



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-317917-23

Development	Demolition of garage and construction of a house.		
Location	Rear of No. 22 Sandymount Road, Dublin 4.		
Planning Authority Ref.	3925/23		
Applicant(s)	Eoin & Jennifer Smartt		
Type of Application	Permission	PA Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First party	Appellant	Eoin & Jennifer Smartt
Observer(s)	Viviana Pascoletti & Tom Dolan Louis Preston		
Date of Site Inspection	10/01/2024	Inspector	D. Aspell

Context

1. Site Location/ and Description

The site is at No. 22 Sandymount Road Dublin 4. It comprises the rear garage and pedestrian access, and a portion of the rear garden. The garage and pedestrian access are single storey and are located at the end of a residential cul de sac to the northeast called The Grove.

Adjacent the north of the site is the rear garage and rear garden of No. 20 Sandymount Road. Adjacent to the south is the rear garden and garden room of No. 24 Sandymount Road. To the east is No. 42A Seafort Gardens. To the north-east is The Grove. To the south-west is No. 22 Sandymount Road.

Each of the 7 no. houses in The Grove has on-curtilage parking. There is a turning area at the end of The Grove, immediately outside the site. The existing garages to the rear of Nos. 20 and 22 Sandymount Road open directly onto this turning area, as do Nos. 6 and 7 The Grove. The Grove itself is accessed from the northeast, from Beach Road through Beach Avenue.

No. 22 Sandymount Road is a 3-storey mid-terrace period dwelling. There is no on-curtilage car parking to the front. There is paid on-street parking along Sandymount Road including outside No. 22. The subject site and rear garden of No. 22 is not visible from Sandymount Road.

2. Description of development

The proposal is for:

- Demolition of single storey garage and side pedestrian entrance gate;
- Construction of a 2-storey, 2-bedroom, 4-person mews dwelling (c.98sqm);
- 1 no. on curtilage car parking space and vehicular access via The Grove.

3. Relevant Planning History

Subject site:

- Reg. Ref. 1519/04: Planning permission granted by the City Council in 2004 for a new garage and side pedestrian gate at rear of house, entered off The Grove.

Nearby sites:

- Reg. Ref. 5773/07 (ABP Ref. PL29S.227279): Split decision issued by An Bord Pleanála in 2008 at 20 Sandymount Road for (i) demolition of existing single storey garage in rear garden, (ii) construction of new 3-storey detached house with garage, 8.75m high to roof ridge, and vehicular & pedestrian access from The Grove, (iii) demolition of existing single storey return and construction of 2-storey return bathroom extension, and (iv) creation of one car parking space in front garden of No. 20 with vehicular access from Sandymount Road, Dublin 4. A split decision issued. The proposed rear bathroom extension was granted, and the remainder of the development including front parking, demolition of rear garage, and proposed new dwelling were refused. Two refusal reasons were given, the 2nd of which is relevant and is summarised as follows:

- 2. *The proposed dwelling, with access onto The Grove, would, be reason of its scale, location, design and proportions, be visually obtrusive, overbearing and incongruous and would unacceptably detract from the character and appearance of the residential conservation area and seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the property planning and sustainable development of the area.*
- Ref. 3315/07: Split decision issued in by Dublin City Council in 2007 in relation to planning application for development at 20 Sandymount Road for (i) demolition of existing single storey garage in rear garden; (ii) construction of 3 storey, 3-bedroom detached house with garage, 8.75 metres high to roof ridge, and vehicular & pedestrian access from The Grove; demolition of existing single storey return and construction of new 2-storey return bathroom extension, and (iv) creation of one car parking space in the front garden of no. 20 with vehicular access from Sandymount Road.

