



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-317563-23

Development	Renovations to existing house including extensions to front and rear and alterations to roof profile.
Location	5 Churchtown Road Upper, Dublin 14, D14 KX57
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D23A/0280
Applicant(s)	Ian and Lisa Marconi
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Fergus Dolan and Eilis Fitzgerald
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	19 th October 2023
Inspector	Bernadette Quinn

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The site has a stated area of 0.0761ha and is located on the north side of Upper Churchtown Road in an established residential area characterised by a mix of single and two storey detached and semi-detached houses. The existing house on the application site is a two storey semi-detached house the total stated floor area of which is 178 square metres. There is vehicular access off Upper Churchtown Road and car parking within the front garden.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Permission is sought for:

- Demolition of existing front porch and single storey extension to rear with a total floor area of 13 sq.m.
- Replace existing hipped roof with new 3.2 m high pitched roof.
- Construct extension at ground floor to front and rear with gross floor area of 71 sq.m.
- Construct first floor extension to front and rear with gross floor area of 15 sq.m.
- Convert existing attic and construct new dormer window to rear.
- Convert existing garage to habitable space & construct new side passage roof.
- Widen existing vehicular access to include for new vehicular and pedestrian gate.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Grant Permission subject to conditions on 16th June 2023.

- Condition 5 requires all external finishes, including roof tiles/slates, shall harmonise in material, colour and texture with the existing dwelling.

- Condition 14 requires the proposed dormer to be reduced to 6m in width and located a minimum of 1 meter from the boundary with the adjoining residential development in the interests of residential amenity.
- Condition 15 requires the proposed side passage roof is to have a height of maximum 3m so as to allow for visual harmony with the surrounding development in the interest of visual amenity.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

Considers the development acceptable and recommends a grant of permission.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

The report of the Drainage Division indicates no objection subject to standard conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None

3.4. Third Party Observations

One objection from the third party appellants to the proposal received by the planning authority is on file for the Board's information. The issues raised are comparable to the issues raised in the third party appeal.

4.0 Planning History

ABP 303074-18 / D18A/0858: Relates to adjoining site to east at No 7 Churchtown Road Upper (appellants property). Permission granted by the planning authority and An Bord Pleanála on appeal for extension to dwelling and new vehicular entrance.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1. The Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan, 2022-2028 is the statutory development plan for the area. The site is zoned Objective 'A' residential with the objective to: 'provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities' under which residential development is listed within the 'Permitted in Principle' category of this zoning objective.

5.1.2. Chapter 12 of the development plan deals with Development Management. Section 12.3.7.1 provides guidance with respect to front and rear extensions and alterations to roof. The relevant considerations include:

- Porch extensions should be of appropriate design and scale relative to the design of the original house. The scale, height, and projection from the front building line of the dwelling should not be excessive so as to dominate the front elevation of the dwelling. The porch should complement the existing dwelling, and a more contemporary design approach can be considered.
- Front extensions, at both ground and first level will be considered acceptable in principle subject to scale, design, and impact on visual and residential amenities. A break in the front building line will be acceptable, over two floors to the front elevation, subject to scale and design Front extensions, particularly at first floor level, should reflect the roof shape and slope of the main dwelling. A minimum driveway length of 6 metres should be maintained.
- Extensions to the Rear: Ground floor rear extensions will be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining. The extension should match or complement the main house. First floor rear extensions will be considered on their merits ... and will only be permitted where the Planning Authority is satisfied that there will be no significant negative impacts on surrounding residential or visual amenities.
- Alterations at Roof/Attic Level: Roof alterations/expansions to main roof profiles - changing the hip-end roof of a semi-detached house to a gable/ 'A' frame end

or 'half-hip' for example – will be assessed against a number of criteria including: Careful consideration and special regard to the character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures; Existing roof variations on the streetscape; Distance/contrast/visibility of proposed roof end; Harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures, and prominence.

- Dormer extensions to roofs, i.e. to the front, side, and rear, will be considered with regard to impacts on existing character and form, and the privacy of adjacent properties. The design, dimensions, and bulk of any roof proposal relative to the overall size of the dwelling and gardens will be the overriding considerations. Dormer extensions shall be set back from the eaves, gables and/or party boundaries. Dormer extensions should be set down from the existing ridge level so as to not read as a third storey extension at roof level to the rear. ... regard should also be had to size of fenestration proposed at attic level relative to adjoining residential amenities. Particular care will be taken in evaluating large, visually dominant dormer window structures, with a balance sought between quality residential amenity and the privacy of adjacent properties. Excessive overlooking of adjacent properties should be avoided.

