



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-318670-23

Development	Retention of rear extension to dwelling house, completion of same and all associated site works.
Location	Dowdstown, Ardee, Co. Louth.
Planning Authority	Louth County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	23316
Applicant(s)	Henry and Gwyneth Mahoko
Type of Application	Retention
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Retention
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Tony and Margaret Maguire Jim Curtis
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	4 th March 2024
Inspector	Rónán O'Connor

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
3.1. Decision	3
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	3
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	6
3.4. Third Party Observations	6
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	7
5.1. Development Plan.....	7
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations.	8
5.3. EIA Screening	8
5.4. Appropriate Assessment	8
6.0 The Appeal	8
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	8
6.2. Applicant Response	11
6.3. Planning Authority Response	13
6.4. Observations	13
7.0 Assessment	13
8.0 Recommendation.....	19
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	19
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1.1. The application site is located with the rural area of Dowdstown, Ardee and is situated on the southern side of the R-215 Regional Road. The site measures 0.27 ha. The site comprises of an existing dwelling semi-detached single storey dwelling (46.91 sq. m) with a 1.5 storey rear extension (148.87 sq. m.) currently under construction and which forms the retention and completion element of this application.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Retention permission for as constructed rear extension to dwelling house and completion of same. Permission for waste water treatment system and percolation to serve same, decommission existing septic tank, all in relation to grant of permission ref. no. 211388 and all associated site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. Grant permission [decision date 17th November 2023] subject to 8 no. conditions. Conditions of note include:
- Condition No. 2 – Internal room configuration as per the plans and particulars lodged with the PA on 6th July 2023
 - Condition No. 3 – Glazing serving Bed 3 to be obscured/removal of pipes and wiring/removal of Juliette Balcony/landing window to be obscured
 - Condition No. 4 – Extension to be integral to the house and not subdivided.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. Planning Reports
- 3.2.2. The First Planner's report is summarised below:
- Principle of development acceptable in principle

- Notes previous extension granted under 21/1338
- Extension which is subject the retention application is 23 sq. m. larger than what was granted/internal configuration and window arrangement altered
- Notes *inter alia* an additional window on the western elevation
- Concern in relation to the internal configuration at ground floor/door is shown on the plans/is not provided for on-site/no subdivision of rooms to provide for Bed 3, Bathroom and Utility – forms one large room/FI requested in relation to same
- Concerns in relation to the overlooking of the neighbouring amenity space/ FI requested in relation to same
- First floor has been constructed larger than that granted under the previous permission
- Internal room arrangements are accurate
- As constructed first floor includes an additional dormer window/dormer window that has been granted has been altered to provide for a Juliette balcony
- Concerns in relation the provision of a Juliette balcony to the rear elevation c3m from the boundary of an adjoining property to the west/ FI requested in relation to same
- Additional dormer windows is considered to be acceptable
- Satisfied that window at ground level on the eastern boundary will not result in an adverse impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property to the east.
- Window serving the landing on the site elevation should be obscured
- Scale of the proposed extension is not considered to be excessive/condition to be attached in relation to use for domestic purposes
- Overall height and depth is as granted under Reg Ref 21/1338
- Note small section of rear of site is subject to pluvial flooding/Satisfied that there is no flood risk to the proposed development

- Further information required in relation to the proposed waste water treatment/minimum separation distances as per Section 6.3 of the EPA Code of Practice is not achieved/location of all WWTS within 100m required
- Further information required in relation to the location of the soakaway
- Note submissions in relation to wiring and possible use of a heat pump

3.2.3. Further Information was requested on 25th August 2023 in relation to the following issues:

1. (a-c) Dimensions/distance to boundaries/all structures to be shown on drawings
2. Clarification of ground floor layout/address concerns in relation to overlooking from Bed 3/address overlooking from the Juliette balcony
3. Clarification on proposed use of pipes/wiring/potential noise concerns in relation to the end use/demonstrate compliance with Planning Regulations
4. Additional details/Clarification/Separation distances/potential inaccuracies relating to the proposed waste water treatment system

3.2.4. Further Information was received on 31st October 2023.

3.2.5. The Second Planner's report is summarised below:

- PA is satisfied that applicant has addressed Items 1(a-c).
- Consider that the window on ground level serving Bed 3 should be obscured in its entirety
- Considered that Juliette Balcony should be removed/revert back to a window of similar size and design to that granted under 21/1338
- Applicant has confirmed that pipes and wiring is to be removed
- Satisfied that applicant has adequately addressed Item 4
- Considered that a condition be attached to ensure the window on the eastern elevation remains permanently obscured
- Concluded that subject to conditions, the retention and permission proposed will not adversely impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties

- Recommendation was to grant permission subject to conditions.

