



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-318146-23

Development	Construction of extension, shed and associated site works.
Location	52 Copeland Grove, Clontarf, Dublin 3, D03 F6X3
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council North
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	4147/23
Applicant(s)	Pat and Susan McNamara
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Pat and Susan McNamara
Observer(s)	Lisa Toolan and residents of Malahide Road; Bridget McGrath and residents of Copeland Grove; Pauline O'Dwyer and residents of Copeland Grove; Tony and Imelda Walsh; Paschal Preston and Trish Morgan; Cllr Catherine Stocker; Brenda and Paul Dolan; Niamh and Damian Bracken;

Denise and James Lidieth; Mary
Kilduff; Stephen and Dolores
Kavanagh; Cllr. Deirdre Heney; and
Sean Haughey TD.

Date of Site Inspection

18th June 2023

Inspector

Bernadette Quinn

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site, with a stated area of 1,607 m², is located at No. 52 Copeland Grove, Dublin 3. The site accommodates a 2-storey, semi-detached dwelling which is one of six similar dwellings arranged around a cul-de-sac. A pedestrian laneway between Nos. 52 and 54 Copeland Grove provides pedestrian access from Copeland Grove to Malahide Road. This laneway adjoins the south-western boundary of the subject site.
- 1.2. The existing dwelling has a 2-storey and single-storey extension to the side and rear, with off-street car parking to the front. The rear garden extends to a depth of approx. 30 m, beyond which is located Mount Temple Secondary School. The property has an extensive side garden which contains a number of mature trees and is backland in nature with restricted access thereto. The buildings associated with Mount Temple Comprehensive School abut the north-eastern boundary of the side garden, with an undeveloped land parcel adjoining the northern and north-western boundaries. The rear gardens of 2-storey dwellings on Malahide Road are located beyond this undeveloped land parcel.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the following:
 - Construction of a two-storey extension to the rear and side of existing dwelling with the following characteristics:
 - Floor area of 596.7 sq.m. comprising 342 sq.m at ground floor and 254 sq.m at first floor.
 - Designed in a curved footprint with a barrel shaped roof with a ridge height of 7.138m and flat roof element with a ridge height of 5.95m.
 - Construction of a single storey flat roof structure for storage including storage of bicycles with a ridge height of 2.585m and with a floor area of approximately 36 sq.m.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

On 06th September 2023 the Planning Authority refused permission for one reason as follows:

The proposed extension of 433sq.m is more than 2.5 times the size of the existing house and contains a significant increase in the number of bedspaces while having minimal relationship with the existing house. Appendix 18.1.7 of the current Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 requires that any extension should not dominate the existing building and should normally be of an overall scale and size to harmonise with the existing house and adjoining buildings. The proposed extension would result in a dwelling, in its scale, extent and appearance, significantly out of proportion with the existing context and would, in itself and by the adverse precedent established for significantly overscaled domestic extensions, cause serious injury to the residential amenities of the area. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to both the current Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The local authority planning report can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed extension is more than 2.5 times the size of the existing house and would accommodate up to 16 people in the eight ensuite double bedrooms.
- The extension has minimal relationship and connectivity with the existing house and could serve as a fully separate entity with the undesignated rooms at ground and first floor able to accommodate kitchens or living rooms. No new car parking is proposed to serve the additional accommodation.

- The Development Plan is explicit under Appendix 18 that residential extensions should not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing building and to make a positive contribution to its context.
- The proposed development is grossly out of scale with the main dwelling and would not be consistent with the established character of Copeland Grove, which is composed of family houses of three and four bedrooms with proportional extensions and at a common scale.
- The decision by An Bord Pleanála reference ABP-313683-22 for a dwelling to the side of 52 Copeland is more appropriate for the site in terms of scale and appearance.
- Permitting an extension of such scale to a typical domestic dwelling would set an undesirable and unsustainable precedent for the area and would be directly contrary to the policy set out in the Development Plan.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Division: Additional information required in relation to the management of surface water.

