design response that considers the characteristics of the site, any development constraints and prevailing character.
- Adequate infrastructural capacity.

Outside the canal ring, in the suburban areas of the city, in accordance with the guidelines, heights of three to four storeys will be promoted as the minimum, with greater heights considered on a case by case basis, having regard in particular to the prevailing site context and character, physical and social infrastructure capacity, public transport capacity and compliance with all of the performance criteria set out in Table 3. A design-led approach to optimise density and height is advocated, which should be based on an evaluation of the site's attributes, its surrounding context and capacity for growth and the most appropriate development form.

The proposal provides for a four-storey parapet height to Templeogue Road, with an additional setback storey. A three-storey building is proposed in the rear area of the site. While these heights can be considered in principle, factors to be considered include the impact on the character and surrounding context of the site, including adjacent historic buildings, the need to ensure placemaking and the need to provide an appropriate transition in scale between the proposed development and surrounding buildings.

As the proposed five-storey height is in excess of the prevailing two-to three-storey height in the vicinity, while there are also single storey buildings nearby, the proposal should be assessed against the criteria set out for assessment of proposal of increased height and density in Section 3.2 of the Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines (2018). These are as follows:

At the scale of the relevant city/town:

- The site is well served by public transport with high capacity, frequent service and good links to other modes of public transport.
- Proposals incorporating increased building height, including proposals within architecturally sensitive areas, should successfully integrate into/enhance the character and public realm of the area, having regard to topography, its cultural context, setting of key landmarks, protection of key views. Proposals shall undertake a landscape and visual assessment, by a suitably qualified practitioner such as a chartered landscape architect.
- On larger urban redevelopment sites, proposed developments should make a positive contribution to placemaking, incorporating new streets and public spaces, using massing and height to achieve the required densities but with sufficient variety in scale and form to respond to the scale of adjoining developments and create visual interest in the streetscape.

The site is situated in an urban village and is on a Bus Connects Core Bus Corridor (CBC) bus stop. The site is in an established urban village which has developed around main crossroads and extends southwest to the crossroads where the proposed development is located. An Architectural Design Statement has been submitted, together with photomontages showing how the proposal would integrate into its surroundings. The proposal provides an active frontage to the existing street network, including a retail/commercial unit and own-door residential units, with residential above. The extent to which the proposed development integrates visually into the surrounding area, impacts on the streetscape and adjacent historic buildings and contributes to placemaking and the public realm will be assessed below.

At the scale of district/neighbourhood/street:

- Proposal responds to its overall natural and built environment and makes a positive contribution to the urban neighbourhood and streetscape
- Proposal is not monolithic and avoids long, uninterrupted walls of building in the form of slab blocks with materials/building fabric well considered.
- Proposal enhances the urban design context for public spaces and key thoroughfares and inland waterway/marine frontage, enabling additional height in development form to be favourably considered in terms of enhancing a sense of scale and enclosure while being in line with the requirements of 'The Planning System and Flood Risk Management – Guidelines for Planning Authorities' (2009).

- Proposal makes a positive contribution to the improvement of legibility through the site or wider urban area within which the development is situated and integrates in a cohesive manner.
- The proposal positively contributes to the mix of uses and/ or building/ dwelling typologies available in the neighbourhood.

The proposal provides for a new corner building on a largely vacant site. The retail/commercial unit at street level is broken down into a number of shopfronts to reflect the existing mainly narrow grain of the urban village. The proposal provides for retail/commercial units at street level with apartments above. The design of the building reflects the curve of the original circle of cottages around the forked junction by providing a concave design at the corner, which also allows for an increased area of footpath on the corner.

At the scale of the site/building:

- Form, massing and height should be carefully modulated so as to maximise access to natural daylight, ventilation and views and minimise overshadowing and loss of light.
- Appropriate and reasonable regard should be taken of quantitative performance approaches to daylight provision outlined in the BRE Guidelines.
- Where a proposal may not be able to fully meet all the requirements of the daylight provisions above, this must be clearly identified and a rationale for any alternative, compensatory design solutions must be set out, in respect of which the planning authority should apply their discretion, having regard to local factors including site constraints and the balancing of that assessment against the desirability of achieving wider planning objectives, such as securing comprehensive urban regeneration and or an effective urban design and streetscape solution.

A Sunlight and Daylight Assessment has been provided which demonstrates how the proposal would comply with the provisions of the BRE Guidelines. This is considered in more detail below.

Specific Assessments

To support proposals at some or all of these scales, specific assessments may be required, including:

- An urban design statement including, as appropriate, impact on the historic built environment.
- Relevant environmental assessment requirements, including SEA, EIA, AA and Ecological Impact Assessment, as appropriate.

As the proposal is for a building with a maximum height of five storeys, on a brownfield site in an established urban village, other identified assessments are not considered to be required in this instance. The impact on the historic built environment will be assessed below. The site is a brownfield site accommodating a car sales yard and there do not appear to be any ecological implications as a result of the proposal. Screening for Appropriate Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out.

Section 15.5.2 of the development plan refers to infill development, defined as development of lands between or to the rear of existing buildings capable of being redeveloped. Infill sites are an integral part of the city's development due to the historic layout of streets and buildings. Infill development should complement the existing streetscape, providing for a new urban design quality to the area. It is particularly important that such development respects and enhances its context and is well integrated with its surroundings, ensuring a more coherent cityscape.

11.3 Compliance with Standards

Plot Ratio and Site Coverage

The proposal provides for a floor area of 4,552m² on a 0.32-hectare site, with a plot ratio of 1.42 which is within the indicative plot ratio of between 1.0 and 2.5 for suburban areas. Site coverage is c.35.5% which is below the indicative standard of 45 - 60%. Having regard to this, the proposal is not considered to comprise overdevelopment of the site.

Residential Standards

Section 15.9 of the development plan sets out standards for new apartments developments, and refers to the DHLGH guidelines 'Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments', which set out quantitative standards for apartment developments. These are now

superseded by the 'Planning Design Standards for Apartments: Guidelines for Planning Authorities', DHLGH (2025) (the 2025 Guidelines).

The proposal provides for 15 one-bedroomed and 30 two-bedroomed apartments. Two thirds of the apartments therefore have two bedrooms. Under the 2025 Guidelines, there is no minimum requirement for apartments more than one bedroom, unless specified in the city development plan following a Housing Need and Demand Analysis (HNDA). While a HNDA was carried out for the city, this did not identify a requirement for a revised mix of units in the Terenure area and there is no minimum requirement for units with more than one bedroom. In this regard the proposed mix of one and two-bedroomed apartments will allow for the provision of housing to smaller and medium sized households. This may include those wishing to downsize from larger homes in the surrounding area, thus ensuring that those homes become available to families. No information is provided in relation to the number of accessible units.

The proposed apartments have floor areas ranging from 49.1m² to 55m² (one-bedroomed) and 77.6m² to 97.6m² (two-bedroomed). These are all in excess of the minimum requirements of 45m² and 73m² respectively, as set out in the 2025 Guidelines. The majority of the units also have floor areas which are more than 10% in excess of the minimum requirement. Room sizes are in accordance with the requirements set out in the Guidelines. From examination of the drawings, all of the proposed units appear to be acceptable in respect of layout and the provision of a balance between living, dining, bedroom and ancillary spaces.

The proposed units also generally comply with minimum requirements for internal storage. There is a slight shortfall in the case of a number of the one-bedroomed units (2.9m² where 3m² is required). This is not considered significant, having regard to the overall floor area of the units, all of which exceed minimum requirements, thus allowing for the provision of additional storage within the units if required. It is noted that, in a number of cases, part of the storage requirement is met by bedroom wardrobes. This is only acceptable where the storage is additional to the normal provision of wardrobes, due to the need to provide adequate storage for bulky household items, outdoor clothing, sports equipment etc. As all floor areas exceed the minimum requirement, sufficient space would exist for the provision of internal storage additional to bedroom wardrobes.

The applicant's covering submission notes that the proposal provides for 51% dual aspect apartments, which exceeds the 25% minimum required under SPPR3 of the 2025 Guidelines. This is confirmed on examination of the drawings.

It is also stated that the proposed blocks are designed to ensure no directly opposing windows within the development. The design statement states that, where there are internal corners on apartment buildings, opaque glazed screens will be used to avoid the provision of views between balconies and windows of adjoining apartments.

All of the proposed units would have private open space. In the case of the own-door units fronting Templeogue Road, this is in the form of patios/terraces to the front of the units, separated from the public footpath by planted buffer zones. Ground floor units to the rear block also have external terraces. All upper floor units have balconies. Balconies and terraces range in area from 5m² to 28.6m² in the case of the one-bedroomed units and from 7m² to 70.6m² in the case of the two-bedroomed units. All of the proposed balconies meet or exceed the minimum requirements of 5m² and 7m² for the respective unit types.