3.2.6. Other Technical Reports

Placemaking & Physical Development [dated 22nd August 2023] – Further Information sought in relation to a revised site layout plan indicating the distance of the proposed soakaway from the proposed percolation area within their own site and any septic tank or percolation area located on adjacent properties.

Waste Management & Environment [dated 22nd August 2023] – Show all wells within 100m of proposed percolation area/show distance to proposed percolation area/show all DWWTS percolation areas within 100m/distance to proposed septic tank and percolation area/show groundwater flow direction.

Waste Management & Environment [dated 10th November 2023 – Following receipt of Further Information] - Satisfied there will be no threat of environmental pollution/Recommended permission be granted subject to conditions.

Placemaking & Physical Development [dated 10th November 2023 - Following receipt of Further Information] – No objection subject to conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1. None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. 3 no. third party submissions were made at application stage. The issues raised are similar to those raised in the grounds of appeal which are summarised below.

4.0 Planning History

4.1.1. 21/1338 - Permission for rear and side extension to existing dwelling, waste water treatment system and percolation area, decommission existing septic tank system and all associated site works *Significant further information received on 04/02/2022 which includes an amended design* Grant Permission [Decision date 24/02/2022].

Enforcement

- 4.1.2. UD 23/028 – Alleged non-compliance with conditions attached to planning reference 21/1338

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The relevant Development Plan is the Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027. The appeal site is not subject to any specific land-use zoning.

The provisions of the Louth County Development Plan 2021 – 2027 relevant to this assessment are as follows:

Chapter 10 (Infrastructure & Public Utilities) - Section 10.2.3 – Onsite waste water treatment systems; Objectives IU 17; IU 18 in relation to waste water. 13.9.18 and Objective IU 19 in relation to surface water and SUDS.

Chapter 13 (Development Management Guidelines) - Section 13.8.35 - House Extensions;

Section 13.9 Housing in the Open Countryside

Section 13.9.20 Residential Extensions - Applications for residential extensions should take into account the following:

- The scale, massing, design and external finishes: – these shall be sympathetic with the built form and appearance of the existing property. However, they need not necessarily replicate or imitate the design and finish of the existing dwelling. Contemporary and innovative designs will be considered where they would make a positive contribution to the landscape
- Neighbouring residents: - Their privacy or amenities shall not be unduly affected by way of overlooking, overshadowing and/or by way of dominance.
- Recreational and domestic purposes: There should be sufficient space remaining within the curtilage of the property for amenity, parking and the manoeuvring of vehicles.
- Services: – If the property is served by an individual on-site wastewater treatment system, this system must have the capacity to accommodate any additional

loading in accordance with the requirements of the EPA Code of Practice; Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (p.e ≤10). This may result in the requirement for existing on-site systems to be upgraded to the current standards.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations.

- 5.2.1. The nearest designated sites are the Stabannon-Braganstown SPA (site code 004091) which is located 3.3km from the site, and Dundalk Bay SPA (site code 004026) and Dundalk Bay SAC (site code 000455), both located 10.8km from the site.

