



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

### ABP-320023-24

#### Development

Revisions to previously approved planning permission (WEB1778/23):  
Removal of 2 dormers and installation of dormer to side; 2 rooflights; demolition of side extension & construction of utility space; widening of vehicular access, minor elevational alterations and all associated site works.

#### Location

24 Greenfield Park, Donnybrook,  
Dublin 4

#### Planning Authority

Dublin City Council South

#### Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

WEB1401/24

#### Applicant(s)

Sean & Catriona Curran

#### Type of Application

Permission

#### Planning Authority Decision

SPLIT DECISION

#### Type of Appeal

First Party

#### Appellant(s)

Sean & Catriona Curran

#### Observer(s)

None

**Date of Site Inspection**

2<sup>nd</sup> September 2024

**Inspector**

Gerard Kellett

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1. The subject site is located at 24 Greenfield Park, Dublin 4 which comprises an existing detached L-shaped bungalow with a converted attic. The area to the front comprises a lawn and turning area for vehicles. The rear area comprises a lawn area with mature trees along the northern and eastern boundaries of the site. An existing garage is site behind the existing dwelling. The front boundary comprises 1.2metre wall with hedging behind.
- 1.2. To the east is no. 22 Greenfield Park which two storey dwelling; to the west is no. 26 Greenfield Park which is also a two-storey dwelling. To the north is Greenfield Manor housing estate. Along the southern side of Greenfield Park there are a row of detached dwelling; further south is University College Dublin Campus. The site accesses onto Greenfield Park, which is a mature tree street. To the east (240metres) is the Stillorgan Road (N11) traffic signalled junction. There is a mature tree located in the grass margin at the outer edge of the footpath to the front of the site. The surrounding is residential character.
- 1.3. The subject site is not a Protected Structure or within an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA). On inspection of the site construction works where progressing regarding the recent permitted works under planning reference Ref: WEB1401/24.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1. Permission is sought for a revision to previously approved planning permission under planning reference (WEB1778/23).
- 2.2. Revisions include the following:
  - (1) Removal of 2 No. dormers to front/side and installation of 1 No. dormer to side and 2 No.rooflights to front/side
  - (2) Demolition of existing extension to side circa 12.5sqm & construction of new Utility space circa 17.5sqm
  - (3) Widening of existing Vehicular access from 3.0metres to 3.6metres,

(4) Minor elevational alterations and all associated site works.

- 2.3. The proposed dormer to the side would measure 3.4metres in width with a height of 2metres. The flat roofed dormer would comprise a bedroom area and be finished with a grey architectural planal that would match the permitted dormers to the rear elevation.

### **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

- 3.1. The Planning Authority issued a SPLIT DECISION permission on the 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2024 as follows below:

(Schedule 1) GRANT permission for the following: (1) The removal of 2 no. dormers to front/side and installation of 2 no. rooflights to front/side (2) Demolition of existing extension to side circa 12.5sqm and construction of new utility space circa 17.5sqm. (3) Minor elevation alterations and all associated site works, subject to 8no. condition(s).

(Schedule 2) REFUSE Permission for the following: (1) 1 no. dormer to side (2) Widening of existing vehicular access, for the following reasons:

1. It is considered that the proposed side dormer extension, which is orientated to face the neighbouring property with a distance of 3.5m to the boundary, would negatively impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring unit No. 22 Greenfield Park, would be visually incongruous to the pattern of development in the area and would contravene 'Z1' zoning where the zoning objective is to protect, provide and improve residential amenities. If granted the proposed side dormer would set an undesirable precedent for similar such developments in the City and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. The proposed widening of the existing vehicular to 3.6m is contrary to Appendix 5, Section 4.3 Parking in Front Gardens of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, which states that the maximum width permitted for vehicular

entrances serving a single residential dwelling is 3.0 metres. The proposed widening would also result in the removal of on-street parking spaces to accommodate a private vehicular entrances, which would be contrary to Policy SMT25, section 8.5.7 and appendix 5, Section 4.1 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022- 2028, which aims to manage on-street parking to serve the needs of the city alongside the needs of residents, visitors, businesses, kerbside activity, and accessible parking requirements. The reduced supply of on-street parking would detract from the convenience of road users and the residential amenity of surrounding properties, would be contrary to the stated policy and would set an undesirable precedent for other similar developments on adjacent roads. The development would set an undesirable precedent for similar developments, and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. The proposed widening of the vehicular entrance and associated dishing would result in the loss of, or damage to, the adjacent street tree and would therefore be contrary to Section 15.6.9, Appendix 5, Section 4.3.2 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and the Dublin Tree Strategy and would seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity. The development would set an undesirable precedent for other similar developments, which would in themselves and cumulatively, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

### **3.2. Planning Authority Reports**

#### **Planning Reports**

- The Planner's Report forms the basis for the decision; the report also provides
  - a description of the site, indicates the planning history, identifies the land use zoning designation and associated policy context from the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028.
- No concerns with respect to AA or EIA.

