



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-321037-24

Development	Construction of two houses and associated works including new vehicular access from Glandore Road.
Location	5B Griffith Avenue, Grace Park, Dublin 9, D09 AE81
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council North
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB1413/24
Applicant(s)	Gary O'Malley
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Rosemount Management CLG
Observer(s)	Paddy Brangan
Date of Site Inspection	14 January 2025
Inspector	Gillian Kane

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
3.1. Decision	3
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	3
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	4
3.4. Third Party Observations	4
4.0 Planning History.....	4
5.0 Policy Context.....	4
5.1. Project Ireland 2040: National Planning Framework.....	4
5.2. Sustainable Residential Development & Compact Settlement Guidelines ...	5
5.3. Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028	6
5.4. Natural Heritage Designations	8
5.5. EIA Screening	8
6.0 The Appeal	8
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	8
6.2. Applicant Response	14
6.3. Planning Authority Response.....	14
6.4. Observations.....	14
6.5. Further Responses	14
7.0 Assessment	14
8.0 AA Screening.....	18
9.0 Recommendation.....	18
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site is located at the junction of Griffith Avenue and Glandore Road, in the north Dublin suburb of Marino. The greenfield site was the rear garden of no. 5B Griffith Avenue – a single storey Gate Lodge extended to the rear. The site has heavy tree and shrub cover and no access to the adjoining roads.
- 1.2. To the north of the site is a part three, part four storey flat roofed apartment block Rosemount. Further north of this is the residential area of Glandore Park. To the east is the residential estate of Charlemont.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission was sought for the construction of two four-bedroom, semi detached houses (165sq.m. each) on a site of 515sq.m., to the rear of 5B Griffith Avenue.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

On the 25th September 2024, the Planning Authority issued a notification of their intention to GRANT permission subject to 13 no. conditions.

Condition no. 4 requires landscape and boundary details,

Condition no. 5 requires compliance with the Transportation Department requirements,

Condition no. 6 requires compliance with landscaping plan.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. **Drainage Division:** No objection subject to standard conditions.
- 3.2.2. **Transportation Planning:** Further information required regarding justification of proposed vehicular access, car parking spaces, auto-track drawings and details of the proposed entrance.
- 3.2.3. **Conservation Officer:** windows will overlook Marino Gate Lodge.
- 3.2.4. **Planning Report:** Opposed to loss of mature trees on site. Habitat concerns. Positioning of dwellings away from the main road is not optimum, applicant should be invited to address. External finishes to be addressed. Proposed houses would not negatively affect adjoining Gate Lodge. Notes the recommendation of the transportation planning department to request Further Information and concurs.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

- 3.3.1. None received.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

- 3.4.1. Issues raised can be summarised as follows: impact on adjoining gate lodge, over shadowing, loss of trees, safety of access, contrary to development plan policy.

3.5. **Further Information**

- 3.5.1. On the 29th May 2024, the applicant was requested to address six items of further information.
- 3.5.2. On the 27th August 2024, the applicant responded to the Further Information request, including in the response revised drawings, an Arboricultural Assessment, auto track drawings and details of the proposed boundary wall.

3.6. **Reports on file following submission of Further Information:**

- 3.6.1. **Transportation Planning:** Grant with conditions.
- 3.6.2. **Drainage Division:** Noted, no change
- 3.6.3. **Planning Report:** Response to Further Information is acceptable. Recommendation to grant subject to conditions.

4.0 **Planning History**

- 4.1.1. None on subject site.
- 4.1.2. On adjoining site to the east: Planning Authority reg. ref. **WEB2084/23**: permission granted for attic conversion to existing dwelling.

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1. **Project Ireland 2040: National Planning Framework**

- 5.1.1. National Strategic Outcome 1, Compact Growth, recognises the need to deliver a greater proportion of residential development within existing built-up areas. Activating these strategic areas and achieving effective density and consolidation, rather than sprawl of urban development, is a top priority.
- 5.1.2. Of relevance to the subject application are the following:
- **National Policy Objective 2a:** A target of half (50%) of future population and employment growth will be focused in the existing five cities and their suburbs

- **National Policy Objective 5:** Develop cities and towns of sufficient scale and quality to compete internationally and to be drivers of national and regional growth, investment and prosperity.