The proposal provides for 15 one-bedroomed and 30 two-bedroomed four person apartments. A minimum of 285m² of communal open space would therefore be required (i.e. 75m² for the one-bedroomed apartments and 210m² for the two-bedroomed units). A 306.1m² area of communal open space is shown in the centre of the site, with an additional 41.9m² area in the northwestern corner, providing for a total of 348m² which exceeds the minimum requirement.

A Daylight and Sunlight Assessment has been submitted which includes an assessment of daylight and sunlight within the proposed development. It is stated that the proposed units have been designed to be in keeping with the recommendations of the BRE guidelines (2022), and that a number of design iterations were conducted to improve daylight and sunlight within the proposed development. It is noted that the guidelines clearly state that the targets are recommendations only and that flexibility is required when setting and interpreting the targets.

The BRE guidelines (2022) recommend assessment methods set out in BS EN 17037 for daylight provision. All of the living, dining, kitchen and bedroom spaces within the proposed development achieve the target values set out in BS EN 17037:2018+A1:2021 Table NA1, which are the minimum values to be achieved in habitable rooms in accordance with the recommendations of the 2022 guidelines. In relation to sunlight, 88.9% of units meet the minimum recommended 1.5 direct sunlight hours, which is in line with the BRE guideline that four in five units achieve the target sunlight hours.

The assessment also demonstrates that, at the time of the spring equinox, the private amenity spaces to Nos. 16 and 18 Terenure Road West will continue to receive two hours of sunlight over 50% of the required area, thus meeting the recommended standard under the BRE guidelines. The communal amenity space would achieve two hours of sunlight over 34.5% of the area which is below the 50% requirement. In this regard the assessment notes that the space is c.19% larger than the minimum area required.

Overall, the proposed apartments are considered to provide for an acceptable standard of amenity to future residents.

Public Open Space

No details have been provided in relation to provision of public open space as part of the proposed development. Section 15.8.6 of the development plan notes that all residential development is required to provide for public open space, defined as external landscaped open space which makes a contribution to the public domain and is accessible to the public and local community. In areas zoned Z1 and Z4 there is a requirement for 10% of the overall site area to be provided for this purpose. While this is normally required to be located on-site, in some instances it may be appropriate to seek a financial contribution towards its provision elsewhere in the vicinity, which may be used for the provision and enhancement of open space and landscape in the locality, as set out in the City Council Parks Programme.

In this instance, having regard to the shape of the site, the provision of public open space on-site may not be feasible. The applicant should be required to address this issue.

11.5 Impact on Visual Amenity (including conservation and built heritage)

Design and Layout

The proposal provides for a predominantly five-storey block, with the fifth floor (fourth storey) set back and a reduction in height to four storeys in the vicinity of the boundary with No. 15 Templeogue Road. The proposed block has frontage to Templeogue Road, to the corner and to Terenure Road West. A vehicular access to the is also provided at street level of the Templeogue Road elevation.

The block incorporates a curve in the area facing the corner, which references the curved design of the existing building on the site, which originally formed part of a circle of houses facing Terenure Place, the outline of which can still be seen in aerial views. The houses were constructed in the early nineteenth century, following the construction of Templeogue Road, and resulted in the area being referred to as Roundtown before its name was changed back to Terenure in the 1860s. The proposal maintains the curve which references the original buildings on the site.

A retail/commercial unit is proposed fronting the corner and extending for two bays along the elevation to Templeogue Road, with own-door residential units in the area further west. An ESB substation is situated further northwest along Terenure Road West. The proposal also provides for a three-storey block in the centre of the site, providing nine apartments.

The proposal provides for a red brick façade to Templeogue Road, with four-storey parapet height. Two glazed shopfronts with fascia signage shown as comprising individually lettering. The remaining frontage to Templeogue Road comprises the building entrance and a number of entrances to own-door units, set back behind low red brick plinth walls/planters with landscaping.

The impact of the proposed development in the context of its surroundings has been considered. The applicant's submission states that the proposed development responds to its surrounding by closing the vista from Terenure Road East and marking the western edge of the district centre/urban village. The proposal provides a transition between the existing two-storey residential

dwelling on Templeogue Road and Terenure Road West and the cluster of taller buildings at the village crossroads.

Shopfront Design

The proposal breaks down the elevation on Templeogue Road with provision of two vertical elements, each with a glazed shopfront at street level, a central building entrance and a number of own-door apartments. This avoids an unduly horizontal emphasis and helps to integrate the building into the village grain. The curved area on the corner also has two glazed shopfronts with signage at street level. There are two sets of stacked balconies projecting forward of the building line in the western area. The setback top floor level would have a metal clad finish.

The proposed shopfronts comprise glazing and metal fascias with signage comprising protruding metal lettering below downlighters. Section 15.7.5 of the development plan states that shopfront signage should be located at fascia level and, in the case of signage relating to commercial ground floor uses, be contained within the fascia board of the shopfront. Lettering should be either on the fascia, or consist of individually mounted solid letters mounted on the fascia and the size of the lettering used should be in proportion to the depth of the fascia board. Proposals for shopfronts and signage should also have regard to the contents of the Retail Design Manual (2012) and the planning authority's Shopfront Design Guide (2001).

The Shopfront Design Guide states that the design of a new shopfront should relate to the building of which it is part, and should relate to the upper floors in proportion, scale and alignment, while features of the building should be reflected in the design. The details of the fascia sign should complement the design of the shopfront, with signs comprising individually mounted or handpainted lettering generally being the most appropriate. Letter design should be simple and legible and any illumination should be discreet, consisting of concealed neon tubing or rear illumination of individual letters.

The design of the proposed shopfronts and associated signage is considered to be generally acceptable and in keeping with the provisions of the Shopfront Design Guide. Final details in relation to the signage can be agreed by condition in the event of permission being granted.

Conservation and Built Heritage

The height criteria set out in the development plan include the requirement for an assessment on the historic built environment in the area. This may include the buildings in the immediately surrounding area and on the site itself.

The site is at the southwestern edge of an established urban village, which includes a main crossroads in addition to the forked junction adjoining the site. The prevailing height around the main crossroads is three-storey. In this area there is a cohesive streetscape which includes the prominent bank building on the southeastern corner, which is a local landmark and is one of the few protected structures in the vicinity of the site. This building has a single storey element facing the junction and is two-storey behind this, with a central feature gable. This allows for an increased sense of space around the crossroads, while ensuring a sense of enclosures at the lower levels. On Terenure Road West and Templeogue Road to the west and southwest of the site, the prevailing height is two-storey, with some single storey cottages at Nos. 16-24 Templeogue Road adjoining Terenure Library, beyond which the village gives way to a more suburban character.

The proposal provides for a four-storey parapet height to Templeogue Road and Terenure Road West, with the top storey set back, and a three-storey building in the centre of the site. At the southwestern end, adjacent to the boundary with No. 15 Templeogue Road, the proposed building is four-storey without the additional setback storey. No. 15 is a single storey building, which is largely hidden behind the existing boundary wall. The terrace comprising Nos. 17-25 is two-storey and set back behind front gardens. The buildings opposite the site, on Templeogue Road and Terenure Road West, are generally two-storey. These include the modern replacement for the circular terrace of cottages facing the junction, which is a two-storey mixed use building set back from the junction, and an adjoining terrace of three two-storey red brick houses. Terenure Library is single storey at the elevation to Templeogue Road and there are single storey cottages beyond this. Loughmorne House, to the northwest of the site on Terenure Road West, is a predominantly three-storey apartment building with some additional floorspace at roof level. At Terenure Place and adjoining the crossroads the buildings are generally three-storey, with a narrow grain reflecting the evolution of the village on individual plots.

Computer generated images (CGIs) have been submitted which show the proposed development in the context of the surrounding area. The CGIs also show the outline of the proposed development for which permission was previously refused and the reduction in scale in the case of the current proposal. The submitted architectural design statement also includes bird's eye views showing how the proposal would integrate into its surroundings.

View 3 shows that the proposed development would be very prominent when viewed from the crossroads on the northeastern side of the junction in the context of the setting of the Bank of Ireland building on the southwestern corner and could be considered to be unduly blocky and not to integrate sufficiently into the existing streetscape. View 3 does not extend as far as No. 17 Templeogue Road and a CGI has not been provided showing how the proposed development would appear when standing directly in front of the site and looking west towards No. 17. This would be useful to demonstrate the extent of the transition in scale in this area where the urban village gives way to the Z1-zoned residential area.

View 5 shows the proposed development when viewed by persons travelling east along Templeogue Road. In this regard the proposal would result in an abrupt transition in scale from the terrace of two-storey houses to the southwest. A mix of windows and brick infill panels are shown in the west elevation, which ensure that an unduly blank elevation is avoided.

