



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-319014-24

Development	Construction of a single storey extension incorporating a "granny flat" and all associated site works.
Location	30 Maunsells Park, Galway City
Planning Authority	Galway City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	23241
Applicant(s)	Pat & Rita Feeney
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Diarmuid and Anne Keaney
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	8/07/2024
Inspector	Darragh Ryan

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located within a residential estate, Maunsells Park within Galway City. The estate consists of semi-detached dwellings laid out in horseshoe shape around a green area. The estate is accessed via Maunsells Road, a single vehicular point of access in and out of the estate. All houses have their own off street car parking and low front boundary walls.
- 1.2. 30 Maunsells Park is a semi – detached dwelling situated to the northern end of the estate. The site is wedged shaped and widens to the rear of the property. There is a mature evergreen hedge between the proposed site and adjacent property to west. The site area is stated .054ha.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposal consists of the following:
- Construction of a single storey granny flat to side and rear (southwestern elevation) of the existing dwelling (57.5sqm). The granny flat consists of 1 bedroom, WC and a kitchen/ living and dining area.
 - Proposed extension to dwelling (34 sqm) – side of dwelling 7m from front boundary. Extension consists of a utility and conservatory to serve the main dwelling
 - The granny flat can be assimilated into the main dwelling via proposed new extension.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority issued a decision to grant permission subject to 7 conditions. Conditions of note include:

C2: The self contained unit hereby approved, shall not be used for short term lettings as defined in the Residential Tenancies (Amendment) Act 2019 and the Planning and Development Act 2000 (exempted Development) No 2 Regulations 2019.

C3: Permission for use of part of the premises as a self-contained unit shall apply only so long as the owner of the premises lives in the self-contained unit or the remainder if the premises as a main residence otherwise the entire premises shall be used as a single dwelling unit.

C7: Construction activity on site shall comply with the following:

- 0800 to 1800 hours Monday to Friday
- 0900 hours to 1300 hours Saturday
- Deviation from these times only permitted with the prior written agreement of the planning authority.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

There is a single planning authority report file. The report can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed granny flat complies with Section 11.3.1 (K) of the Galway City Development Plan 2023 -2029 for the development of self -contained units
- The proposal accords with Section 11.3.1 (I) Residential Extensions of the Galway City Development Plan
- Satisfied that the development as proposed will not have a significant impact on residential amenity
- The private amenity open space provision exceeds the Development Plan standards as set out in section 11.3.1.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Active Travel – no objection to the proposal
- Drainage Section – no objection subject to conditions

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- None

3.4. Third Party Observations

There are three third party submissions on file. The issues raised in the submissions are also raised in the appeal. The issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- Concerns around subdivision of a site and the provision of a second dwelling on site
- Applicant already has a number of vehicles to the front of the site, this will result in increased levels of traffic in the estate
- Concerns with respect to depth, length and scale of the development
- Concerned that the self-contained unit and extension shall be used as a separate house for rental/commercial purposes and state that the dwelling has been used in the past for Air bnb.
- Development is not in keeping with the character of the area.
- Potential for increased road traffic through the estate.

4.0 Planning History

PA reg ref 06/139 – Permission granted to Rita and Pat Feeney for the construction of a bay window, the conversion of a garage into a bedroom and the replacement of the garage door with a window. Permission to construct a combined single and two storey extension to the rear of the dwelling.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Galway City Development Plan 2023 – 2029

11.3.1 (k) Self Contained Residential Units Self-contained residential units will be considered when:

- The unit is an integral part of the main dwelling capable of re-assimilation into the dwelling. Specific prior grant of planning permission is required for consequent subdivision of the site. This will generally be discouraged on amenity grounds.

- The unit is an addition to the existing structure or a garage conversion and shall generally be located at the side as opposed to the rear garden of the existing house.
- The floor area of the unit does not normally exceed the equivalent of 25% of the floor area of the existing house.
- Self-contained units will only be considered so long as the owner of the premises lives in the unit or the remainder of the premises as their main residence.

11.3.1 (l) Residential Extensions The design and layout of extensions to houses should complement the character and form of the existing building, having regard to its context and adjacent residential amenities.