5.3. EIA Screening

- 5.3.1. See completed Form 2 on file. Having regard to the limited nature and scale of development and the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity of the site, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

5.4. Appropriate Assessment

- 5.4.1. Having regard to the minor nature and scale of the proposed development, the site location outside of any protected site, the nature of the receiving environment and the proximity of the lands in question to the nearest European Sites, it is my opinion that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise and that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, on any Natura 2000 site.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1.1. 2 no. appeals have been received from Jim Curtis, and Tony & Margaret Maguire. The main issues are summarised below:

Appeal submitted by Jim Curtis

- Applicants were granted permission for a single story structure/instead built a two-storey structure
- Applicants were issued a warning letter but works continued after it was received
- Physical and mental wellbeing has been affected
- Windows in living area/bedroom now facing directly onto property/over decking area
- Believe that Juliette balcony will be installed as originally intended
- In the event it is not installed there will still be a huge floor to ceiling window overlooking property
- Initial plans did not include a western elevation/did not allow an opportunity to review at planning stage
- Feel the County Council erred in accepting this application
- Omissions on the drawings were strategic omissions
- Not all unauthorised elements on the site area listed on retention application
- The old septic tank is still being used/have photographic evidence of same/this was constructed many decades ago/not designed to be used in conjunction with a structure of this scale
- May lead to increased ground water levels and leaking of contaminants into the surrounding soil
- No doubt there is no intention of installing the proposed new system
- Location for the proposed percolation area is currently occupied by footings for a shed built above ground-level with a steel reinforced floor/is not a viable option/will result in flooding and damage
- Structure as it now stands is essentially two separate residencies, each with their own front door and independent from one another bar a shared wall
- Will cause issues for insurance
- Do not believe the works will be undone

- Require a permanent solution rather than lightly obscured glass/installation of frosted glass will affect the habitability of the structure
- Existing structures and orientation mean the living area of new structure already has lower light levels/have a right to build on boundary up to 2m in height/could further reduce habitability
- There is no evidence of daylight standards being met
- Will increase energy use by increased use of artificial light and heat
- No aesthetic link between the house and the extension/what has been constructed is a separate dwelling house/detracts from the quaintness which prevailed prior to its construction/do not believe any extension which exceeds the height of the existing roof should be constructed
- Do not believe it is possible for the applicants to comply with conditions as set out by the Council

Enclosed: Exhibits 1 – 10

Appeal submitted by Tony & Margaret Maguire

- Was not possible to view the original application
- Shocked to see a second storey building being built behind the existing house
- No mention of a second storey on the site notice nor a separate dwelling house
- When eventually got to view the plans it was too late and planning had been granted
- Building behind the existing house was different than that shown on the plans
- Work carried on following warning letter
- Have introduced a new front door into the existing house combined with building a new staircase into the existing house/there is a completely separate staircase and separate front door to the new house behind the original
- Contend that what has been building is an individual semi-detached dwelling house
- Asked for decision to be addressed with regards this information

- Sitting room window faces the side boundary/landing room window faces the side boundary /not happy with frosted glass as it still overlooks property and is overpowering in appearance/do not believe frosted glass will be installed
- Both first floor bedroom windows overlook property
- Principle of a two storey extension is unacceptable
- Treatment system and percolation area have been designed for one house/will now serve two houses
- Question the level of daylight to the new bedroom/compliance with BRE Guidance

6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1. The applicant has submitted a response to the appeal (received on 17th January 2024). This is summarised below:

- When the house was purchased there was already permission for an extension and garage/works had been commenced but were abandoned/also stables to be back
- Have obtained permission for a dormer style extension in 2021
- Have increased privacy by installing a 1m high timber fence on top of the already existing block wall between neighbouring property
- Have provided all the necessary drawings to Louth County Council
- Appellant is referring to old, incomplete applications which have no bearing here
- Stables were already in place when property was purchased.
- Appellant had no issue with unauthorised foundations when he was selling the land
- Waste treatment plant is currently being installed/appellant installed the unauthorised foundations/will need to dig it up and put in the percolation area
- Picture of the sewer pipes is correct/being laid in preparation of the new sewage treatment unit

- Frosted glass has been installed in the windows
- Light is not an issue/have ample sunlight in the winter months
- Have installed external insulation on the house which has reduced energy use
- Have kept the original cottage feature to the north and west sides of the house/appellant did not take his own advise when building his extension to the front of his own house/big grey shed directly behind appellants property which are an eyesore
- Development is not unauthorised/have planning permission from Louth County Council
- Floor plan/staircase was moved to take into account neighbour's patio
- Double doors are being replaced with a window/works are still ongoing/This window will look onto our back garden
- Light pollution from neighbours sheds
- Heat pump has been moved to a new location
- Extension has no impact on light to neighbours garden
- First floor window is not looking into neighbouring property
- Extension is not two storey
- Is not a separate dwellings/is an extension
- Landing window only provides light to the stairwell/is not a living area
- Waste water treatment system is for one house
- The front door mentioned is the original door to the cottage/will be removed when the house is made into an integral unit
- Previous agreement to built a wall in place of the hedge
- All conditions are being fulfilled