A split decision was issued. Permission for the proposed rear bathroom extension to No. 20 was granted, and the remainder of the development including parking space to front, demolition of garage and construction of dwelling was refused. In relation to the refused elements of the proposal, 3 no. refusal reasons were given. The first two reasons are relevant to the subject proposal and are summarised as follows:

- 1. *The proposed house, by reason of its size, height and design, will be injurious to the residential amenities of adjoining properties for reasons of overlooking and overshadowing.*
- 2. *The proposed house is significantly out of keeping with the established architectural pattern of adjacent houses in this Residential Conservation Area by reason of its size, height, architectural treatment and design.*
- Ref. 3579/98: Planning permission granted in 1999 at No. 42 Seafort Gardens by Dublin City Council for a two-storey house at side (ie. 42A Seafort Gardens).

4. Planning Policy

Development Plan

I note the following provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028:

- The land use zoning objective for the site and dwellings along Sandymount Road is 'Z2 Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Area)'. The zoning objective for adjacent lands to the east in The Grove and Seafort Gardens is 'Z1 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods'.
- Policy SC5 Urban Design and Architectural Principles and Policies SC19 High Quality Architecture and SC21 Architectural Design
- Policy QHSN6 Urban Consolidation and Objective QHSNO4 Densification of Suburbs
- Section 8.5.7 Car Parking and Policy SMT27 Car Parking in Residential and Mixed Use Developments
- Section 9.5.3 Flood Management, including Policies SI14 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, SI15 & SI16 Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment, and SI23 Green Blue Roofs.
- Policy BHA9 Conservation Areas
- Chapter 15 Development Standards, including Sections 15.4.2 Architectural Design Quality, 15.11 House Developments, 15.13 Other Residential Typologies, 15.13.4 Backland Housing, 15.13.5 Mews, 15.16 Sustainable Movement and Transport, and 15.18.14 Flood Risk Management.
- Appendix 5, including 4.3.7 Parking in the Curtilage of Protected Structures, Architectural Conservation Areas and Conservation Areas.
- Volume 7 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, including Section 4.5.1 Minor Development

Ministerial Guidelines

Sustainable Residential and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning

Authorities Compact Settlement Guidelines 2023

The Planning System & Flood Risk Management Guidelines 2009 including Section 5.28, Technical Appendices, and Circular PL2/2014

Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities', 2007

5. Natural Heritage designations

None relevant.

Decision and Grounds of Appeal

6. Planning Authority decision

The planning authority issued a notification of decision to refuse permission on 3rd August 2023 for 1 no. reason, as follows:

“The proposed backland development with access onto The Grove, would, by reason of its scale, location, design and proportions, contravene the provisions of Section 15.13.4 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028. The proposed dwelling would be visually obtrusive, overbearing and incongruous and would seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity, in contravention of Policy BHA9 of the Development Plan. The proposed dwelling would not accord with the pattern of development in this Residential Conservation Area (Z2) and would have a poor relationship with adjoining dwellings. The proposal would set an undesirable precedent for backland development within Conservation Areas, and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area”.

7. Appeal

The first party appeal on behalf of Eoin & Jennifer Smartt dated 30th August 2023 is prepared by the appellant’s architect and is summarised as follows:

- No. 22 is owned by the applicant’s parents;
- The proposed mews has been designed to preserve amenities and privacy of adjacent occupiers;
- Avoidance of overlooking, overshadowing, and overbearing impacts formed key design considerations
- The submitted daylight & sunlight assessment shows minor impacts on daylight and sunlight levels;
- The rear garden will be 7.1m deep for the proposed dwelling and 9.35m for No. 22 Sandymount Road, resulting in a combined separation distance of 16.7m;
- The proposed sloped rear roof will avoid potential overlooking;
- The accommodation schedule aligns with Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities;