#### **Other Technical Reports**

- **Engineering Department Drainage Division:** No objection subject to conditions
- **Transportation Division:** Report received recommending omission of the widening of the entrance.

### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- **Irish Water:** No report received

### 3.4. Third Party Observations

One third-party submission was made on the application making the following points:

- Residential Amenity
  - Overlooking from proposed dormer
- Design

## 4.0 Planning History

**PA Ref: WEB 1778/23** – Refers to a GRANT of permission (1) Widening of existing Vehicular access, (2) reopening of existing pedestrian entrance with installation of gate (3) 6 No. Dormers (2 to rear & 4 to front/side (4) single storey extensions to rear/side, (5) demolition of existing single storey extension to rear & chimney stacks (6) Change of roof profile from flat roof to pitched roof to existing garage & extension of garage to rear to accommodate shed & minor alterations to fenestration to existing house and all associated site works

Notable condition(s) include:

No 6: The proposed widening vehicular entrance shall be omitted and shall not have outward opening gates. The development shall be served by the existing width entrance.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

The Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028 is the relevant development Plan for the subject site.

The site is subject to land use zoning “Z1” – (Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods) which has the objective *“to protect, provide and improve residential amenities”*.

#### Chapter 8 – Sustainable Movement and Transport

- Policy SMT25: To manage on-street car parking to serve the needs of the city alongside the needs of residents, visitors, businesses, kerbside activity and accessible parking requirements, and to facilitate the re-organisation and loss of spaces to serve sustainable development targets such as in relation to, sustainable transport provision, greening initiatives, sustainable urban drainage, access to new developments, or public realm improvements.

#### Chapter 10 – Green Infrastructure and Recreation

- Policy GI41: Protect Existing Trees as Part of New Development To protect existing trees as part of new development, particularly those that are of visual, biodiversity or amenity quality and significance. There will be a presumption in favour of retaining and safeguarding trees that make a valuable contribution to the environment.

#### Chapter 15 – Development Standards

- 15.6.9 Trees and Hedgerows
  - Trees and hedgerows add a sense of character, maturity and provide valuable screening, shelter and privacy and will often have a useful life expectancy beyond the life of new buildings. Dublin City Council will seek to protect existing trees and hedgerows when granting planning

permission for developments and will seek to ensure maximum retention, preservation and management of important trees, groups of trees, and hedges as set out in Section 10.5.7 of the plan

- 15.6.10 Tree Removal
  - Where a proposal impacts on trees within the public realm, a revised design will need to be considered to avoid conflicts with street trees. Where a conflict is unavoidable and where a tree, located on-street, requires removal to facilitate a new development or widened vehicular entrance and cannot be conveniently relocated within the public domain, then when agreed by Parks Services and the Planning Department by way of condition to a grant of permission, a financial contribution will be required in lieu. The financial contribution is calculated by the Capital Asset Value for Amenity Trees (CAVAT) by an Arboriculturist. The payment is required to be lodged with Dublin City Council before the tree can be removed.

Volume 2 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 contains a number of appendices containing notes and standards for various development types.