Encl: Photographs/Agreement /Documents

6.3. Planning Authority Response

6.3.1. A response from the Planning Authority was received on 11th January 2024. This is summarised below:

- All issues have been considered and set out in the planning reports/is not proposed to reassess the concerns raised/any further unauthorised development at the site is a matter for the Planning Enforcement section to investigate.
- Requests the Board uphold the decision of the Planning Authority.

6.4. Observations

6.4.1. None received.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. The planning issues raised in this appeal are as follows:

- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Internal Residential Standards/Amenity
- Design Issues
- Waste Water/Surface Water
- Other Issues

7.2. Impact on Residential Amenity

7.2.1. The 2 no. appeal submissions have raised the issue of overlooking and loss of privacy. In relation to same, and having regard to the drawings submitted at Further Information stage, I would share the concerns of the planning authority in relation to the Juliette balcony as shown to the rear elevation, and as installed on site, and I am of the view that this window/balcony would lead to undue adverse impacts on the amenity of the adjoining property, as a result of actual or perceived overlooking of the amenity space associated with same. However, I concur with the view that this can be omitted by way of condition. However, I am of the view that this window should be replaced with a window that replicates the size of the other dormer window, as a large floor to ceiling window (which is effectively at first floor level) is

not appropriate in my view, and would lead to actual or perceived overlooking from this window. I would note that such a window would be more in line with that granted under 21/1338. In relation to the remaining dormer window, this is not as approved under 21/1338. However, this is set back some 5m from the neighbouring property to the east, and I am not of the view that material overlooking would result from same. In relation to those windows at the ground floor rear elevation, these are located at ground floor level, and do not face directly towards neighbouring properties, and I am not of the view that any material overlooking would result from same.

- 7.2.2. In relation to the windows on the side (south-west) elevation, the plans as submitted at application stage (as submitted to the PA on 6th July 2023) indicate 3 no. windows on this elevation, serving a bathroom, a bedroom and an en-suite bathroom. The approved plans (under 21/1338) indicate windows serving a utility room, a bathroom and a landing window. The appellants have stated that the windows are serving rooms not indicated on the plans, and in particular state that the bathroom window, is in fact a kitchen/living area window, and state that overlooking results from this window, as well as the from bedroom and the bathroom window. I note that the applicants have erected a fence between this site and the neighbouring property which seeks to overcome any overlooking concerns (but this is not shown on the plans). Notwithstanding, I am of the view that the principle of a habitable room window (serving proposed Bed 3 as shown on the plans) so close to a neighbouring boundary (it is set in 1.040m from the boundary) is not acceptable in principle, and the preservation of the neighbouring amenity is wholly reliant on the fence on site, and/or the shed in the neighbouring site, remaining in situ. Given this situation, I am of the view that this proposed window would result in material overlooking of the neighbouring amenity/patio area, with a resulting adverse impact on the residential amenity of this property. I do not concur with the view of the Planning Authority that this window should be obscured (as per Condition 3 of the Planning Authority's decision) as this would result in adverse impacts on the internal amenity of same (as per discussion below). I have given consideration to recommending a condition be imposed that would require Bedroom 3 to be amalgamated with Bedroom 4, and that the window serving Bedroom 3 be removed. However this would then result in an oversized bedroom. As such, I minded to recommend a refusal of permission on the

basis of an adverse impact on residential amenity as a result of overlooking (and on the basis of internal residential amenity as per below).

7.2.3. In relation to the other windows, as shown on the plans submitted, these are not habitable room windows and the glazing can be obscured on same, by way of condition, so as to prevent overlooking from same. I would note that there appears to be a further window not shown on the plans on the rear elevation of the original house, and this is not shown on the plans (although is shown on the approved plans under 21/1338).