Transportation Planning: Additional information required in relation to the following:

- The proposed is assessed as if it were an apartment block and requires submission of a Service Delivery and Access Strategy, Operational Waste Management Plan and Residential Travel Plan.
- Development Plan car parking standards for an apartment scheme of the scale proposed provide that the maximum allowed on site is 9 no. spaces.
- Inadequate bicycle parking to is provided to comply with the standards for cycle parking under the Development Plan.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None

3.4. Third Party Observations

17 submissions were received in relation to the proposed development. Issues raised include concerns relating to the scale of development relative to the existing dwelling; impact on the character of the area; the development results in the equivalent of an additional 3-4 houses; no increase in parking is proposed; increased traffic; overdevelopment; concerns relating to reinstatement of pedestrian access to lane; impact on drainage and sewerage.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. The following planning applications relate to the appeal Site:

3492/22 / ABP-313683-22: On 27/07/2023 [after the date the application which is the subject of this appeal was lodged to the planning authority] permission was granted following a first party appeal for construction of a dwelling and all associated site works. Condition no. 2 is of note which states “No onsite car parking shall be provided for the new dwelling. Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall submit for the written agreement of the planning authority revised drawings showing the turning circle and parking proposed to the rear of number 52 Copeland Grove removed and the area landscaped. Reason: In the interest of traffic safety.”

3823/21: Permission refused by DCC for a detached single storey dwelling for one reason relating to traffic safety.

2273/20 / ABP-307225-20: Permission refused by DCC and ABP for three no. two storey houses with associated shared surface parking for one reason relating to traffic hazard.

2856/19 permission refused by DCC for three no. two storey mews houses with associated shared surface parking for one reason relating to substandard vehicular access.

3053/18 Permission refused by DCC for development comprising a terrace of four houses with associated access road and services for four reasons relating to design, impact on existing dwelling, impact on residential amenities of adjoining dwellings and impact on pedestrian right of way.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The Dublin City Development Plan, 2022-2028 is the operational development plan for the area within which the site is zoned 'Z1 – Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods'. This land use objective seeks: “to protect, provide and improve residential amenities”.
- 5.1.2. Volume 2 Appendix 18 relates to ancillary residential accommodation. Section 1.1 acknowledges that residential extensions play an important role in promoting a compact city as well as providing for sustainable neighbourhoods and areas where a wide range of families can live. It states that the: “design of residential extensions should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties and in particular, the need for light and privacy. In addition, the form of the existing building should be respected.” It also sets out the following design principles for residential extensions:
- Not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling.
 - Not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy, outlook and access to daylight and sunlight.
 - Achieve a high quality of design.
 - Make a positive contribution to the streetscape (front extensions).

Section 1.2 relates to extensions to the rear and states that first floor extensions will only be permitted where the planning authority is satisfied that there will be no significant negative impacts on surrounding residential or visual amenities, with factors to be considered including overshadowing, overbearing, and overlooking and that external finishes and design, which shall generally be in harmony with existing.

Section 1.3 provides that ground floor side extensions will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size, and visual harmony with existing (especially front elevation) and impacts on adjoining residential amenity. In relation to first floor extensions, in certain cases a set-back of an extension's front façade and its roof profile and ridge may be sought to protect amenities, integrate into the streetscape,

and avoid a 'terracing' effect. External finishes shall normally be in harmony with existing.

Section 1.4 relates to privacy and amenity and states that it is important to make sure that any extension does not unacceptably affect the amenities of neighbouring properties. This includes privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight.

Section 1.7 states "the extension should not dominate the existing building and should normally be of an overall scale and size to harmonise with the existing house and adjoining buildings".

5.1.3. Section 7.0 Ancillary Family Accommodation refers to subdivision or extension of a single family dwelling unit to accommodate an immediate family member. Generally, the purpose of ancillary family accommodation is to provide an amenable living area offering privacy, manoeuvrability and independence while maintaining a direct connection to the main dwelling. Usually, there is no exterior difference in appearance between an extension and ancillary family accommodation and is still considered a single residential unit.

