



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-319802-24

Development	Construction of a mews dwelling and all associated ancillary works.
Location	Rear of No. 23 Blessington Street, Dublin 7, D07 DT6D
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council North
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	3367/24
Applicant(s)	BGTS Holdings Limited
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	BGTS Holdings Limited
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	09 th September 2024
Inspector	Bernadette Quinn

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located to the rear of a three-storey mid-terrace building located on the northern side of Blessington Street, close to its junction with Mountjoy Street. The appeal site forms part of the rear garden of this property, is irregular in shape, contains no structures and is overgrown. A gate defines the northern boundary which accesses onto Blessington Place and faces the junction with St. Joseph's Place. Immediately to the east on Blessington Place is a two storey dwelling with a first floor terrace. To the south and west are the rear elevations of three storey properties on Blessington Street and to the north are single storey cottages. The appeal site has a stated area of 54.7 sq.m and the overall property including the dwelling at No. 23 Blessington Street has an area of 168 sq.m.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for construction of a two storey one bedroom dwelling with a total floor area of 57 sq.m. fronting onto Blessington Place. Private open space is proposed in a rear garden and first floor terrace. A flat roof with a height of 5.5m is proposed. Finishes include selected brick on the front elevation facing Blessington Place.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.2. On 02nd May 2024 the Planning Authority refused permission for one reason as follows:

The proposed development of this mews house in close proximity to the existing house would constitute overdevelopment of the site, compromising the residential amenity of the existing recently permitted residential units on the site, due to the minimal private open space left to the main house, in contravention of the Ministerial Guidelines Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024). The proposed new house would not provide appropriate residential amenity to future residents, providing inadequate

private open space, and failing to comply with the relevant Ministerial Standards 'Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities', 2007 having regard to room width and provision of storage, due to the constrained size and width of the site.

Additionally, there would be undue overbearing impacts of the existing house, and it fails to comply with Section 15.13.5 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-28 on mews development.

3.3. Planning Authority Reports

3.3.1. Planning Reports

The report reflects the decision to refuse permission and can be summarised as follows:

- The proposal is assessed against section 15.13.5 Mews of the Development Plan.
- A rear garden of c. 27 sqm is retained for the permitted house which is low for a dwelling of its size and the open space is north facing, likely to be largely overshadowed and lacking amenity for a family home.
- The dwelling meets or exceeds the relevant standards for room widths and sizes, however there are concerns regarding the provision of storage, and the quality (as opposed to the size) of the rooms.
- There is no possibility of an external garden shed for storage and no meaningful storage is provided at ground floor.
- The living room and bedroom are irregular in shape, with the living room having a width of c. 3.0 metres for the majority of its length, and a pinch point of 1.5 metres, creating a corridor effect to access the private open space, and hampering a normal arrangement of furniture. There are concerns in relation to internal daylight available for the kitchen and living room.
- The existing building, with a height of 10.6m and 9.4m at eaves level at a distance of 10m would have a significant overbearing impact on the new dwelling.

- The first and second floor bedroom windows of the permitted development would overlook the proposed private open space at a distance of c. 7 metres.
- There would be likely impacts on daylight to the windows of the new building, due to the size and proximity of the existing building to it.
- No shadow path diagram has been provided and proposed private open space at ground floor is likely to be overshadowed by its boundary walls for much of the day and first floor obscure glazing inhibits the amenity of the first floor open space.
- Potential impacts on daylight and overbearing impacts to the rear windows and rear yard to 22 Blessington Street, however, it is not clear if windows serve habitable rooms.
- The development as proposed would not provide adequate residential amenity, due to non-compliance with Ministerial standards, and would compromise the residential amenity of the recently permitted four-bedroom duplex unit in the main house, due to the minimal garden area remaining to that dwelling.

3.3.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage: Additional information required in relation to surface water management detail and an appropriate flood risk assessment.

Road Planning Division: No objection subject to conditions including a requirement for a sheltered bicycle space.

3.4. **Prescribed Bodies**

TII: A Section 49 condition should be applied in relation to Luas Cross City.

NTA: The site is directly above the proposed MetroLink tunnel. A further information request is recommended requiring the applicant to liaise with the NTA in order to establish any interfaces to MetroLink and to ensure that designs are compatible with MetroLink infrastructure.

3.5. **Third Party Observations**

None.

4.0 Planning History

Appeal Site:

4007/23: Permission granted for change of use of a vacant derelict structure (derelict sites register file no. DS1006) at no. 23 Blessington Street, to 1 no. one-bedroom apartment at basement floor level and 1 no. four bedroom dwelling over ground, first and second floor levels.