11.3.4 (d) Car Parking Standard

- On smaller developments, car parking should also be discouraged but regardless, shall not exceed a maximum 1 car parking space per dwelling

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

Inner Galway Bay SAC – 1.1km to the south

Lough Corrib SAC – 1km to the east

5.3. EIA Screening

See completed form 2 on file. Having regard to the limited nature and scale of the proposed development, 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.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

This is a third-party appeal against the decision of Galway City Council to grant permission

6.1.1. Non-Compliance with Galway City Development Plan 2023 – 2029

- The proposed dwelling cannot be easily assimilated back into the main dwelling without substantial future works being carried out to the dwelling in the future. The application drawings as submitted raise significant concerns that it is the intention of the Applicant to split the existing house into apartments as well as constructing a new residential unit on the application site
- The proposed unit is located entirely to the rear of the existing house
- The floor area of the unit exceeds the allowable 25% floor area of the existing house. 57.5sqm of 196sqm equates to 29% of total floor area. The applicant attempts to overcome this through the addition of an extension to the existing dwelling, however the Development Plan would not appear to support such an approach as new self-contained units refers to the “floor area of the existing house”
- It is unclear how the proposed extension would function as part of the existing house. The extension comprises two rooms of a conservatory and a utility room and a corridor serving the proposed new self-contained unit. The proposed conservatory is not significantly glazed as would be expected. A shared entrance to the dwelling as indicated on the plans suggests that both parties to the main dwelling and self-contained unit will access the property through the conservatory.
- The appellant notes that the size of the utility room of 11.4sqm is the minimum area for a double bedroom as set out in Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – the utility room also has large windows where by there is potential that the utility room is used as habitable bedroom in the future.
- The appellant is satisfied with the conditions as set out by Galway City Council in relation to the letting of the property and request that where planning permission is deemed appropriate to include a relevant sample condition outlined in the Office of the Planning Regulator’s Practice Note PN03.

6.1.2. Congested form of development out of character with the area

- The original size of the dwelling house on site was 125sqm or 138sqm including the area of the former garage. The applicant received planning permission in 2006 increasing the size of the dwelling to 196sqm. If permitted the proposed dwelling will increase the size of the house to 287.5sqm more than double the size of the original house. This is considered a congested form of development and out of character with the area.

6.1.3. Negative Impact on Residential Amenity

- It is noted that the screening between the two properties as indicated on the plans on the property of 31 Maunsells Park. This Griselinia hedging is subject to die back and there is no telling how long this hedging will live for given that it is currently over 30 years old. There is potential for the new structure to damage this hedging. In the absence of any boundary screening it is likely that the proposed development will appear overbearing and jarring in views from 31 Maunsells Park.
- There are often up to three or four vehicles parked in the driveway of or on the street outside the house at No 30. As the existing parking demands of the occupants of house no 30 exceed the on-site provision of parking it is unclear how the site will accommodate even more parking for the applicants daughter and her growing family.

6.2. **Applicant Response**

6.2.1. Compliance with 11.3.1 (K) Self Contained Units – City Development Plan

- The proposed self-contained unit is an integral part of the main dwelling and easily capable of re-assimilation. It is remained linked internally by a hallway and two doorways, so can be re-assimilated without any building or demolition works being required
- The unit is fully located to the side of the dwelling, it is set back from the front building face in order to assimilate in the receiving site.
- When the extension is constructed the total floor area of the dwelling would be 230sqm The granny flat element would equate to 25% of this floor area. It should be noted that there is latitude in the 25% and 29% of the existing floor

area could be considered as an exception owing to large size of the site, screening between boundaries and the subordinate nature of the extension relative to the main dwelling.

- The owners of the property are at retirement age and will live in the property. There are assumptions/assertions made in the appeal documentation that are not true.

6.2.2. Visual Impact

The proposed development will be modest in scale and capable of satisfactory assimilation into the site and surrounding neighbourhood. The development would be imperceptible from the public road and neighbouring dwellings.

- Single storey dwelling with a proposed ridge height at 4.5m.
- Side extension set back from the front of the dwelling by circa 7m, meaning the development recedes into the site and reduces potential visual impact
- Form and finish will harmonise with the existing building
- Presence of a circa 3m high, mature, evergreen hedgerow bounding the site.
- The orientation/ alignment of the southwestern boundary and hedging indicates the development would be very well screened
- The proposed development is in keeping with the character of the area. Photographs provided of other properties located in Maunsells Park.

6.2.3. Car Parking

- There are only two cars parked at the site every evening. There is availability for 3 cars on site.