National Policy Objective 6: Regenerate and rejuvenate cities, towns and villages of all types and scale as environmental assets, that can accommodate changing roles and functions, increased residential population and employment activity and enhanced levels of amenity and design quality, in order to sustainably influence and support their surrounding area.

- **National Policy Objective 33:** Prioritise the provision of new homes at locations that can support sustainable development and at an appropriate scale of provision relative to location.
- **National Policy Objective 35:** Increase residential density in settlements, through a range of measures including reductions in vacancy, re-use of existing buildings, infill development schemes, area or site-based regeneration and increased building heights.
- **National Policy Objective 27:** seeks to ensure the integration of safe and convenient alternatives to the car into the design of our communities, by prioritising walking and cycling accessibility to both existing and proposed developments and integrating physical activity facilities for all ages.
- **National Policy Objective 33:** seeks to prioritise the provision of new homes at locations that can support sustainable development and at an appropriate scale of provision relative to location.

5.2. Sustainable Residential Development & Compact Settlement Guidelines

- 5.2.1. The 2024 guidelines expand on the higher-level policies of the National Planning Framework (NPF) in relation to the creation of settlements that are compact, attractive, liveable and well-designed. There is a focus on the renewal of settlements and on the interaction between residential density, housing standards and placemaking to support the sustainable and compact growth of settlement.
- 5.2.2. In accordance with the provisions of Section 34 of the Act when making a decision in relation to an application that includes a residential element or other elements covered by these guidelines, the planning authority is required to have regard to the

policies and objectives of the Guidelines and to apply the specific planning policy requirements (SPPRs).

5.2.3. Of relevance to the subject application are the following:

- Residential densities of 50-250dhp for city-urban neighbourhoods in Dublin and Cork with typical density range for low rise apartments – c.100-150 dph,
- **SPPR1** – separation distances of c.16m between directly opposing first floor windows
- **SPPR3**: In city centres and urban neighbourhoods of the five cities, defined in Chapter 3 (Table 3.1 and Table 3.2) car-parking provision should be minimised, substantially reduced or wholly eliminated. The maximum rate of car parking provision for residential development at these locations, where such provision is justified to the satisfaction of the planning authority, shall be 1 no. space per dwelling.

5.3. Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028

5.3.1. The subject site is zoned Z1: Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods in the 2022-2028 city Development Plan. Z1 lands have the stated objective to 'protect, provide and improve residential amenities'. Residential is a permissible use.

5.3.2. Policies of relevance to the proposed development include:

- **QHSN2**: To have regard to the DEHLG Guidelines on 'Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities' (2007), 'Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments' (2020), 'Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas' and the accompanying 'Urban Design Manual: A Best Practice Guide' (2009), Housing Options for our Aging Population 2019, the Design Manual for Quality Housing (2022), the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS) (2019), the Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2018) and the Affordable Housing Act 2021 including Part 2 Section 6 with regard to community land trusts and/or other appropriate mechanisms in the provision of dwellings.

- **QHSN6 Urban Consolidation** To promote and support residential consolidation and sustainable intensification through the consideration of applications for infill development, backland development, mews development, re-use/adaption of existing housing stock and use of upper floors, subject to the provision of good quality accommodation.
- **QHSN11 15-Minute City** To promote the realisation of the 15-minute city which provides for liveable, sustainable urban neighbourhoods and villages throughout the city that deliver healthy placemaking, high quality housing and well designed, intergenerational and accessible, safe and inclusive public spaces served by local services, amenities, sports facilities and sustainable modes of public and accessible transport where feasible.

5.3.3. Development management standards applicable to the proposed development are set out in Chapter 15 and Appendix 3 of the Development Plan.

5.3.4. Regarding **houses in side gardens / infill**, section **15.13.3** states that the planning authority will have regard to the following criteria in assessing proposals for the development of corner/side garden sites:

- The character of the street.
- Compatibility of design and scale with adjoining dwellings, paying attention to the established building line, proportion, heights, parapet levels and materials of adjoining buildings.
- Accommodation standards for occupiers.
- Development plan standards for existing and proposed dwellings.
- Impact on the residential amenities of adjoining sites.
- Open space standards and refuse standards for both existing and proposed dwellings.
- The provision of a safe means of access to and egress from the site.
- The provision of landscaping and boundary treatments which are in keeping with other properties in the area.
- The maintenance of the front and side building lines, where appropriate.
- Level of visual harmony, including external finishes and colours.
- Larger corner sites may allow more variation in design, but more compact detached proposals should more closely relate to adjacent dwellings. A modern

design response may, however, be deemed more appropriate in certain areas and the Council will support innovation in design.