The proposed height has been reduced since the previous refusal of permission on the site, where the concerns included the failure to provide a transition in height. While the proposal provides for a reduced scale, with a four-storey parapet height, concerns remain in relation to the transition in scale and the impact of the proposal when viewed both from the crossroads and from Templeogue Road to the west. There are also concerns in relation to the scale of the proposed four-storey block when viewed from Terenure Place in the context of existing two-storey houses on the opposite side of Terenure Road West (View 8).

The applicant's submission notes that the concave elevation on the corner responds to the geometry of the site and to the original pattern of development around the crossroads, reflecting the line of the existing building and the circle of cottages which dated from 1801, thus enhancing the architectural identity of the scheme and reinforcing a sense of place. The concave elevation in front of the proposed retail/commercial unit also allows for an increased area of public realm in front of an active use which will animate the corner and contribute to placemaking.

While the integration of the curve on the site into the design is welcome, the proposal provides for demolition of a building which, although not a protected structure, dates from 1801 and is the last remaining structure from a circle of cottages which surrounded the forked junction in the nineteenth century, resulting in the area being known as Roundtown until the 1860s when it was renamed as Terenure. Although the remaining cottages no longer exist, the circular boundaries remain and can be seen from aerial views.

The applicant's design statement notes the above and states that, although much altered, the corner building on the site is the remains of an urban composition that formed a full circle of cottages built around a junction of roads leading to the city. It is stated that Circle Cottages were constructed by a local landowner in 1801, and were not symmetrical in their plan layout, as the subject site had two cottages while the southeastern segment had six. The remaining elements of these are the only element of the composition surviving apart from a curved boundary line located along Terenure West and Terenure Place, where a fragment of walling remains.

The report from the City Archaeologist notes that the site is not within a Zone of Archaeological Constraint for a Recorded Monument (RMP); however, the building proposed for demolition is clearly depicted on the Ordnance Survey 1st Edition map of 1847. In this regard development plan policy BHA6 is: 'That there will be a presumption against the demolition or substantial loss of any building or other structure which appears on historic maps up to and including the Ordnance Survey of Dublin City, 1847'.

The report notes that the proposal includes demolition of a historic building within the site. This curved structure in the eastern area of the site comprises the last remaining building associated with a circular development built in 1801, which is thought to have provided the inspiration for the name 'Roundtown'. The building is clearly depicted on the Ordnance Survey 1st Edition map of 1847. The demolition of the building is raised as a concern in several third-party submissions, including one from an Associate Professor in Architectural History, UCD, which notes that the

building was deemed to be of sufficient significance to be included in Terenure Walking Trails (published by Dublin City Council in 2022).

The report notes that the retention and reuse of buildings of heritage interest add to the streetscape and sense of place and have a role in the sustainable development of the city. Section 11.5.3 of the development plan states that there 'will be a presumption against demolition of individual structures of vernacular or historic/social interest that contribute to the character of an area.' It is noted that the application provides insufficient information in relation to the heritage of the site, that a justification has not been provided to support the demolition of the historic structure and that mitigation measures are insufficient to record the building. Further information would be required relating to the redesign of the proposed development to provide for reuse of the 19th century building based on a detailed survey.

Having regard to the age of the building, its appearance on historic maps and its significance in terms of the history and urban design of Terenure Village, it is considered that the applicant should be requested to reconsider the design of the proposed development with a view to retaining the existing building and incorporating it into the proposed development.

11.6 Impact on Residential Amenity

Daylight and Sunlight

The submitted Daylight and Sunlight Assessment include details of the impact of the proposal in terms of daylight and sunlight to neighbouring buildings and sunlight to neighbouring amenity spaces, in addition to sunlight and daylight to the proposed development and sunlight to proposed amenity spaces. A shadow study is included.

The assessment states that the BRE guidelines (2022) deal with daylight and sunlight to neighbouring buildings and defers to BS EN17037:2018+A1:2021 for daylight and sunlight within the proposed development. The 2022 guidelines present a discussion on aspects of daylight and sunlight and interpreting the results of these assessments. BS EN17037:2018 does not set out any guidance for assessing the impact to daylight and sunlight from a proposed development on neighbouring buildings, nor is there any Irish government guidance on interpreting results and percentages of units to achieve target results in multi-unit developments.

In relation to daylight to neighbouring buildings, the assessment notes the mix of commercial, residential and community uses facing the site. Any existing windows impacted currently face a car park and the existing low rise buildings on the site, and therefore have virtually no obstruction to the sky and have high levels of VSC (Visual Sky Component) in their existing condition. The assessment considers the impact on existing two-storey houses on the northern side of Terenure Road West (Nos. 3, 5 and 7), rear windows in Nos. 17, 19 and 21 Templeogue Road to the southwest of the site and Nos. 4-10 Templeogue Road and Terenure Library (all facing the site, including No. 10 which is a former forge building gabling onto Templeogue Road). In the case of windows to Nos. 4-8 the proposal would result in a reduction, stated as minor, to between 56.5% and 64.6% of their former value. In the case of No. 10 there is a reduction to below 0.27 and between 61.4% and 76.6% of their former value. One window to Terenure Library is assessed and this meets the criteria. The assessment notes that these windows currently enjoy high levels of daylight due to the existing open aspect of the site, where any development would result in an impact.

In the case of the existing two-storey block of shops at Nos. 8a to 14a Terenure Road West, it is noted that this building is mainly commercial in use; however, the first floor has the potential to be in residential use and rear windows have therefore been assessed. In all cases, daylight to these windows is reduced to below 0.27 and below 80% of its former value (between 53.4% and 70.9%). This is stated as being a minor reduction and the existing open aspect is noted. No. 16, which is within the site, is also assessed and is concluded as experiencing a negligible or minor impact.

It is stated that there is a minor to negligible reduction to the existing windows, with most retaining a VSC above 20%. It is also stated that any new development, no matter how modest in height, will result in a reduction in VSC levels; however, the resulting levels are in line with emerging trends for urban locations and the proposed development meets the recommendations for daylight in the BRE guidelines BR209:2022 (3rd edition).

In relation to sunlight, the site location on the southwestern side of an existing forked junction helps to minimise overshadowing of any immediately adjoining residential buildings and ensures that there is unlikely to be a significant impact on sunlight to existing dwellings on Templeogue Road and Olney Crescent/Grove to the south of the site; however, the impact on existing dwellings on the northern and southern sides of Terenure Road West, on first floor residential accommodation on Terenure Place and on existing dwellings on the eastern side of Templeogue Road needs to be considered. The impact of the proposed rear block on the development potential of the existing two-storey block of shops on the southern side of Terenure Road West, which is surrounded by the site on three sides, also needs to be considered.

The assessment of APSH (Annual Probable Sunlight Hours) and WPSH (Winter Probable Sunlight Hours) concludes that sunlight to Nos. 3, 5 and 7 Terenure Road West would continue to meet the criteria in all cases. In the case of Nos. 8a to 14a, all windows would continue to meet the criteria for APSH; however, three windows adjacent to the proposed rear block would fail to meet the criteria for WPSH. It is stated that these currently enjoy an open aspect and that the proposal is in line with emerging trends for urban locations. All windows to No. 16 Terenure Road West would continue to meet the criteria. All private amenity spaces assessed also met the requirement of two hours of sunlight over 50% of the space at the time of the spring equinox.

It is concluded that there will be a minor to negligible reduction in sunlight in neighbouring dwellings and a negligible reduction to neighbouring amenity spaces. The proposed development meets the recommendations for sunlight in the BRE guidelines BR209:2022..

The assessment includes shadow diagrams which show that there would be an increase in overshadowing of the rear of the existing block on Terenure Road West (Nos. 8a – 14a) at certain times of the year, including during mornings in spring and mornings, afternoons and evenings in summer. The front garden of No. 4 Templeogue Road would experience an increase in overshadowing during evenings in spring.

Having regard to the above, there are some concerns in relation to the conclusions of the Sunlight and Daylight Assessment. Notwithstanding the conclusions that most of the reductions would be minor or negligible, a significant proportion of the windows assessed would experience a reduction in daylight to below 0.27 and below 80% of their former value (between 53.4% and 70.9%). These reductions should be not considered to be minor and the applicant would be required to reconsider the proposed design with a view to improving daylight provision, in particular to Nos. 4-10 Templeogue Road and Nos. 8a to 14a Terenure Road West, and also reducing the overshadowing impact to Nos. 8a to 14a to the north and No. 4 Templeogue Road to the east of the site.

Overlooking

In the case of the previous refusal of permission on the site, the An Coimisiún Pleanála inspector's report referred to the issue of overlooking of No. 15 from balconies to the proposed development, stating that the number of balconies on the corner of the building would give rise to significant overlooking and a detrimental impact on the established amenity of this dwelling and also those adjacent. There were also concerns in relation to the commercial units to the north west of the site fronting onto Terenure Road West (Nos. 8a to 14a) which appeared to have an element of residential use, with the proposal considered to have an undue impact in terms of overlooking and overbearing impact.

