



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-319744-24

Development	Sub-divide two storey dwelling and construction of extension together with all associated site works.
Location	Meadowbank, Orchard Road, Cork
Planning Authority	Cork City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2442701
Applicants	Michael and Patricia Scanlan.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant, subject to conditions.
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellants	Denis and Catherine O'Mullane.
Observers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Janice Healey and Brian Bird• Thomas C. Kenefick
Date of Site Inspection	5 th September 2025
Inspector	Terence McLellan

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The subject site is a dwelling known as Meadowbank, located on Orchard Road which is to the south-west of the city centre. Meadowbank is a large, two storey detached dwelling on a large corner plot with two separate vehicular entrances. There are various changes in levels across the site, most notably a reduction from east to west. The surrounding area is residential and generally characterised by large, detached dwellings although there is a flatted block opposite the subject site and further examples of semi-detached homes in the area. There is an existing neighbourhood centre a short distance to the south at Dennehy's Cross and various public transport routes from Victoria Cross Road which is to the west.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Planning permission is sought to extend and covert the existing dwelling to provide two homes. The extensions would be modest single storey installations.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. Permission was granted by Cork City Council on the 22nd April 2025 subject to 11 generally standard conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. The Planner's Report contains the following points of note:

- Permission was previously granted for a two-storey extension to the rear, a porch to the side of the house and the conversion and alterations to the existing garage including raising front boundary wall of dwelling. Whilst the two-storey extension was omitted, the remainder was approved and Condition 3 required that 'the entire premises shall only be used as a single dwelling unit and shall not be sub-divided or sub-let without a grant of planning permission for such purpose'. The current application complies with Condition 3 of 08/33065 by seeking planning permission for the proposal.

- The conversion to two units is supported and density would rise to 30 units per hectare which is low considering the proximity to the city centre.
- The proposed extensions are not considered to result in any residential amenity impacts.
- Existing access and parking would be retained and would meet CDP parking standards.
- The proposed new boundary fence is high at 2.4m and a condition is imposed to reduce it to 2.2 metres in height.

3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports**

3.2.3. **Contributions (17.04.2024):** No contributions sought.

3.2.4. **Drainage (07.04.2024):** No objection, subject to standard drainage conditions.

3.2.5. **Environment (12.03.2024):** No objection, subject to conditions (waste, noise, environmental impacts, tree removal/wildlife preservation).

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.3.1. **Uisce Éireann** – No response.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

3.4.1. One observation was received from Denis and Catherine O'Mullane (the Appellants). The observation raises similar issues to the grounds of appeal which are set out in detail in Section 6.

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. The planning history of most relevance includes the following:

4.2. **Planning Authority Reference 0833065:** Permission was granted by Cork City Council in June 2008 for the construction of a two-storey extension to the rear, a porch to the side of the house and the conversion and alterations to the existing garage including raising front boundary wall of dwelling. The permission issued by the City Council omitted the two-storey element and imposed Condition 3 which required that

'the entire premises shall only be used as a single dwelling unit and shall not be subdivided on sub let without a grant of planning permission for such purpose'.

4.3. **Planning Authority Reference 0833590:** Permission was refused for for the demolition of the garage and part of existing dwelling and the construction of a split-level dwelling to the rear with associated site works. Permission was refused for the following reason:

1. The proposed infill dwelling, by reason of its proximity to site boundaries, massing, and site coverage, would result in overdevelopment of the site, would adversely impact the privacy and amenity of adjoining dwellings, and would provide inadequate private open space; it would subsequently seriously injure the amenities and depreciate the value of property in the vicinity and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028

- 5.1.1. The site is zoned objective ZO 01 – Sustainable Residential neighbourhoods, the stated objective of which is 'To protect and provide for residential uses and amenities, local services and community, institutional, educational and civic uses.'
- 5.1.2. Development in this zone should generally respect the character and scale of the neighbourhood in which it is situated. Development that does not support the primary objective of this zone will be resisted.