The following application traverses the appeal site:

314724-22: Application currently under consideration for a railway (Metrolink - Estuary to Charlemont via Dublin Airport) Order.

Adjoining site:

2687/17 / PL29N.248828: Permission granted for construction of two own-door apartments in a three-storey building at Blessington Place, to rear of Nos. 24-25 Blessington Street. The decision to grant permission was upheld by An Bord Pleanála on appeal.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 is the operative Development Plan for the area. It has regard to national and regional policies in respect of infill development within existing built-up areas.
- 5.1.2. The site is in an area zoned 'Objective Z2 – Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Area) with the land use zoning objective 'to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas'. 'Residential' is a permissible use within this land use zoning. The Development Plan states that the general objective for such areas is to protect them from unsuitable new developments or works that would have a negative impact on the amenity or architectural quality of the area.
- 5.1.3. Policy BHA9 and Section 11.5.3 seek to protect the special interest and character of all Dublin's Conservation Areas – including within the Z2 zoning objective.

- 5.1.4. Section 15.11.1 'Floor Areas' states that houses shall comply with the principles and standards outlined in Section 5.3: 'Internal Layout and Space Provision' contained in the DEHLG 'Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities' (2007).
- 5.1.5. Section 15.11.3 relates to private open space stating a minimum standard of 10 sq. m. of private open space per bedspace will normally be applied and for houses within the inner city, a standard of 5– 8 sq. m. of private open space per bedspace will normally be applied.
- 5.1.6. Section 15.13.4 sets out criteria to be considered in applications for backland housing.
- 5.1.7. Section 15.13.5 sets out criteria to be considered in applications for mews housing. Relevant considerations include
- The distance between the opposing windows of mews dwellings and of the main houses shall ensure a high level of privacy is provided and potential overlooking is minimised. In such cases, innovative and high quality design will be required to ensure privacy and to provide an adequate setting, including amenity space, for both the main building and the mews dwelling.
 - Private open space shall be provided to the rear of the mews building to provide for adequate amenity space for both the original and proposed dwelling and shall be landscaped so as to provide for a quality residential environment.
- 5.1.8. Appendix 3 - Table 2 outlines indicative Plot Ratio and Site Coverage for different area types. For Conservation Areas an indicative plot ratio of 1.5-2.0 and indicative site coverage of 45-50%. Higher plot ratio and site coverage may be permitted in certain circumstances.
- 5.1.9. The appeal site is included on the Derelict Sites Register (DS1006).

5.2. Ministerial Guidelines

- 5.2.1. Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (Compact Settlements Guidelines)

- SPPR 1 requires a separation distance of at least 16 metres between rear opposing windows above ground floor level. Separation distances below 16 metres may be considered where suitable privacy measures have been designed into the scheme to prevent undue overlooking of habitable rooms and private amenity spaces.
- SPPR 2 outlines minimum private open space standards for houses, with 20 sq.m. required for a one bed house and 50 sq.m. required for a 4+ bed house. For building refurbishment schemes on sites of any size or urban infill schemes on smaller sites (for example, sites of up to 0.25 hectares) 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.
- SPPR 3 requires that in city centres car-parking provision should be minimised, substantially reduced or wholly eliminated.
- SPPR 4 relates to cycle parking and storage and states that a general minimum standard of 1 cycle storage space per bedroom should be applied.

5.2.2. Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities (2007)

These guidelines promote a high standard in the design and construction and in the provision of residential amenity and services in new housing schemes.

Recommended standards for internal layout and space provision are provided in Table 5.1.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

None.

5.4. EIA Screening

- 5.4.1. See completed Form 2 on file. Having regard to the nature, size and location of the proposed development and to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations, I have concluded at preliminary examination that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. EIA, therefore, is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first party appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The proposal complies with national and regional policy and ministerial guidelines relating to compact growth, density and development of underused sites and is consistent with the Z2 zoning objective and does not have an adverse impact on adjoining amenities.
- The proposal complies with Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities guidelines in relation to standards for a one bed house and to SPPR 1 of Compact Settlements Guidelines.
- Private open space for the permitted four-bedroom dwelling measuring 29.3 sq.m. and apartment measuring 14 sq.m is in compliance with Development Plan standard of 5-8 sq.m per bedspace. Compact settlements guidelines allow for a relaxation of private open space standards which is appropriate for this site given the city centre location and access to public open space.
- The proposed dwelling exceeds Development Plan private open space requirements of 5sq.m per one bed unit with the provision of 16 sq.m.
- The contemporary form and design and the materials proposed comply with Development Plan requirements and will not create undue visual impacts on the character of the area.
- The proposal complies with the provisions of the development plan relating to backland development, maintains adequate distance between the existing dwelling whilst maintaining adequate private open space for the existing and proposed buildings and no overlooking of the existing property will occur.
- Overbearing impacts on adjoining properties will not occur.
- No car parking is required at this location.
- Blessington Place features a number of mews developments.
- Planning precedents exist for development of a similar scale and design within the Dublin City Council area.

