



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-319591-24

Development	Retention of demolition and retention of rear conservatory and kitchen extension.
Location	65 Renmore Park, Renmore, Galway, H91 E2AN
Planning Authority	Galway City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2360033
Applicant(s)	Bebhinn and Maxim Kelly
Type of Application	Retention permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Enda Gallagher, Mark Gallagher, Sinead Gallagher and Padraic Lynagh.
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	24/10/24
Inspector	Ronan Murphy

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site is located at No. 65 Renmore Park, which is located c.3.1km to the east of Galway City. The subject site contains a two-storey semi-detached dwelling which is attached to No. 64 Renmore Park to the east.
- 1.2. The topography of Renmore Park is notable and slopes substantially from the east the in a westerly direction. The subject site is, therefore, at a higher ground level to dwellings to the west. In addition to this, the alignment of the site is unusual in that the subject site has a north-south orientation while No's 66,67,68 and 69 Renmore Park are perpendicular to the site and have an east-west orientation, meaning that the rear elevations of these dwellings face towards the side elevation and rear gardens of the subject site. It is noted that No's 66,67,68 and 69 Renmore Park all include relatively long back gardens of c. 21m to 25m long.
- 1.3. The elements for which retention are sought include the demolition of a conservatory to the rear of the dwelling, the retention of a new conservatory, kitchen extension and shed to and the rear of the dwelling, a porch to the front of the dwelling and alterations to a window in the side (north/west gable).

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the retention of a number of alterations to an existing two-storey semi-detached dwelling in Renmore Park, Galway. The elements for which retention permission is proposed as set out in the site notices is as follows:
 - Retention of demolition of dilapidated rear conservatory and utility.
 - Retention of rear conservatory and kitchen extension comprising an additional 10m² rear extension floor area.
 - Retention of 2m² front porch.
 - Retention of alterations to existing window in NW gable reducing glass area from 1.3m² clear glass to 0.5m² obscure glass.
 - Retention of shed.
 - Retention of all other associated site works.

- 2.2. The conservatory which was demolished had an internal floor area of c.15.1m² and had a height of c.3.2m with a sloping roof. The utility which was demolished had an internal floor area of c. 2.5m² with a height of c. 3.1m with a flat roof.
- 2.3. The conservatory for which retention is sought (shown on the drawings as a living room) has an internal area of c. 13.6m² and the kitchen extension for which retention is sought has an internal area of c. 11.3m². This extension has a height of c.3.5m with a flat roof.
- 2.4. The shed to the rear for which retention is sought has a height of c. 1.9m with a flat roof and a floor area of c.3.8m².
- 2.5. To the front of the dwelling, it is proposed to retain a porch. The porch structure has a height c.3.5m with a flat roof and an internal floor area of c.2.2m². In addition to this there is a raised patio to the front of the dwelling.
- 2.6. Finally, this application seeks to retain alterations of a window to the side elevation of the dwelling which comprises of the replacement of previous window at ground floor level with two new triple glazed windows with opaque glazing. The opening is the same size as the previous opening.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

By order dated 28/3/24 Galway City Council decided to grant retention planning permission subject to 9 conditions which were generally standard. Condition 6 the permanent erection of a timber effect (or similar) screen be attached to the top of the retaining wall to a height of 1.8m above the patio levels to the front and rear patio areas.

Planning Authority Reports

3.1.1. Planning Reports

There are two planning reports on file. The first report, dated 12/9/23 recommended that Further Information be requested relating to the following:

1. A report to address the following overlooking concerns and how the development complies with the City Development Plan Standard

a) the north / northside elevation living room does not comply with Section 11.3.1(d) overlooking standard of the City Development Plan 2023-2029 being positioned 5.7m from the side / north-western boundary and allows overlooking of adjacent properties and

b) The raised patio area to the front and rear of the dwelling enables overlooking of adjoining properties, details of natural landscaping and / or screening design solutions to address overlooking from these raised patios having due regard to the residential amenities required.