Qualitative Standards for Houses (Section 11.106)

- 5.1.3. Cork City Council will seek to ensure that all new houses are designed to excellent design standards. In determining the adequacy of living space, Cork City Council will refer to the minimum standards for apartments, also taking into account the space required for vertical circulation where homes are over two or three floors. Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities (2007) provides a quality reference point that will be taken into account

Objective 11.5 – Private Amenity Space for Houses

- 5.1.4. Houses should provide a private garden / terrace, of adequate size and proportions for the size of house proposed. The private outdoor areas should allow space for outside dining and / or clothes drying, with reasonable circulation. Private open space for houses should aim to be at least 48 sqm. However, it may be acceptable to provide a smaller area where it can be demonstrated that good quality, useable open space can be provided on site.

Adaptation of Existing Homes (Section 11.140)

- 5.1.5. The design and layout of extensions to houses should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties particularly as regards sunlight, daylight and privacy. The character and form of the existing building should be respected, and external finishes and window types should match the existing.

Extensions should:

- Follow the pattern of the existing building as much as possible.
- Be constructed with similar finishes and similar windows to the existing building so that they would integrate with it.
- Roof form should be compatible with the existing roof form and character. Traditional pitched roofs will generally be appropriate when visible from the public road. Given the high rainfall in Cork the traditional ridged roof is likely to cause fewer maintenance problems in the future than flat ones. High quality mono-pitch and flat-roof solutions will be considered appropriate providing they are of a high standard and employ appropriate detailing and materials.
- Dormer extensions should not obscure the main features of the existing roof, i.e. should not break the ridge or eaves lines of the roof. Box dormers will not usually be permitted where visible from a public area.
- Traditional style dormers should provide the design basis for new dormers.
- Front dormers should normally be set back at least three-tile courses from the eaves line and should be clad in a material matching the existing roof.
- Care should be taken to ensure that the extension does not overshadow windows, yards or gardens or have windows in flank walls which would reduce the privacy of adjoining properties.

5.2. Relevant Guidance

- 5.2.1. Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) – SPPR 2 provides minimum private open space standards for houses and notes that for building refurbishment schemes on sites of any size or urban infill schemes on smaller sites (e.g. sites of up to 0.25ha) the private open space standard may be relaxed in part or whole, on a case-by-case basis, subject to overall design quality and proximity to public open space.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.3.1. None of relevance.

5.4. EIA Screening

- 5.4.1. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2, in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1.1. A third party appeal has been submitted by FP Logue Solicitors, for and on behalf of the Appellants, Dennis and Catherine O'Mullane who live in the adjacent dwelling to the east. The main points of the grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:
- The proposal would be overdevelopment that would not be consistent with the pattern of development in the area and would set an unwelcome precedent.
 - There would be residential amenity impacts due to building up to the shared boundary and the proposed back door being in close proximity to the front door of No. 16 Orchard Road.

- The development would not be consistent with the policies and objectives of the Cork City Development Plan.
- Previous applications for development on the site have been refused for similar reasons.
- The validity of the application is questioned, the application form does not include all relevant site history. These omissions are not immaterial as previous applications were refused due to poor provision of private open space and impact on residential amenity.
- There are deficiencies in the plans and particulars including: no details of plot ratio; no description of private open space; no information on daylight/sunlight performance; and incomplete schedule of floor areas. This makes it difficult to evaluate the proposal against relevant policies and guidance.
- Conditions 2 and 3 imposed by the planning authority are contradictory and confusing.
- The proposal would be a material change of use and would materially contravene the development plan which only allows subdivision in the context of 'granny flats' under section 11.146 and 11.147, and conversion to flat accommodation under 11.152. Exceptional circumstances do not apply in this instance. There is no other possibility of subdivision.
- There is no daylight and sunlight assessment. The subdivided dwelling to the north and private open space would be unlikely to be adequately lit
- Private open space would materially contravene section 11.5 in quantitative and qualitative terms. It would be small, narrow, overshadowed and constrained.
- The proposal materially contravenes section 11.8 of the CDP, the dwelling is not appropriate for the elderly. It would be poor quality (daylight/open space), and inaccessible.
- Plot ratio is likely to contravene the CDP.
- There would be overlooking impacts in addition to impacts on visual amenity and the development would adversely affect the enjoyment of No. 16 Orchard Road.

6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1. McCutcheon Halley Planning Consultants, for and on behalf of the Applicants Michael and Patricia Scanlan.

