



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-319814-24

Development

PROTECTED STRUCTURE:

Retention of alterations, construction of terrace and all associated site works.

Location

37 Northumberland Road, Dublin 4,
D04 C1X3

Planning Authority

Dublin City Council South

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

3343/24

Applicant(s)

Wes Wallace

Type of Application

Retention Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Split Decision

Type of Appeal

First Party

Appellant(s)

Wes Wallace

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

11th December 2024.

Inspector

Gerard Kellett

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1.** The subject site relates to No. 37 Northumberland Road which is a two storey over raised basement semi-detached dwelling. The front elevation is in red brick with a projecting timber bay window at upper ground floor level, and coursed granite at lower ground level with brick window surrounds. The structure has decorative corbels at eaves level. The main entrance door is recessed in an external porch with arched brick and stone columns either side. The rear elevation is of masonry construction exposed with brick soldier courses over windows. There is an existing modern two-storey extension to the rear, with is set back from both boundaries. The site is listed as a Protected Structure (RPS No. 5900) within the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028.
- 1.2.** The site is located on west side of Northumberland Road. St. Mary's Lane is to the rear of the site where vehicular access is gained. The rear area comprises a hardstand for parking and a lawned garden. The southern rear boundary is defined by a stone wall approx. 1.8 metres in height. To the south is No.39 Northumberland Road which is also a Protected Structure of similar design. Many buildings along Northumberland Road are Protected Structures and are uniform in appearance.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1.** Retention Permission is sought for the following:
- 1) Alterations to the shape of the windows at the first floor of the rear extension.
 - 2) The conversion of the single window at the ground floor of the rear extension into double French doors opening onto the garden.
 - 3) The construction of a timber and metal structure with a screened terrace and a staircase connecting the first floor with the garden level; and all the associated site works.
 - 4) The conversion of a window at the first floor in the rear extension into a French door.
 - 5) Alteration of one of the rear windows at the first floor of the original building to convert it into a French door.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority issued a split decision on the 2nd of May 2024 as follows:

(Schedule 1) Grant permission for the following:

- 1) Alterations to the shape of the two windows on the rear façade at the first floor of the rear extension.
- 2) The conversion of the single window at the ground floor of the rear extension into double French doors opening onto the garden.

(Schedule 2) Refuse permission for the following:

- 1) The construction of a timber and metal structure with a screened terrace and a staircase connecting the first floor with the garden level.
- 2) The conversion of a window at the first floor in the rear extension into a French door.
- 3) Alteration of one of the rear windows at the first floor of the original building to convert it into a French door.

For the following reasons:

- 1) The terrace and trellis screening along with the single French door from the kitchen on the rear elevation and the single French door from the bedroom to the side of the rear extension at first floor level appear excessive and create visual clutter, which has an injurious impact on the rear elevation of the protected structure. The terrace also results in an unacceptable level of overlooking, loss of privacy and negatively impacts on the residential amenity of the adjoining property, no. 39 Northumberland Road. The terrace and trellis screening and associated doors therefore are contrary to Policies BHA2 and BHA9 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028, would create an undesirable precedent for similar type development and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

For clarity the trellis screen at the external staircase has now been removed.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planner's Report forms the basis for the decision, the report states:

- 1) Alterations to the shape of the windows at the first floor of the rear extension are considered acceptable as they form part of a modern rear extension. Whilst the Conservation Officer would have preferred the vertical emphasis of the original windows on the rear elevation to be mirrored by these new windows, the changes have already been carried out and it is considered that the horizontal windows are considered acceptable in this instance and do not impact negatively on the character of the Protected Structure. Retention of these windows is acceptable.
- 2) The retention of conversion of the single window at the ground floor of the rear extension into double French doors opening onto the garden is acceptable.
- 3) The construction of a timber and metal structure with a screened terrace and a staircase connecting the first floor with the garden level is considered excessive and would create visual clutter on the rear elevation, which has an injurious impact on the rear elevation of the protected structure.
- 4) The conversion of a window at the first floor in the rear extension into a French door. While this element forms part of the more modern rear extension and there has been no loss of historic fabric, it is considered appropriate to refuse retention for this element as without the terrace, this door is considered unnecessary and increases the level of overlooking to No. 39.
- 5) Alteration of one of the rear windows at the first floor of the original building and to convert it into a French door. This opening was originally a kitchen window, and the Conservation Officer has stated the loss of the original window has resulted in a loss of original fabric which has impacted the character of the Protected

Structure. This element of the development is therefore contrary to the zoning objective of the area and is detrimental to the character of the Protected Structure. Without the terrace this door is considered unnecessary and a window of the same dimensions and design as that removed should be reinstated within 3 months of the decision date of this application.