- Side gable walls as side boundaries facing corners in estate roads are not considered acceptable and should be avoided.
- Appropriate boundary treatments should be provided both around the site and between the existing and proposed dwellings. Existing boundary treatments should be retained/ reinstated where possible.
- Use of first floor/apex windows on gables close to boundaries overlooking footpaths, roads and open spaces for visual amenity and passive surveillance.

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.4.1. North Dublin Bay SAC (000206) and North Bull Island SPA (004006) are approx. 5km to the east.

5.5. EIA Screening

- 5.5.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the development in an established urban area, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1.1. An agent on behalf of Rosemount (Glandore Road) Management CLG has submitted a third-party appeal against the decision of the Planning Authority to grant permission. The appeal submission provides details of the location and site description, noting that the Gate Lodge is included on the NIAH with a regional status and that it will be considered for addition on the RPS at review stage. The appeal provides a list of policies in the city development plan that are relevant to the proposed development and details of the planning history. Details of the proposed development and the observations made to the City Council are provided.

6.1.2. The grounds of the appeal can be summarised as follows:

Architectural Heritage

- Negative visual impact on a prominent junction with a historical building included in the NIAH.
- Policy BHA4 requires the Planning Authority to have regard to the NIAH rating and so the impact of the proposed development on the Gate Lodge must be assessed.
- The proposed development is wholly inadequate for the subject location, with no regard for the NIAH structure, the existing boundary treatment or pattern of development in the area.
- The location of the rear of the houses to the main thoroughfare is contrary to good practice.
- The trees to be retained will cast significant shadow on the proposed dwellings and will likely be removed by future residents.
- The existing boundary of painted railings is absent from elevational drawings.
- The proposed boundary on to Griffith Avenue is not shown or detailed. A fence would be inappropriate but the existing see-through railing would not be acceptable to residents.
- The Planning Authority noted that the existing boundary should remain in-situ in WEB1582/20.
- Section 11.5.3 of the development plan seeks to safeguard non protected structures which contribute to the character of the city. The proposed development is within the curtilage of the Gate Lodge and within the historical setting of the educational demesne. Section 15.15.2.4 of the plan recognises the rich and varied built heritage.
- The Planning Authority should refuse permission by reason of the two and three storey proposed development adjoining the single storey historic Gate Lodge is contrary to policy BHA4.

Development Plan Policy

- The proposed development is contrary to Development Plan policy on infill / side garden / backland housing.
- The Planning Authority are required to have regard to sections 15.13.3 and 15.13.4.
- The applicant has not met the criteria under section 15.13.3 for the following reasons:
 - Character of the street is not respected with rear of dwellings presented to the main road,
 - Bears no resemblance to adjoining dwellings, Gate Lodge or apartment in terms of proportion, heights, parapet levels or materials,
 - Negative impact on residential amenities of adjoining properties – two/three storey gable is 6.5m from the rear of the Gate Lodge with no assessment of overshadowing and loss of daylight / sunlight.
 - Proposed eastern gable of 8.05m will overshadow the private open space of Gate Lodge and the separation distance of 6.6m will have an overbearing impact
 - No spot levels or contour lines provided. Rosemount is elevated over the application site. The front of the proposed dwellings will directly overlook Rosemount balconies. Photo submitted. The balconies extend beyond the elevation.
 - Drawings are not correct as double doors are on the south elevation not the east.
 - The southern ground floor unit in Rosemount will be subject to noise and loss of amenity,
 - The retained trees will reduce the private open space which will be overlooked of the railing is retained,
 - No refuse provision proposed,
 - Proposed vehicular access so close to junction is hazardous,

- Landscaping and boundary treatments on Griffith Avenue have not been provided,
- No visual harmony with Gate Lodge or Rosemount,
- Gable wall elevation facing the corner is not acceptable,
- Appropriate boundary treatment not provided,
- Development is not of sufficiently high quality urban design,
- Proposed development does not comply with section 15.13.4 of the city development plan for the following reasons:
 - Insufficient separation distances to prevent overlooking,
 - Scale, form and massing is at odds. Under WEB1582/20 the conservation section required two storey extension that was much lower than subject proposal,
 - 6.5m between development and Gate Lodge is less than 15m required, and creates a rear garden of less than 7m,
 - Relaxation in garden depth has not been justified,
- Planning Authority should refuse permission on the grounds of scale and proximity to boundaries and Gate Lodge, prominent location, haphazard and piecemeal development that is out of character with development in the area.