7.2.4. In relation to those windows on the side (north-east) elevation of the extension, the plans submitted with the application indicate that these serve a landing and a sitting room. The approved plans (as approved under 21/1338) indicate windows serving a bedroom and an ensuite window on this elevation. Notwithstanding the deviation from the approved plans, I am not of the view that these windows would result in material overlooking of the neighbouring property, subject to the landing window being obscured glazed, as required by condition No. 3 of the Planning Authority's decision. The windows are set some 3.5m from the neighbouring boundary wall, and the sitting room window is at ground floor level, and views to and from same are partially obscured by the existing boundary wall. The landing window is raised on the elevation and views to and from same are not screened by the boundary wall, and I would be of the view that, in the absence of obscured glazing, there would be actual and perceived overlooking of the neighbouring amenity areas. As such, if the Board is minded to grant, I would recommend a condition be imposed requiring obscured glazing to this landing window, as per Condition 3 of the Planning Authority's decision.

7.3. Internal Residential Standards/Amenity

7.3.1. The appellants have stated that the light levels to the extension and question compliance with BRE Daylight Standards and question the habitability of same. In response, the applicants have state that daylight levels are sufficient, given the orientation of the habitable rooms.

7.3.2. In relation to same, I would note that a BRE assessment, indicating internal daylight standards, would not generally be required for a development of this scale. Notwithstanding, habitable rooms would still be expected to receive sufficient

daylighting. Given the location of the window serving Bed 3, approximately 1m from the boundary wall/fence, and also within close proximity to the neighbouring shed, I am not satisfied that it has been shown that this habitable room would receive sufficient daylight. As noted in the appeal submissions, daylight levels could be further compromised should any development (exempted development or otherwise) come forward on the neighbouring property. Furthermore, I am of the view that the outlook from this bedroom window is poor, with a view onto the boundary wall/fence some 1m from the window. This would be further compromised (to be effectively non-existent) should these window be obscured as per Condition No. 3 of the Planning Authority's decision. As such I am minded to recommend refusal on the basis of poor internal residential amenity to this bedroom, with the room likely to suffer from poor daylight levels and poor outlook.

7.4. Design Issues

- 7.4.1. The 2 no. appeal submissions raise design concerns including in relation to the height of the proposed extension and the appearance of same. In response, the applicants state that they have obtained permission for a dormer style extension in 2021.
- 7.4.2. The Planning Authority have not raised an issue in relation to the design and scale of the extension and the Planner's Report states that the overall height and depth is as granted under Ref Ref 21/1338.
- 7.4.3. In relation to same, I note the approved drawings (as approved under Reg. Ref 21/1338) indicate an dormer style extension with a maximum height of 6.4m and an overall depth (from the front elevation of the existing dwelling house) of 18.85m. This is as proposed under this retention application. The total additional floorspace approved under the previous permission (21/1338) was 119 sq. m., whereas the total additional floorspace applied for under this retention application is 148.87 sq. m, an additional 29.87 sq. m. The additional floorspace would appear to be accommodated at first floor level, noting the revised first floor arrangement and the additional dormer window, which has allowed for additional floorspace. Therefore, notwithstanding the revised floorplans and revisions to the window and dormer arrangements, the overall scale and bulk of the extension is similar to the approved plans (which were not the subject of appeal) and I am not of the view that the revisions to the plans as

approved under 21/1338 have a material impact on the appearance of the extension when viewed from the public realm. The visual impact from the neighbouring sites is generally as per the plans approved under 21/1338.