- 6) Overlooking – The Planning Authority also have concerns regarding the level of overlooking and loss of privacy experience by the neighbouring unit, no. 39, due to the presence of the terrace. The terrace is therefore contrary to the zoning objective of the area ‘to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas’ and is also not supported by the Conservation Officer as it has ‘an injurious impact on the rear elevation of the protected structure.

- No concerns were raised with respect to AA or EIA.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Conservation Officer (CO) – Requested further information

- The CO notes that the proposed plan drawings show a cyan hatch with the note ‘Cyan hatch indicates structures subject to Retention Application’. The photographs of the existing house and garden appear to match the existing drawings. The application shall clarify whether any of the proposed works have already proceeded and if there is any development that is subject to a retention permission application on this site.
- Modification of fenestration to rear elevation of extension: The proposed modification of the window to French doors on ground floor level is acceptable to the CO. The proposed changes to the rear window at first floor level would provide a more consistent fenestration pattern to the rear elevation of the extension. However, it is not clear to the CO why it is proposed to maintain the window opening with the horizontal emphasis. In the opinion of the CO, the window on the right, which has a vertical emphasis, is more in keeping with the character of the original windows on the house, and modifying the horizontal window to match,

would be more sympathetic to the character and rear setting of the protected structure, all subject to meeting the requirements of the Building Regulations. The applicant shall submit revised drawings showing the window on the right retained and the window on the left matching, including details and materiality of the proposed windows, for the written agreement of the CO.

- Construction of terrace and associated modifications to windows: The loss of the original window in the rear elevation is not supported to the CO. In the opinion of the CO, this would represent an unnecessary loss of original fabric and would cause damage the character of the rear elevation of the protected structure, as it is also proposed to provide a new door in the side elevation of the extension in order to provide access to the garden. Therefore, the original window in the existing kitchen of the protected structure shall be retained. The proposed modification to the door in the side elevation is considered acceptable to the CO. In light of the assessment above regarding the original window on the rear elevation, the proposed terrace and screen would be excessive and would create visual clutter on the rear elevation, which would have an injurious impact on the rear elevation of the Protected Structure. Therefore, the terrace and screen shall be omitted and a staircase only be provided from the first floor of the extension to the garden level. The proposed trellis screen in front of the boundary wall with No. 39 is not supported by the CO as it would result in a loss of character of the side boundary walls and would not be considered to mitigate overlooking issues. Therefore, the trellis screen shall be omitted. Revised drawings shall be submitted for the written agreement of the CO”.

Drainage Division – No object subject to conditions

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Irish Water – No comments received

Irish Rail – No comments received

Fáilte Ireland – No comments received

An Chomhairle Ealaíon – No comments received

Heritage Council – No comments received

An Taisce – No comments received

3.4. Third Party Observation

One third-party observation was made on the application from No. 39 Northumberland Road (to the south) making the following points:

- Residential Amenity
 - Overlooking/loss of privacy from terrace area and from side door of bedroom.
 - Overshadowing from timber trellis screening.
 - Loss of privacy from the side door to the extension

4.0 Planning History

PA REF: 2260/21 – Refers to a refuse of permission in February 2021 by Dublin City for alterations to existing front railings to provide new vehicular access and 1 no. off-street parking space and associated landscape works to front garden.

PA REF: 2878/11 – Refers to granted of permission in 2011 for the material change of use of the existing building from office to residential use.

PA REF: 0944/01 – Refers to a Split decision in 2001 for refurbishment of an existing two storey extension to the rear of their existing office premises at 37 Northumberland Road, to allow the continued use of this extension as an ancillary element of the permitted office use of the property, material works to the basement level including replacement of degraded floor surface with a concrete floor, new door openings, removal of specific internal walls, closure of door openings and other refurbishments detailed in the application documentation; the relocation of permitted car parking to the rear of the property and the development of 2 no. Mews dwellings to the rear of the property, fronting St. Marys Lane along with ancillary development. 37 Northumberland Road is a List 2 building (Protected Structure) in the Dublin City

Development Plan 1999. The Mews element of proposal was refused as it was deemed, they would be obtrusive and cause unacceptable overshadowing to the rear of the adjacent mews dwelling.