Appendix 5 (Transport and Mobility: Technical Requirements):

- 4.1 On Street Parking – *There will be a presumption against the removal of on-street parking spaces to facilitate the provision of vehicular entrances to single dwellings in predominantly residential areas where residents are largely reliant on on-street car-parking spaces or where there is a demand for public parking serving other uses in the area. Where new residential developments result in the removal of on-street parking spaces or where no parking is provided for new residential developments, residents of these dwellings will not automatically be entitled to a parking permit. In this instance, the issuing of a parking permit will be based on the current capacity of the permit parking scheme in question*
- 4.3 Parking in Front Gardens



- 4.3.1 Dimensions and Surfacing – *Vehicular entrances shall be designed to avoid creation of a traffic hazard for passing traffic and conflict with pedestrians. Where a new entrance onto a public road is proposed, the Council will have regard to the road and footway layout, the impact on on-street parking provision (formal or informal), the traffic conditions on the road and available sightlines.*

*For a single residential dwelling, the vehicular opening proposed shall be at least 2.5 metres or at most 3 metres in width and shall not have outward opening gates.*

*Where a shared entrance for two residential dwellings is proposed, this width may increase to a maximum of 4 metres...*

- 4.3.2 Impact on Street Trees – *In all cases, the proposed vehicular entrance shall not interfere with any street trees. Proposals to provide a new entrance or widen an existing vehicular entrance that would result in the removal of, or damage to, a street tree will not generally be permitted and where permitted in exceptional circumstances, must be mitigated. Where a street tree is located in close proximity to a vehicular entrance, protective measures shall be implemented during construction to safeguard against any damage caused and a financial security required to cover any damage caused (see Chapter 15 for further details).*

*The extent of the associated dishing of the footpath and kerb for a vehicular entrance shall not negatively impact on existing street trees and tree root zone. A minimum clearance will be required from the surface of the tree trunk to the proposed edge of the dishing. Figure 1 illustrates the various minimum clearance distances required, based on the maturity of the street tree. In the event the minimum clearance cannot be achieved, consultation with the Parks, Biodiversity and Landscape Services Department will be required to ascertain the*

*acceptability of the potential loss of a street tree as a result of the proposed development and associated dishing.*

- Appendix 18 (Ancillary Residential Accommodation):
  - 1.0 Residential Extensions
  - 4.0 Alterations at Roof Level/ Attics/ Dormers/ Additional Floors
  - 5.0 Attic Conversions / Dormer Windows

## **5.2. 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:

- South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024) 1.5km to the east of the subject site.
- South Dublin Bay SAC (000210) 1.5km to the east of the subject site.
- South Dublin Bay (Proposed Natural Heritage Areas) 1.5km to the east of the subject site.

## **5.3. EIA Screening**

Refer to Appendix 1 – Form 1. Having regard to the nature of the proposed development, it is not considered 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 decision of Dublin City Council to refuse planning permission for the proposed dormer window to the side and for widening the existing vehicular entrance. The main grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- Access & Impact on Tree
  - Widening of vehicular entrance would be 0.5metres which is very minor and is for the purpose of public and private traffic safety.
  - There is no change to the existing dished curb The existing pillar would be relocated only.
  - There would be no impact on the adjoining tree and would comply with section 4.3.2 of the Development Plan.
- Design
  - Proposed dormer is set back from the adjoining road and would not be too dissimilar to the permitted dormers to the front and rear elevations.
  - Request the board could impose a condition indicating the applicant agree a revised design with the Planning Authority.
- Residential Amenity
  - The proposed dormer would not be glazed and as such there would be no issues with regard to sunlight, daylight, overlooking and overshadowing.

### **6.2. Planning Authority Response**

Response received dated 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2024 requesting the Board to uphold the decision of the Planning Authority and if permissions if granted a payment of a section 48 development contribution condition should be attached in any final grant of permission.

### **6.3. Observations**

None

## 7.0 Assessment

This is a first party appeal which seeks to overcome the reasons for refusal which relate to a dormer to the eastern side of the existing dwelling and the proposed widening of the existing entrance.

Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions 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:

- Principle of Development
- Access & Impact on Street Tree
- Design
- Residential Amenity

### 7.1. Principle of Development

- 7.1.1. The subject site is zoned “Z1” – (Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods) as per the Dublin City Council Development Plan 2022 – 2028 which has the objective “*to protect, provide and improve residential amenities*”. The subject site relates to an existing dwelling where extensions and alterations to the existing site can be considered. Therefore, the principle of the development is deemed acceptable, subject to normal planning considerations.