7.5. Waste Water/Surface Water

Waste Water

- 7.5.1. The applicants are proposing to decommission the existing septic tank and to replace same with a new septic tank and percolation area.
- 7.5.2. The appellants have stated that the old septic tank is still being used and have stated that it is not designed to accommodate a structure of this scale, and the continued use of same will cause contamination. In response, the applicants have stated that new waste water treatment system, as proposed, is currently being installed.
- 7.5.3. Following the receipt of amended drawings at Further Information Stage, the Planning Authority had no objections to the proposed waste water treatment proposals, subject to conditions.
- 7.5.4. I would note, with reference to the approved plans (as approved under Reg. Ref 21/1338), that a replacement septic tank with percolation area was previously proposed and approved on this site. The waste water system now proposed is of a similar design and type to that which was approved, although the proposed percolation area is in a slightly different location to that which was previously approved. I would note that no parties have questioned the suitability of the site to accommodate the proposed waste water treatment system, although a submission at Planning Application stage noted that the proposed percolation area is too close to the neighbouring boundary wall. These distances were amended at Further Information Stage.
- 7.5.5. The Site Characterisation Form submitted with the application identifies the category of aquifer as 'Poor Aquifer', with a vulnerability classification of 'moderate'. Table E1 (Response Matrix for DWWTSs) of the EPA Code of Practice Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems identifies an 'R1' response category i.e. *'acceptable subject to normal good practice'* The Site Characterisation Form indicates that a trial hole with a depth of 2.2m recorded silt/clay to a depth of 0.5m, clay intermixed with stone to a depth of 1.1m, with stone and gravel below this to a depth of 2.2m. Neither bedrock

nor groundwater was encountered in the trial hole. In relation to the percolation characteristics of the soil, a sub-surface percolation test result of 15.37min/25mm (previously known as a 'T' Test) was returned. A surface percolation test result of 9.94min/25mm was returned (previously known as a 'P' Test). These are both within the range as set out in the EPA Code of Practice (which requires a percolation value of at least 3, but not greater than 50 (for a septic tank) or 90 to 120 (for varying types of secondary treatment systems). The report recommends that the existing septic tank is decommissioned and replaced with new septic tank and percolation area.

7.5.6. Having regard to the site percolation test results, and the supporting documentation accompanying the application, I consider it has been demonstrated that the site can accommodate a wastewater treatment system as recommended in the Site Characterisation Form, subject to the system being installed as recommended and in line with the EPA Code of Practice – Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (p.e. ≤ 10), 2021.

7.5.7. In relation to the contention that the old septic tank is being used, and will be continue to be used, I would not that the continued use of same would not be in accordance with either the plans as approved under 21/1338, nor would it be in accordance with the plans as submitted under this application, should the Board be minded to approve the application. Issues of alleged non-compliance are not a matter for the Board but rather are a matter for the Planning Authority (see further discussion of same below).

Surface Water

7.5.8. Surface water is proposed to be drained to a soakaway, with a soakaway design report included with the application. This is generally as per approved plans (under PA Reg Ref 21/1338) and, subject to standard conditions is considered to be acceptable.

7.6. Other Issues

7.6.1. Enforcement Issues – The 2 no. appeal submissions have raised various issues as related to alleged non-compliance with the plans as approved under 21/1338 and potential non-compliance with the plans as submitted under this application. It is alleged that what is being constructed on site is two separate dwellings rather than an extension. In relation to same, the plans as submitted with the application (and as

amended at Further Information Stage) show a single self-contained dwelling. While the plans do not necessarily reflect what is on site (for example, there appears to be two separate entrance doors), the applicants have stated that works are ongoing and the works will be carried out, and completed, in accordance with the plans. Should the Board be minded to approve the application, I recommend that a standard condition be imposed requiring the works to be retained, and completed, in accordance with the plans as submitted at application stage, and as amended at Further Application Stage. In relation to alleged non-compliance with the plans and particulars accompanying the application, I would note that matters of enforcement are not within the remit of the Board, and are a matter for the Planning Authority in question, in this case Louth County Council.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend that retention permission be **Refused** for the reasons and considerations below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The development proposed for retention would result in an adverse impact on neighbouring residential amenity as a result of overlooking from the window serving Bedroom No. 3, at ground floor level. Furthermore, in the absence of information to demonstrate otherwise, the proximity of this window to the neighbouring boundary would likely result in substandard levels of daylighting to this habitable room, with this room also suffering from a poor outlook. As such the development as proposed for retention is contrary to Section 13.9.20 'Residential Extensions' of the Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027, and would not be in accordance with 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.

Ronan O'Connor
Senior Planning Inspector

5th March 2024

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	318670-23			
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of rear extension to dwelling house, completion of same and all associated site works.			
Development Address	Dowdstown, Ardee, Co. Louth			
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)				
		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			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		Class/Threshold.....		Proceed to Q.4

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?

No		Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____

Date: 5th March 2024