Enforcement

E0221/23 – Enforcement file opened in respect of the terrace area and the existing window replaced by a door.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028 is the relevant Development Plan for the subject site and the following policies and objectives are relevant below.

The site is subject to land use zoning “Z2” – (Residential Neighbourhoods Conservation Areas) which has the objective, *“to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas”*.

The subject site is a Protected Structure (R.P.S. No. 5900), 37 Northumberland Road, Dublin 4, D04 C1X3.

Chapter 11 – Built Heritage & Archaeology

- Policy BHA2: Development of Protected Structures
 - That development will conserve and enhance protected structures and their curtilage and will:
 - Ensure that any development proposals to protected structures, their curtilage and setting shall have regard to the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011) published by the Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht.
 - Protect structures included on the RPS from any works that would negatively impact their special character and appearance.

- Ensure that works are carried out in line with best conservation practice as advised by a suitably qualified person with expertise in architectural conservation.
 - Ensure that any development, modification, alteration, or extension affecting a protected structure and/or its setting is sensitively sited and designed, and is appropriate in terms of the proposed scale, mass, height, density, layout and materials.
 - Ensure that the form and structural integrity of the protected structure is retained in any redevelopment and ensure that new development does not adversely impact the curtilage or the special character of the protected structure.
 - Respect the historic fabric and the special interest of the interior, including its plan form, hierarchy of spaces, structure and architectural detail, fixtures and fittings and materials.
 - Ensure that new and adapted uses are compatible with the architectural character and special interest(s) of the protected structure.
 - Protect and retain important elements of built heritage including historic gardens, stone walls, entrance gates and piers and any other associated curtilage features.
 - Ensure historic landscapes, gardens and trees (in good condition) associated with protected structures are protected from inappropriate development.
 - Have regard to ecological considerations for example, protection of species such as bats.
- Policy BHA9: Conservation Areas
 - To protect the special interest and character of all Dublin's Conservation Areas – identified under Z8 and Z2 zoning objectives and denoted by red line conservation hatching on the zoning maps. Development within or affecting a Conservation Area must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting, wherever possible.
 - Enhancement opportunities may include:

- Replacement or improvement of any building, feature or element which detracts from the character of the area or its setting.
 - Re-instatement of missing architectural detail or important features.
 - Improvement of open spaces and the wider public realm and reinstatement of historic routes and characteristic plot patterns.
 - Contemporary architecture of exceptional design quality, which is in harmony with the Conservation Area.
 - The repair and retention of shop and pub fronts of architectural interest.
 - Retention of buildings and features that contribute to the overall character and integrity of the Conservation Area.
 - The return of buildings to residential use.
- Changes of use will be acceptable where in compliance with the zoning objectives and where they make a positive contribution to the character, function and appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting. The Council will consider the contribution of existing uses to the special interest of an area when assessing change of use applications, and will promote compatible uses which ensure future long-term viability

5.2. Section 28 Guidelines

Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011). These guidelines outline the responsibilities of the Planning Authority in preserving the character of protected structures and conservation areas within their functional area.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

The site is not located within or adjacent to any designated Natura 2000 site. The nearest Natura 2000 site(s) are as follows:

- The South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA) (Site Code: 004024), approximately 2.0km east of the site.
- The South Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (Site Code: 000210), approximately 2.0km east of the site.

5.4. EIA Screening

Refer to Appendix 1 – Form 1. Having regard to the nature of the proposed development, it is not considered a project that it falls within the classes listed in Part 1 or Part 2 of Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended), and as such preliminary examination or an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required in this instance.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first-party appeal has been lodged against the split decision of Dublin City Council to refuse planning permission for the following:

- 1) The construction of a timber and metal structure with a screened terrace and a staircase connecting the first floor with the garden level.
- 2) The conversion of a window at the first floor in the rear extension into a French door.
- 3) Alteration of one of the rear windows at the first floor of the original building to convert it into a French door.

The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- Built Heritage
 - The property previously functioned as an office.
 - The applicant has sought to restore the Protected Structure as a private residence.
 - The alterations to the dwelling represent a very minimal intervention to the original fabric of the Protected Structure.
 - The works are considered to align with the conservation philosophy of a 'minimum intervention approach'
 - The works are reversible.
 - For clarity the screen at the external staircase has now been removed.