5.1.3. Section 12.4.8 of the Development Plan relates to vehicle entrances and hardstanding.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

5.2.1. None in the vicinity of the site.

5.3. EIA Screening

5.3.1. The proposed development does not fall within a class of development set out in Part 1 or Part 2 of Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, (as amended), and therefore is not subject to EIA requirements.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

One third party appeal received from Fergus Dolan and Eilis Fitzgerald of 7 Churchtown Road Upper which adjoins the appeal site to the east.

The main points of the grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows:

- Proposal will seriously injure streetscape and character of the area as it will form an incongruous feature, set an undesirable precedent and is contrary to zoning objective and Section 12.3.7.1 of development plan. No precedent exists for the scale of development proposed.
- Size, height, bulk and scale, in particular front two storey extension and rear dormer, is overdevelopment of property and combined with alterations to roof profile will be visually dominant and overbearing when viewed from appellants property injuring their residential and visual amenities.
- Front extension will be overbearing and result in potential loss of light to front of appellants property. Appellants front garden provides main amenity space with parking provided to rear. Design of proposed two storey extension will result in overlooking of the private amenity space to front of appellants property.
- Refers to appellants permitted and constructed single storey extension which is set back from boundary with appeal site. Planning authority failed to consider this extension as forming a precedent for appeal site.
- Dormer will result in overlooking of appellants property and should be refused. Conditions attached by planning authority to reduce dormer do not address concerns.
- Appellants use of their own side and front garden as main amenity space and rear garden as vehicular access and parking may be reversed in the future and should be considered in making a decision on the appeal site.
- Condition to reduce side passage height to 3 metres should be applied to rear extension, failure by planning authority to do so reflects a lack of consideration of impact on residential amenity of appellant.

- Proposed finishes to front façade and rear dormer are inappropriate.
- No quantitative assessment of impact on adjoining property carried out by the planning authority in making decision, cannot be assumed impact will not be significant.
- Proposal would result in reduction in appellants property value due to impact on residential and visual amenity.
- Existing front porch to be replaced is unauthorised.
- Conditions relating to surface water drainage have potential to negatively impact appellant's rear garden.
- Inaccurate site size referred to in planning authority assessment report.

6.2. Applicant Response

- Requests the Board dismiss appeal under Section 138 of Planning and Development Act as appeal is vexatious, without foundation and made with the intent of delaying the development.
- Appellants have extended and altered their property changing its relationship with the street.
- Refutes the grounds of appeal and outlines how the proposal complies with Section 12.7.1 of the Development Plan and includes 3D images showing the proposed development.
- Proposed extension is similar to others in the area, is in accordance with development plan and provides for an overall additional floor space of 26.8 sq.m.
- House requires renovation, has a large rear garden and can facilitate proposal.
- Existing extensions to house were granted in 1960's and copies of documents relating to same attached with response. Notes that the argument relating to unauthorised development is irrelevant as it is proposed to remove existing extensions, that they are unenforceable due to the passage of time, and were not carried out by the current owners.

- Conditions relating to SuDS are feasible and notes large garden size.
- Refers to the planning authority assessment of the proposal which was considered acceptable subject to a number of amendments by condition which are acceptable to the applicant.
- Variety of house types in the area which have been altered and extended over the years, including the appellants house. Includes reference to similar extensions and dormers permitted in the area.

6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

Submission from PA states grounds of appeal raise no matters which would justify a change in attitude to the proposed development.

6.4. **Observations**

None received.

7.0 **Assessment**

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

- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Impact on Visual Amenity
- Surface Water Drainage
- Other Matters
- Appropriate Assessment