- The Applicants seek to downsize whilst remaining within their community and will continue to live in the subdivided home whilst selling the other unit which will be more manageable for the couple and would provide a much-needed family home for another family.
- The proposal would result in a modest but welcome increase in the number of homes in the area, which the Council notes is low given the location and accessibility.
- Subdivision into two semidetached homes is consistent with the pattern of development in the area where there is a high proportion of semi-detached homes.
- CDP policy 11.152 encourages the subdivision of large houses subject to various criteria which the development complies with.
- Previous refusals on the site were for much larger developments, the current proposal is modest in scale. They are not comparable.
- Increase of dwellings on infill sites and increased density are important in achieving compact growth and avoiding urban sprawl and appropriate in areas with good public transport close to urban centres.
- The extensions are modest, do not make any material difference to the form/scale/massing of the dwelling and does not propose any alterations at upper floors. There would be no impact on amenity in terms of overshadowing/daylight/sunlight or overlooking/privacy.
- There would be no overlooking from the proposed back door and obscure glazing could be used if required.
- The proposed northern dwelling is not entirely north facing. The main windows to the lounge, kitchen, and dining room face west and would enjoy sunlight.
- The Planner's Report acknowledges the previous site history and the difference in scale. The comparison between what was previously refused and what is proposed is irrelevant.

- The application was assessed and considered valid by Cork City Council and the Planner's Report provides a thorough evaluation of the development.
- Criteria set out at CDP Section 11.146 and 11.147 are not relevant to the development which seeks to provide two separate and independent units as opposed to ancillary family accommodation.
- Whilst Section 11.152 relates to the conversion of dwellings to flats, relevant performance criteria is specified, which the development would fully comply with.
- New windows would be larger and would provide additional daylight and sunlight in the dwelling.
- The modest size of the extensions would not result in any daylight/sunlight/overshadowing impacts to neighbours.
- Private open space would meet the 48sqm requirement for new dwellings.
- The proposal aims to allow the Applicants to downsize, it is not designed as accommodation for elderly people.
- Table 11.2 refers to building height and density and does not include any plot ratio standards. There would be no material change in plot ratio.
- The Appellant's reference to Section 3(3) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 is not relevant to the application as permission has been sought and granted in compliance with the legislation.
- The proposal complies with Condition 3 of 08/33065 by seeking permission for the development.
- Claims of a Material Contravention are unsubstantiated and not applicable to the development.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

6.3.1. No response on file.

6.4. Observations

6.4.1. Two observations were received from Janice Healey and Brian Bird, and Thomas C. Kenefick. The issues raised are similar to the grounds of appeal.

6.5. Further Responses

6.5.1. None.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Density, Design and Quality of Accommodation
- Residential Amenity
- Other Matters

7.2. Principle of Development

7.2.1. It is stated in the grounds of appeal that the development would not be consistent with the Cork City Development Plan, that previous applications have been refused and that the proposal would be a material change of use that would contravene the CDP on the basis that subdivision is only allowed in the context of 'granny flats' or conversion to flats (sections 11.46/47 and 11.52 respectively).

7.2.2. The site is zoned residential and currently in residential use and this would continue under the proposed scheme. As such I do not consider that there would be a material change of use, nor would the provision of residential be contrary to the land use zoning. I accept that previous applications for the development of this site have been refused, however these were for larger developments that would have affected neighbouring amenity and are not, in my mind, directly comparable to the current proposal, which should be assessed on its own merits. Furthermore, I do not accept the Appellants' view that the development would be contrary to a condition imposed on a previous consent. As noted by the Planning Authority, in submitting the current application for planning permission, the Applicant is complying with Condition 3 of Planning Reference 08/33065.

7.2.3. I note the Appellants' comments regarding current CDP policies on subdivision and the Applicant's view that these policies would not apply to the proposal as it is neither a granny flat/ancillary accommodation nor conversion to flats. I accept the Applicant's argument on this matter and whilst I acknowledge that there are no conversion policies directly applicable to the proposal, which is for the sub-division of an existing dwelling to two dwellings, this does not in my mind infer a blanket ban on the potential subdivision of existing large dwellings. On that basis, the principle of subdivision is generally acceptable subject to the development being of a satisfactory scale and design, quality of accommodation (for both dwellings), access, and impacts on residential/visual amenity, which I will consider in detail below.