- Reference made in the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy with regard the regeneration of historic buildings to provide contemporary family homes.
 - The reasoning and basis for the works carried out the accord with the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011).
 - Purpose of the works are to rebalance the elevations of the rear extension.
 - Prior to the works access the rear garden from the first floor was via the basement to a side door which connected to a side courtyard/walkway. This was very impractical from a means of escape and child supervision point of view.
- Residential Amenity
 - No. 39 Northumberland Road is not a private dwelling but a long-established office use.
 - There are no identifiable windows in the office. Windows exist at basement level with their primary function is to provide daylight into the offices.
 - The presence of mature trees screens views from the terrace in the direction of the office building.
 - The terrace to be retained is not an external amenity area, it is a transient space to facilitate movement between the dwelling and the garden area.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

None received.

6.3. Observations

None received.

7.0 Assessment

This is a first party appeal against a split decision of Dublin City Council to refuse retention permission for, *“The construction of a timber and metal structure with a screened terrace and a staircase connecting the first floor with the garden level. The conversion of a window at the first floor in the rear extension into a French door. Alteration of one of the rear windows at the first floor of the original building to convert it into a French door”*. For clarity the trellis screen referred at the external staircase has now been removed.

The reason for refusal relates to the, *“terrace and trellis screening along with the single French door from the kitchen on the rear elevation and the single French door from the bedroom to the side of the rear extension at first floor level appear excessive and create visual clutter, which has an injurious impact on the rear elevation of the protected structure. The terrace also results in an unacceptable level of overlooking, loss of privacy and negatively impacts on the residential amenity of the adjoining property, no. 39 Northumberland Road”*.

Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the submission received in relation to the appeal, and inspected the site, and having regard to relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are as follows:

- Built Heritage
- Residential Amenity

7.1. Built Heritage

- 7.1.1. The Planning Authority's reason for refusal for unauthorised works to the Protected Structure is on the basis that, *“the terrace and trellis screening along with the single French door from the kitchen on the rear elevation and the single French door from the bedroom to the side of the rear extension at first floor level appear excessive and create visual clutter”*.

- 7.1.2. I note DCC Conservation Officer raised no concerns with regard the modification of a window to a door in the side elevation of the non-original extension. The Conservation Officer's main concern is the loss of the original window in the rear elevation with a French door would represent an unnecessary loss of original fabric.
- 7.1.3. I note the grounds of appeal which states, the alterations represent a minimal intervention to the original fabric of the Protected Structure and that the works are reversible. The appellant considers the nature of the works have practical and modernising improvements for the property in terms of internal layout.
- 7.1.4. I have had regard to the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011) in particular Section 7.3 (Keeping a Building in Use) which states, *"It is generally recognised that the best method of conserving a historic building is to keep it in active use..., every effort should be made to minimise change to, and loss of, significant fabric and the special interest of the structure should not be compromised.* (Emphasis added).
- 7.1.5. In my opinion, the replacement of the large vertical emphasis kitchen window in the rear elevation of the original structure with a French door of similar size is acceptable. I consider this element would enhance the practical use/flow as a private dwelling. I concur with the appellant and I consider the level of intervention would be minimal with the length of the door size marginally greater than the window (circa 0.5sqm). In my view by reason of its proportions, vertical emphasis, dimensions and use of materials is acceptable and would be a sympathetic design and would seriously injure the character or setting of the existing Protected Structure. I note the original brick surround is been preserved along with a shutter box window above the door. Given the above it is my view this element would accord with the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011) and Policy BHA2 (Development of Protected Structures) of the Plan which sets out criteria for development of Protected Structures.

- 7.1.6. The alteration of the side window of the rear extension to a French door in my view represents a small intervention in a non-original extension. The proportions of the door opening in my view are acceptable and serve as a means of fire escape from a bedroom to a terrace area. Both new French doors at first floor level in my view would enhance the practical use/flow as a private dwelling. I note the concerns raised by the DCC Conservation Officer regarding the external staircase should only be provided from the first-floor bedroom of the non-original extension. In my view, the external staircase and terrace area is a standalone structure and is not physically connected to the Protected Structure. As such, I believe its presence has not caused any damage to or loss of the original building fabric, and it can be easily removed if necessary, making it a reversible addition.
- 7.1.7. I note the other proposed alterations granted by the Planning Authority, which it should be noted do not form part of this appeal. This includes changes to *"the shape of the windows at the first floor of the rear extension and the conversion of the single window at the ground floor of the rear extension into double French doors"* that open into the garden. These proposed alterations, which I consider acceptable, pertain to a rear non-original extension built around the circa 1960s. In my opinion, the rear window at the first-floor level and the double French doors would create a more consistent fenestration pattern for the rear elevation of the extension.
- 7.1.8. I note the timber trellis screen referred at the external staircase has now been removed. In my view the removal of the screening is a positive change and further reduces potential impact on the Protected Structure. I note this element is however still highlighted on the plans and particulars submitted with this appeal. If the board is of a mind to grant permission, I consider that revised drawings with its omission be conditioned. I have assessed the above elements of the subject development, and I am satisfied that they raise no fundamental issues which would merit refusal in their own instance