7.2. Impact on residential amenity

- 7.2.1. The front alterations proposed include a part single and part two storey extension, with single storey element to the east adjoining the appellants property and two storey element to the west. The single storey front extension projects approx. 0.75m beyond the existing front façade and incorporates a new porch with slate lean to roof above, the eaves height of the proposed new porch is approx. 2.7m and the highest point of the roof is approx. 3.4 m high. This extension will replace the existing 3 metre high front porch extension.
- 7.2.2. The proposed two storey front extension will replace the existing garage at ground floor and living accommodation at first floor. It will extend beyond the existing front façade by 1.8 metres which incorporates bay window protrusions of approx. 0.5 metres depth at ground and first floor with hipped roof above. This accommodation will provide for additional living accommodation at ground floor and bedroom at first floor.
- 7.2.3. The appellants property (no. 7) and the appeal site (no. 5) form a pair of semi-detached dwellings. Planning permission ABP 303074-18 granted permission for development at no 7 which included a front side and rear single storey extension extending approx. 1 m beyond the front façade and off set from the front boundary with no. 5 by approx. 3.5m.
- 7.2.4. In relation to concerns regarding overbearing and potential loss of light from the single storey extension, the appeal outlines that the single storey extension at no. 7 is setback from the boundary between the two properties which the appellant considers respects residential amenity and the character of the area. The appellant argues that the planning authority in their assessment has failed to consider the existing permitted extension at no. 7 as a precedent for assessing the proposal at no. 5.
- 7.2.5. Having regard to the scale of the proposed extension noted above I am satisfied that it would be unlikely to result in any noticeable loss of light at No. 7 or be overbearing given the single storey nature and the modest depth proposed of approx. 0.75m. It will replace an existing extension at this location and although slightly higher than the existing porch it is modest in scale and appropriately designed to complement the

overall development and is considered acceptable. Based on the above I do not agree with the appellants assertions that the front extension will lead to loss of light of the adjoining property or be overbearing. I also do not agree that the permitted extension at number 7 should form a precedent for development on adjoining property. I consider each application should be considered on its merits and having regard to its impacts on adjoining property and on the streetscape as set out in the development management guidelines in the development plan. I am satisfied that the proposed single storey front extension is appropriately designed and is acceptable at this location.

- 7.2.6. The appellant raises concerns that the proposed front 2 storey extension will result in overlooking of their private amenity space to the front of their property. The above mentioned planning permission ABP 303074-18 at no. 7 provided for a new vehicular access and car parking to rear resulting in the main private amenity space being located to the front and east side of the property. I note that there are currently a number of first floor windows on the front elevation of no. 5 including at the location of the proposed first floor extension. Whilst the new first floor extension will extend beyond the existing façade by 1.8 m at its deepest, I consider the two storey extension is modest in comparison to the existing dwelling on site and I do not consider it will result in additional overlooking beyond that which already exists. Furthermore, I do not consider the level of overlooking from first floor windows exceeds that which normally occurs in a suburban situation such as this and I note the appellants private amenity space includes space to the east side of their dwelling. As such I do not agree with the appellants that unacceptable overlooking will occur as a result of the front extension.
- 7.2.7. To the rear, a proposed ground floor extension projects between 2.3 m and 3.6 m from the existing rear façade of no. 5 and is offset 355mm from the rear boundary wall with no. 7. A flat roof is proposed at a height of 3.430 m. The rear extension will protrude 3.3m beyond the rear façade and 2.3m beyond the rear extension of No. 7. The rear extension at no. 7 is off set from the boundary between the two dwellings by 3.6m.
- 7.2.8. Noting the scale and height of the proposed rear single storey extension which I consider to be modest in proportion to the existing house, and noting its orientation

relative to the appellants property to the east, I do not consider it will give rise to any overbearing or overshadowing impact on the appellants property.

- 7.2.9. A first floor rear extension is proposed which will infill an existing return at the rear on its western side bringing it in line with the remaining rear façade. The first floor rear extension is proposed to provide for a bathroom. Having regard to its scale and positioning this is considered acceptable.
- 7.2.10. A new covered side passage is proposed along the site boundary to the west providing access to the rear garden. This structure has a proposed height of 3.2m. This will replace an existing side passage structure with a height of 3m which mirrors the existing side passage structure on the adjoining property to the west. The planning authority decision included condition no. 15 that the proposed side passage is to have a height of a maximum of 3m so as to allow for visual harmony with the surrounding development. I note the first party response states no objection to condition 15 and noting the nature of the third party appeal, if permission is granted I consider it appropriate to amend the height of this structure as per the Planning Authority's condition.
- 7.2.11. The appellant argues that the inclusion by the planning authority of condition 15 requiring a reduction in height of the side passage to 3 metres should also be applied to the rear extension. I do not consider this necessary as the proposed height of the rear extension at 3.43m is appropriate for this site.
- 7.2.12. A dormer projection on the rear roof is proposed which includes two windows. The dormer is situated 800 mm from the edge of the roof of the appellants property to the east, has a height of 2.5m and length of 6.9m. This is set within a proposed new roof which has an overall height of 3.2 m and length of 10.7 m. The dormer is set 300mm below the ridge level and 400mm above the top of the eaves and will not be visible from the public realm in front of the house.
- 7.2.13. Having regard to the scale of the proposed dormer I consider it complies with the development plan requirement that it be set back from the eaves, gables and/or party boundaries. I am satisfied that the height of the proposed dormer is acceptable and

would not read as a third storey extension at roof level to the rear, as is required by Section 12.3.7.1 (iv) of the Development Plan.