### 7.2. Access & Impact on Street Tree

- 7.2.1. The issue with regard to loss of on street parking and the widening of the existing entrance has been raised as a reason for refusal by the Planning Authority. The Planning Authority in their reasons for refusal stated the proposed development would be contrary to Policy SMT25 which seeks to manage on-street car parking; section 4.1 (On Street Parking) which states there will be a presumption against the removal of on-street parking spaces and section 4.3.1 (Dimensions and Surfacing)

which states that a proposed vehicular opening shall be at least 2.5 metres or at most 3.0 metres in width

- 7.2.2. The grounds of appeal state the widening of the vehicular entrance would be 0.6metres in total which in the applicant's view is very minor and is for the purpose of public and private traffic safety and that no change to the existing dishd curbing is required. The applicant states the existing white lined parking is faded, narrow, poorly maintained and is of continuous length and not divided into spaces.
- 7.2.3. I would have no objection in principle regarding the widening of the existing entrance from 3.0metres to 3.6metres and would consider the works to be minor in nature. I note that the neighbouring property to the west no.26 has an entrance greater than 3metres. I could not verify whether permission had been obtained for these works but in my view the kerb and footpath would appear to be recently dishd.
- 7.2.4. Given the context of the site and character of the area I do not consider that the increase in width of the vehicular entrance by 0.6 metres would cause any significant harmful visual impact to the streetscape. Notwithstanding, it is my view that consequences of widening of the entrance from 3.0 metres to 3.6 metres would result in the loss of a formal 'pay and display' car parking space along the public road which I consider on balance is unacceptable and as such would be contrary to policy SMT 25 of the Dublin City Development Plan which aims to manage on street parking and section 4.1 (On Street Parking) of the Development Plan which states there will be a presumption against the removal of on-street parking spaces.
- 7.2.5. The Planning Authority also included in their reasons for refusal that the other consequences of widening the entrance would result in the loss/damage to an adjacent street tree that is located on the grass margin and as such would be contrary to section 15.5.10 (Tree Removal) and section 4.3.2 of the Development Plan (Impact on Street Trees).
- 7.2.6. The grounds of appeal state that there would be no change proposed to the existing dishd kerb, with the proposal only to move the existing pier 0.6metres along the

existing roadside boundary and states there would be no impact on the adjoining tree as a result.

- 7.2.7. I note both the reason for refusal and the grounds of the appeal relating to the existing street tree. I observed that there are roadside trees on either side of the existing entrance in particular this mature tree which in my view grouped with the other trees along the street enhances the character of the Greenfield Park area which is defined by a tree lined street. Notwithstanding, the tree itself is not protected and it is my view there been many replacement trees planted along the grass verge over the previous years which in my opinion have been accepted. If the Board were minded to approve the widening of the entrance, then a replacement tree could be considered in any grant of permission.
- 7.2.8. Having regard to the foregoing it is my view that the proposed widening of the existing entrance from 3.0 metres to 3.6 metres and the resulting loss of on street parking and as such would be contrary to policy SMT 25 and contrary to section 4.1 (On Street Parking) of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028.

### 7.3. Design

- 7.3.1. The issue with regard to design was raised as a reason for refusal by the Planning Authority.
- 7.3.2. Appendix 18 (Ancillary Residential Accommodation) Section 5.0 (Attic Conversions / Dormer Windows) of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028 states, *“Dormer windows, where proposed should complement the existing roof profile and be sympathetic to the overall design of the dwelling”... “The proposed scale of the roof should retain similar proportions to the building where possible”*
- 7.3.3. The existing dwelling comprises an L-shaped bungalow with a converted attic. The subject site has already permission granted under ref: WEB1778-23 to insert standard 4no. dormers to the front with 2no. flat roof dormers to the rear. The applicant is seeking permission for an additional dormer to the eastern roof slope.

The dormer would measure 3.4metres in width with a height of 2metres. The flat roofed dormer would be finished with a grey architectural panel that would match those permitted dormers to the rear elevation.

- 7.3.4. It is my view by reason of the size, scale and massing in particular the height set below the eaves would whilst being set to the side would complement the permitted flat roof dormers, be sympathetic to the overall design of the dwelling and in my view on balance acceptable in that regard.
- 7.3.5. I note the concerns raised pertaining to visual impacts from the Planning Authority. I have visited the site and viewed the development along Greenfield Park road from the approaching east and west. I am of the view that by reason of the existing dwelling being set back 15metres from the public road, the existing mature onsite vegetation that in my view aids screening of the proposal from the public road, the overall height of the dormer set down below the eaves and the use of contemporary materials, which I deem to be acceptable, would not appear excessively dominant in the streetscape and could be reasonably absorbed due to the built character of the area being large detached dwellings on large curtilages set back from the public road. As such it is my opinion that the proposed dormer would not have a significant visual impact to the built environment. I consider the visual impact on balance acceptable in that regard.
- 7.3.6. Having regard to the foregoing it is my view that the design and appearance of the proposed development would not cause any significant harmful visual impact to the area and would be in accordance with Appendix 18 (Ancillary Residential Accommodation) Section 5.0 (Attic Conversions / Dormer Windows) of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028.