In the case of the current proposal, there are no balconies in the area of the front block closest to the boundary with No. 15, with balconies to the southwestern units being to the front of the building. Windows in the rear elevation of the front block would face northwest, ensuring no direct overlooking rear gardens to houses on Templeogue Road. Balconies further along this elevation would face the rear block, as would windows. Some windows and balconies would also face the rear of the existing two-storey block at No. 8a- 14a Terenure Road West, with minimum separation distances of c.11m between the balcony edges of Unit A-107 and the boundary and c.3m beyond this. Having regard to the relative sizes of the two sites, the proposed separation distance could not be mirrored on the opposite side of the boundary. In the case of the side of the balcony to Unit A-108 the separation distance would be c.4m to the boundary. While any overlooking would be indirect, adequate screening should be provided to the balconies to minimise any such overlooking.

A separation of less than 2m is provided between the proposed rear block and the building at No. 8a-14a, allowing for an overall separation of 6.1m between the proposed new three-storey block and the rear of the existing block. No windows are shown in the north elevation of the rear block above first floor level; however, balcony edges should be screened to mitigate any indirect overlooking.

The proposed rear block includes west facing balconies. It is noted that the existing single storey dwelling at No. 15 Templeogue Road has a large triangular garden to the rear. The closest balconies to this garden would be those to units B-103 and above in the southwestern corner of the rear block. The balconies would be situated at an angle to the garden, while the sides would face the area above the single storey dwelling, with a separation distance of c.9m. Screening should be provided to ensure that no indirect overlooking or perceived overlooking of this dwelling or its regard garden would occur. The distance from rear gardens at Olney Crescent (minimum c.19m from the boundary) appears to be sufficient to preclude any overlooking.

The site includes two existing semi-detached houses at Nos. 16 and 18 Terenure Road West, No works are proposed to these houses; however, the existing long rear gardens would be incorporated into the proposed development to provide surface car parking. Private open space of 52m² and 60m² would remain to Nos. 16 and 18 respectively. This is sufficient in both cases to comply with the minimum rear garden size requirement for a house with four or more bedrooms, as set out in the Compact Settlement Guidelines (2024).

11.7 Access, Movement and Parking

The proposal provides for 20 car parking spaces and three motorcycle spaces, with vehicular access from Templeogue Road. Bicycle parking is also provided. Third parties have raised concerns including the following: increase in traffic congestion adjacent to two busy junctions in Terenure village; conflict with Bus Connects; need for traffic to cross over a busy road adjacent to a junction to access and egress the site; hazard to pedestrians including schoolchildren and conflict with school safety measures; insufficient car parking resulting in overspill parking, both legal and illegal; impact of servicing and refuse collection adjacent to the junction; need for a construction traffic management plan and need for more mobility management measures to reduce reliance on private cars. A number of submissions also state that there should be no car parking to reduce the impact on traffic congestion and ensure use of sustainable transport modes.

The submission from the National Transport Authority (NTA) states that the proposed development requires to be carefully considered as the potential exists for both the development and Core Bus Corridor (CBC) projects to be significantly compromised in advance of and during the construction phase. In the event of a grant of permission, the NTA recommend a condition be attached requiring ongoing consultation in relation to this.

The report from the Transportation Planning Division (TPD) notes that the site interfaces with the permitted Tallaght to Terenure Bus Connects route, which travels along Templeogue Road and includes a bus gate at the northeastern end of Templeogue Road adjacent to the site, which will restrict northbound movements during peak hours to buses, cyclists, taxis and other authorised vehicles, with a 30 kmph speed limit. The plan also provides a southbound cycle track and new bus stops beside the site. One-way arrangements and revised turning movements are also proposed. The planned Terenure to Kimmage Active Travel route will travel along Terenure Road West.

The report notes the previous refusal of permission on the site by the planning authority and An Coimisiún Pleanála. While that proposal was considered to provide for improved access arrangements relative to those existing, TPD had concerns regarding the implications of the draft Bus Connects proposals, and the limited car parking proposed, which could result in overspill parking on the surrounding road network. A comprehensive car parking strategy and further clarification in relation to servicing arrangements and emergency access were required by TPD. An increased setback from Templeogue Road was also recommended to allow for a wider footpath.

The report notes the site history, the observations received and the submission from the National Transportation Authority (NTA). The site is currently occupied by a car sales showroom, with a substantial surface yard used for the display and storage of vehicles for sale and servicing. There are two existing vehicular entrances onto Templeogue Road and a further entrance onto Terenure Road West, and the nature of the current commercial use generates a significant volume of daily

traffic movements. A bus stop and loading bay are located immediately adjacent to the northern boundary of the site.

The proposal rationalises the existing access arrangements by replacing multiple entrance points with a single vehicular access from Templeogue Road. The proposed undercroft access with vertical clearance of 3.2m proposed is considered acceptable by TPD. The vehicular entrance would be secured by a gate, while pedestrian access would be segregated via a dedicated pedestrian gate on Templeogue Road. The overall access layout is considered acceptable.

The drawings show that vehicular movements will be restricted to right turns only following implementation of the Bus Connects scheme. The observation from the NTA states that there is no objection to the proposal; however, continued engagement between the applicant and the NTA will be required to ensure co-ordinated delivery of the scheme and the CBC.

An internal access road of approximately 5.5m in width is also proposed, which will allow for vehicle and cyclist movements to the on-site parking area, while a pedestrian route will provide a direct route towards both residential blocks from Templeogue Road. A Traffic and Transportation Assessment (TTA) has been submitted.

TPD note the site location in development plan car parking area 2, where Table 2 of Appendix 5 sets out a maximum provision of one space per dwelling. The proposed 20 spaces equate to a parking ratio of 0.42. No dedicated car parking is proposed for the commercial unit, which is considered appropriate given the location and scale of the unit.

While TPD acknowledges the concerns in relation to the adequacy of parking provision and potential overspill onto the surrounding road network, it is noted that reduced parking provision may be acceptable in highly accessible locations in accordance with Section 4 of Appendix 5. The site is located on a CBC, served by high-frequency A-Spine routes with peak service intervals of approximately 12 minutes and off-peak intervals of approximately 15 minutes. It is stated that the applicant has addressed the criteria set out under Section 4 in the TTA and that, given the infill nature of the site, proximity to high-quality public transport and availability of local services within walking distance, the proposed parking ratio is acceptable in principle. The applicant would be required to prepare a Mobility Management Plan outlining the long-term car-parking management strategy, including assignment, operation and ongoing management by the management company. It is also recommended that one car parking space be allocated to car share.

In accordance with Table 1.0 of Appendix 5, the proposal would require 75 long term and 23 short stay cycle spaces. 74 long term spaces, two cargo bike spaces, 22 visitor spaces and one visitor cargo bike space are proposed. For the commercial unit, one long stay space is required per five staff members and one short stay space per 100m² gfa. No details have been provided in relation to staff numbers for the unit. In this regard it is recognised that, at this stage of the application process, the proposed use or occupier of the unit has not been finalised and it is therefore unlikely that staff numbers will be known; however, a location should be identified for staff cycle parking based on estimated numbers.

The report also notes the submitted Traffic and Transport Assessment (TTA), which includes details of a traffic survey undertaken in November 2024 at the signalised junction between Terenure Road West and Templeogue Road, and also estimates traffic generated by the proposed development. Capacity analysis shows that all turning movements will operate significantly below the accepted maximum RFC threshold, that the most heavily loaded movement will utilise only 2% of available capacity and that no queuing will occur onto Templeogue Road. The proposed access can therefore accommodate the forecast development traffic efficiently and without adverse impact on the surrounding road network.

Having regard to the accessible location with regard to public transport, and the reduced on-site car parking and rationalised vehicular access arrangement as a result of the proposed development, TPD concur that the proposal would not give rise to significant traffic impacts on the surrounding road network. The dedicated set-down/loading bay proposed along Terenure Road West is welcomed as, while there is an existing bus stop/loading bay, the provision of a dedicated servicing bay is considered beneficial for the servicing of both the application site and surrounding area.

An Operational Waste Management Plan has been submitted, which includes swept path analysis showing that refuse collection vehicles can access the loading bay on Terenure Road West. The location of the proposed residential and retail waste storage areas, internal staging area and collection point are all considered acceptable.

Clarification would be required in relation to discrepancies in the drawings in relation to the location of the proposed fire hydrant, and to emergency access arrangements, including fire tender access, which have not been submitted. A drawing has been submitted delineating areas proposed to be taken in charge. These are acceptable to TPD subject to works and materials being to Dublin City Council taken in charge standards. A Construction Management Plan has not been submitted; however, can be required by condition in the event of permission being granted.

Overall the report recommends that further information be requested. This is considered reasonable, having regard to the nature of the concerns raised.