6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

- None

6.4. **Observations**

- None

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the appeal, and having inspected the site and having regard to the relevant local policy guidance, I consider the main issues in relation to this appeal are as follows:

- Design/ Impact on Residential Amenity
- Compliance with City Development Plan Standards
- Other Issues
- Appropriate Assessment

7.2. Design/ Impact on Residential Amenity

- 7.2.1. The appellant contends that the size and scale of the proposed development are out of character with the surrounding residential neighborhood. Specifically, they argue that the screen hedging referenced in the planning authority report is not within the applicant's ownership and is subject to dieback, thereby reducing its effectiveness in minimizing visual impact over time.
- 7.2.2. The proposed development involves a single-storey hipped roof structure. The extension to the existing dwelling totals 34m² and includes a utility room and conservatory. This extension is set back 7.7 meters from the front building line of the dwelling, with the “granny flat” extension (57m²) extending approximately 11 meters to the rear of this extension. The hipped roof structure reaches a maximum height of 4.5 meters. The site features an existing mature evergreen hedge on the southwest boundary, approximately 1 meter thick. Post-construction, a large private open space of approximately 283m² will remain, to be shared by the residents of both the granny flat and the main dwelling.
- 7.2.3. Section 11.3.1(i) of the Galway City Development Plan states that the design and layout of extensions should complement the character and form of the existing building, considering its context and the adjacent residential amenities. The height of the extension and granny flat is not exceptional at 4.5m. The setback of the proposal will reduce the bulk and scale of the proposal on the site and in my view will be imperceptible from the perspective of the public road. Furthermore the dwelling is

located on a relatively large site of .054ha and concerns around congested form of development is in my opinion unfounded. The design details as presented are of a high quality, which has due cognisance of amenity to neighbouring residential properties. Therefore, I consider that the proposed development will not be visible from the public road, and only partially visible from the adjoining property to the southwest, and therefore will not have a negative visual impact.

7.2.4. Regarding the appellant's concerns in relation to dieback and potential damage to the neighbouring hedgerow, I do not believe that the construction of the extension and granny flat will exacerbate these issues. Hedge maintenance and care are the responsibilities of the property residents and do not constitute a material concern for this planning application.

7.2.5. Based on the current site conditions and the mature screening already in place, I am confident that the development will not create a significant visual impact on neighbouring properties. The proposed development's design and layout align with the principles outlined in the Galway City Development Plan 2023 - 2029. The single-storey extension and granny flat are consistent with the character of the existing dwelling and the surrounding residential area. The setback from the front building line, combined with the mature evergreen hedge on the southwest boundary, ensures that the visual impact is minimal. The remaining private open space of approximately 283m² provides ample shared outdoor area for the residents, further integrating the new structure into the existing site. Given the level of detail submitted and the characteristics of the site, I am satisfied that the proposed development is capable of satisfactory assimilation into the large site and complies with the development management standards for design as set out in the Galway City Development Plan.

7.3. Compliance with City Development Plan Standards

The appellant contends that the proposed development does not comply with Galway City Development Plan policies regarding self-contained units. Specifically, Section 11.3.1 (K) outlines the relevant development management standards. The appellant has systematically detailed how the proposed development fails to meet each standard set out in the Development Plan.

- 7.3.1. The standard sets out that *the self-contained unit should be part of the main dwelling house and capable of re-assimilation into the main dwelling*. The appellant asserts that owing to the layout and scale of the development the proposal would not be capable of future assimilation into the main dwelling without significant future works taking place. As part of the proposed development the applicant proposes an extension in the form of a utility room and conservatory that will be located to the side (west) of the existing dwelling. The utility and conservatory is proposed to serve the main dwelling house. The self-contained unit ("granny flat") shall be accessed through this extension. Having regard to the details supplied, I am satisfied that the proposal as presented is capable of being accommodated back into the main dwelling without extensive future works been required. The access from the granny flat into the main dwelling will be through the conservatory which leads into a hallway within the main dwelling. I find the drawings clear and legible and there is no cause for confusion as indicated by the appellant in this regard. I am satisfied the proposal accords with this specific requirement of the City Development Plan.
- 7.3.2. Section 11.3.1 of the Galway City Development Plan states that *"the unit ... shall generally be located at the side as opposed to the rear garden of the existing house."* The appellant argues that the "granny flats" position wholly behind the building line of the main dwelling does not comply with this standard. The proposed extension to the main dwelling, which includes a utility room and conservatory, is situated on the southwestern gable of the existing house. The proposed "granny flat" is located to the rear of this extension. The applicant asserts that, although the "granny flat" is set back, it is effectively positioned to the side of the dwelling to assimilate into the site better.
- 7.3.3. Upon reviewing the design, it is evident that while the "granny flat" is technically located behind the main dwelling, it is positioned against the westernmost boundary of the site. This design takes into account the wedge-shaped nature of the site, thereby minimising the visual impact on neighbouring properties. Additionally, the site layout allows for an extensive rear garden that can be shared by the residents of both the main dwelling and the "granny flat".
- 7.3.4. It is important to note that the development management standard states "generally" rather than explicitly prohibiting rear extensions. This wording provides flexibility to accommodate unique site characteristics that may benefit the proposal. Given the