- Site coverage of 78% and plot ratio of 1.04 are substantially in compliance with guiding figures in the Development Plan.

6.2. **Planning Authority Response**

A response received requests that the decision of the planning authority be upheld and that if permission is granted conditions be attached requiring a section 48 development contribution, a section 49 contribution, a social housing condition and a naming and numbering condition.

6.3. **Observations**

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 inspected the site, and having regard to relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issue in this appeal are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Design and Layout
- Visual Impact
- Precedent

7.2. **Principle of Development**

7.2.1. The site is zoned Z2 Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas) whereby it is the Council's objective 'to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas' and residential use is a permissible use. The site comprises a back land site which is surrounded by residential development and is serviced. I am satisfied that residential development is acceptable in principle and I note that national, regional and local policy and Ministerial guidelines seek to consolidate and provide for compact growth in urban areas.

7.3. Design and Layout

Private Open Space

- 7.3.1. The Planning Authority's reason for refusal considered that the proposed mews house would compromise the residential amenity of the recently permitted residential units on the site, due to the minimal private open space left to the main house, in contravention of the Ministerial Guidelines Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines.
- 7.3.2. The appeal site forms part of a larger site which contains a three storey building where permission was recently granted for a one bedroom apartment at basement level served by a light well to the rear and a four bedroom dwelling within the existing building with a rear garden area of 84 sq.m. The appeal site is located within this rear garden area and has a stated area of 54.7 sq.m thereby providing a balance of 29.3 sq.m rear private open space for the permitted house. Private open space to serve the proposed mews house measures a stated 10sq.m at ground floor level and a terrace at first floor measuring 6sq.m.
- 7.3.3. The first party argue that the private open space complies with section 15.11.3 of the Development Plan which states that a standard of 5-8 sq.m. of private open space per bedspace will normally be applied. I note that the Compact Settlements Guidelines were published in 2024, following the adoption of the Development Plan and that the Planning and Development Act in Section 34 provides that where specific planning policy requirements of guidelines differ from provisions of the development plan then the specific planning policy requirements shall apply instead of the provisions of the development plan.
- 7.3.4. Compact Settlements guidelines SPPR 2 requires private open space of 20 sq.m. for a one bed house and 50 sq.m. for a 4 bed house. I note that these guidelines state that for building refurbishment schemes on sites of any size or urban infill schemes on smaller sites (for example, sites of up to 0.25 hectares) 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. SPPR 4 requires cycle parking at a rate of 1 cycle storage space per bedroom.
- 7.3.5. I note that no car parking is proposed to serve the proposed dwelling and this is supported at this location by SPPR 3 of the Compact Settlements Guidelines. No

details of cycle parking have been provided and I note no cycle or bin storage was indicated on the site layout plan relating to the permitted residential development on the site. Based on SPPR 4, one bicycle parking space would be required to serve the proposed development. Bin storage would also be required.

- 7.3.6. Based on SPPR 2 the overall private open space required to serve the permitted house and proposed house amounts to 70 sq.m. As a result of the proposed development the total amount of private open space proposed to serve both dwellings measures 45.3 sq.m. which is below the standards set out in SPPR 2. I note there would be a requirement to incorporate cycle and bin storage into this already limited area for the proposed development. I also note that the rear garden serving the permitted dwelling is north facing and any reduction in size would further reduce its amenity value. The planning authority noted that the open space to serve the proposed dwelling would likely be overshadowed by its boundary walls for much of the day and that the obscure glazing would inhibit the amenity of the first-floor terrace and I agree with the concerns of the planning authority in this regard. I note that no assessment of overshadowing was submitted with the planning application.
- 7.3.7. In relation to SPPR 1 of the Compact Settlements requirement for a separation distance of at least 16 metres between rear opposing windows above ground floor, the proposal provides for a separation distance of 12.6 metres above ground floor. Whilst opaque glazing to the rear first floor amenity space will limit overlooking between rear opposing windows, the limited separation distance has the potential to result in undue overlooking from the permitted development in to the private amenity space to the rear of the proposed dwelling. The existing dwelling at No. 23 is located approximately 7 metres from the rear boundary of the proposed dwelling and has the potential to overlook the proposed private amenity space at ground and first floor.
- 7.3.8. Having regard to the foregoing I consider the proposal fails to provide for adequate private open space to serve the permitted and proposed development and would fail to comply with Section 15.13.5 of the Development Plan relating to considerations in relation to design and layout for mews development and with SPPR 1 and SPPR 2 of the Compact Settlements Guidelines. I note the first party's case that SPPR 2 allows for a reduction on smaller sites and urban infill sites such as the appeal site. However, having regard to the shortfall proposed for both the permitted and

proposed dwellings and to the limited amenity value of the private open space I do not consider the development as proposed is acceptable.