7.2.14. The planning authority has included condition no. 14 which requires the scale of the dormer is to be reduced to 6m in width and located a minimum of 1m from the boundary with the adjoining residential development in the interests of residential amenity. I note the first party response stating no objection to inclusion of this condition and having regard to the nature of the third party appeal, if permission is granted I consider it appropriate to include condition 14 as proposed by the planning authority.

7.2.15. The appellant considers the assessment of the dormer fails to take into account that the appellant may revert to using their rear garden as their main private amenity space. Whilst the dormer may give rise to some additional overlooking I do not consider this to be of such a scale as to negatively impact on neighbouring properties and as noted above I consider the dormer acceptable in scale and design. I do not accept the appellants arguments that they may wish to reverse the current arrangement where their main open space area is to the front of the house and their parking and vehicular access is to the rear as grounds for refusal and would consider it inappropriate to refuse the proposed development on these grounds.

7.2.16. In relation to overbearing impact, the appellant claims that the front, rear and dormer extension will be significantly overbearing when viewed from no. 7 due to its mass and scale and lack of consideration of amenities of appellants property and is contrary to the zoning objective to protect and improve residential amenity. As outlined above, I consider the proposed development is well designed, is respectful in scale and appearance to the existing dwelling on site and to adjoining properties, will not result in an overbearing impact on adjoining properties, and will provide for an improved residential amenity for occupants of no. 5.

7.2.17. The appellant argues that no quantitative assessment has been carried out of the impact of the development on the residential and visual amenity of the appellants property, and it should not be assumed that the impact will not be significant. The appellant has not specified the quantitative assessment they consider appropriate. Considerations for the assessment of amenity impact arising from proposed

extensions and alterations to roof are outlined in Section 12.3.7.1 of the development plan. As outlined in paragraphs above, I am satisfied that the proportions, scale and extent of development proposed is acceptable, that adequate separation is maintained to surrounding properties, and sufficient garden space is retained to the rear and front of no. 5. As such the proposal is not visually overbearing and unlikely to result in perceptible impacts on residential amenity of adjoining properties.

7.3. Impact on Visual Amenity

- 7.3.1. The appellant raises concerns that the scale, height and projection of the front extension beyond the existing building line will form an incongruous feature on the streetscape. The appellant considers that this will injure the visual amenity of no. 7 and seriously injure the streetscape and character of area.
- 7.3.2. Noting the dimensions of the works proposed outlined above and the scale of the existing dwelling on site along with the deep front garden, I consider the scale acceptable and in accordance with the pattern of development in the area which is a mature residential area with houses with generous front gardens and many of which have been modified and extended over the years, including the appellants property. There have also been a number of infill properties proximate to the appeal site providing for additional variety. I note numerous properties in the area have incorporated front porches and front extensions including along Churchtown Rd Upper and Landscape Park. As such I do not consider the proposed development would negatively affect the character of the area. I do not agree with the appellants that the front extension will be visually incongruous or that it will have a negative impact on the streetscape or the visual amenities of the area. I am satisfied that the scale and design of the front extension is acceptable with reference to the Development Management Guidelines contained in the development plan, does not result in a dominant feature, is appropriate for this location and will not detract from the streetscape in this area.
- 7.3.3. I note the development plan states in relation to first floor front extensions that they should reflect the roof shape and slope of the main dwelling. Whilst it is proposed to revise the existing main roof profile from hipped to pitched profile and provide for a

hipped roof above the extension, I note there are a mix of roof styles on both sides of Churchtown Road upper in the vicinity of the appeal site, including hipped, pitched, A frame and dormer and I am satisfied that the scale of the front extension is such that it will satisfactorily integrate with the proposed development and will not negatively impact on the character of the surrounding area. As such I consider the proposed hipped roof above the two-storey extension acceptable.