2. No element of the proposed development should encroach upon or overhang adjoining site boundaries including pipework, vents, flues, eaves etc. Confirm and demonstrate that the proposed development is wholly contained within the site boundary.
3. Details and relevant drawings of proposed surface water drainage management.
4. Invited to comment on third party concerns.

3.1.2. Other Technical Reports

- No reports on file

3.1.3. A further information response was received on 27/2/24 on the 4 items including:

- A cover letter responding to all the items of further information.
- Confirmation that no part of the development overhangs any neighbouring property including a boundary survey conducted with Trimble VRS Global Positioning Systems Technology.
- Drawings showing a 1.8m high screening wall along the western boundaries of the front and rear patios.
- A new drainage layout drawing
- Response to the 3rd party concerns

3.2.4 This applicants Further Information response was deemed to be significant, and the application was readvertised.

3.2.5 A second planning report dated 25/3/24 recommended that retention planning permission be granted, subject to conditions.

3.2. Prescribed Bodies

None

3.3. Third Party Observations

None

4.0 Planning History

4.1 Subject site

4.2 **Reg. Ref. 75/397:** Retention planning permission for windows in the extension refused. There is no record of the decision on the Galway City Council planning search, however, I note the planning officers report states that permission was refused for the following reason:

The window interferes to an undesirable degree with the privacy of the gardens of the houses they overlook and detract from the residential amenity of the said houses.

4.3 **Reg. Ref. 76/457:** Application for retention planning permission for windows at first floor level. There is no record of a decision on the Galway City Council planning search.

4.3 **Reg. Ref. 77/90:** Planning permission for a gable window. There is no record of the decision on the Galway City Council planning search.

4.4 **Reg. Ref. 89/623:** Planning permission for erection of conservatory to rear. There is no record of the decision on the Galway City Council planning search.

Surrounding sites

19/77 64 Renmore Park. Planning permission granted for development consisting of (a) covert existing domestic garage to living (b) construct a single storey extension to the front and rear with first floor extension to the side of existing dwelling (c) wide existing driveway.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1 The *Galway City Development Plan 2023-2029* is the operative plan for this area. The subject land is within the 'Residential' zone which has the following objective '*To provide for residential development and for associated support development, which will ensure the protection of existing residential amenity and will contribute to sustainable residential neighbourhoods.*' The following policies are of relevance:

11.3.1 (d) Overlooking

- Residential units shall generally not directly overlook private open space or land with development potential from above ground floor level by less than 11 metres minimum.
- In the case of developments exceeding 2 storeys in height a greater distance than 11 metres may be required, depending on the specific site characteristics.
- With regard to domestic extensions, architectural resolutions to prevent overlooking may be considered, where the linear 11m standard is marginally less, and the overlooking impact is reduced through design.

11.3.1 (I) 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.

5.2. EIA Screening

5.2.1 The proposal comprises of the retention of alterations to an existing dwelling and does not come within the scope of EIA requirements.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1 A third party appeal has been submitted by Enda Gallagher, Mark Gallagher, Sinead Flannery and Padric Lynch. The key issues raised within the appeal submission in relation to planning matters can be summarised as follows:

- Having regard to the planning history of the site and in particular 75/397 and 77/ 90 it would not be consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of this area to allow for the retention of the ground floor window facing directly into the garden of No.67 Renmore Park at a distance of 200mm from the shared property boundary.
- This window would have a very significant on the elderly residents of 67 Renmore Park. The removal of this window will have no material impact on the granted development and the Bord is requested to remove this window as a condition of planning. If the Bord is intent on reversing its previous decisions, then we ask that the window be conditioned to a fixed pane with no opening and be permanently maintained in obscure glass.
- The planning officer in their report confirmed that there would be overlooking of the properties at No's 67 and 68 Renmore Park from the front and rear terraces. Condition No.6 has proposed a Cedral timber effect cladding screening be placed to the front and rear of the property to a height of 1.8m. This cladding will exacerbate the visual intrusion of No's 67 and 68 and will lead to an unsightly structure to the front of this property. Structural details of structure have not been provided. If the screening has an unfinished side facing No's 67 and 68 then the visual intrusion will be greatly exacerbated. The obvious solution would be to lower the front and rear terrace to pre-existing ground level. If the terraces are to be retained and the proposed

screening accepted, then full structure detail is required, and shadow surveys be presented.