12.0 Screening for Appropriate Assessment

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, and the distance to the nearest European site, it is considered that significant effects are not likely to arise, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects that will result in significant effects to any Natura 2000 area. A full Appropriate Assessment of this project is therefore not required.

13.0 Environmental Impact Assessment

The proposed development is sub-threshold for EIAR. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and the distance of the site from nearby sensitive receptors, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

14.0 Conclusion

The proposal for 45 apartments and a retail/commercial unit, with a net density of 145 dwellings per hectare, can be considered in principle on this mainly Z4-zoned site in a transitional location at the edge of the urban village of Terenure. There are some concerns in relation to the proposed demolition of a building on the site which dates from 1801 and, although not a protected structure, is the last survivor of the circle of cottages which previously surrounded the forked junction and makes an important contribution to the character and sense of place within the village. Although the applicant has incorporated a curved element into the building in recognition of this, having regard to the history of the site consideration should also be given to incorporating the existing building, or elements of the building, into the proposed new development. Further information would be required in relation to this.

There are also concerns that, having regard to its location on the edge of the urban village, the proposed development does not sufficiently integrate into the village or provide an appropriate transition in scale to the terrace of two-storey houses at Nos. 17-23 Templeogue Road or the redbrick terrace at Nos. 4-8 Templeogue Road opposite the site. There are also concerns regarding the conclusions of the submitted Sunlight and Daylight Assessment. Notwithstanding the statement that any impacts would be minor or negligible, the results in some case fall significantly below the recommended levels set out in the BRE Guidelines, with loss of both sunlight and daylight to existing houses on the opposite side of Templeogue Road at Nos. 4-10, and loss of sunlight to rear windows in the existing two-storey block at Nos. 8a – 14a Terenure Road West as a result of the proposed rear block. A reduction in the scale of the proposed development would be required to address these issues. Details of screening to balcony edges to mitigate overlooking would also be required.

The applicant would also be required to demonstrate how the proposal will provide for public open space in accordance with the 10% requirement set out in Section 15.8.6 of the development plan. Transportation Planning also have concerns in relation to mobility management, discrepancies in the drawings and the need for tactile paving and pedestrian crossings within the internal road network and provision of cycle parking for the retail/commercial unit.

15.0 Recommendation

It is recommended that further information be sought

FURTHER INFORMATION REPORT

Further information was sought and has now been submitted. The further information submitted includes a covering submission, detailed design response document, updated Architectural Design Statement, Historic Building Survey, Traffic, Transport and Mobility Report, revised drawings, an updated accommodation schedule, amended site plan and amended verified views.

For clarity, the proposed floor area is now 4,358m², the proposed plot ratio is 1.38 and the proposed site coverage is 35%. The number of apartments is reduced from 45 to 43. Block A now comprises 34 apartments, of which 12 are one-bedroomed and 22 are two-bedroomed. Block B comprises nine apartments, of which two are one-bedroomed and seven are two-bedroomed. The proposed commercial unit has a floor area of 164.5m².

Significant Further Information

The submission has not been deemed to constitute significant further information in accordance with Article 35 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended.

Interdepartmental Reports

Drainage:	No further report received.
Transportation Planning:	Report received; no objection subject to conditions.
Conservation:	Report received; recommend refusal of permission.
Archaeology:	Report received; recommend refusal of permission.

Prescribed Bodies

Uisce Eireann:	No further submissions received.
National Transport Authority:	No further submissions received.

Assessment of Further Information Response

The response to the further information request, contained in the applicant's covering submission and supporting documentation, is set out below, followed by the assessment of the planning authority, including, where relevant, the Conservation, Archaeology and Transportation Planning Divisions.

1. *Having regard to Policy BHA6 (Buildings on Historic Maps) of the current Dublin City Development Plan (2022-2028) which is 'That there will be a presumption against the demolition or substantial loss of any building or other structure which appears on historic maps up to and including the Ordnance Survey of Dublin City, 1847' and Section 11.5.3 which states that there 'will be a presumption against demolition of individual structures of vernacular or historic/social interest that contribute to the character of an area' the applicant is requested to submit the following:*
 - a) *The applicant is requested to submit an Historic Building Survey of the existing building on the site (i.e. the 'Roundtown' building) by a suitably qualified and experienced archaeologist, architectural historian, conservation architect or other built heritage professional. This survey should include a detailed written, drawn and photographic record of all upstanding structures (Level 3 specification of Historic England's Understanding Historic Buildings, 2016) supplemented and cross referenced with an analysis of primary and secondary documentary sources to determine a statement of significance and mitigation proposals.*
 - b) *The applicant is requested to re-examine the design of the proposed development in the light of the above, with a view to retaining the historic 'Roundtown' building and incorporating it into the proposed development in accordance with Policy BHA6.*

Response and Assessment

In response to the above, the applicant's covering submission notes that a Historic Building Survey has been submitted, prepared by a Grade 1 Conservation Architect, which includes a detailed written, drawn and photographic record of the existing building in accordance with (a) above. The report includes a brief historical background, condition survey, detailed description, photographic record, statement of significance and impact assessment.

The report sets out the site history and context, noting that the original circle of cottages around the junction was constructed in 1801, and is clearly visible on maps dating from 1836 (where the village is referred to as Roundtown), 1879 and 1907. A photograph showing part of the original

circle on the northern side of the junction in the 1960s is also included. Aerial views show that the circular form of the site boundary on the northern side of the junction still exists. It is stated that the none of the circle remains on the eastern side (where the two-storey replacement building is set back from the junction in an L-shape rather than a circle).

The existing building is a two-storey pitched roof building dating from 1801. The single storey extension to the front, which is used as a car showroom, dates from the early twentieth century. There is also a two-storey extension to the rear. The building has a rendered finish facing Terenure Road West and an exposed masonry finish at the elevation to Templeogue Road. The fenestration has been significantly altered at ground floor level. Although the building has been altered internally, some original or historic features survive, including ceilings with decorative cornices and ceiling roses, some internal doors, panelled timber surrounds, shutters and the central cut-string stairs.

It is stated that the original building is a modest two-storey cottage built in a traditional manner with solid load bearing masonry walls, suspended timber upper floor and cut timber pitched roof. The building has been altered and extended in at least three separate phases since its construction. The curved form indicates its history as one of the original 'Roundtown' cottages developed at the junction of Terenure Road and Templeogue Road by Baronet Robert Shaw at the start of the nineteenth century, and is of historical interest; however, although the original form is still evident, the curve is somewhat obscured by the later additions to the front and rear. The early twentieth century shopfront extension is well proportioned, but is not of any great heritage significance. At first floor level, the layout of the original rooms is still evident and some decorative features are retained, including the original early nineteenth century window surrounds and shutters to the hall window.

The report concludes that, although the existing building is of some architectural and historic interest as the remaining fragment of the circle of cottages which gave the village of Terenure the name 'Roundtown' for a short period of its history, it is modest in scale and in terms of its original decorative features, and has been substantially altered and extended over its history, resulting in loss of character. Interventions which have occurred to the original fabric include replacement of the original roof covering, replacement of original windows, significant alteration and removal of original fabric on the front façade, substantial removal of the original render and substantial alteration of the ground floor layout.

It is stated that the extent of revisions which have occurred have resulted in the building not being granted protected status and not being referenced on the NIAH. In the case of the previous refusal of permission on the site (Reg. Ref. 4702/18) the An Coimisiun Pleanála inspector's report stated that later interventions and modifications had resulted in a significant loss of historic fabric, that it would be arbitrary to require the preservation of the historic building for the sake of conservation, and that there was sufficient rationale to justify the removal of the existing building to allow for the construction of a modern mixed-use development. The inspector did consider that, in order to acknowledge the heritage of the site and the landmark location, and in the interests of placemaking, the concave form and building elements, or other acknowledgement of the significance of the heritage of the site, should be incorporated into any redesign. The applicant's submission states that the concave form has been incorporated into the proposal in the area facing the junction, and that this is considered to represent an appropriate acknowledgement of the site's heritage, while presenting a high standard of contemporary design and adding visual interest to the approach to the site from the village.

The applicant also examined options for retaining the existing structure and incorporating it into the proposed development; however, the following issues emerged:

- Limited footpath width (1.6m wide at its narrowest point).
- Non-provision of public loading bay, which was to be delivered based on consultation with Transportation Planning Division
- Inefficient development, resulting in a reduction in the density on the site to c. 100 residential units per hectare.
- Limited viability of commercial use - retention of the existing structure would result in a commercial building with a poor internal layout, which would appeal to only a limited range of commercial uses.
- Poor visual aesthetic - retention of the existing structure, with the two options provided, would not provide an attractive visual aesthetic at a prominent corner site.