specific site shape and the thoughtful design response, I am satisfied that the proposed development aligns with the principles set out in Section 11.3.1. In conclusion, the proposed “granny flat’s” design and location are considered appropriate given the site’s unique characteristics and comply with the relevant development management standards.

- 7.3.5. The Galway City Development Plan specifies acceptable size limits for independent units relative to existing dwellings, stating that *“the floor area of the unit does not normally exceed the equivalent of 25% of the floor area of the existing house.”* The appellant contends that with an existing house of 196 sqm and a proposed “granny flat” of 57.5 sqm, the unit would constitute 29% of the total floor area, exceeding the acceptable size limit.
- 7.3.6. The applicant argues that once the extension is constructed, the total floor area of the “granny flat” relative to the dwelling would be only 25%. Additionally, the applicant points to the wording “normally,” suggesting flexibility based on design and site-specific characteristics. I agree with the applicant’s perspective. The proposed “granny flat” and its floor area are proportionate given the relatively large site size of 0.054 hectares. The development can assimilate satisfactorily into the site with minimal impact on neighbouring properties. The design is tailored to the existing site, and the size and scale of the “granny flat” are not exceptional in the context of the dwelling house or surrounding area. Furthermore, the wording of the development management standard does allow for some flexibility, permitting a greater ratio in specific circumstances. I consider the proposal as outlined does not run contrary to this specific DM standard.
- 7.3.7. The final element of the development management standard states that *“self-contained units will only be considered if the owner of the premises resides in the unit or the remainder of the premises as their main residence.”* The appellant has expressed concerns that the existing dwelling may be subdivided into apartments, particularly since some bedrooms have been used for Airbnb in the past. The applicant has clarified that the purpose of the granny flat is for the applicants to reside in, while the main dwelling will be occupied by their daughter and her family. The planning authority did not object to the construction of a “granny flat” on these grounds.

- 7.3.8. Based on the information provided, the proposal does not appear to represent a commercial venture or a subdivision of the dwelling for rental accommodation. The applicant has stated that the Airbnb use was in place in 2016 and is no longer active. The detailed drawings and the applicant's stated need for a granny flat, coupled with the proposed conditions restricting use to residential purposes only, provide sufficient assurance. Consequently, I am satisfied that the proposal complies with this element of development management standard 11.3.1(K).
- 7.3.9. In conclusion, I am satisfied the proposal as presented aligns with DM standard Section 11.3.1 as set out in the Galway City Development Plan 2023 -2029.

7.4. Other Issues

Carparking

- 7.4.1. The appellant has raised concerns regarding the adequacy of car parking on-site and the potential for nuisance caused by excessive parking. Photographs provided by the appellant indicate a number of cars present on-site, suggesting overcrowding. However, the applicant contends that these photographs are misleading, dating back to approximately 2016 or 2017, and do not reflect the current situation. The applicant asserts that currently, there are only two cars on-site, with sufficient space for a third car. Additionally, the applicant notes that all neighbours benefit from unofficial on-street parking, with photographs supplied to support this claim.
- 7.4.2. The Galway City Development Plan 2023-2029, Section 11.3.4(d), states that on smaller developments, car parking should be discouraged and shall not exceed a maximum of one car parking space per dwelling. Given that there is an existing dwelling on the site, the current arrangement, which accommodates three cars, is deemed sufficient to manage the expected level of parking.
- 7.4.3. During my site inspection, I observed several cars parked on the public road outside of several of the front boundaries, indicating a common practice of on-street parking in the neighborhood. While the appellant's concerns about parking are noted, the issue does not appear to be substantive enough to warrant refusal. The existing dwelling and the provision of three parking spaces exceeds the development management standards set out in the Galway City Development Plan.