Traffic Hazard

- New 3.5m access will cause a traffic hazard on the narrow 7m Glandore Road, close to the entrance to Rosemount and Griffith Hall apartments.
- Glandore Road junction with Griffith Avenue is busy and complex, providing main access to large secondary school, and lots of other schools in wider area.
- New cycle lanes on Griffith Avenue.
- Dublin City Council are aware of tailbacks at the junction.
- Two further junctions south of the subject junction can result in driver confusion. Long queues onto Griffith Avenue and Philipsburgh Avenue.

- Subject proposal should have required a traffic assessment due to junction on busy road with long tailbacks. Proposed access is less than 30m from signalised junctions requiring consent from Roadworks Control Unit.
- Hoarding on Glandore Road would restrict pedestrians and vulnerable road users. No construction management plan has been submitted.

Parking

- Parking spaces are not delineated on the drawings. Appendix 5 of the development plan requires demonstration of safe vehicular access and egress arrangements.
- Rational for the quantum of parking proposed has not been included, as required by Appendix 5.
- Manoeuvring within the site has not been shown. Proposed arrangements will require reversal on to Glandore Road.
- The proposed privacy strip to the front of the first house reduces the 5.19m depth available for parking. This is contrary to section 4.3.1 of appendix 5 which requires a car space of 3mx5m.
- Section 4.3.1 states that proposals will not be permitted where there is insufficient area to accommodate a car safely within the garden without overhang, where safe access cannot be provided or where visibility is restricted
- If gates are proposed this will cause vehicular delays on a very busy road, will cause parking on the footpath.
- No details of the common areas are provided, whether parking will be separated and whether right of way will be required.

Trees

- Subject site has mixture of mature trees that contribute to visual amenity and are of high ecological and biodiversity value. This was recognised in WEB1582/20.
- The trees form an important acoustic buffer.

- As per section 15.6.9 of the development plan, a tree survey must be submitted. Applicant has not submitted a tree survey, tree retention plan, tree protection plan, details of retained trees and their root protection area, Arboricultural impact assessment and method statement, boundary treatments, flora, fauna and ecological survey including bats and birds.
- The three trees to be retained do not correspond with the drawings submitted. Their RPA's have not been identified. Drawings provided under WEB2084/23 differs to the current application.
- London Planes on the western end of Griffith Avenue have been removed. Removal of trees from the subject site will result in greater visibility.
- The cutting back of the laurel hedge between the subject and appeal site has commenced and will continue. The applicant was advised of this.

Ecology and Biodiversity

- The applicant has not demonstrated that the development will not lead to a disturbance or destruction of roosting sites for bats, a protected species.
- No ecological assessment undertaken, no bird surveys.
- Griffith Avenue will be an ecological corridor as per policy GI02, Green Infrastructure Strategy.
- The proposal does not comply with Policy GI14 Ecological / Wildlife Corridors and should be refused.

Regulations

- Planning Authority are requested to note that the elevation on to Glandore Road is incorrect in relation to the setback to Rosemount.
- No spot levels or contour lines are provided.
- The development is for three storeys not two.
- A privacy strip is indicated on the plans but not the elevations.
- Elevations have omitted the historic railings on Griffith Avenue.
- Elevation of fence dividing the gardens has been omitted.

- Consent to carry out works outside of the site i.e. dish footpath has not been submitted.

6.2. **Applicant Response**

6.2.1. None on file.

6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

6.3.1. Board is requested to uphold the decision of the Planning Authority to grant permission. Board is requested to attach conditions under section 48, payment of a bond, payment of a contribution in lieu of open space (if applicable) and a naming and numbering condition.

6.4. **Observations**

6.4.1. **Paddy Brangan, 2 Glandore Road:** The proposed entrance is close to a dangerous bend where hundreds of children use the path daily. The site never had an entrance on to Glandore Road – photo submitted. Site should have only one house, in line with the apartments. Application should be rejected on health and safety grounds.