Given the above, it is contended that the retention and integration of the existing structure into the proposed development would have a negative impact on the wider proposal. Further intervention would be required to improve the width of adjoining footpaths and allow the provision of the public loading bay and, even without these, the retention of the building would substantially reduce the density of development and compromise the viability of the commercial use. It is stated that the existing building is not considered to be of sufficient architectural quality to provide a visual aesthetic befitting the prominent junction, whether directly integrated into the proposed development or separated from it.

It is contended that, given the conclusion of the submitted Historic Building Survey detailing the extent of interventions which have taken place and the resulting lack of conservation-based merit, requiring the existing building to be retained would be solely for the sake of conservation. Given this and the impracticality of incorporating the original building into the proposed redevelopment, it is not proposed to amend the proposal as requested under (b) above, although amendments are proposed to address issues raised under items 2, 3 and 5.

The above information is considered in the reports by the Conservation Officer (CO) and the City Archaeologist's Division. It is noted that the report by the CO on the initial application was not received until after completion of the planner's report. That report considered it regrettable that the application had not included an appropriate Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment (AHIA), and recommended seeking further information, to include an AHIA, together with revised drawings incorporating the whole of the extant historic structure into a revised proposal, with a spatial buffer to the rear to protect its setting, allowing the historic building to form an architectural cornerstone to the new development. The report also sought revisions to the massing of Block A, with reduction in its street facing facades to three storeys with an additional setback storey and retention of the historic boundary walls to the rear gardens of Nos. 16 and 18. These concerns were already largely incorporated in the further information request.

Conservation Officer's Report

A report on the further information response has now been received from the CO. This reiterates the history of the building and states that, according to Samuel Lewis' Topographical Dictionary of Ireland 1837, the settlement of Roundtown took its name from *'the arrangement of its cottages in the form of a circle: it is neat and pleasantly situated, and forms a pleasing feature in the environs of the metropolis...'*. The report includes an excerpt from the First Edition OS Map, which clearly shows the outline of the circle of cottages.

The report notes the historic building survey submitted in response to 1(a) above, which was prepared by an RIAI Grade 1 conservation architect and is considered to be well-researched and presented. The statement of significance notes that: *'The building is not a Protected Structure and is not included in the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage. Given its modest interior and the significant alterations which have occurred at ground floor level, it is considered that the main heritage interest is the history of the building as part of the original circle of 'Roundtown' cottages.'* The report concludes that, although the existing building is of some architectural and historic interest as the remaining fragment of the circle of cottages which gave the village of Terenure the name 'Roundtown' for a short period of its history, it is modest in scale and in its original decorative features. Furthermore, it has been substantially altered and extended over its history which has resulted in the loss of character.'

It is noted that this part of the city has not yet been surveyed for the NIAH, with results expected in 2026; however, the CO report considers that the structures on the site are of regional significance and architectural interest. Given this, it is considered that the conservation report does not adequately appraise the rarity value and uniqueness of the extant and last-remaining historic structure which was originally part of a unique circular-plan development. Such a design form is atypical of Ireland and is therefore of great architectural heritage significance and worthy of retention.

The CO considers that, although the building has been altered and has lost some of its early features, it is in good condition and is sufficiently intact to warrant retention and appropriate conservation-led adaptation. The internal photographs also show that, despite previous alterations, notable features are intact, including a fine early nineteenth century staircase and original window joinery. If restored sympathetically and incorporated into a high-quality residential development, the building would greatly enhance the street corner and character of the urban village.

The report refers to Policy BHA6 which is that: *'There will be a presumption against the demolition or substantial loss of any building or other structure which appears on historic maps up to and including the Ordnance Survey of Dublin City, 1847. A conservation report shall be submitted with the application and there will be a presumption against the demolition or substantial loss of the building or structure, unless demonstrated in the submitted conservation report that it has little or no special interest or merit having regard to the provisions of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011)'*. As the submitted conservation report does not demonstrate that the building has little or no special interest or merit, the CO considers that demolition would contravene the built heritage policy BHA6 and would be highly regrettable.

In response to (b) the CO report notes the applicant's study exploring the retention and incorporation of the historic Roundtown building into the proposed development and the two design options proposed, of which Option 1 would set back the proposed residential block behind the existing structure, while Option 2 would include a vertical extension above the historic building. 3D views of both options have been included. From a visual perspective, the CO would favour Option 1; however, the applicant is not proposing either option, providing various arguments including limited footpath width, non-provision of the proposed loading bay, inefficient development, limited viability of the commercial use and poor visual aesthetic and considering that the retention and integration of the existing structure into the proposed scheme would have a negative impact on the wider proposal.

The CO report notes that applicant's argument that, whether or not further interventions are carried out to improve the width of adjoining footpaths and to allow the provision of the public loading bay, the retention of the building would substantially reduce the density of development achieved, and would compromise the viability of the commercial use being delivered. The argument that the building is not considered to be of sufficient architectural quality to result in a visual aesthetic befitting the prominent junction, whether the building is directly integrated into the scheme or separated, is also noted.

Although the applicant has strongly argued for demolition of the existing building for the above reasons, the CO considers that the historic building is of architectural heritage significance, is not beyond conservation-led refurbishment, and could be retained and incorporated into the development. Due to the highly adverse impact of wholesale demolition of the historic building on the Z4-zoned urban village and the contravention of Policy BHA6, the CO recommends refusal of permission for the proposal.

The CO report also notes that the Option 1 3D view shows that a design allowing for the retention of the historic building with the proposed development would be feasible for the site from a conservation and urban enhancement perspective and recommends that the application explores this proposal further under a new application.

City Archaeologist's Report

A report on the further information has been received from the City Archaeologist's Division. This also notes the submitted Historic Building Survey and examination of the possibility of retaining the 'Roundtown' building within the proposed development. It is noted that the survey provides a summary of the historic setting of the 'Roundtown' building, including mapping, although it fails to provide any information from easily accessible sources such as business directories, which would have given a clearer picture of the uses of the building over time. It also includes a photographic and descriptive record of the exterior and interior of the building.

The survey shows that the building has undergone a substantial alteration to the ground floor to facilitate use as a car showroom. Despite this, the original ground floor plan is still entirely legible and, surprisingly, the entrance hall survives in an intact state with the original staircase. Although the area occupied by the car showroom appears to have been stripped of original fabric, the stair hall and the upstairs rooms retain original decorative details including window shutters, plaster cornicing and ceiling roses. The building appears to be in good condition, is in active use and shows no signs of dereliction. The submitted photographs are noted in this regard.

The survey does not include a full analysis of the potential special interest categories of the building in accordance with the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011). It notes that the building is not a protected structure and is not listed on the NIAH and, while stating that it is of historic interest as part of the original circle of 'Roundtown'

cottages', it concludes that it is modest in scale, and in its original decorative features, and has been substantially altered.

The two proposed options for retaining the building, and the submitted 3D drawings showing these options, are noted. Both include removal of the car showroom to the front of the building and the full retention of the main building as part of a revised scheme. Reasons why these are not considered possible include that the proposal would leave the remaining fabric 'fragmented and structurally compromised', that retention would prevent footpath widening and construction for a new loading bay on Terenure Road West, that the retained building would have limited commercial use, and that it would reduce net site density.

The archaeology report considers that, although the building is not a protected structure, this does not mean it is not of architectural merit. The development plan recognises the positive contribution made by many older buildings and structures in the city, which are not protected or within a conservation area or ACA, to the historic built environment. The development plan states that: *'The retention and reuse of these buildings add to the streetscape and sense of place and have a role in the sustainable development of the city. There will be a presumption against demolition of individual structures of vernacular or historic/social interest that contribute to the character of an area'*.

The report refers to two specific policies in the development plan in this regard, i.e. Policy BHA6 in relation to buildings on historic maps (previously noted) and Policy BHA11 which is:

- a) *To retain, where appropriate, and encourage the rehabilitation and suitable adaptive reuse of existing older buildings/structures/features which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area and streetscape, in preference to their demolition and redevelopment.*
- b) *Encourage the retention and/or reinstatement of original fabric of our historic building stock such as windows, doors, roof coverings, shopfronts (including signage and associated features), pub fronts and other significant features.*
- c) *Ensure that appropriate materials are used to carry out any repairs to the historic fabric*

The archaeology report notes that, as no NIAH survey has as yet been published for this area, the absence of the building from the NIAH cannot be relied upon as evidence that a structure is not of architectural significance. The architectural heritage survey carried out as part of the EIAR for the Bus Connects Templeogue/Rathfarnham to City Centre Scheme also identified this building as a non-designated architectural heritage asset (Identifier CBC1012BTH020) to be protected. The building was evaluated under the NIAH criteria and was considered to be of regional significance and of architectural, artistic and social interest.