- 49sqm of private amenity space is proposed for the dwelling which is above the 10sqm required for each bedspace, and 63sqm is proposed for No. 22 which is above that required for the 3-bedroom dwelling;
- The height at 6.05m is subordinate to existing properties at Sandymount Road;
- Proposed materials and colour are sympathetic to the existing dwelling;
- The proposal is contemporary architecture in line with Policy BHA9;
- Proposal is designed to respond sensitively to adjacent houses in compliance with relevant design standards set out in Section 15.13.4 and 15.13.5;
- In response to impact on No. 22 specifically, existing planting will screen and the proposed 1.8m high fence will protect privacy and amenity;
- A slate finish to the side elevations is proposed as an amendment to give a dormer style appearance which will soften the view from No. 24 (drawing 22047-PL-10 dated August 2023 submitted as part of the appeal);
- Further information was issued by the planning authority transportation and water services departments; these matters can be addressed by condition.
- The Grove is taken in charge by Dublin City Council. Applicant has existing right of access to this roadway via existing garage and pedestrian access approved under Ref. Ref. 1519/04 now proposed for demolition;
- 1 no. parking space is proposed for the development in line with the requirements for parking Zone 2;
- Service connections are proposed via this roadway.

8. Planning authority response

No response recorded.

9. Observations

An observation from Viviana Pascoletti & Tom Dolan of No. 24 Sandymount Road was received 25th September 2023 and is summarised as follows:

- Concerns regarding the overall design as it impacts their property;
- The proposal is referred to as mews development rather than backland development, the policies for which are different. The planning authority refer to the proposal as backland development;

- Section 15.13.4 of the development plan states that proposals for backland development should consider the scale, form and massing of existing properties and interrelationship with the proposed backland development;
- The ground floor level of No. 24 Sandymount road is 0.5m below the rear garden of No. 22 which would create a greater overbearing impact;
- The proposal does not relate to the existing properties, including No. 24 Sandymount Road and those on The Grove, and would create an incongruous relationship with the existing built form;
- States Dublin City Council has taken The Grove in charge, but queries the applicant right to lay services in the road.

An observation was received from Louis Preston of 16 Sandymount Road dated 22nd September 2023, and is summarised as follows:

- The building will directly overlook their back garden and invade privacy;
- It will devalue their property;
- It will block sunlight reaching their back garden.

Environmental screening

10. Environmental Impact Assessment screening

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed dwelling located in an established, serviced urban area, I consider 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 or EIA is not required (See Forms 1 and 2 Appendix 1).

11. Appropriate Assessment screening

Having regard to the nature and scale of the development and the location in an urban area with connection to existing services, and absence of connectivity to European sites, I conclude that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise as the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on any European site.

2.0 Assessment

2.1. Having regard to the foregoing; having examined the appeal documentation; having visited the site; and having regard to relevant policies and objectives, I consider the main issues in the appeal are:

- Principle of development
- Residential amenity
- Form, scale and design
- Related matters raised in the appeal

Principle of development

2.2. Residential development is permitted in principle in Z2 land use zoning objective areas. Development plan Policies QHSN6 Urban Consolidation, Policy QHSNO4, and 15.3.4 Backland Housing support backland development and densification of the suburbs in principle. I consider the principle of the development is acceptable.

2.3. For completeness I note in the submitted documentation alternating references to the development as both mews and backland development. Having regard to the characteristics of the site and surrounding area, and to the policies of the development plan, I am satisfied the development should be considered as backland development more generally rather than as mews development specifically.

Residential amenity

2.4. In relation to sunlight, daylight and overshadowing, I have reviewed the sunlight, daylight and overshadowing report submitted by the applicant. The report assesses the proposed dwelling and the likely impacts on existing development. The proposal is to the north of dwellings on Sandymount Road, and as such, potential impacts arising from the proposal would primarily be on rear gardens to the west, dwellings to the north-west (ie. mainly Nos. 6 and 7 The Grove), and to a lesser extent on No. 42A Seafort Gardens. Given the distances involved and the size of the rear gardens, and given the conclusions of the technical report submitted, I am satisfied the proposal would not have significant detrimental impacts on existing dwellings in these regards. I am also satisfied the proposal would provide for a reasonable degree of natural light for occupants.