6.5. **Further Responses**

6.5.1. None on file.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1.1. I have examined the file and the planning history, considered national and local policies and guidance and inspected the site. I have assessed the proposed development. I am satisfied that the issues raised adequately identify the key potential impacts and I will address each in turn as follows:

- Principle of Proposed development
- Architectural Heritage
- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Traffic
- Boundary Treatment

7.2. Principle of Proposed Development

- 7.2.1. The subject site is located in an area zoned for residential development. I note section 15.13.3 of the 2022-2028 development plan wherein the Planning Authority state that they will favourably consider infill / side garden housing having regard to development plan policy on infill / side garden sites and to facilitate the most sustainable use of land and existing urban infrastructure. Subject to compliance with all other planning considerations, the proposed development is acceptable in principle.

7.3. Architectural Heritage

- 7.3.1. The appellant submits that the subject site forms part of the curtilage of the adjoining Gate Lodge, that the lodge is listed as being of Regional importance on the NIAH and that the impact of the proposed development on the historic single storey gate lodge should have been assessed.
- 7.3.2. The appellant notes that the Conservation Department of Dublin City Council commented on the application for a two-storey extension to the lodge (WEB1582/20) and recommended a single storey extension. In the subject appeal, the Conservation department comments that the proposed development will overlook the Gate Lodge.
- 7.3.3. The subject site formed the rear garden of the Gate Lodge and therefore is within the curtilage of the structure, notwithstanding that it is not a Protected Structure and that the red line boundary excludes the Gate Lodge. I note that on commenting on the adjoining planning application for the Lodge, the Conservation Officer notes that the Lodge will be considered for addition to the Record of Protected Structures at the next review. Policy BHA4 of the 2022 city development plan states that it is the policy of the council to have regard to the NIAH rating of a structure in the assessment of planning applications.
- 7.3.4. I draw the Board attention to policy BHA15 which seeks to encourage the encourage the appropriate development of exemplar twentieth century buildings and structures to ensure their character is not compromised. It is considered that the impact of the proposed development on the adjoining Gate Lodge has not been adequately addressed in the subject application.
- 7.3.5. I note the large-scale removal of the existing landscaping on the subject site. It is considered this will negatively impact on the context and setting of the Gate Lodge.

7.4. Impact on Residential Amenity

- 7.4.1. The proposed dwellings are approx. 5.4m from the rear elevation of the Gate Lodge. Two windows are proposed on the eastern elevation of the upper floor of the closest dwelling, both illuminating a stairwell. Notwithstanding the limited separation distance, I am satisfied that any overlooking would not seriously injure the residential amenities of the Gate Lodge.
- 7.4.2. The proposed dwellings are 5.19m from the northern boundary with Rosemount. I note the appellants submission that the balconies on the southern elevation have not been shown on the applicant drawings and that the separation distance between the two is not sufficient to prevent overlooking and injury to residential amenity. The proposed first floor windows on the northern elevation of the dwellings are (at the closest point) 10m from the balconies on the southern side of Rosemount. I note SPPR1 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines which requires a 16m separation distance between directly opposing windows at the rear or side of houses and apartment units. The eastern most dwelling orients the 'front' of the house to the north of the site, with the result that the front elevation faces the 'side' of the apartment balconies. SPPR1 states that there shall not be a minimum separation distance to the front of houses but I am satisfied that this does not apply to the subject site as it is not a case of two houses directly facing one another. The first floor bedroom windows of the proposed eastern most dwelling will be 10m from the private open space of the existing apartment block. The side windows of the westernmost dwelling will be 10m from the balconies. The heavy tree line that currently exists between the two sites will be removed on the subject site and could be removed on the adjoining site. So, no protection from overlooking will exist.
- 7.4.3. SPPR1 requires that the developer demonstrate that residents will enjoy a high standard of amenity and that the proposed development will not have a significant negative impact on the amenity of occupiers of existing residential properties. I am not satisfied that this has been demonstrated in the subject development. It is considered that the proposed development will cause significant injury to the residential amenity of the adjoining property to the north.
- 7.4.4. Were the subject dwellings rotated to face Glandore Road, the overlooking of Rosemount would be removed but it would cause overlooking of the adjoining Gate

Lodge. It is considered that the constraints of the site are such that one dwelling is the most appropriate response.