Floor Area and Room Size

- 7.3.9. The Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities Guidelines provide space provision and room sizes for typical dwellings and these areas are reproduced in the more recently published Design Manual for Quality Housing (2022). These documents relate to the design of social housing developments. It is a requirement of the development plan in section 15.11.1 that the floor areas of houses shall comply with the 2007 guidelines. In relation to one bed dwellings standards are provided for a 1 bed/2P House (1 storey) and a 1Bed/2P Apartment. No standards are provided for a 1 bed (2 storey house). I consider the standards relating to a 1 storey 1 bed house relevant to this application as outlined in the table below.

Required standards Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities (2007)		Proposed
Target Gross Floor Area (m ²)	44	57
Min. Main Living Room (m ²)	11	Approx.12
Aggregate Living Area (m ²)	23	23.6
Aggregate Bedroom Area (m ²)	11	15.7
Storage (m ²)	2	3
Min unobstructed living room width (m)	3.3	2.9 - 3.1
Min bedroom width (m)	2.8	2.9 – 3.1

- 7.3.10. The planning officers report raised concerns in relation to the quality (as opposed to the size) of the rooms and the failure to provide meaningful storage. I note that the floor area is above the minimum targets for a one bed dwelling, however the guidelines relate to a single storey house and as such would not include stairs and circulation space for accessing the first floor. As a result of the irregular and narrow site configuration the internal width of the living room ranges between 2.9m and

3.1m and narrows to approximately 1.5m where it enters the dining area which has a width of between 1.6m and 2m.

- 7.3.11. Whilst I note the living room width falls below the recommended standard, I am generally satisfied that the overall floor areas are adequate to provide sufficient residential amenity for future occupants of this one bedroom house. However I do share the concerns of the planning authority in relation to the quality of the rooms due to the irregular shape of the layout and the proposed living room fails to comply with the standards for living room width set out in Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities Guidelines and as required in Section 15.11.1 of the Development Plan.
- 7.3.12. In relation to storage the first party appeal notes that a total of 3 sq.m storage space is proposed. I note that in addition to the internal storage which is located within the first floor bedroom wardrobes and a ground floor WC, an external storage area measuring approx. 0.75 sq.m. is proposed and I note that there is little or no provision for storage of bulky items.
- 7.3.13. Having regard to the poor quality internal layout and inadequate storage provision I have concerns that the proposed house fails to provide for an appropriate level of amenity for future occupants and as such I do not consider the proposed development is acceptable.

Overbearing

- 7.3.14. The planning authority reason for refusal referred to the overbearing impact on the proposed mews from the existing house. No site section drawings were included with the planning application. The existing three storey building at no. 23 Blessington Street is located approximately 10 metres from the proposed ground floor rear elevation. To the southeast of the proposed dwelling a two storey with pitched roof rear return at no. 22 Blessington street is located approximately 2.5m from the rear ground floor elevation. I share the concerns of the planning authority that the existing building, by reason of its height and proximity to the rear of the proposed mews, as well as the rear return at no. 22 Blessington Street is likely to have an overbearing impact on the proposed dwelling and that this has the potential to result in a negative impact on the residential amenity of future occupants.

- 7.3.15. The proposal would be located approx. 2.1 m from the rear elevation of the rear return at no. 22 Blessington Street. I note that no assessment of the impact of the proposal on daylight and sunlight was submitted with the planning application. I agree with the concerns of the planning authority that the proposal, due to its proximity, has the potential to result in a negative impact in terms of overbearing and impact on daylight levels serving the rear windows and rear garden at no. 22.