5.1.4. Policy GI41 states it is the Policy of Dublin City Council to protect existing trees as part of new development, particularly those that are of visual, biodiversity or amenity quality and significance. There will be a presumption in favour of retaining and safeguarding trees that make a valuable contribution to the environment.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

5.2.1. The subject site is located approx. 700m from the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (site code 004024) and North Dublin Bay Proposed NHA.

5.3. EIA Screening

5.3.1. See Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening attached to this report. Notwithstanding the description of the proposed development as an extension, given the scale of development proposed, it is appropriate to bring this to preliminary screening. See also Form 2 EIA Preliminary Examination attached to this report.

5.3.2. Having regard to the limited nature and scale of the proposed development and the absence of any connectivity to any sensitive location, to the criteria set out in

Schedule 7 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, as amended, to the established suburban nature of the receiving environment, and to the nature, extent, characteristics and likely duration of potential impacts, I conclude that the proposed development is not likely to have significant effects on the environment and that the submission of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first party appeal can be summarised as follows:

Design and Layout

- The proposal is to accommodate multigenerational housing for one family and has been designed to offer privacy for all occupants.
- The design avoids overlooking with all first-floor windows in excess of 11m from boundaries with the exception of a south-western window which is 7.36m from the laneway which provides visual control over the laneway.
- The design is unlikely to have any impact on adjoining properties due to being screened by existing trees and setback from adjoining boundaries.
- Internal standards have had regard to *Quality Housing Sustainable Communities*.
- The plot ratio of 0.37 and site coverage of 24% are lower than that proposed in the Development Plan.
- Private open space is in excess of Development Plan requirements.
- The site is very well served by public transport and bicycle parking is to be provided on site. The existing two car parking spaces are to be retained.
- The extension is proposed to be set back from the existing site frontage in excess of 20 metres and from the building line by 10 metres to limit the impact on adjoining amenities and on the street.

- The design and layout maintain the character of the existing house and the streetscape and the scale and height proposed avoids overshadowing.
- The reason for refusal relating to Appendix 18 of the Development Plan is believed to be erroneous as the proposal complies with Development Plan standards. The site is unique in that it provides the opportunity to provide the level of accommodation proposed without impacting on the existing house on site or on houses in the vicinity.

Precedent

- Similar site characteristics exist to the rear of No. 25 Hollybrook Grove where a primary school is accessed by a side laneway which measures 2.64m in width granted by DCC, permission reference 3140/00 .
- At 25 The Styles Road, DCC granted permission reference 1039/07 with access to a site that runs along a general public laneway with a width of 2.64m., not dissimilar to the appeal site.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

The response from the planning authority can be summarised as follows:

- Requests the decision to refuse permission be upheld.
- If permission is granted, a Section 48 development contribution condition is requested to be applied.

6.3. Observations

13 observations have been received from Lisa Toolan and residents of Malahide Road; Bridget McGrath and residents of Copeland Grove; Pauline O'Dwyer and residents of Copeland Grove; Tony and Imelda Walsh; Paschal Preston and Trish Morgan; Cllr Catherine Stocker; Brenda and Paul Dolan; Niamh and Damian Bracken; Denise and James Lidieth; Mary Kilduff; Stephen and Dolores Kavanagh; Cllr. Deirdre Heney; and Sean Haughey TD. The issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- The scale, proportions and design of the extension are contrary to planning policy, would have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling, are inconsistent with existing houses in the area, and would cause serious injury to the residential amenities of the area.
- Considerable impacts will arise on neighbouring properties, including in relation to views and aspects, overlooking, noise disturbance and loss of daylight.
- The proposal fails to address previous reasons for refusal on the site and the first party appeal fails to address deficiencies in the planning application.
- The property has previously been extended and combined with the proposed development will resemble a hotel or apartment block. The proposed extension is not subordinate to the existing dwelling.
- There is a lack of detail in the application including in relation to layout of spaces and their function and there is limited interconnectivity between the existing house and the extension.
- Inadequate vehicular access and car parking is proposed which is contrary to the Development Plan and would result in more on street parking on an already congested road, risks obstruction to emergency vehicles and bin lorries, and will be a hazard to pedestrians and cyclists using the laneway.
- The existing vehicular entrance and road are unsuited to construction traffic. Construction of the development would require the laneway wall to be demolished and rebuilt when construction is completed resulting in a traffic hazard.
- The requirements of the Dublin City Tree Strategy have not been met and no measures to protect wildlife have been included.
- The appeal includes false claims relating to reinstating direct access to the laneway. No. 52 has never had any direct access from its rear garden on to the laneway. Prior applications for commercial development in this rear garden were rejected because of risks to users of the laneway.