- 2.5. In relation to overlooking, the proposed dwelling has first floor bedroom windows facing south-west and north-east. The primary areas of potential overlooking are the rear of Nos. 22 and 24 Sandymount Road and the rear of No. 42A Seafort Gardens.
- 2.6. In relation to potential overlooking of No. 22. Sandymount Road, the proposed rear first-floor window would be approximately 16m away. This exceeds backland development separation distance requirements (ie. 15m) in Section 15.13.4 Backland Housing of the development plan. I note the proposed rear window is on a pitched roof and angled upward; this will reduce the ceiling height and further reduce the potential for overlooking of both No. 22 and its rear amenity space. Back-to-back rear gardens are proposed for both the existing and proposed dwellings. I note No. 22 is a 3-storey dwelling whilst the proposal is 2-storey. I also note that the finished floor level of the proposed dwelling would be c.0.5m higher than the remaining rear garden of No. 22. On balance, having regard to the distances involved, the relative ground levels and building heights, and the proposed layout and design, I consider the proposal would not give rise to an unacceptable degree of overlooking, either from the proposed dwelling or from No. 22 Sandymount Road.
- 2.7. In relation to potential overlooking of No. 24 Sandymount Road adjacent to the south, due to the proximity and alignment of the proposed first floor relative to the existing ground floor extension to the rear of No. 24 I do not consider there would be significant overlooking. Above ground floor level, the existing first floor return to the rear of No. 24 does not have any windows facing the proposed development. The existing windows in the main rear elevation of No. 24 that face the site would be approximately 17m away. As such I do not consider there would be significant overlooking between No. 24 and the proposed development.
- 2.8. I do not consider there is any significant prospect of the proposal overlooking dwellings along The Grove or other dwellings along Sandymount Road.
- 2.9. In relation to potential overlooking of No. 42A, I note that whilst not directly to the rear of No. 42A, the front elevation of the proposed dwelling would be in close proximity to the rear of No. 42A. No. 42A is a 2-storey dwelling and I note the proposal at first floor would be c.18m to the rear elevation of No. 42A at first floor. I am satisfied that overlooking between the elevations of No. 42A and the proposed dwelling would not be significant. However, I consider the proposal would overlook

the majority of the rear amenity space of No. 42A. Whilst I acknowledge a box-window is proposed and there is an existing garden room within the rear garden of No. 42A which would provide some mitigation in this regard, I consider the dwelling as proposed would have a significant negative impact on the residential amenity of the rear garden of No. 42A in terms of overlooking of the rear private amenity space. As such I do not consider the current proposal is consistent with Section 15.13.4 Backland Housing or Policy SC5 of the development plan.

- 2.10. In relation to overbearance, I note again the ground levels within the rear garden of No. 22. Given the distance involved and the relative heights of the two dwellings I do not consider there would be significant detrimental impacts on either the existing or proposed dwelling in this regard.
- 2.11. However, in relation to overbearance of No. 24 Sandymount Road to the south, the proposed dwelling would measure over c.14.5m in length at first floor and would run alongside a large portion (ie. c.two-thirds) of the remaining open rear garden space of No. 24. Finished ground levels within the site would be between c.0.5m and c.0.7m higher than the garden of No. 24, and the proposed structure would be c.6m in height. I note the proposal would be set back from the shared boundary between c.0.75m and c.1.75m at first floor. I also note No. 24 has been extended to the rear and has a garden room adjacent the subject site. On balance I consider the first-floor element as proposed would be unacceptably overbearing over a large portion of the rear garden of No. 24 and would have a significant negative impact on the residential amenity of the private amenity space of No. 24 Sandymount Road as a result. As such I do not consider the proposal is consistent with Section 15.13.4 Backland Housing and Policies SC5 of the development plan in this regard.
- 2.12. In relation to overbearance of No. 20 Sandymount Road to the north, I note that whilst there would be some impacts on No. 20 in this regard, I consider these would generally be acceptable. In this regard, whilst I note the proposal would not be set back from the boundary with No. 20, over half the length of the proposed dwelling would sit beside the existing garage of No. 20, and the remaining rear garden is significantly larger than that of No. 24. As such I consider that the proposal is acceptable in relation to overbearance in this regard.