Overdevelopment

- 7.3.16. The planning authority's refusal reason states that the development would constitute overdevelopment of the site. The development plan in Appendix 3 - Table 2 outlines indicative Plot Ratio and Site Coverage for different area types. For Conservation Areas an indicative plot ratio of 1.5-2.0 and indicative site coverage of 45-50% are outlined. Higher plot ratio and site coverage may be permitted in certain circumstances.
- 7.3.17. The permitted development has a floor area of 203.8 sq.m and the proposed development has a floor area of 57 sq.m. on an overall site area of 168 sq.m. I calculate an overall plot ratio of 1.55 which is in line with development plan recommendations. The first party outlines that the proposal will result in a site coverage of 78% which is in excess of the development plan recommended standards however the development plan notes that higher levels may be permitted. Whilst the site location may be appropriate for increased plot ratio and site coverage, having regard to the concerns outlined above regarding failure to achieve overall standards to provide for satisfactory residential amenity for residents of the permitted and proposed development, and to the restricted site size and configuration, I agree with the planning authority's reason for refusal relating to overdevelopment of this site.

7.4. Visual Impact

- 7.4.1. Existing development surrounding the appeal site includes a mix of red brick cottages as well as two storey dwellings of rendered finishes. The proposed two storey dwelling would have a flat roof with a height of 5.5 metres and be finished in brick on its front elevation and render to the rear. I consider the design, scale and material finishes proposed are appropriate in terms of visual impact on the streetscape at this location and within a Z2 conservation area.

7.5. Precedent

- 7.5.1. The appeal submission includes details of applications which are considered to demonstrate precedent for the proposed development. I do not consider the precedents referred to are relevant to the planning authority's reason for refusal or to the appeal site and I do not consider that these applications are appropriate precedents for the purposes of this case.

8.0 AA Screening

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

The subject site is located approx. 5 km from the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (site code 004024) and the South Dublin Bay SAC (000210).

The proposed development comprises a mews dwelling and associated ancillary works. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature and scale of the proposed dwelling and the serviced nature of the site.
- The location and distance from the nearest European site and the lack of any hydrological connectivity between the application site and the SAC/SPA.
- Taking into account the screening determination by the Planning Authority.

I consider that the development to be retained would not be likely to 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 permission be refused for the reasons and considerations set out below.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 10.1. Having regard to the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and to Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024), it is considered that the proposed development, by reason of the restricted overall site size, proximity to the permitted dwelling at 23 Blessington Street, and to the design and layout proposed, would result in an unsatisfactory standard of residential amenity in terms of failure to provide for adequate private open space for future occupants of the permitted development at No. 23 Blessington Street and of the proposed mews dwelling by reason of the poor quality layout, lack of adequate storage and inadequate private open space. The proposal would also be subject to significant overbearing from surrounding properties and would itself have an overbearing effect on the rear of no. 22 Blessington Street. The proposed development therefore fails to comply with section 15.11.1 and section 15.13.5 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and to SPPR1 and SPPR 2 of Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) and would, therefore, by itself and by reason of the undesirable precedent it would set for similar development in the area, be contrary to proper planning and sustainable development.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Bernadette Quinn
Planning Inspector

24th September 2024

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-319802-24		
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a mews dwelling and all associated ancillary works.		
Development Address	Rear of No. 23 Blessington Street, Dublin 7, D07 DT6D		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	X
		No	No further action required
2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?			
Yes		Class.....	EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	X		Proceed to Q.3
3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?			
		Threshold	Comment (if relevant)
No		N/A	No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required
Yes	X	Class 10(b)(i) and (iv) of Schedule 5 Part 2	Proceed to Q.4

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

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-319802-24	
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a mews dwelling and all associated ancillary works.	
Development Address	Rear of No. 23 Blessington Street, Dublin 7, D07 DT6D	
<p>The Board carried out a preliminary examination [ref. Art. 109(2)(a), Planning and Development regulations 2001, as amended] of at least the nature, size or location of the proposed development, having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations.</p> <p>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</p>		
	Examination	Yes/No/ Uncertain
<p>Nature of the Development. Is the nature of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment.</p> <p>Will the development result in the production of any significant waste, emissions or pollutants?</p>	<p>Proposal for residential development on land zoned residential located in an existing urban area is not considered exceptional in the context of the existing urban environment.</p> <p>No, the proposal will be connected to the existing water supply and waste water drainage infrastructure.</p>	No
<p>Size of the Development 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 and / or permitted projects?</p>	<p>The proposed development seeks permission for 1 house on a site measuring 54.7 sq.m. which is not considered exceptional in the context of the existing urban environment.</p>	No

<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, or protected species?</p> <p>Does the proposed development have the potential to significantly affect other significant environmental sensitivities in the area, including any protected structure?</p>	<p>No, South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024) is located approximately 2.5 kilometres east of the site. North Bull Island SPA (004006) and North Dublin Bay SAC (000206) are located 4.3 km east of the site.</p> <p>There are no other locally sensitive environmental sensitivities in the vicinity of relevance</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Conclusion</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. • EIA is not required. 		

Inspector:

Date:

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

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)