- The planning authority requested details and relevant drawings dealing with surface water. Drawing No. 402IE-20 cannot be found on the file. If this drawing has not been submitted, then the applicant has not submitted the required details with regards to surface water drainage. No reference to the design, date of installation, certification or photographic support for the soak pits. Clearly these pits are not working and do not comply with SUDS. The Bord is requested to attach a strict condition that an appropriate soak pit be installed and certified by a competent and insured engineer to comply with SUDS and to ensure no adverse impacts on No's 67 and 68.
- In conclusion the Bord is requested to attach conditions to remove the window previously refused twice, to lower the raised terraces to the front and rear and to include conditions relating to drainage to include a soak pit which is designed and certified.

6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1 The applicant's response can be summarised as below:

- With regard to planning history the key issues under 75/497 and 77/90 were in respect of upper-level windows which were blocked up in the 1970's
- The window now in question has been in position since 1960 and what is proposed is a replacement of the frame. This window will be in obscure glazing and will have a restrictor to ensure a very limited opening, entirely within the curtilage of No. 65 Renmore Park.
- The window face is 500mm from the boundary rather than 200mm. Removing this window or requiring it to be fixed would serve no benefit whatsoever to the appellants but would significantly reduce the amenity of the applicants as the purpose is for ventilation in a kitchen / utility.
- Due to the delineation of the site, it is No's 67 and 68 that overlook the applicant's amenity space. The applicants have taken every opportunity to protect the amenity of their neighbours.

- No increase in overlooking from terraces that have been installed at the same floor level as the house has been in since 1960. Having a terrace / patio at the same level as the house is important from the point of view of ease of access and general accessibility into the long term. The ground outside is uneven and the maximum level increase in level was 300mm at any part of the terrace. This within exempted development provision for change in height of external ground.
- The original Renmore Park Estate was constructed on a hill, meaning that No's 67 and 68 are below No.65. This is the natural lie of the land, and it is appropriate in any construction that steps will be taken to ameliorate and mitigate impacts that are caused by existing contours.
- Cedar timber effect cladding (or similar) 1.8m above patio level is a condition of 23/6033 from Galway City Council. The existing 1960's block-built boundary wall at the front of the property is already c.0.9m high from patio level. This structure has been in place for almost half a century and is quite sufficient for attaching screening. As the proposed screening runs along the boundary of 65 Renmore Park and 66 Renmore Park, it is the owners of the properties who decide on appropriateness. The 1.8m high fence will not exacerbate visual intrusion. There is no need for a shadow study.
- No issue relating to surface water ponding or flooding. A copy of drawing No. 4021-E-20 was submitted in response to further information. There is no evidence to suggest that soakage on site is not working.
- Existing rear soak pits uncovered during works are estimated to date from the 1960's and no survey records survive. There is no history of drainage concerns with any properties westward of 65 Renmore Park. No evidence of drainage issues has been offered, and it is impossible to allay concerns regarding something that does not exist.
- Post works the drainage profile of 65 Renmore Park is far superior to what preceded it, as rainwater pipes which previously discharged onto the front lawn now take water off the property to the sewer connection via a newly constructed sump. There is no requirement for ABP to attach a condition requiring an appropriate soak pit be installed, no adverse impact on 67 and 68 Renmore Park has been indicated.