7.2. Residential Amenity

- 7.2.1. The issue with regard to overlooking and loss of privacy has been raised in the reason for refusal by the Planning Authority stating, *“the terrace also results in an unacceptable level of overlooking, loss of privacy and negatively impacts on the residential amenity of the adjoining property, no. 39 Northumberland Road”*. For clarity the screen at the external staircase referred to in the initial third-party submission from No. 39 Northumberland Road (to the south) has been removed which in my view does not pose any overshadowing in this case.
- 7.2.2. The Planning Authority considered the impacts on the residential amenity of No. 39 Northumberland Road. However, I note that the current use of this property relates to a commercial office rather than residential, which in my view is not sensitive use where hours of operation are mainly during daytime as opposed to a residential use. The terrace and staircase in question, which I consider acceptable, is positioned circa 4.5 metres from the southern wall of No. 39 Northumberland Road. Window locations of No. 39 Northumberland are located on the lower ground/basement level and provide daylight into the offices. Furthermore, it is my opinion the terrace and staircase acts as a transient space between the first-floor kitchen and bedroom with the garden area below. I consider the separations distances and positioning of windows acceptable.
- 7.2.3. Having regard to the above, I consider the development to be retained would not cause any adverse impacts on the amenities of the residential property to the south by way of overlooking or loss of privacy.

8.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening

Refer to Appendix 2. Having regard to nature, scale, and location of the proposed development and nature of the receiving environment and proximity to the nearest European site, it is concluded that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise as the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

9.0 Recommendation

I recommend that retention permission for: 1) *“The construction of a timber and metal structure with a screened terrace and a staircase connecting the first floor with the garden level. 2) The conversion of a window at the first floor in the rear extension into a French door. 3) Alteration of one of the rear windows at the first floor of the original building to convert it into a French door”*, should be granted for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the nature of the development to be retained, the provisions of the Dublin City Council Development Plan 2022 – 2028 and the policies regarding Protected Structures specifically Policy BHA2 (Development of Protected Structures), it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the development to be retained, would not seriously injure the character or setting of the existing Protected Structure at No.37 Northumberland (R.P.S. No. 5900), would not seriously injure the amenity of neighbouring properties, and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be retained and carried out in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority and the development shall be retained in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: **In the interest of clarity.**

2. The development hereby be retained shall comprise the following, 'The conversion of a window at the first floor in the rear extension into a French door and alteration of one of the rear windows at the first floor of the original building to convert it into a French door'.

Reason: **In the interest of clarity.**

3. Within 3 months of the date of the final grant of retention permission the applicant shall submit details to the Planning Authority for written agreement the omission of the timber trellis screen. Development shall there after only be retained in accordance with the agreed plans.

Reason: **In the interest of the protection of architectural heritage.**

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.

Gerard Kellett

Planning Inspector

23rd December 2024

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-319814-24		
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of alterations, construction of terrace and all associated site works.		
Development Address	37 Northumberland Road, Dublin 4, D04 C1X3		
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	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?			
Yes			
No	√		No further action required.
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes			
No	√		Proceed to Q4
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes			Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)
5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?			
No	√	Screening determination remains as above (Q1 to Q4)	
Yes			

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 2

AA Screening

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

The site is not located within or adjacent to any designated Natura 2000 site. The nearest Natura 2000 site(s) are as follows:

- The South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA) (Site Code: 004024), approximately 2.0km east of the site.
- The South Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (Site Code: 000210), approximately 2.0km east of the site.

The development is located within an established residential area and comprises the *retention of alterations to the existing building, construction of a terrace area and all associated site works.*

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 nature of the development.
- The location of the development in a serviced urban area, distance from European Sites and urban nature of intervening habitats, absence of ecological pathways to any European Site.

I consider that the proposed development 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.