The report concurs with the recommendation of the Bus Connects EIAR that the 'Roundtown' building is of architectural significance and considers that its demolition would have a permanent negative impact on the character of the streetscape and the area. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to development plan policies BHA6 and BHA11. The design options suggested as alternatives by the applicant, in which the building is retained, are considered to be feasible and to result in a positive, workable, and attractive scheme, which would balance the value of the historic fabric with the needs of new development, and it is considered that the issues raised could be solved through further design iteration. In the absence of a proposal to retain the 'Roundtown' building, the report considers that permission should be refused.

The report also notes the existing 'Cló Gaelach' street sign on the Templeogue Road façade of the building, which dates from the time of the Gaelic Revival movement in the early twentieth century. In the event of permission being granted, the sign should be salvaged and re-erected in accordance with development plan policy BHA20 (Ghost Heritage Signs). This can be addressed by condition in the event of permission being granted. Notwithstanding this, the overall recommendation is to refuse permission.

Evaluation

Having regard to the above, while the applicant's conservation report states that the existing building is not of any special interest or merit, there are concerns in relation to its demolition. The comments of the An Coimisiún Pleanála inspector in relation to the previous proposal are noted; however, that proposal, for which permission was ultimately refused, was assessed under a previous development plan (2016-2022). Policy BHA6 of the current plan sets out a presumption against the demolition or substantial loss of any building or other structure which appears on

historic maps, up to and including the 1847 Ordnance Survey of Dublin City, unless a submitted conservation report demonstrates that it has little or no special interest or merit. The previous development plan did not include a policy in relation to buildings on historic maps. Policy BHA11 in relation to the rehabilitation and reuse of older buildings which make a positive contribution to the character and streetscape of an area, is also noted.

Policy BHA24, which is that: *'Dublin City Council will positively encourage and facilitate the careful refurbishment of the historic built environment for sustainable and economically viable uses and support the implementation of the National Policy on Architecture as it relates to historic buildings, streetscapes, towns and villages, by ensuring the delivery of high quality architecture and quality place-making, and by demonstrating best practice in the care and maintenance of historic properties in public ownership'* is also noted.

The building which is the subject of this application appears on a historic map from the 1830s and was constructed in 1801. Although it has been extended to the front and some alterations have been made, the original building survives, retains original features, is generally in good condition and makes a unique contribution to the streetscape and character of the area, providing a clear reference to the original circle of cottages which surrounded the junction, the remaining outline of which can still be seen in aerial views. The building is a local landmark which is included in local walking tours. While the site has not yet been surveyed for the NIAH, surveys carried out for the BusConnects EIAR considered it to be of regional significance and of architectural, artistic and social interest.

Having regard to the above and to the unique characteristics of the site, the concerns of the CO and the Archaeology Division, including the recommendations to refuse permission, are considered reasonable and are supported by development plan policy. The applicant has demonstrated that the building could potentially be incorporated into the redevelopment of the site and, while noting that this would reduce the density on the site to c.100 dwellings per hectare, this figure sits comfortably within the net density ranges set out in Appendix 3 of the development plan for outer suburban areas (60-120 dph) and key urban villages (60-150) and within the range of 50 to 250 dwellings per hectare for city-urban neighbourhoods in Dublin as set out in the 2024 Compact Settlement Guidelines. In this instance, the protection of the built heritage on the site therefore does not preclude the development of the site for residential use at a sustainable density, having regard to the transitional location adjoining residential areas. The retention of historic fabric in other redevelopment sites in the area, such as the ALDI site on Terenure Road East, is noted. Issues of the footpath width and relocation of the loading bay could be addressed in a future application.

While it is acknowledged that the applicant has attempted to incorporate the curve of the original building into the proposed redevelopment, there are also concerns that the curve as proposed is somewhat tokenist and does not fully reflect the extent of the original circle around the junction. In the event of permission being considered, the setback would need to be increased to better reflect the existing position of the curve.

2. *The applicant is requested to reconsider the design of the proposed development with a view to addressing the following issues:*

- a) *Provision of an improved transition in scale, massing and height between the main block, which is situated at the edge of the urban village of Terenure, and the existing houses to the southwest on Templeogue Road, reducing its dominance when viewed from the main crossroads in Terenure Village and ensuring that it integrates better into the vista of the existing buildings around the historic crossroads, and on the approach to the village from Templeogue Road. This may require a reduction in the parapet height of the proposed block, in particular in the vicinity of the boundary with Nos. 15 and 17 Templeogue Road, in order to ensure an improved transition in scale between the urban village and the adjoining residential area. Consideration should also be given to measures to reduce the impact on Nos. 4-10 Templeogue Road in respect of loss of daylight and sunlight.*
- b) *A reduction in the scale of the rear block in the area adjacent to the two-storey block of retail/commercial units at Nos. 8a- 14a Terenure Road West to reduce the impact on the amenities, including sunlight and daylight, of this block and ensure that its future development potential is protected.*

- c) *The visual impact assessment should include a photomontage showing the proposed development in the context of Nos. 15-23 Templeogue Road when viewed from the area directly in front of the site, and a photomontage showing the proposed development when viewed from Hannaville Park.*

Response and Assessment

In response to this, the proposed development has been revised, resulting in a reduction in the number of residential units from 45 to 43, of which are 14 are one-bedroomed and 29 are two-bedroomed. The proposed revisions are as follows:

- Reduction in overall height of Block A by 0.2m.
- Reduction in overall height of Block B by 0.9m.
- Reduction in footprint of Block A by 108.9m² (22%) at fourth floor level with loss of a one-bedroomed unit.
- Reduction in footprint of Block B by 85m² (10%) at third floor level, with loss of a two-bedroomed unit.

The response notes the reference to Nos. 4-10 Templeogue Road, and states that the proposed revisions to Block A will cumulatively ensure no undue loss of daylight or sunlight to Nos. 4-10 and also ensure an improved transition in scale, massing and height. The proposed reduction in the floor area at third and fourth floor level is intended to allow for a stepping down in height and allow for an improved visual transition on the approach to the village centre from Templeogue Road and when approaching the site from the crossroads. Block A will gradually increase in height from three to five storeys in a manner which is stated as ensuring that the bulk and massing is appropriately reduced, with the overall reduction in building height mitigating any semblance of an overbearing impact.

An updated Architectural Design Statement has been submitted which demonstrates how the site of No. 15 Templeogue Road may be viewed as an opportunity site for future redevelopment, and demonstrates that the proposal will not compromise the future development potential that site. Drawings have been submitted showing a two-storey house on the site. It is stated that the submitted images and CGIs demonstrate that the proposal will provide an appropriate step up in building height between No. 15 and the site.

It is stated that the reduction in the height of Block B by 0.9m, which is achieved by a reduction in floor to floor heights and parapet levels, is considered appropriate in the context of ensuring that the proposal will not result in any undue loss of daylight or sunlight to the block of retail/commercial units at Nos. 8-14a Terenure Road West. A study has also been carried out showing that the existing two-storey block at Nos. 8-14a could be replaced by a three-storey block, with two storeys of residential above ground floor commercial units, and that this development potential would not be compromised by the proposed development.

The proposed reductions in the height and footprint of Blocks A and B will reduce the impact on adjoining dwellings in respect of loss of light. The visualisations showing the potential future development of the immediately adjoining sites on Terenure Road West and Templeogue Road are considered acceptable.

Additional photomontages have been submitted as requested, showing the proposed development as viewed from Hannaville Park and from Templeogue Road in front of the site. The applicant's submission notes that the stepped massing and reduction in height at upper floor levels provide an improved transition in scale towards the adjoining residential areas. The photomontages show the outline of the originally proposed development and also the development which was previously refused permission.

From viewing the amended drawings and photomontages, it is considered that, while the proposal provides for a reduction in the overall scale and massing of the development, there are still concerns in relation to the scale and visual impact of the proposal when approaching the village from the residential areas on Templeogue Road (View 5) and Terenure Road West (View 7). Notwithstanding the reduction in the scale and massing of Block A, the proposal still provides an abrupt transition when viewed in the context of the existing houses on Templeogue Road and the existing two-to three-storey block on the northern side of the forked junction, and is considered to detract from the character of the urban village. View 10, which is the view requested under 2(c) (above) also demonstrates an abrupt transition in scale and shows the prominence of the

projecting balcony element in the context of the streetscape. In the event of permission being considered, revisions would be required omitting this element and setting the balconies back into the building elevation.

The western gable of Block A and additional setback storey still appear unduly prominent in the context of the adjoining two-storey building on Terenure Road West and the existing two-storey buildings on the eastern side of the forked junction. The area of Block A which is visible from Hannaville Park also appears somewhat monolithic and incongruous in the context of the two-storey houses, with an abrupt transition in scale and character. In the event of permission being considered, revisions would be required in this regard.

While the scale and massing of the proposed development when viewed from the crossroads is considered to be generally acceptable, there are concerns that the design does not adequately reference the curve on the corner of the site or the original circular form at the junction, and that the proposal would result in further erosion of the original character provided by the circle of cottages on the junction. In the event of permission being considered, further revisions would be required in this regard.