7.3. Density, Design, and Quality of Accommodation

7.3.1. The Appellants consider that the proposal would be overdevelopment that would not be consistent with the pattern of development in the area and that this would set an unwelcome precedent. It is also stated that the plot ratio would likely contravene CDP standards. The proposed extensions are single storey and very modest in footprint and having regard to the size of the plot I do not consider that there would be any meaningful increase in plot ratio.

7.3.2. The subdivision would result in an additional dwelling resulting in a density of c. however this would have minimal impact on density which would increase to c. 30uph which would be in line with the CDP and the Compact Settlement Guidelines and is entirely acceptable given the location of the site close to the city centre, in close proximity to public transport and a neighbourhood centre.

7.3.3. I fully accept that the subdivision has the potential to alter the surrounding pattern of development however I find that these concerns are unfounded. I come to this conclusion on the basis that the alterations and subdivision are both modest and discrete. Furthermore, and most importantly, the specific nature of this site, which is a large corner plot with two separate and established vehicular entrances on separate street frontages is such that a subdivision can take place without having any demonstrable impact on the pattern of development or character of the street. Having regard to the specific nature and attributes of this site which lends itself to a successful subdivision, I do not consider that granting permission would set a precedent.

7.3.4. In design terms, the proposed extensions are acceptable, modest in scale and well considered. I have no objections in this regard. I note the concerns raised by the Appellant's in terms of perceived deficiencies in the quality of accommodation, particularly with regard to amenity space, daylight, and floorspace standards. Again, I consider these concerns to be unfounded. From the information available to me the resulting unit would comfortably meet both floorspace and amenity space standards for what I consider to be the equivalent of a three-bedroom dwelling. The dwelling would be dual aspect with windows on both the north and west frontages, and I am satisfied that it would be well lit.

7.3.5. The northern amenity space would equate to c.50sqm and whilst I accept that it would be overshadowed for part of the day, it does enjoy an open aspect to the west, and I am satisfied that it would receive satisfactory sunlight overall. Whilst currently a hard surface, there is no impediment to improving the hard and soft landscaping of this space. I also note that there is an additional amenity space proposed on the western frontage. Even taking account of space to park a vehicle (which would meet the required dimensions), noting the CDP maximum standards, this amenity space would equate to approximately 30sqm and would have an open aspect to both the west/south and as before, there are no obvious impediments to undertaking hard/soft landscaping improvements to this space. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposal would provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation and that the parent dwelling would also meet all required quality standards.

7.4. Residential Amenity

7.4.1. The Appellants argue that the development would result in adverse amenity impacts in terms of overlooking and visual amenity. Given the modest scale of the extensions and their relationship to the boundary of No. 16 Orchard Road (the Appellants' property) I am fully satisfied that there would be no adverse amenity impacts that would compromise the enjoyment of the Appellants' property.

7.4.2. I note the Appellants' concern regarding the back door. This provides access to a small courtyard. I don't consider that this raises any amenity concerns given the small size of the courtyard and the proposed boundary fence negates the risk of it being used as an access, however, should the Commission consider it necessary, this door could be omitted by condition. In terms of the boundary fence, I note the condition imposed by

the Planning Authority that seeks to reduce its height from 2.4 metres to 2.2 metres. In my opinion this condition isn't entirely necessary, the height of the fence doesn't result in any residential or visual amenity impacts.

7.5. Other Matters

- 7.5.1. The Appellants question the validity of the application on the basis that it doesn't include all of the relevant site history and that there are deficiencies in the plans and particulars, making it difficult to evaluate the proposal. I note that Cork City Council validated the application and considered the information submitted to be sufficient to process the application. It is not a matter for the Commission to address perceived or actual deficiencies in the Planning Authority's processing of the application. Notwithstanding, I have considered all relevant site history in my assessment, and I consider the plans and particulars to be sufficient with regards to the nature and scope of the proposal. I am therefore satisfied that sufficient and appropriate information has been provided to allow a full assessment of the proposal.
- 7.5.2. The grounds of appeal argue that conditions 2 and 3 imposed by the Planning Authority are contradictory and confusing. In my opinion conditions 2 and 3 largely duplicate each other rather than being contradictory or confusing and I have combined them into a single condition.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1. I have considered the proposal in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located in Cory City Centre south at a distance of approximately 4.7km from the Cork Harbour SPA (004030), which is the nearest European site. The development comprises the extension and conversion of the existing dwelling to provide two separate dwellings as set out in Section 2.1 of this report. No appropriate assessment issues were raised as part of the appeal. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature and small scale of the works.