#### **7.4. Residential Amenity**

- 7.4.1. The issue with regard to residential amenity was raised as a reason for refusal by the Planning Authority. I have viewed the proposed development from the adjoining property at no.22 Greenfield Park to the east.
- 7.4.2. The proposed additional dormer to the eastern roof slope would not be glazed which I deem to be acceptable and as such in my view would not result in any issues with regard to overlooking/loss of privacy. This could be addressed by way of an appropriate condition if the Board is of a mind to grant permission. The proposed additional dormer would also be set 5 metres from the roof plane to the common boundary with no. 22 Greenfield Park to the east which I deem to be acceptable and, in my view, would not result in any undue overbearing when viewed from this property.
- 7.4.3. Having regard to this separation distance which is acceptable it is my view that the proposed dormer would not cause any significant harmful impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of overbearing and overlooking.

#### **8.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening**

- 8.1. 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.
- 8.2. 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**

- 9.1. It is recommended a split decision be issued regarding certain elements of the application as outlined under schedule's 1 and 2 below.

## **10.0 Schedule 1**

- 10.1. I recommend that PERMISSION for "*Installation of dormer to side*" should be GRANTED for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

## **11.0 Reasons and Considerations**

- 11.1. Having regard to the nature, scale, location and design of the proposed development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would comply with the zoning objective for the site, as set out in the Dubin City Council Development Plan 2022 – 2028, would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenity of the area, and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## **12.0 Condition(s)**

1. The development shall be retained 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 existing dwelling and the proposed extension shall be jointly occupied as a single residential unit and the extension shall not be used, sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the dwelling.

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

3. No window shall be inserted into the dormer hereby permitted and of which shall remain permanently blank.

**Reason:**           **In the interest of residential amenity.**

4. The site development and building works required to implement the development shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1800 Monday to Fridays, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Public Holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

**Reason:**           **In order to safeguard the residential amenities of adjoining property in the vicinity.**

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

proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

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

## 13.0 Schedule 2

13.1. I recommend that PERMISSION for “*Widening of vehicular access*” should be REFUSED for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

## 14.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028, the Z1 zoning objectives (Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods) and the policies regarding on street parking specifically Policy SMT25 and Appendix 5, Section 4.1 (On street parking), it is considered the proposed development would be contrary to the relevant provisions of the Development Plan and would negatively impact on the supply of formal car parking in the area. The development would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

---

Gerard Kellett  
Planning Inspector  
21<sup>st</sup> October 2024

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.

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

<b>An Bord Pleanála Case Reference</b>			
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Revisions to previously approved planning permission (WEB1778/23): Removal of 2 dormers and installation of dormer to side; 2 rooflights; demolition of side extension & construction of utility space; widening of vehicular access, minor elevational alterations and all associated site works.		
<b>Development Address</b>	24 Greenfield Park, Donnybrook, Dublin 4		
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b> (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		<b>Yes</b>	<b>x</b>
		<b>No</b>	
<b>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?</b>			
<b>Yes</b>			EIA Mandatory EIAR required
<b>No</b>	<b>x</b>		Proceed to Q.3
<b>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]?</b>			
		<b>Threshold</b>	<b>Comment (if relevant)</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>x</b>	N/A	No EIAR or Preliminary

				Examination required
Yes				Proceed to Q.4

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

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 subject site is not located within or adjacent to any European Site. The closest European Site, part of the Natura 2000 Network, is the:

- South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024) 1.5km to the east of the subject site.
- South Dublin Bay SAC (000210) 1.5km to the east of the subject site.
- South Dublin Bay (Proposed Natural Heritage Areas) 1.5km to the east of the subject site.

The proposed development is located within a residential area and comprises, *Revisions to previously approved planning permission (WEB1778/23): Removal of 2 dormers and installation of dormer to side; 2 rooflights; demolition of side extension & construction of utility space; widening of vehicular access, minor elevational alterations 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:

- Small scale and domestic 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.