- Gable window has not been introduced by this application. The window has been in existence since 1960, and this is statute barred from enforcement action. Ground and first floor gable windows are a common feature throughout Renmore Park.
- Photos in the appeal are misleading, two separate views side by side and taken from different tilt angles.
- The height of the windows in the new extension are lower than the highest point of the glazing in the 1990's conservatory. The new glazing the same height as the eaves point of the 1900's conservatory. Much less glazing is provided in the new construction than existed in the conservatory.
- Site section drawing 4021-E-12 showing 'before and after' included with the appeal response.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- There is no response from the Planning Authority on file.

6.4. Observations

- There are no observations on file.

6.5. Further Responses

- There are no further responses on file.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having inspected the site and reviewed the documents on the file, I consider that the appeal can be addressed under the following headings:

- Principle of development
- Design
- Residential amenity
- Overlooking

- Drainage
- Appropriate Assessment

7.2 Principle of Development

7.2.1 The subject land is within the Renmore area of Galway City which is identified as an 'Established Suburb' in Figure 11.32 'Neighbourhood Areas of the *Galway City Development Plan 2023-2029*. The site itself is within the 'Residential' zone which has the following objective '*To provide for residential development and for associated support development, which will ensure the protection of existing residential amenity and will contribute to sustainable residential neighbourhoods*'. The proposal which comprises of the retention of demolition of a rear extension and utility and retention of new works including a new conservatory / extension to the rear and a porch to the front, alterations to windows on the north-western gable and a new shed to the rear of the site on land which is zoned for residential purposes is in my opinion, acceptable, in principle.

7.3 Design

7.3.1 The development for which retention is sought includes a porch extension to the front of the dwelling and an extension to the rear of the dwelling. In terms of the design / visual appearance it is my opinion that the extensions are in keeping with the character of the area and do not detract from the visual integrity of the surrounding streetscape. In my opinion, there are no issues relating to the design or visual appearance of the development for retention.

7.4 Residential amenity

7.4.1 The grounds of appeal state that, having regard to the history of the site, allowing the retention of the ground floor window on the side gable of the dwelling facing towards the garden of No.67 Renmore Park at a distance of 200mm from the shared property boundary would be inconsistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area and would have a very significant impact on the residents of No.67 Renmore Park.

7.4.2 The applicants state that there is no increase in the size of the window opes that the window in question has been in position since the 1960's and that the window is

obscured by opaque glazing and has restrictors to allow very limited opening. The applicants also note that the window is 500mm from the shared boundary.

7.4.3 I note the planning history on the land and the concerns of the appellants, however, having regard to the information available to me on this file and having been on site, I am of the opinion the retention of the window in the north-western gable of the subject dwelling is acceptable. While it is noted that the window does face towards the back garden of No.67 Renmore Park, I note that the window is obscured by opaque glazing and as such does not cause any impact on the residential amenity of No. 67 Renmore Park. The applicants note that the windows have a restrictor to ensure a very limited opening, however, I am of the opinion that, given the set back to the shared boundary and the topography of the site whereby the subject site is at a higher gradient to the appellants property, these windows should be fixed to ensure that no impacts on the residential amenity of No.67 Renmore Park. This matter could be deal with by way of condition, should the Board be of the opinion that retention planning permission should be granted.

7.5 Overlooking

7.5.1 The grounds of appeal state that the front and rear terraces will lead to overlooking and that the cladding required as a result of Condition 6 of the notification to grant planning permission will exacerbate the visual intrusion of No's 67 and 68 Renmore Park. The appellants state that the obvious solution would be to lower the front and rear garden to the pre-existing ground level. The appellants are of the opinion that should the screening be accepted, then full structural details should be provided including shadow analysis.

7.5.2 The applicants state that due to the delineation of the site, it is the owners of No's 67 and 68 Renmore Park that are overlooking their property. The applicants state that the maximum increase in level over the previous ground level is 300mm at any part of the terrace and that having terrace at the same level as the dwelling is important for accessibility.