- The applicant has no legal right of way to make alterations to the laneway which could encroach upon it.
- The proposal to use the development as a single family home is not credible and raises questions regarding the intended use of the development.
- The appeal site and other rear gardens in the area act as sinks to alleviate flooding, the risk of flooding will be amplified as a result of the development.
- The Board granted permission for a dwelling without parking on the appeal site under reference ABP-313683-22 and clarification is sought regarding where additional vehicles at this approved dwelling will be parked.

6.4. Further Responses

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 issue in this appeal are as follows:

- Design and Visual Impact
- Nature of Development
- Precedent
- Other Issues

7.2. Design and Visual Impact

7.2.1. The extension is proposed to be located to the side and rear of the existing dwelling, extending in a curved form approximately 26 m from the existing side elevation. The design incorporates a barrel shaped roof with a ridge height of 7.1m which is below the existing ridge height of 7.5m. A flat roofed element with a height of 5.9m is proposed to the side of the existing dwelling which is higher than the existing first floor eaves height of 5.1m. The extension is proposed to be connected via what

appears to be a utility room at ground floor in the existing dwelling. At first floor there is no connection between the existing dwelling and the extension, with access to the first floor proposed via stairs within the extension. The existing dwelling on site has a floor area of 196 sq.m. The proposal would provide for an additional 596 sq.m. which, if permitted, would provide for a dwelling with a total floor area of 766 sq.m. Accommodation within the extension comprises an additional 8 en-suite bedrooms and 2 no. additional spaces at ground and first floor (each with a floor area of 43.sq.m) for which the purpose has not been stated.

- 7.2.2. The Development Plan guidance contained in Appendix 18 relating to ancillary residential accommodation acknowledges the important role extensions play in providing for sustainable neighbourhoods where a wide range of families can live. In relation to design, the guidance includes that the form of the existing building should be respected; the extension should avoid having a significant negative impact on surrounding residential amenities and that the extension should not dominate the existing building and should normally be of an overall scale and size to harmonise with the existing house and adjoining buildings.
- 7.2.3. In relation to site context, I note the uniform pattern of development in the area and that whilst a number of dwellings on Copeland Grove have been extended or altered, in general the variation in form, scale and design is in keeping with the form and character of existing dwellings.
- 7.2.4. I consider that the extension would conflict significantly with the form and scale of the existing dwelling and adjoining dwellings particularly when viewed from Copeland Grove and from the existing dwelling on site. This arises primarily from the overall footprint size and shape, and from the variation in roof styles which include a barrel roof to the rear and a flat roof towards the front which would extend above the existing eaves height. I consider the proposed two storey extension with a length of 23 m from the existing rear elevation and an overall height of 7.138m is overly dominant and out of scale with that of the existing dwelling and the established pattern of development and architectural character of the area. Although the extension is set back from the front elevation, I consider it would be visually incongruous when viewed from the existing dwelling on site and from Copeland Grove fronting the site and would have a significant detrimental impact on the visual

amenities of the area and on the scale and character of the existing dwelling and adjoining dwellings.