3. *The applicant is requested to provide details of screening to the sides of the balconies to Units A-108 and B-101 (and equivalent units above these) to avoid overlooking of the rear of existing commercial/residential units on Terenure Road West, and to the front and side of Unit B-103 to avoid overlooking of the rear garden of No. 15 Templeogue Road.*

Response and Assessment

In response to this, the applicant's submission notes the amended floor plans and elevational drawings which have been submitted. Originally proposed screens on the side of the balcony serving Unit B-103 prevent overlooking towards the rear garden of No. 15. It is stated that the applicant's preference would be not to provide additional screening to the front of this balcony, as the unit's orientation in conjunction with the screening of the balcony side will ensure that there would be no meaningful overlooking of No. 15. Notwithstanding this, the applicant would be willing to the applicant's willingness to relocate the balcony further towards the northeast if considered necessary, and that this could be achieved by way of compliance with a condition. It is stated that the balcony would remain accessible from the kitchen/living/dining room as shown on the first floor plan.

The proposal provides for full height metal screens to the sides of the balconies in the relevant locations, with additional metal panels between the screens, which will ensure no direct overlooking from the balcony sides. In the case of the balconies to Unit B-103, the drawings show that the side of the balcony facing the site of No. 15 Templeogue Road would be screened by full height metal screens. The main balcony edge would face west, and would not directly overlook the rear garden of No. 15. The distance from the corner to the boundary with No. 15 is c.9m, while the boundary itself would also provide some screening of the immediately adjacent area. While there may be some potential for indirect overlooking, this would be partly curtailed by the full height screen to the balcony side. The design response document includes a drawing showing the view when standing on the balcony of the unit, which demonstrates that any potential for overlooking of the rear garden of No. 15 would be very limited. The drawings also show the potential to relocate the balcony further to the northeast, thus increasing the separation distance to c.11m. In order to further reduce any perception of overlooking, if considered necessary a condition can be attached to any grant of permission requiring the balcony to be relocated as shown on the drawings.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the details submitted address the issue raised.

4. *The applicant is requested to submit details of how it is proposed to comply with the requirement for public open space as set out in Section 15.8.6 of the Dublin City Development Plan (2022-2028).*

Response and Assessment

In response to this, it is stated that the applicant is willing to make a financial contribution in lieu of the provision of public open space, as provided for under Section 15.8.7 of the development plan. It is considered that this is acceptable and addresses the issue raised.

5. *The applicant is requested to address the following concerns in relation to access and movement:*

- a) *The applicant is requested to submit a Mobility Management Plan in accordance with Policy SMT6 and Table 15-1 of Chapter 15 of the Dublin City Development Plan (2022-2028). The plan should include baseline information on existing and predicted travel patterns for the area, which should inform proposed measures to promote active travel / public transport use by residents. The baseline information should provide a basis for realistic modal split targets along with a car parking strategy and car parking management plan for this development and indicate how parking will be assigned and managed. The applicant should consider the inclusion of a car share parking space within the proposed development.*
- b) *The applicant is requested to address discrepancies in the submitted drawings and provide a revised site layout clearly indicating the location of the proposed fire hydrant. The applicant shall also clarify emergency access arrangements within the site.*
- c) *The applicant is requested to submit details of cycle parking for the proposed retail/commercial unit, having regard to likely staff numbers and the standards set out Table 1.0 of Appendix 5 of the Dublin City Development Plan (2022-2028).*
- d) *The applicant is requested to review the proposed site layout and examine the need for tactile paving and pedestrian crossings within the internal road layout.*

Response and Assessment

A Traffic, Transport and Mobility Report has been submitted which sets out the applicant's response to (a), (c) and (d) above. The report includes a Mobility Management Plan which sets out details of the inclusion of a car share space. In response to (c), the site layout and ground floor plans have been amended to show the provision of four bicycle parking spaces for the commercial unit, two for staff and two for customers. In response to (d), the report shows the inclusion of dropped kerbs and tactile paving at the accessible parking space, adjacent to the set down servicing bay and at all pedestrian crossings and key desire lines within the development.

The report from the Transportation Planning Division (TPD) notes the above and considers that the submitted Mobility Management Plan provides a robust justification for the proposed car parking provision and addresses the criteria set out under Section 2.4 of Appendix 5 in respect of reduced car parking provision. The plan outlines existing travel patterns, modal split data and the accessibility of the site by walking and cycling, and sets out objectives and associated measures aimed at promoting sustainable travel behaviour among future residents, to be overseen by an appointed Travel Plan Co-ordinator. A monitoring and review framework is provided. Having reviewed the submitted documentation, TPD consider that the proposed measures are acceptable.

The TPD report also notes the proposed Parking Strategy and Management Plan. The proposal provides for 18 car parking spaces, with one accessible parking space, one car-share space and one service bay. Parking spaces will be allocated and managed by the management company through a priority-based allocation system, with preference potentially afforded to residents with mobility requirements and occupiers of larger units. TPD consider these arrangements to be acceptable. The report notes that the location of the car share space is not clearly shown on the revised site layout drawings; however, this can be addressed by condition in the event of permission being granted. In this regard it is noted that the design response document shows the location of the car share space as being in space no. 19. The report notes that the provision of EV charging associated with the car parking spaces can also be addressed by condition.

The TPD report also notes the details of cycle parking for the proposed commercial/retail unit in response to item 5(c). This will comprise two spaces in the shared bicycle store serving the development, which is considered acceptable. A Sheffield stand is also shown positioned along the footpath adjacent to the commercial unit to facilitate short-stay visitor cycle parking. While TPD generally welcome the provision of visitor cycle parking, there are concerns that, given the location of the stand adjacent to a key pedestrian desire line and junction area, there is potential for it, and parked bicycles, to impede pedestrian movement and reduce the usable width of the footpath. Having regard to the constrained footpath environment and the need to maintain unobstructed pedestrian accessibility, TPD consider that the proposed Sheffield stand should be omitted by condition.

The TPD report also notes the revised site layout drawing showing dropped kerbs and tactile paving at pedestrian crossings and key desire lines in response to 5(d). Dropped kerbs and tactile

paving have also been introduced to meet the needs of the accessible parking space and the adjacent set down space. The proposed amendments are welcomed by TPD.

A revised site layout plan has been submitted in response to 5(b), in which the fire hydrant is relocated to 6m from the building. This is stated as fully complying with the requirements of Part B of the Building Regulations. In relation to emergency service vehicles, it is stated that each building will be fitted with a dry rising main, with the dry rising mains inlet to be not more than 18m from the parking position of the fire tender on the main road and an outlet to be provided on each of the upper landing levels in the stairs/lobby. No part of the building will be more than 45m from the outlet. The inlet for Block B will not be on the face of the building, but will be clearly marked and visible from the parking position of the fire tender. It is stated that all items relating to fire safety will be agreed with the fire department by way of a fire safety certificate.

The TPD report notes the details submitted, including the relocation of the hydrant. The measures outlined are acceptable to TPD and it is acknowledged that such proposed measures will be subject to a fire safety certificate.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the information submitted addresses the issues raised in item 5.

Further AA and EIA Screening

Following receipt of the further information response, it is considered that there are no further environmental considerations having regard to the assessment in the initial report.

Conclusion

The proposal has been considered in the context of the site history and the applicant's response to the further information request. Having regard to the zoning of the site and the provisions of the current Dublin City Development Plan (2022-2028), it is considered that the proposed development would contravene the policies and objectives of the development plan and would not accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. It is therefore considered that permission should be refused.

15.0 Recommendation

It is recommended that permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposal includes the demolition of the last remaining structures of the historic circular-plan Roundtown housing development which is recorded on the first edition Ordnance Survey map and earlier maps. This building is of historical interest, makes a positive and unique contribution to the historic streetscape and character of Terenure Village and is of local and regional significance. The proposed demolition would be contrary to Policy BHA6 of the Dublin City Development Plan (2022-2028) - 'Buildings on Historic Maps' and Policy BHA11 - 'Rehabilitation and Reuse of Existing Older Buildings' and would set an undesirable precedent in this regard. The proposal to demolish the structure, rather than incorporate it into the proposed new development, would result in a seriously adverse visual impact to the historic streetscape within the urban village of Terenure, thus being contrary to development plan policy and to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area
2. Having regard to the unique characteristics of this prominent corner site, situated on the edge of Terenure village, it is considered that the design of the proposed development fails to adequately respond to the site context, including the historic circle of cottages around the junction, the outline of which partly remains. The proposal, by reason of its scale and massing, would also result in a visually discordant feature, which would fail to successfully integrate into the built form of Terenure village or provide an appropriate transition between the village and adjoining residential areas on Terenure Road West and Templeogue Road. The proposal would therefore be seriously injurious to the visual amenities and character of the surrounding area and to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area