Form, scale and design

- 2.13. In relation to the proposed demolition, I consider the garage and rear access are of little conservation value. As such the proposed demolition in principle is acceptable and would not have a detrimental impact on the area or the character of Z2 lands.
- 2.14. In relation to the site context, whilst located to the rear of No. 22 and at the end of a cul de sac, due to the absence of development either side and the layout of the area, the proposed dwelling would be prominent in the context of surrounding dwellings.
- 2.15. In relation to the design and character of the area, the surrounding dwellings are a mixture of 2- and 3-storeys. The majority have hipped or gabled roofs. To the west, No. 22 Sandymount Road and the adjoining dwellings are Victorian-era dwellings, and the dwellings to the north, east and south are modern. The prevailing materials in the area are brick and render, whereas the proposal is primarily render and slate.
- 2.16. In relation to the proposed dwelling layout and internal provision, the height, footprint and volume are each approximately twice that of the existing garage. The majority of the dwelling floorspace would be at first floor. The first floor comprises 2 no. double-bed bedrooms, a study, and storage. Both bedrooms are large en-suite bedrooms and measure approximately 17.6sqm and 17.7sqm in area respectively. An on-curtilage parking space is proposed, as is dedicated side access to the rear garden.
- 2.17. In relation to form and design, I note the finishes at first floor are proposed to be changed as part of the appeal. The proposed dwelling is flat-roofed and relatively long (c.14.5m), with the first floor being wider and longer than the ground floor. Fenestration is confined to the front and rear elevations. Whilst the ground floor and eastern/front elevations are reasonably well modulated, the side and rear elevations offer little in this regard. When viewed from the east/front the dwelling would be subordinate in height and width compared to neighbouring dwellings, however when viewed from the side I consider the scale is excessive relative to the site and other dwellings in the area. I consider the side and rear elevations would present a severe form and design which would not complement the existing dwellings in the area.
- 2.18. Having regard to the foregoing, I consider the dwelling as currently proposed, primarily on account of its form, scale, and design, particularly at first-floor, would be incongruous, visually obtrusive and out of character with the area. I consider that given its context, the dwelling as proposed would seriously injure the visual and residential amenities of dwellings in the vicinity and would be inconsistent with the Z2

land use zoning objective for the area and Policies SC5 and BHA9 and Section 15.13.4 Backland Housing of the development plan. In this regard, I do not consider the proposal contributes positively to the character and distinctiveness of the area or protects and enhances the character and appearance of the area and its setting. In this regard, whilst the proposed architecture is contemporary, I do not consider it to be in harmony with the residential conservation area.

Related matters raised in the appeal

- 2.19. For completeness I set out commentary below relating to matters raised in the appeal and observations regarding access, water and drainage. Should the Board be minded to grant permission for the proposed development I consider these matters can be resolved by conditions as set out below.

Access

- 2.20. In relation to vehicular access to serve the development, the roadway in The Grove is c.7.5 wide inclusive of footpath. Immediately outside the site is a turning circle, which is over c.10m wide. There is no footpath outside the site, however given the site is at the end of a cul de sac I consider this is acceptable. I note the planning authority transportation division report state that The Grove is taken in charge.
- 2.21. In relation to parking provision, the site is within Zone 2 of Map J of the development plan. One parking space is proposed which is acceptable.
- 2.22. In relation to parking for No. 22 Sandymount Road, the proposal involves demolition of the garage serving No. 22. There is no on-curtilage parking to the front of No. 22, however on-street permit parking is available outside No. 22. Demolition of the garage and loss of dedicated parking for No. 22 is acceptable in these regards.
- 2.23. The planning authority transportation division report states there may be a conflict between the proposed parking layout and the main dwelling access and recommends further information in this regard. I note the site can accommodate a standard size parking space, with an additional c.0.5m circulation space around this. I am satisfied that, given the proposed internal and external layout, satisfactory detailed design of the parking and access layout can be agreed by condition.
- 2.24. The planning authority transportation division also recommended further information in relation to the provision of gates. The report further identifies the absence of

dedicated cycle parking and temporary waste storage. Given the proposed rear garden, the set back of the front ground floor elevation, and dedicated side access I am satisfied these matters can be resolved by condition.