- 7.2.5. Although the proposal complies with development plan provisions relating to plot ratio, site coverage, and distance from boundaries and is setback from the existing front building line, I consider the proposal is not one which is ancillary to the existing dwelling in terms of floor area and scale. As such, I consider the proposal does not accord with the specific guidance and recommendations relating to residential extensions contained in Section 1.0 of Appendix 18 of the Development Plan
- 7.2.6. Whilst the application does not seek permission for a family flat, the first party outlines that the need for the extension is to accommodate different generations of the applicants' family. The Development Plan guidance in relation to ancillary family accommodation provides that usually, there is no exterior difference in appearance between an extension and ancillary family accommodation and is still considered a single residential unit. I do not consider the proposed extension complies in this regard and I also note the limited connection between the existing dwelling and the proposed extension, with no connection provided at first floor.
- 7.2.7. Noting the size of the site and separation distances from neighbouring dwellings I do not consider the proposal is likely to impact on daylight or sunlight of neighbouring properties or result in excessive overlooking.

7.3. Nature of Development

- 7.3.1. Concerns have been raised by observers and the planning authority in relation to the potential future use of the extension. Notwithstanding the proposed use as described in the planning application, the scale of development would not be ancillary to the original house. The proposed layout reflects a shared or more institutional type of use such as student accommodation or shared living. I consider the resulting intensity of use (8 no. en-suite bedrooms plus ancillary accommodation) would result in an intensity of use that is not appropriate to this restricted site.
- 7.3.2. The Board should note that this would comprise a new issue as it is not cited in the planning authority's decision but is a significant concern in relation to the scale of the proposal for this site. Given the fundamental reason for refusal relating to design the Board may not consider it necessary to attach a reason for refusal relating to this issue.

7.4. Precedent

- 7.4.1. I agree with the first party that the appeal site may be unique in the area in terms of its capacity to accommodate additional development, and this capacity is evident in the grant of permission for a detached dwelling permitted under ABP-313683-22 under which planning permission was granted for a single storey dwelling with a ridge height of 5.71m and which is offset from the rear of the existing dwelling on site by approximately 13 metres. In making its decision, the Board considered the house as proposed would be in accordance with the development plan requirements with respect to design, layout and impact on adjoining properties. I do not consider a precedent has been set by the permitted development, noting the differences in scale, height and separation distances and resulting impacts on the existing dwelling on site.
- 7.4.2. Within the general vicinity of the appeal site, there are no directly comparable existing two storey rear extensions to that of the subject proposal, particularly in terms of size and scale. The appeal submission includes details of applications which are considered to demonstrate precedent for the proposed development. I note the precedents referred to were assessed under previous development plans and in my opinion are not relevant to the planning authority's reason for refusal or to the appeal site which does not propose a new vehicular access. As such, I do not consider that these applications are appropriate precedents for the purposes of this case.

7.5. Other Issues

- 7.5.1. In relation to flood risk, the appeal site is located within Flood Zone C. The proposed development is therefore acceptable from a Flood Risk perspective. However, details in relation to the management of surface water resulting from the development have not been included in the application.
- 7.5.2. Observers have raised concerns in relation to non-compliance with Development Plan provisions relating to protection of trees. No tree survey or landscape plan has been submitted with the application and I note that the proposed development would result in the removal of some trees from the site. Development Plan policy GI41 seeks to protect existing trees as part of new development, particularly those that are of visual, biodiversity or amenity quality and significance and that make a valuable

contribution to the environment. There are no objectives on the site to protect or preserve trees. Having regard to the general nature of the policy I am satisfied that the development will not materially contravene any specific policy or objective of the Development Plan.