- The significant separation distance from the nearest European site and lack of connections.
- The screening determination of the Planning Authority.

8.2. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the 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 (under Section 177V of the Planning and development Act 2000) is not required.

9.0 Water Framework Directive

9.1. There are no water courses in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. The proposed development comprises the construction of two new houses. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration.

9.2. 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 surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature and scale of the works;
- The location of the site in a serviced urban area and the distance from nearest Water bodies and lack of direct hydrological connections.

9.3. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

10.0 Recommendation

10.1. I recommend that the Commission grant planning permission, subject to conditions, for the reasons and considerations set out below.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

11.1. Having regard to the zoning objective of the site and considering the design, scale, form and nature of the proposed development, the location of the site in a serviced urban area, the wider character of Orchard Road, the provisions of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024), and the location of the site close to Cork City Centre, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would provide for an acceptable design and standard of accommodation, would not seriously injure the residential amenities of property in the vicinity or the visual amenities and character of the area, and would, therefore, be in accordance with the provisions of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028 and with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plans and particulars submitted with the planning application except as may be otherwise required by the following conditions.

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

2. The proposed dwelling and existing dwelling shall both be retained and occupied as separate single residential units and not let or otherwise transferred or conveyed unless permitted by way of a separate planning application.

Reason: To restrict the use of the dwellings in the interest of residential amenity.

3. Water supply and drainage arrangements (including attenuation and disposal of surface water) shall comply with the requirements of the Planning Authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

4. Development described in Class 1 of Schedule 2 to the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, or any statutory provision modifying or replacing them, shall not be carried out within the curtilage of any either dwelling without a prior grant of planning permission.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity and to ensure that a reasonable amount of private open space is provided for the benefit of the occupants of the proposed dwellings.

5. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall enter into a Connection Agreement with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for a service connection to the public water supply and wastewater collection network.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water/wastewater facilities.

6. Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 8:00 to 19:00 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 08:00 to 14:00 on Saturdays, and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.

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.

Terence McLellan
Senior Planning Inspector

3rd October 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP-319744-24
Proposed Development Summary	Sub-divide two storey dwelling and construction of extension together with all associated site works.
Development Address	Meadowbank, Orchard Road, Cork
In all cases check box /or leave blank	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a ‘project’ for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, “Project” means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a ‘Project’. Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

<p>development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	<p>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	<p>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</p> <p>Class 10 (b) (i) >500 dwellings.</p>

<p>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ABP-319744-24
Proposed Development Summary	Sub-divide two storey dwelling and construction of extension together with all associated site works.
Development Address	Meadowbank, Orchard Road, Cork
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
<p>Characteristics of proposed development</p> <p>(In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).</p>	<p>Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed.</p> <p>The appeal site is located in an urban area characterised by residential development. The proposed development would therefore not be exceptional in the context of the existing environment in terms of its nature. The development would not result in the production of any significant waste, emissions or pollutants due to the nature of the proposed residential use.</p>
<p>Location of development</p> <p>(The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).</p>	<p>Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed</p> <p>The site is not located within, or immediately adjoining, any protected areas. The development would be in a serviced urban area and would not have the potential to significantly impact on any ecologically sensitive site or location.</p> <p>The proposal would not give rise to significant impact on nearby water courses (whether linked to any European site or other sensitive receptors). The site is not considered to be an environmentally sensitive site. It is considered that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise, and it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect, individually, or in combination with other plans or projects, on any European Site.</p> <p>The proposed development would not give rise to waste, pollution or nuisances that differ significantly from that arising from other urban developments. Given the nature of the development and the site/surroundings, it would not have the potential to significantly affect other significant environmental sensitivities in the area.</p>
Types and characteristics of potential impacts	Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location,

<p>(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).</p>	<p>consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects.</p> <p>The development would generally be consistent with the scale of surrounding developments and would not be exceptional in the context of the existing urban environment. There would be no significant cumulative considerations with regards to existing and permitted projects/developments.</p>
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
<p>There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p>	<p>EIA is not required.</p>

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

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

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)