Drainage and water

- 2.25. In relation to drainage, the application proposes new foul and surface water drains in the public roadway, both of which are to connect to an existing foul manhole in The Grove. A surface water attenuation tank is proposed under the proposed car parking space, and a tree pit connected to the proposed on-site surface water drainage network is proposed in the rear garden. Details of water supply and water supply pre-connection enquiry from Irish Water are not included.
- 2.26. The report from the planning authority Drainage Division recommended further information relating to management of surface water. In this regard, the report states the construction of private drains in the public carriageway is not permitted and that the design should be revised to comply with the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works. The report also requests the applicant provide evidence of approval from Irish Water for connection to their infrastructure. Having regard to the information submitted including the proposed drainage layout, and the available water supply and drainage infrastructure in the vicinity, I am satisfied these issues could be resolved by condition in the event of a decision to grant permission.
- 2.27. Proposals for green or blue roof are not required for the proposal in line with Policy SI23 Green Blue Roofs of the development plan.
- 2.28. In relation to flood risk, the site is within Flood Risk Zone B. A flood risk assessment is submitted with the application, including a justification test. Site specific flood risk mitigation is proposed. This includes flood resistant ground floor construction, drop-down electrical wiring and raised outlets, and an emergency flood response plan. Section 4.51 of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment states the requirement for providing compensatory storage for minor developments can be relaxed; the applicant addresses this matter and confirms no compensatory storage is to be provided. As the proposed backland development is minor I am satisfied it can be permitted with the proposed mitigation in line with policy and national guidelines. Overall I am satisfied the proposed development with the proposed mitigation would not significantly increase flood risk subject to condition.

Construction management

- 2.29. The site is located at the end of a cul de sac and opens onto a turning circle. I note uncontrolled parking within the turning circle outside the site. I also note a number of vehicular and pedestrian accesses open onto the turning circle. No construction management plan is submitted. A number of observations raise concerns in this regard. Appropriate management of construction activities is required, including to ensure the safe and efficient movement and parking of vehicles in the vicinity of the site. A condition requiring the agreement of a construction management plan would be appropriate in the event of a decision to grant planning permission.

3.0 Recommendation

- 3.1. I recommend permission be refused for the reasons and considerations below.

4.0 Reasons & Considerations

The proposed development, by reason of its form, scale and design would be visually obtrusive, overbearing and incongruous, and would unacceptably detract from the character and appearance of the residential conservation area. The proposal would seriously injure the residential and visual amenities of dwellings in the vicinity and would contravene the Z2 land use zoning objective and Policies SC5 and BHA9 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

-I confirm 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.-

Dan Aspell

Inspector

15th January 2024

APPENDIX 1

Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening [EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	317917-23		
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of garage and construction of a house.		
Development Address	Rear of No. Sandymount Road, Dublin 4.		
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) and 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)
			Conclusion
No		N/A	No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required
Yes	X	Class/Threshold.....	Proceed to Q.4
4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?			
No	X	Preliminary Examination required	
Yes		Screening Determination required	

Inspector: _____

Date: __13th January 2024__

Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	317917-23		
Development Summary	Demolition of garage and construction of a house.		
Examination			Yes / No / Uncertain
1. Is the size or nature of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment?			No
2. Will the development result in the production of any significant waste, or result in significant emissions or pollutants?			No
3. Is the proposed development located on, in, adjoining or have the potential to impact on an ecologically sensitive site or location*?			No
4. Does the proposed development have the potential to affect other significant environmental sensitivities in the area?			No
Comment (if relevant)			
Conclusion			
Based on a preliminary examination of the nature, size or location of the development, is there a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment **?			
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment	EIAR not required	Yes	
There is significant and realistic doubt in regard to the likelihood of significant effects on the environment	Screening Determination required	No	
	Sch 7A information submitted?	Yes	No
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment	EIAR is required (Issue notification)	No	

Inspector _____ **Date:** __13th January 2024_____

DP/ADP _____ **Date:** _____

(only where EIAR/ Schedule 7A information is being sought)