- 7.3.4. It is proposed to replace the existing hipped roof which measures between 2.3m and 3.2 m above eaves level. The new roof will be 3.2m in height and will match the height and pitched form of the adjoining house at No. 7. Having regard to the height and design of the proposed alterations and the pattern of development surrounding the site, including that of the adjoining dwelling, I am satisfied that the revisions to the roof are appropriate and will not result in any negative impact on the visual amenity or street scape in this area.
- 7.3.5. The appellant considers that the proposed changes to the roof profile combined with dormer is significantly larger than the existing roof and the design is overscaled and domineering and will be visible from Landscape Park and impact on properties in the vicinity. As noted above, I consider the scale of the proposed alterations to roof and dormer is acceptable, I consider it is appropriately designed and that the extent of dormer fenestration is acceptable and will not detract from the amenities of adjoining properties or that it will result in an overly dominant feature from surrounding properties.
- 7.3.6. The proposed material finishes include brick and render. The property's immediately surrounding the application site are finished in render with some properties in the wider area including further east on Churchtown Road Upper and on Landscape Park contain part brick finishes. The planning authority and appellants raise concerns in relation to proposed use of brick and the planning authority decision included a condition that all external finishes shall harmonise with existing. I have no objection to the proposed material finishes, however I note the first party in their response state no objection to this condition. In the event of a grant of permission I consider that this matter can be addressed by condition requiring agreement of finishes with the planning authority.

7.3.7. In conclusion I am of the opinion that the development has been designed to an acceptable standard. It is of an appropriate scale, height, bulk and massing relative to the existing house and site size so as not to appear overbearing and has limited impacts on the amenity of neighbouring properties. I am satisfied that the scale and design does not overwhelm or dominate the original form or appearance of the host dwelling and its streetscape scene. I consider the proposed amendments to the roof respects the character of the host dwelling and the semi-detached pair which it forms part of. I do not consider that the overall design concept of the proposed development when considered as part of the overall streetscape context on Churchtown Road Upper is out of character or visually overbearing. I am satisfied that the development complies with development plan standards set out in section 12.3.7.1 and does not result in overdevelopment of the site.

7.4. Surface Water

7.4.1. The planning application included surface water drainage details providing for a soakaway in the rear garden and the local authority Drainage Planning Report states no objection subject to standard conditions. Having regard to the size of the site and the amount of rear garden space that will be retained following completion of the development, I am satisfied that surface water drainage requirements can be addressed by condition.

7.5. Other Issues

7.5.1. In terms of setting of precedent for similar type developments and the planning authority's failure to consider the appellants permitted extension as a precedent for the current proposal, I note that each application is assessed on its own merits. I do not consider this application would set a negative precedent given the design proposed and compliance with development plan standards.

7.5.2. I note the appellants concern regarding the impact of the proposed development upon property values. I am not aware of any evidence to support the assertion that the

proposed development would negatively impact property values in the area, and nothing has been submitted to demonstrate that this would be the case.

7.5.3. In relation to concerns regarding unauthorised development on the site I consider this is a matter for the planning authority.

7.5.4. Regarding concerns that the planners report cited the incorrect site area, I am satisfied that this error has not materially impacted on the assessment or decision of the planning authority.

7.6. **Appropriate Assessment**

7.6.1. Having regard to the nature of the application, the minor scale of the development in the context of the permission, and to the location of the site in a serviced urban area and the separation distance to the nearest European site, no Appropriate Assessment issues arise, and it is not considered that the development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

8.0 **Recommendation**

8.1. I recommend that permission be granted, subject to the conditions below.

9.0 **Reasons and Considerations**

Having the provisions of the Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan, 2022-2028, the zoning objective to ‘provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities’, the pattern of development in the area, and the scale, form and design of the proposed development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, there would be no adverse impact on the existing residential and visual amenities of the area. The proposal would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The developer shall comply with the following:</p> <p>(a) the scale of the proposed dormer shall be reduced to 6m in width and located a minimum of 1m from the boundary with adjoining residential development</p> <p>(b) The proposed side passage shall have a height of maximum 3m.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of residential amenity / traffic safety</p>
3.	<p>The external finishes of the proposed extension (including roof tiles/slates) shall be the same as those of the existing dwelling in respect of colour and texture, or as otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
4.	<p>The developer shall comply with all requirements of the planning authority in relation to transport and traffic matters.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and the proper planning and development of the area.</p>
5.	<p>Surface water drainage arrangements shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health.</p>
6.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 and 1900 from Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800</p>

	<p>and 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity</p>
7.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</p> <p>Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.</p>

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

Bernadette Quinn
 Planning Inspector

04th December 2023

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-317563/23		
Proposed Development Summary	Demolish porch and construct extensions to dwelling		
Development Address	5 Churchtown Road Upper, Dublin 14, D14 KX57		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	X
		No	No further action required
2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) or does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?			
Yes		Class.....	EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	X		Proceed to Q.3
3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?			
		Threshold	Comment (if relevant)
No	X	N/A	Conclusion No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Class/Threshold.....	Proceed to Q.4

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?

No		Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____

Date: 04/12/23