7.5. Traffic

- 7.5.1. It is proposed to create a new vehicular entrance on to Glandore Avenue. I note the comments of the Transportation department that this is acceptable and will not cause a traffic hazard. I consider Glandore Avenue to be the most appropriate location to vehicularly access the site.
- 7.5.2. I note SPPR3 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines which encourages the minimisation of car parking provision in urban neighbourhoods, with a maximum of one space per dwelling. I note the appellants submission that the spaces are not delineated and that on-street car parking will arise. It is proposed to create a communal car parking space to the north of the site. Drawings submitted with the application show three cars parked in this area.
- 7.5.3. I note the auto-track drawing submitted in response to the Planning Authority request for Further Information. The movement shown on the drawing that would allow the vehicle to exit the site in forward motion would not be possible were the two spaces to the front of the site occupied. This is not considered worthy of a reason for refusal however, given that the difficulty could be overcome by the creation of only two delineated car spaces on site.

7.6. Boundary Treatment

- 7.6.1. The subject site and the adjoining Gate Lodge site share a railing over low boundary wall fronting Griffith Avenue. Currently, a fence has been erected inside the railing. The presentation to Griffith Avenue is underutilised. Both sites would benefit from addressing this elevation sympathetically.
- 7.6.2. The subject application is silent on how the Griffith Avenue boundary will be treated. I note the comments of the appellant that the orientation of the dwellings to the north and west is at odds with the main thoroughfare on Griffith Avenue. I share this view and consider that any development on site should, ideally, wholly address Glandore Road. This would allow the pattern set by the Gate Lodge (gable elevation facing Griffith Avenue) to be replicated, would create sufficient separation distance to the adjoining apartment block and the Gate Lodge, and would allow the boundary

treatment to Griffith Avenue to be restored, thereby creating an attractive streetscape at this prominent location.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed residential development of two dwellings in a fully serviced built-up urban area, no appropriate assessment issues arise and it is considered that 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.
- 8.1.2. 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. 5km to the west of the North Dublin Bay SAC (000206) and North Bull Island SPA (004006). The proposed development comprises the construction of two dwellings on a greenfield site.
- 8.1.3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any appreciable effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is due to the small scale of the proposed residential development in a zoned and serviced area and the distance to the nearest European site and lack of connections.
- 8.1.4. 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.

9.0 Recommendation

- 9.1.1. I recommend permission be REFUSED for the following reasons and considerations:
 - 1 Having regard to the constraints of the subject site and the limited separation distances to adjoining residential development, it is considered the proposed dwellings would overlook the private open space of the adjoining properties, thereby causing injury to their residential amenity. Further, the proposed development fails to address main thoroughfare on Griffith Avenue and fails to establish a new streetscape or respect the existing boundary treatment on Griffith Avenue. The proposed

development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

- 2 The proposed development which is located within the curtilage of Marino Gate Lodge fails to adequately address the structure, a building identified as being of Regional Importance on the NIAH. Further the large scale tree removal required for the proposed development would negatively affect the context and setting of the Gate Lodge. The proposed development is therefore considered to be contrary to policies BHA4 and BHA15 of the Dublin City Council development plan 2022-2028, which seek to protect structures listed on the NIAH and buildings of twentieth century architectural.. The proposed development is considered to be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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.

Gillian Kane
Senior Planning Inspector

Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-321037-24		
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of two houses and associated works including new vehicular access from Glandore Road.		
Development Address	5b Griffith Avenue, Grace Park, Dublin 9		
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	Tick if relevant and proceed to Q2.
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			Proceed to Q3.
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
No			Proceed to Q4
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes		10(b)(i) construction of more than 500 dwelling units	Preliminary examination required (Form 2)
5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?			
No		Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q4)	

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Form 2 EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-321037-24	
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of two houses including new vehicular access	
Development Address	5B Griffith Avenue, Grace Park, Dublin 9	
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. This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.		
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	Proposed development of two dwellings of 330sq.m. on a greenfield site of 515sq.m.	
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	Greenfield site in an established residential / urban area that is zoned and serviced. 5km from any sites of environment interest.	
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	No impacts likely	
Conclusion		
Likelihood of Significant Effects There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	Conclusion in respect of EIA EIA is not required.	

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____
DP/ADP: _____ **Date:** _____
(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)