- 7.5.3. With regard to the opening of a pedestrian entrance from the site onto the lane, the Planning Authority considered this would not be appropriate or necessary. Whilst provision of a pedestrian access onto an existing pedestrian route may be acceptable in principle, no details have been submitted in relation to this access in terms of the width and height of the access and proposed boundary treatments. In relation to concerns relating to the first party having sufficient legal interest to carry out alterations to the laneway, including the boundary wall along the laneway, the observers have not submitted any evidence to support their concerns in this regard. I note that the planning authority were satisfied that the applicant demonstrated sufficient legal interest to make the planning application. It is not clear if any legal issues arise however Section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act provides that an applicant shall not be entitled solely by reason of permission to carry out any development.
- 7.5.4. An observer has sought clarification in relation to the Boards decision to grant permission on the appeal site for a dwelling under planning permission reference ABP-313683-22. I do not consider it is within the remit of this appeal to consider matters relating to a separate application for which a decision has been made.

8.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening

- 8.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located approx. 700m from the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (site code 004024).

The proposed development comprises the development of a residential extension, shed and associated site works. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site. The reason for this conclusion stems from the limited scale and nature of the proposed development and the lack of connections to the nearest European site.

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

Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

9.0 Recommendation

- 9.1. I recommend that permission be refused for the reasons and considerations set out below.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 10.1. Having regard to the Z1 zoning objective for the site which seeks to protect, provide and improve residential amenities, and Section 1.0 (Residential Extensions) of Appendix 18 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028 which requires that extensions should not dominate the existing building and should normally be of an overall scale and size to harmonise with the existing house and adjoining buildings, and to the scale, mass, design, height and proportions of the proposed development, it is considered that the development would be out of scale and out of character in comparison with the existing dwelling and the prevailing architectural context, would have a negative impact on the character of the existing dwelling and would appear visually incongruous on the streetscape. The proposed development would therefore fail to accord with the Z1 zoning objective pertaining to the site which seeks to protect, provide and improve residential amenities, would fail to comply with the provisions set out in Section 1 of Appendix 18 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 in respect of residential extensions and would, therefore, by itself and by reason of the undesirable precedent it would set for similar development in the area, be contrary to proper planning and sustainable development.

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

21st June 2024

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-318146-23		
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of extension, shed and associated site works.		
Development Address	52 Copeland Grove, Clontarf, Dublin 3, D03 F6X3.		
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)
No		N/A	No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required
Yes	X	Class 10(b)(i) and (iv) of Schedule 5 Part 2	Proceed to Q.4

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?

No	X	Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

Appendix 1 - Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-318146-23	
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of extension, shed and associated site works..	
Development Address	52 Copeland Grove, Clontarf, Dublin 3, D03 F6X3	
<p>The Board carries out a preliminary examination [Ref. Art. 109(2)(a), Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)] of, at least, the nature, size or location of the proposed development having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations.</p>		
	Examination	Yes/No/ Uncertain
<p>Nature of the Development</p> <p>Is the nature of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment?</p> <p>Will the development result in the production of any significant waste, emissions or pollutants?</p>	<p>Proposal for a residential extension on land zoned residential located in an existing urban area is not considered exceptional in the context of the existing urban environment.</p> <p>No, the proposal will be connected to the existing water supply and waste water drainage infrastructure. Construction waste can be managed through standard waste management conditions.</p>	No
<p>Size of the Development</p> <p>Is the size of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment?</p> <p>Are there significant cumulative considerations having regard to other existing</p>	<p>The proposed development is not considered exceptional in the context of the existing urban environment.</p> <p>No</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>

and/or permitted projects?		
<p>Location of the Development</p> <p>Is the proposed development located on, in, adjoining or does it have the potential to significantly impact on an ecologically sensitive site or location?</p> <p>Does the proposed development have the potential to significantly affect other significant environmental sensitivities in the area?</p>	<p>No, South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024) and North Dublin Bay Proposed NHA are located approximately 700m south of the site.</p> <p>There are no other locally sensitive environmental sensitivities in the vicinity of relevance.</p>	No
<p style="text-align: center;">Conclusion</p>		
<p>There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>EIA not required.</p>		

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

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

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)