7.5.3 From an inspection of the drawings I note that the patio to the rear of the property has been constructed at a raised level of 0.6m above the adjoining ground. I would draw the Boards attention to Class 6(b)(i) of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) which provides exemptions for the

provision to the rear of the house of a hard surface for use for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the house as such, subject to the following limitation: *The level of the ground shall not be altered by more than 1 metre above or below the level of the adjoining ground.* As the ground has been raised by less than 1 meter, I would be of the opinion that the raising of the ground to facilitate the patio to the rear of the dwelling is exempted development. Having visited the site, I noted that the boundary between 68 Renmore Park and the subject site is not heavily vegetated or screened. Landowners can provide for appropriate boundary treatments subject to certain height limitations within their own property.

- 7.5.4 With regard to fencing, the applicants state that it is not reasonable to object to fencing which has been required to mitigate overlooking. With regard to the patio to the front of the property, the applicants contend that the block-built boundary wall to the front is sufficient for attaching screening and that all shadows will fall within their garden aside from a few hours after dawn a few days per year.
- 7.5.5 From an inspection of the drawings submitted with the application, it is noted that the patio to the rear has a maximum depth of c. 4.4m and has an area of 30.6m². The patio to the rear abuts the eastern boundary of the land and is set back c. 2m from the western boundary of the land. The patio to the front has an area of c. 26.6m² and abuts the western boundary of the land. In their initial report, the planning authority outlined concern in relation to overlooking from the front and rear patio areas and requested further information for the applicants to consider design solutions to mitigate this. The applicant's response to the further information showed Cedral timber effect cladding or similar on top of the retaining wall to a height of 1.8m above patio level. The planning officer was satisfied that this measure would adequately mitigate any overlooking concerns.
- 7.5.6 Having undertaken a site inspection, and while I am of the opinion that both patio areas are relatively small, I would agree with the appellants and the planning authority that overlooking is possible from both the front and rear patios in their current layout. Notwithstanding this, I would also agree with the applicant that overlooking can be satisfactorily mitigated by way of screening. I note that Condition 6 of the notification to grant planning permission requires screening on top of retaining wall to height of 1.8m above the patio level is erected within 8 weeks of the date of the final grant of planning permission.

7.5.7 I note the concerns of the appellants in relation to the Cedral type cladding and the potential visual intrusion as a result of the screening. I would agree with the appellants that Cedral type fencing to the front of the property would not enhance the character of the area, I would therefore recommend to the Board that a condition requiring the patio to the front be screened by a block wall to a height of 1.8m with a rendered finish similar to the main dwelling be included. In my opinion the proposed Cedral screening to the rear is acceptable and be in character with the existing boundary treatment and would not cause any undue visual intrusion. I also do not have concerns in relation to overshadowing caused by the screening. While, having regard to the orientation of the subject site and the appellants site, there maybe some additional shadow cast into the rear of the properties to the west of the site, in my opinion this would be minimal and would not cause undue overshadowing of these properties. In addition to this, the structural integrity of the screening would be required to be agreed with the Local Authority. Having regard to all of the foregoing, it is my opinion, the issue of overlooking from the patios to the front and rear of the property have been adequately addressed and provided for by the way of the required screening.

7.6 Drainage

7.6.1 The grounds of appeal state that they cannot locate Drawing No. 4021-E-20 on the panning file and that if this drawing is not on the file, then the applicant has not provided the required details in relation to surface water drainage. The appellant has requested that the Board include a condition which requires that an appropriate soak pit be installed and certified by a competent and insured engineer to comply with SUDS to ensure that there is no adverse impact on No's 67 and 68 Renmore Park.

7.6.2 The applicants state that there is no issue with regard to surface water ponding or flooding. The applicants state that a copy of Drawing No. 4021-E-20 which shows new channel drains, new surface water pipes and new gully traps was submitted in response to the further information response. In addition to this the applicants state that there is no evidence to suggest the soakage pit on site is not working and that there is no history of drainage concerns with any properties westward of No.65 Renmore Park. The applicant's state that post works the drainage profile of No.65 Renmore Park is far superior to that which was the case pre-development. Rainwater pipes no longer discharge to the front lawn now take water off the property to the sewer connection by way of a newly constructed sump.