- 7.4.4. Based on the site inspection and the information provided, I do not consider the issue of car parking to be a significant concern. The current arrangement on-site, which accommodates three cars, is sufficient and exceeds current standards as set out in the Galway City Development Plan, which discourages excessive parking and limits it to one space per dwelling. Given the existing conditions and the surrounding context, I find that the parking situation does not constitute a reason for refusal.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1.1. I have considered the construction of a residential development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located Inner Galway Bay SAC & Lough Corrib SAC – 1km from the subject site

- 8.1.2. The proposed development comprises:

- Extension 34sqm and Granny Flat 57sqm

- 8.1.3. 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 is as follows:

- The proposed works are limited in scale and located with an existing Residential estate on zoned lands within the Galway City Boundary. The existing dwelling connects into the public sewer. There are no impacts/effects predicted in this regard.
- Due to the distance of the site and intervening land uses from any SAC and SPA, no impacts/ effects are predicted in this regard.
- There are no identifiable hydrological/ecological connector pathways between the application and the SAC or SPA. This combined with the distance and built up intervening environment between the application site and the SAC & SPA removes any potential connector/receptor pathways. Therefore no impacts/effects are predicted.

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

Having regard to the above it is recommended that permission is granted based on the following reasons and considerations and subject to the attached conditions.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

The proposed development as set out complies with Section 11.3.1 (K) of the Galway City Development Plan namely in that the unit is an integral part of the main dwelling and capable of re-assimilation into the dwelling, the design and layout of the structure, the details supplied in relation to the intended occupier of the self-contained unit it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not be seriously injurious to the amenities of the area or the residential amenities of properties in the vicinity and would not give rise to the creation of a traffic hazard. The proposed development would, therefore be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars received by An Board Pleanála on the 9th of February 2024 except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the Planning Authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The independent family unit for a family member(s) shall not be sold, let or otherwise conveyed as an independent living unit and shall revert to use as part of the main dwelling on the cessation of such use. The existing garden and curtilage of the overall residential property on this site shall not be subdivided.

Reason - In the interest of residential amenity and to control the density of residential units.

3. The self-contained unit hereby approved, shall not be used for short term lettings as defined in the Planning and Development Act 2000 (exempted Development) (No.2) Regulations 2019

Reason: In the interest of proper planning and sustainable development

4. All surface water generated within the site boundaries shall be collected and disposed of within the curtilage of the site. No surface water from roofs, paved areas or otherwise shall discharge onto the public road or adjoining properties.

Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and to prevent pollution.

5. The external finishes of the proposed extension (including roof tiles/slates) shall be the same as those of the existing dwelling in respect of colour and texture. [Samples of the proposed materials shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

6. The developer shall ensure that all construction activity within this site shall comply with the following:
 - i. All construction activity shall be restricted to the following:
 - Between 0800 hours and 1800 hours Monday to Friday
 - Between 0900 hours and 1300 hours Saturday unless otherwise agreed in writing with Galway City Council.
 - No works shall take place on Sundays, Bank Holidays or Public Holidays;

- The site may be opened 30 minutes prior to the above outlined times in order to facilitate the arrival of workers, however no activity shall take place during this time.
 - Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the Planning Authority.
- ii. In the event that rock breaking is required on the site, a schedule of works including mitigating measures and the hours and days of operations shall be submitted for the agreement of the Planning Authority in writing.
- iii. Any alterations to public services, public areas or utilities necessitated by the development shall be carried at the developers expense having firstly obtained the agreement in writing of Galway City Council or other public bodies responsible for utilities.
- iv. All works shall be carried out in accordance with the requirements for “Site Development Works for Housing Areas” as issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government unless required otherwise by Galway City Council in which case Galway City Council Standards apply.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity and the 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.

Darragh Ryan

Planning Inspector

24th of July 2024

Appendix 1 - Form 1
EIA Pre-Screening
[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	319014-24		
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of an extension and granny flat		
Development Address	30 Maunsells Park, Galway City		
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	
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			
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			
Yes		Class/Threshold.....	Proceed to Q.4

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No		Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	319014-24	
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of extension and “granny flat” to existing dwelling	
Development Address	30 Maunsells Park, Galway City	
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.		
	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>The proposed development is on a brownfield site on a .054ha site on zoned land. The proposed development is not exceptional in the context of existing environment.</p> <p>The proposed development will not result in the production of any significant waste, emissions or pollutants.</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>No. The site area is .054ha.</p> <p>There are no other developments under construction in proximity to the site. All other developments are established uses.</p>	No

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. The proposed development is not within a designated Natura 2000 site.</p> <p>There are no other locally sensitive environmental sensitivities in the vicinity of relevance.</p>	No
Conclusion		
<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)