- 7.6.3 In the first instance I confirm to the Board that I have inspected the digital files relating to this application on the Galway City Council website and note that a drainage drawing would appear to have been included with the applicants Further Information response. The Drawing No. would appear to be 4021-20-Rev G and not 4021-E-20 as referred to in both the appeal response and the Further Information response to Galway City Council.
- 7.6.4 In any case, I note that no objections to the development were received from any internal departments in respect to the surface water management provisions shown on the drawing submitted by way of Further Information. In this regard the planning officers report states that a new surface water drainage pipework system has been installed on site and that *'While it is acknowledged that in the past there was drainage issues in relation to no. 65, an area near and adjoining no. 64 to the south this has been remedied under planning permission ref. no. 19/77'.*
- 7.6.5 In my opinion, the issue of surface water drainage from the subject land can be adequately addressed by way of Condition.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1 I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of S177U the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The proposed development is located within the development boundary of Galway City. The proposal comprises of the retention of a house extension.
- 8.2 The subject land is not directly adjacent to a European site. The closest such site to the appeal site is the Galway Bay Complex SAC and the Inner Galway Bay SPA both of which are located c.298m to the west of the site. it is noted that there is no hydrological connection between the site and either the Galway Bay Complex SAC or the Inner Galway Bay SPA. In this regard, all surface water, effluent and greywater generated on site is required to be discharged to the Uisce Eireann Sewerage Network.
- 8.3 Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any appreciable effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The relatively small scale of the proposal; and
- The location of the development and its distance from the closest European Site.

8.4 I consider that the proposed development did not have a significant effect individually, or in-combination with other plans and projects, on a European Site and appropriate assessment is therefore not required.

9.0 Recommendation

9.1 I recommend that retention planning permission be granted.

10.0 Conditions attached by the planning authority

10.1 I note that the planning authority attached a number of conditions which would not normally be included on a Notification of Decision to Grant Retention Planning Permission. However, in this case, I am of the opinion that conditions relating to the screening to the front and rear patio areas and certain windows, financial contributions and surface water are appropriate.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

10.1. Having regard to the scale of development to be retained, the planning history of the site, the permanent obscuring of the windows on the north-western gable of the dwelling and the appropriate screening of the patios to the front and rear of the property, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the development for retention would not seriously injure the residential amenities of adjoining properties or the visual amenities of the area, would not be prejudicial to public health or adversely affect the environment, and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be retained in accordance with the plans and particulars submitted with the planning application, as modified by further information

submitted on 27/2/24, save as may otherwise be required by the following conditions.

Reason: To clarify the plans and particulars for which retention permission is granted.

2. Within 8 weeks of the date of this retention permission the applicant shall confirm the following in writing with the planning authority:
 - a) The window in the side elevation of the living room located on the rear extension is permanently maintained in obscure glass to a minimum height of 1.8m.
 - b) The windows within the north-western gable of the dwelling are permanently obscured by opaque glazing and are not openable.
 - c) The screen to the western side of the front patio is to be of a block construction to a height of 1.8m with a rendered finish similar to the main dwelling.
 - d) The screen to the western side of the rear patio shall be of a Cedral Timber effect cladding (or similar) to a height of 1.8m.
 - e) The surface water layout complies with the planning authority's requirements.

Reason: In the interests of the protection of residential amenities

3. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or,

in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

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 Murphy

Ronan Murphy
Planning Inspector

22 November 2024

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-319591-24		
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of demolition and retention of rear conservatory and kitchen extension.		
Development Address	65 Renmore Park		
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	
		No X	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)
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: Ronan Murphy _____ **Date: 22/11/24** _____